[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 14:07
To: Crown Casework
Cc: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject: Formal Objection – Site A, MOD Bicester – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

[redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Proposed Home Office asylum accommodation, Site A, MOD Bicester
Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

I am writing to make a formal objection to the above application.

[redacted]

Highway and pedestrian safety

My principal concern regarding the surrounding road network is highway safety.

[redacted]. The B4011 is, in my experience, a dangerous road. Cars and motorbikes frequently travel at high speeds in both directions, and there are several tight corners and sections where visibility is restricted.

I have witnessed occasions where pedestrians or cyclists have caused approaching vehicles to brake sharply or swerve to avoid them.

My concern is therefore about the additional traffic and vehicle movements that would be generated by a development of this scale. The proposed accommodation could house up to 1,256 people, in addition to staff, coaches, minibuses and delivery vehicles.

I am concerned that the Transport Assessment does not adequately assess the particular risks associated with the road network serving Piddington. In particular, Widnell Lane, which provides the direct route towards Piddington, does not appear to have been subject to a traffic count, collision search or specific road safety assessment.

There are also existing narrow footways and relatively high vehicle speeds on the surrounding roads. I do not believe that the application has adequately demonstrated

that the additional traffic associated with the development can be accommodated without an unacceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety.

Impact on Piddington and its community

I am also concerned about the effect that a development of this scale would have on the character and day-to-day environment of Piddington.

[redacted].

The proposed development would introduce up to 1,256 additional residents immediately outside the village, alongside associated staff and visitors. This represents a very substantial change in the number of people regularly using the village and its surrounding roads and facilities.

My concern is not about the background or status of the people who may be accommodated at the site. It is about the scale of the change to the local environment and the consequences for families who currently allow their children to move around the village relatively independently.

As a parent, I would be significantly less comfortable with my daughters walking through the village on their own or even together if the number of people unfamiliar to the existing community increased to this extent. I would expect to have to accompany them for activities that they can currently undertake independently. That would represent a meaningful change to our family's use and enjoyment of the village.

I appreciate that this is a personal concern, but I believe it is relevant when considering the impact of a development of this exceptional scale on an existing small rural community. I would therefore expect the implications for community cohesion, safeguarding and the use of local facilities to have been properly assessed before a decision is made.

Flood risk and drainage

I am also concerned about flood risk and drainage.

The area around Piddington is prone to flooding. The application identifies approximately a quarter of the proposed site as having a high chance of surface-water flooding in any given year.

I am particularly concerned that the drainage arrangements do not appear to have been fully established. The site's existing private drainage ditches and pipework have not apparently been fully surveyed, while the drainage strategy remains subject to further work.

Given the scale of the proposed development, I do not believe that such fundamental issues should remain unresolved when the decision is made.

Infrastructure capacity

The proposed development would introduce up to 1,256 additional residents to the area. I am concerned that the necessary infrastructure capacity has not been demonstrated.

In particular, the proposed wastewater arrangements appear to depend upon confirmation that sufficient capacity exists within the local network. There does not appear to be confirmation from Thames Water that the network can accommodate the additional demand.

The capacity of the electricity infrastructure serving the site also appears not to have been fully established, with generators proposed to meet the anticipated demand.

For a development of this scale, I would expect the necessary infrastructure requirements to have been properly established before a decision is taken.

Scale and suitability

I am concerned about the sheer scale of the proposed development in this location.

Accommodation for up to 1,256 people represents a very substantial development in the context of Piddington and the surrounding villages. Piddington itself has a population of only around 300 people.

The proposal would therefore have a significant impact on the surrounding rural area and on the roads and infrastructure serving the local communities.

In my view, the greater the scale of a development, the greater the need for the applicant to demonstrate convincingly that the site is suitable and that the resulting impacts can be safely and sustainably accommodated. I do not believe that this has been demonstrated in this case.

Adequacy of the application

I am also concerned that a number of important aspects of the proposal have not been sufficiently resolved within the application.

In particular, detailed information appears to be lacking in relation to matters including the final site layout, external lighting, boundary and security arrangements and drainage.

I do not consider it appropriate for fundamental matters that could materially affect the impact of a development of this scale on its neighbours and the surrounding area to remain unresolved until after permission has been granted.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I object to application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

My objection is based on the suitability of the proposed site and the likely planning impacts of the development, particularly:

• highway and pedestrian safety;
• the impact of additional traffic on the B4011 and Widnell Lane;
• the impact of such a substantial increase in population on Piddington and its existing community;
• flood risk and drainage;
• the adequacy of local infrastructure and utilities;
• the exceptional scale of the development in the context of the surrounding villages; and
• the extent to which important aspects of the proposal remain unresolved.

I respectfully ask that these matters are fully considered before any decision is made and that the application is refused if it cannot be demonstrated that these impacts can be satisfactorily addressed.

Please confirm receipt of my representation and that it will be placed on the official case file.

Yours faithfully,

Jamie Sinclair

[redacted]

[redacted]