From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Strong Objection - Piddington A Site near Bicester
Date: 05 September 2026 10:13:50

You don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed asylum accommodation at Piddington – Site A.

I believe this is fundamentally the wrong location for a development of this scale and nature. My objection is not about the nationality or immigration status of the individuals who may be accommodated there; it is about whether this particular site is suitable, safe and sustainable for the people being placed there, as well as for the existing communities who will be directly affected.

The location is simply inappropriate. Piddington is a rural and relatively remote area with limited public transport, services, shops, healthcare provision and other essential facilities. A large population being placed in such a location risks creating isolation for those accommodated on the site while simultaneously placing additional pressure on already limited local infrastructure.

The proposal needs to properly address how residents will access GP services, hospitals, pharmacies, shops, public transport and other essential facilities. These are not readily available within easy walking distance, and relying on surrounding towns to provide these services raises serious questions about transport capacity and cost.

Safety of women and children

There are also legitimate concerns about the safety and wellbeing of women and children living in the surrounding communities.

People should not be expected to accept a significant change to the character and population of their local area without proper consideration being given to safeguarding, policing, transport and the impact on the ability of local authorities and emergency services to respond effectively.

Women and children should be able to feel safe walking, cycling and travelling through their local communities. The fact that this is a rural area, with isolated roads and limited public transport, makes the question

of safeguarding particularly important.

I would therefore expect a full and transparent assessment of the likely impact on local policing, safeguarding, crime prevention, emergency response times and community safety, rather than simply an assumption that existing services will be sufficient.

Infrastructure and local facilities

Piddington and the surrounding villages were not designed to accommodate a sudden and substantial increase in population of this nature.

There are legitimate concerns regarding:

- Roads and traffic capacity
- Public transport
- Healthcare provision
- Emergency services
- Local policing
- Waste and refuse services
- Water and sewage infrastructure
- Local shops and other essential services
- The capacity of surrounding towns and villages to absorb additional demand

It is difficult to understand how a remote rural site can be considered appropriate without significant investment in infrastructure being made first.

Cost to the taxpayer

There must also be proper scrutiny of the cost to the taxpayer.

Local residents should be given a clear explanation of the total projected cost of establishing, operating, securing and servicing this accommodation, including transport and additional demands placed upon local public services.

At a time when councils and public services are already under significant financial pressure, it is entirely reasonable for taxpayers to ask whether this is an appropriate and cost-effective use of public money.

Impact on the local community and property values

The proposal will inevitably affect the surrounding community and raises concerns about the potential impact on local property values and the attractiveness of the area.

Residents have invested significant amounts of their own money in their homes and should not simply be expected to accept a development of this scale and nature immediately within their community without proper consideration of its potential economic consequences.

The character and amenity of an area are important factors when people choose where to live. A large-scale accommodation facility in an otherwise rural setting could materially change the character of the area.

The fundamental issue: this is the wrong site

Ultimately, I believe the most important question is why Piddington has been selected at all.

If asylum accommodation is required, it should be located somewhere with appropriate infrastructure, reliable public transport, access to healthcare, shops and other essential services, and sufficient capacity to support the proposed population.

Piddington does not have those characteristics.

Locating a large accommodation facility in an isolated rural area does not appear to be in the interests of the existing community, nor does it necessarily appear to be in the interests of the people who would be accommodated there.

I therefore strongly urge the relevant authorities to reconsider Site A and identify a location that is better connected, properly serviced and genuinely capable of supporting accommodation of this scale.

I would also ask that the following matters are fully investigated and publicly addressed before any decision is made:

1. A comprehensive independent assessment of the site’s suitability.
2. The impact on local policing and community safety.
3. Safeguarding arrangements for women and children in the surrounding community.
4. Emergency service capacity and response times.
5. The impact on local healthcare and GP services.
6. Transport arrangements and the additional cost to the taxpayer.
7. The impact on local roads and infrastructure.

8. Water, sewage and waste-management capacity.
9. The projected total cost to taxpayers.
10. The potential economic and property-value impact on surrounding residents.
11. Why this remote location has been considered preferable to a more appropriately connected site.

I fully support the principle that decisions of this significance should be made fairly, transparently and on the basis of evidence. However, that must apply to the local community as well as to those who may ultimately be accommodated at the site.

Piddington is simply not the right location for a development of this nature and scale.

I respectfully request that this objection is formally recorded and that Site A is rejected on the grounds of its remoteness, inadequate infrastructure and facilities, potential impact on community safety and the substantial additional pressures and costs it could place on local services and taxpayers.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone