[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 14:59
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.millier.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjections@gmail.com
Subject: Application Reference - PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 Letter of objection.

[redacted]

[redacted]

LETTER OF REPRESENTATION

Objection to Proposed Home Office Immigration Accommodation Site – Piddington, Near Bicester, Oxfordshire

From:
Alan Russell
[redacted]

To:

crowncasework@communities.gov.uk

Basis of Objection

I submit this representation [redacted] directly affected by the proposed immigration accommodation site at Piddington. My proximity to the site, daily reliance on local services, and familiarity with the area's infrastructure give me clear standing to raise material planning objections.

I also write as a legal professional, applying the statutory and policy framework governing planning decisions, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031, and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Based on all publicly released government information, the proposal is incompatible with national policy, contrary to the Cherwell Local Plan, and harmful to the local environment and community. It should therefore be refused.

- Conflict with National Planning Policy (NPPF)

1 - Unsustainable Rural Location (NPPF SS7–11)

The NPPF requires development to be located where residents have access to essential services, public transport, and sustainable infrastructure. Piddington is a Category C rural village with:

• No GP surgery
• No pharmacy
• No secondary school
• Minimal public transport
• No local policing base
• Limited road capacity

The proposed accommodation would place vulnerable residents in a location that fails every core sustainability test set out in the NPPF. It would force reliance on Ambrosden and Bicester, both of which already operate under significant pressure.

2 - Strain on Local Services (NPPF §§92–93)

The NPPF requires planning authorities to ensure communities have adequate social infrastructure. Current conditions in the Bicester–Ambrosden area include:

• GP practices operating at or above safe capacity
• Oversubscribed schools
• Stretched policing resources
• Extended emergency response times in rural areas

The proposal would significantly worsen these pressures, contrary to the NPPF's requirement to protect community health, safety, and wellbeing.

3 - Environmental Protection (NPPF SS174–182)

The Piddington site sits within sensitive rural landscape and ecological corridors. Government documentation indicates risks relating to:

• Protected species
• Noise and light pollution
• Increased hard surfacing
• Drainage and run-off impacts

The proposal does not demonstrate compliance with the NPPF's requirement to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

- Conflict with Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031

1 - Policy Villages 1 & 2 – Rural Protection

Piddington is designated as a Category C village, where development is strictly limited. Large-scale institutional accommodation is explicitly incompatible with the scale, character, and infrastructure of such settlements.

2 - Policy ESD13 – Landscape Protection

The Local Plan requires protection of rural character, tranquillity, and visual amenity. The proposed compound would introduce:

• A large, visually intrusive built form
• Permanent landscape disruption
• Increased noise and activity levels

This is contrary to ESD13's landscape protection requirements.

3 - Policy INF1 – Infrastructure Capacity

The proposal does not demonstrate adequate infrastructure capacity. The Home Office has not provided:

• A credible transport or traffic plan
• Evidence of healthcare capacity
• Policing and security assessments
• Emergency access modelling

This is a clear breach of INF1.

- Unsuitability of the Site for Immigration Accommodation

Government guidance emphasises that asylum accommodation should be:

• Safe
• Accessible
• Integrated
• Close to essential services
• Supported by transport links

Piddington meets none of these criteria.

The rural isolation would:

• Restrict access to healthcare and legal support
• Increase safeguarding risks
• Impede integration
• Create social isolation
• Increase reliance on overstretched neighbouring villages

This raises Equality Act 2010 concerns, as the location disproportionately disadvantages asylum seekers compared with urban alternatives.

- Environmental Concerns

The proposal presents multiple environmental risks:

• Flooding and drainage: Rural drainage systems are already strained; additional impermeable surfaces increase run-off risk.
• Biodiversity impact: The area supports protected species and ecological corridors.
• Traffic emissions: Increased vehicle movements through Ambrosden and surrounding lanes will worsen air quality.
• Landscape degradation: The compound would permanently alter rural character.

These are material planning considerations that have not been adequately addressed.

- Procedural and Transparency Concerns

The Home Office's site selection process appears to lack:

• Clear justification for choosing a rural Category C village
• Evidence of alternative site assessment
• Adequate community consultation
• Proper environmental impact screening
• Compliance with statutory duties under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

These deficiencies raise concerns about procedural fairness and public law compliance.

In Conclusion. For the reasons set out above, the proposed immigration accommodation site at Piddington is:

• Contrary to the NPPF
• Contrary to the Cherwell Local Plan
• Environmentally harmful
• Unsuitable for vulnerable residents
• Damaging to local services
• Inconsistent with statutory planning duties

I therefore request that Cherwell District Council and the Home Office withdraw or refuse the proposal.

Signed,

Mr Alan C Russell
[redacted]