From:	Robert Cowell
To:	Crown Casework; public.enquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk; homeaffcom@parliament.uk; calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; bicester.garrison@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject:	MOD Bicester PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843: 3,510 figure, women's safety and safeguarding
Date:	11 September 2026 19:36:03

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing regarding the MOD Bicester Site A proposal, reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, and ask that this email be treated as a formal representation where applicable.

The current application states a maximum of 1,256 service users. However, a Government Property Agency unexploded-ordnance risk assessment dated March 2026 refers to a proposed scheme accommodating 3,510 service users. The Home Office says this was an earlier preliminary figure published in error. That does not answer the obvious question: why was a government-commissioned risk assessment being prepared around accommodation for 3,510 people if that capacity was never genuinely contemplated?

This needs to be considered alongside the safeguarding issue I have already raised. The Home Office has itself published guidance for asylum seekers covering gender equality, domestic abuse, sexual consent, the age of consent and harassment. Sexual-health services also include access to free condoms. I want to know whether condoms or other sexual-health provision will be supplied or made available at MOD Bicester, and what safeguarding assessment accompanies that provision. I am not objecting to contraception. I am asking why the Government simultaneously identifies the need for explicit guidance on consent, harassment and women's rights while proposing to place a very large population of single adult men beside a tiny rural community.

The women of Piddington are now publicly saying they are frightened. Piddington has around 350 residents, including only 133 women. The current proposal alone would place up to 1,256 single adult men nearby. The 3,510 figure appearing in government documentation makes their demand for answers even more urgent.

Please answer these questions directly:

1. Who authorised the 3,510 capacity used in the March 2026 risk-assessment documentation, and on what date was it reduced to 1,256?
2. Please disclose every document that considered capacities above 1,256, including 3,510.
3. What specific assessment has been made of risks to women and girls in Piddington and surrounding communities?
4. Did that assessment take account of the very matters addressed in the Home Office's own guidance on consent, harassment, domestic abuse and gender equality?
5. Will free condoms or other sexual-health supplies be provided on site or through arrangements made for residents, and if so what safeguarding planning accompanies that provision?
6. The Government describes this as non-detained accommodation. What powers will the site operator actually have to control entry and exit, and what restrictions, if any, will apply to residents' movements?

7. How many security staff will be on duty by shift at full occupancy, what will their powers be, and what police resources have been assessed as necessary?
8. What happens when a resident breaches site rules or behaves in a way that causes local residents to fear for their safety?
9. Has the safeguarding and policing assessment been modelled only at 1,256 residents, or has the Government also modelled the 3,510 figure found in its own documentation?

A leaflet handed to residents after arrival is not a substitute for a proper risk assessment before a site is approved. Nor is saying that an accommodation provider will manage the site an answer to the question of who has the legal power and resources to maintain public safety outside a non-detained facility.

The women living beside this proposed site deserve direct answers before any decision is made. Please place these questions and the 3,510 figure before the decision-maker before the representation period closes.

Regards,

Robert Cowell