From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Formal objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 07 September 2026 21:06:09

[redacted]

Formal Objection to Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a member of the public to formally object to planning application **PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843**, concerning the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

My objection is **not based on the nationality, ethnicity or immigration status of the individuals who may ultimately be accommodated at the site**. My concerns relate to the exceptional scale of the proposal in relation to the existing size, infrastructure, facilities and capacity of Piddington and the surrounding rural communities.

I respectfully ask that the following concerns are fully considered before any decision is made.

1. Disproportionate scale

Piddington is a very small rural community of approximately 315 residents. The proposed accommodation of approximately 1,250 additional people would therefore represent an increase equivalent to almost four times the existing population.

This would result in a population of approximately 1,565 people, meaning that the existing community would effectively have to accommodate a population almost five times its current size.

This is not a modest increase. It represents a fundamental change to the scale and character of the settlement and surrounding area.

The suitability of the proposal should therefore be considered not simply on whether the existing MOD buildings can physically accommodate this number of people, but whether the surrounding community, infrastructure and services are capable of supporting such a substantial increase in population.

2. Lack of local facilities

Piddington does not have the facilities that would ordinarily be expected to support a population of this size.

There is no village shop, public house or comparable local facility providing residents with everyday access to basic goods and services.

As a result, a substantial number of the proposed residents would inevitably need to travel outside Piddington for shopping, healthcare, recreation, essential services and other day-to-day needs.

This raises significant concerns regarding:

- public transport availability and capacity;
- additional traffic generation;
- pedestrian safety;
- access to healthcare;
- pressure on neighbouring communities and their facilities;
- access to shops and essential services;
- the capacity of local public services; and
- the ability of the wider area to accommodate such a substantial additional population.

The proposal should therefore be assessed in terms of its impact on the **wider local area**, not solely within the physical boundary of the MOD site.

3. Inadequate pedestrian infrastructure

One of the most significant concerns is the lack of adequate pedestrian infrastructure within Piddington and on the surrounding roads.

Piddington is a rural settlement and does not have a comprehensive network of pavements capable of safely accommodating large numbers of additional pedestrians.

The introduction of approximately 1,250 additional residents would inevitably result in significantly increased pedestrian movement between the accommodation site, public transport, neighbouring settlements and local facilities.

This creates serious concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety, particularly where people may be required to walk alongside rural roads without pavements.

A detailed and independent assessment should establish:

- anticipated pedestrian movements;
- likely routes;
- the adequacy of existing footways;
- road-crossing requirements;
- traffic speeds;
- visibility;
- accident risks;
- public transport access; and
- whether additional pedestrian infrastructure would be required.

4. Inadequate street lighting

There are also concerns regarding street lighting, particularly where lighting is switched off overnight.

The combination of a large additional population, rural roads, limited pedestrian infrastructure and inadequate overnight lighting creates legitimate concerns regarding both pedestrian and road safety.

It would be unreasonable to expect significant numbers of people to travel through an unlit rural environment without first establishing that the relevant routes are safe and suitable.

I therefore request that a specific night-time pedestrian and highway safety assessment is undertaken in light of the proposed accommodation.

5. Pressure on healthcare and public services

An additional population of approximately 1,250 people would inevitably create additional demand for local services.

It is therefore important that the capacity of the following services is properly assessed:

- GP surgeries;
- dentists;
- pharmacies;
- hospitals;
- ambulance services;
- mental health and welfare services;
- police;
- fire and rescue services; and
- other relevant public services.

It should not simply be assumed that existing services have sufficient capacity.

The proposal should be supported by clear evidence that relevant service providers have been consulted and that the additional demand has been properly assessed and appropriately resourced.

6. Emergency services and access

The rural nature of Piddington also raises concerns regarding emergency access.

The authorities should demonstrate that the increased population can be adequately served by emergency services and that appropriate arrangements are in place for:

- emergency vehicle access;
- evacuation;
- fire safety;
- medical emergencies;
- policing;
- safeguarding; and
- emergency communications.

Any potential increase in demand should be assessed against the existing capacity of the relevant services rather than considered in isolation.

7. Impact on neighbouring communities

Given Piddington’s very limited local facilities, many of the proposed residents would necessarily rely upon facilities and services in neighbouring communities.

The proposal could therefore place additional pressure on:

- shops and supermarkets;
- GP surgeries;
- dentists;

- pharmacies;
- bus services;
- railway stations;
- local roads;
- public spaces; and
- emergency services.

It is therefore essential that the assessment considers the **cumulative impact across the wider area**, rather than restricting consideration to the physical boundary of the MOD site.

8. Community cohesion and the character of the village

The introduction of a population almost four times the size of the existing community cannot reasonably be regarded as having no effect on the character and functioning of the village.

Piddington has developed as a small rural community. Introducing approximately 1,250 additional people would fundamentally alter the demographic and physical scale of the settlement.

This is not an argument against welcoming newcomers. Rather, successful integration and community cohesion require appropriate scale, facilities, transport, services and resources.

A proposal of this magnitude should therefore include a clear and credible strategy demonstrating how community cohesion will be supported and how both existing residents and those being accommodated will be able to access appropriate services and facilities.

9. Suitability of the site

The fundamental question should be whether this is an appropriate location for accommodation on the scale proposed.

The fact that the MOD site contains buildings capable of being converted into accommodation does not, in itself, demonstrate that the location is suitable for approximately 1,250 residents.

The suitability of the site should be assessed in the context of the whole environment in which people would be living, including:

- transport;
- healthcare;
- pedestrian infrastructure;
- lighting;
- shops and essential services;
- emergency services;
- recreation;
- access to support services; and
- the impact on surrounding communities.

A site which is physically capable of accommodating people is not necessarily a site which is socially, environmentally or infrastructurally suitable for accommodating them at this scale.

10. Request for full evidence and assessments

Before any decision is made, I respectfully request that the relevant authorities make available the evidence and assessments underpinning the decision to identify Piddington as a suitable location.

In particular, I request clear evidence addressing:

1. Highway and traffic impact;
2. Pedestrian and road safety;
3. Night-time pedestrian safety;
4. Public transport capacity;
5. Healthcare capacity;
6. Police and emergency service capacity;
7. Fire safety and emergency evacuation;
8. Safeguarding;
9. Waste and refuse management;
10. Water, sewage and other utilities;
11. Environmental impact;
12. Community cohesion;
13. Impact upon neighbouring settlements;
14. The cumulative impact of the proposed population increase; and
15. Why accommodation for approximately 1,250 people is considered proportionate and appropriate for a community of approximately 315 existing residents.

Conclusion

I respectfully request that the proposal is **reconsidered and refused**, or that a more appropriate and proportionate location is identified.

The issue is not whether people seeking asylum should receive appropriate accommodation. They should.

The issue is whether it is reasonable or sustainable to place approximately 1,250 additional people within a small rural community of approximately 315 residents which has very limited local facilities, no village shop or public house, inadequate pedestrian infrastructure and limited overnight street lighting.

Such a substantial increase in population requires considerably more than buildings capable of providing accommodation. It requires appropriate infrastructure, transport, healthcare, emergency provision, pedestrian safety measures, public services and a realistic strategy for supporting both the existing community and those being accommodated.

In the absence of compelling evidence demonstrating that these matters have been properly assessed and adequately addressed, I believe there are serious grounds to conclude that the proposed site is unsuitable for accommodation on the scale proposed.

I therefore respectfully ask that this objection is formally recorded and fully considered before any decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

