



Press Briefing: MOD Bicester Site A

About Wrong Plan. Wrong Site.

Wrong Plan. Wrong Site. is a community-led, non-political campaign challenging the proposed use of **MOD Bicester Site A** for large-scale asylum accommodation.

Our campaign is focused on the **scale, location, suitability and decision-making process surrounding the proposal.**

We believe major decisions of this kind should be supported by clear evidence, proper scrutiny and a transparent, lawful process.

Our position is about the proposal and the site - not hostility towards people seeking asylum.

What is being proposed?

The Government is considering using **MOD Bicester Site A**, a former military site between Piddington and Upper Arccott in Oxfordshire, as accommodation for people seeking asylum. The proposal is part of the Government's wider strategy to reduce reliance on asylum hotels.

The Home Office has submitted an **Urgent Crown Development application** in relation to the proposed use of Site A.

As of the latest Government information, **no final decision has been taken**. The proposal remains subject to planning, feasibility work, due diligence, assessments and approvals.

The Government has previously stated that the proposal could accommodate **up to around 1,250 single adult male asylum seekers**. Bicester Town Council has referred publicly to that figure in its correspondence about the proposal.

If taken forward, the Home Office says the site would be intended for use for a **minimum of 10 years**.

Why are we challenging it?

WPWS believes the Government has yet to demonstrate publicly that Site A is an appropriate location for accommodation on this scale.

Our principal areas of concern include:

Site suitability

Site A was not designed as a residential community. We want clear evidence demonstrating that the land, buildings and wider site are suitable for the proposed use.

Roads, access and transport

The site sits within a predominantly rural road network. The implications for traffic, pedestrian movement, public transport and road safety need to be properly assessed.

Infrastructure and utilities

The Government should demonstrate that the required electricity, water, drainage, sewage and other infrastructure can be provided reliably and at proportionate cost.

Health and public services

A development accommodating a large population needs a credible plan for healthcare, mental-health support and other essential services without creating unacceptable pressure on existing provision.

Community safety and safeguarding

The Government should publish clear, site-specific assessments showing how community safety, policing, safeguarding, walking and transport routes, vulnerable people and emergency planning have been considered.

Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner Matthew Barber has already raised concerns about the potential additional demand on local policing and has sought discussions with the Home Office about additional resources.

Cost and value for money

We want transparent information about the capital and operating costs associated with bringing Site A into use, together with the evidence demonstrating that the proposal represents value for taxpayers.

Transparency and local scrutiny

Local authorities have themselves sought further information from Government. Cherwell District Council says it was not consulted in advance of the announcement and has raised questions concerning operation, security, community safety and policing.

A site with history

This is not the first time this area has been considered for asylum accommodation.

A previous proposal involving Site A in the early 2000s went through an extensive planning process before ultimately being abandoned.

That history makes it particularly important that lessons from the previous proposal are understood and that current decisions are supported by up-to-date, site-specific evidence.

What are we asking Government to do?

Our central request is straightforward:

Publish the evidence. Demonstrate the safeguards. Prove the site is suitable before proceeding.

WPWS wants Government to provide clear evidence covering areas including:

- planning and the justification for the Urgent Crown Development route;
- site and land suitability;
- roads, transport and pedestrian safety;
- utilities and infrastructure capacity;

- healthcare and public-service provision;
- policing, safeguarding and community safety;
- environmental impacts;
- costs and value for money;
- accountability for managing and monitoring the site.

We do not believe communities should simply be expected to accept assurances where detailed evidence can and should be provided.

Our approach

Wrong Plan. Wrong Site. is:

Community-led. Run by local volunteers.

Non-political. We work constructively with representatives and organisations from across the political spectrum where doing so helps secure scrutiny of the proposal.

Evidence-led. We gather documentation, research and professional input and aim to distinguish clearly between established facts, outstanding questions and opinion.

Focused on Site A. We are not a general anti-immigration campaign. Our purpose is to scrutinise this particular proposal and its suitability for this particular location.

The campaign operates through **Bicester Countryside and Communities C.I.C.**

Media enquiries

We welcome enquiries from local, regional and national journalists covering MOD Bicester Site A, asylum accommodation policy, planning, infrastructure, community impact and the work of the campaign.

Email: wrongplanwrongsite@gmail.com

Website: wrongplanwrongsite.org.uk

Media assets, campaign updates and further information are available through our **Press & Media** section.