

Planning Inspectorate
Crown Development Casework Unit
crowncasework@communities.gov.uk

07/09/2026

Dear Sirs

Application ref: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

I am writing to object to the above Crown Development Plan for Site A Bicester.

As the site was previously found to be unsuitable for a smaller accommodation centre proposed in the early 2000s, I do not understand what has changed that now makes it a possibility.

This new application and documentation seem rushed, incomplete and inconsistent; the application records the proposed development as a Secure Residential Institution, C2A which is for prisons and detention centres and in contrast to the government's description that residents will be free to come and go and surely is therefore not applicable for this application?

The Statement of National Importance confirm a capacity of 1250 men which is more than four times the entire recorded population of Piddington; however, I note that in another part of the application there is reference to residents numbering 3510, nearly three times the capacity stated elsewhere. This makes the application information appear very unreliable.

To further explore the inconsistencies in the application, we can take as an example that the location of the site is not even correct; it is noted as being in Essex in the transport assessment with the wrong road number given at least ten times. This could be the reason that no proper consideration has been given to road safety, the increase in traffic on a key link road between Thame and Bicester and a road that is totally unsuitable for pedestrians or cyclists.

The site is quoted as being' an irregular shaped greenfield area', yet it is actually noted elsewhere (correctly) that it's a 1943 ordnance depot with hardstanding, railway sidings, asbestos and possible unexploded ordnance. Just this latter point alone should lead to the conclusion that the site is unsuitable. Loca lpeople will have many stories of WW2 and post WW2 munitions activities at the site.

Further investigation evidences that no proper consideration has been given to the provision of mains services:

Sewage: there is no wastewater on site, the site has never been used for accommodation and the approach to drainage/foul water disposal is inconsistent: one document refers to a new on-site works discharging to a watercourse (drainage and utilities) and another states that “foul water will be connected to the mains” yet there is no evidence that Thames Water have confirmed this. The volumes of waste generated in a site this size would be considerable.

Water: the area already suffers from low water pressure and increasing demand to supply the residents of the site (whether 1250 plus staff or 3510 plus staff) would put an unreasonable demand upon the local supplies and lead to supply difficulties.

Flood risk: Piddington is a low lying village that suffers from flooding regularly; it is documented in the report that a quarter of the site has a high chance of surface water flooding in any one year which would be undesirable for the residents of the site.

D*ischarge* into local watercourses relating to sewage processing would greatly increase the risk of flooding to the village which lies below the site. At times the village can already become difficult to access during times of flooding and this site would exacerbate that due to run off, the size of local waterways and no suggestion of any drainage and water collection to mitigate the impact on the local area.

Power: relying on power generators at the site would be an excessively expensive route to go down as well as polluting the air and creating even more noise than that made by 1240 men (or is it 3510 men?). Piddington already suffers from frequent power outages so it is clear that the grid is not suitable for the site to be connected as it would be detrimental to the local area.

Heating: many of the occupants will have come from warmer climates and so a great deal of fuel will need to be provided to keep the place at a suitable temperature and provide hot water for the residents and staff. As the site currently has no accommodation, heating needs to be installed and fuel brought in to the site to satisfy this, along with the appropriate water supply.

Provision of services will bring many, many *lorry movements* along the local roads and on and off the site which will be dangerous for local traffic and residents. Add to this staff transport, minibuses to take the occupants into towns, fuel lorries, sewage lorries, water tankers, more fuel for generators etc.

Light pollution added to the noise alone from the 24 hour site (which it would be impossible to mitigate) is a further reason that this plan should be abandoned. This would put undue stress on the locals who moved to the village to get away from the noise and disturbances of living amongst many people and I myself am already experiencing anxiety around the prospect of this change to our environment.

Ecological concerns: we are fortunate to live in an area with a good deal of wildlife including rare animals. Great crested newts are found in local waterways - the applicant’s own ecological report says that their survey is not comprehensive and the wild flora and fauna will be seriously impacted by this site and the scale of development.

The proposal would have more weight if it were factually correct and consistent, there was evidence of a site management plan and that the names of all of the people involved in the assessments were not invisible.

I would also like to know why a proposal has been submitted with so many paragraphs redacted - what does the government not want us to see in the proposal?

I hope that the Planning Inspectorate will turn this proposal down for good. I should be grateful for acknowledgement of my letter.

Yours faithfully

