[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 13:43
To: Crown Casework
Cc: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk; [redacted]
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 Use of MOD A Site Biester for Asylum Accommodation Centre

[redacted] [redacted]

[redacted]

I would like to object to this proposal in the strongest possible terms for the following reasons.

Lack of Utilities & Infrastructure

The site does not have, and cannot be provided with, the necessary services of water drainage and power without either a massive negative impact on the existing local infrastructure or totally uneconomic upgrades to that infrastructure. Given that this application is for a temporary change of use, such massive expenditure is very hard to justify in the current fiscal climate.

The Utilities and Infrastructure Assessment states that the electrical network's "condition, capacity and configuration ... are currently unknown" and that "the capacity of the primary intake ... has not been verified at this stage". It recommends on-site power generation.

The use of temporary infrastructure arrangement eg onsite power generation, will result in pollution and noise from generators operating 24x7. It has been estimated by an independent chartered electrical engineer that based on the information available, a resilient temporary supply could require four 1MW generators, with three operating continuously. This could consume around 20,000 litres of diesel per day, requiring a 40,000 litre tanker delivery every two days.

Temporary infrastructure would result in a massive number of vehicle movements to deliver water and remove waste. This would cause further unnecessary pollution, as well as increasing the risk of accidents on an already dangerous road.

Noise Impact Assessment

The Noise Impact Assessment is totally inadequate in at least two major respects.

The very limited sample period takes no account of occasional but very loud and potentially psychologically damaging noise as follows

A military training area is located approximately 800 meters south of the proposed site where loud training takes place including gunfire and simulated explosions.

The very low overflight of large military aircraft based at RAF Brise Norton and supporting parachute training at RAF Weston-on-the Green.

The very low overflight of Chinook helicopters based at RAF Benson on low level training flights.

The sound of gunfire from occasional Clay Pidgeon shooting immediately adjoining the northern boundary of the proposed site.

While the local communities understand and accept these noisy activities, they could be very damaging to some of the "Service Users" and this risk must be taken into account.

Secondly, no account has been taken of the potential noise impact on the surrounding areas. It is very likely that a large number of "Service Users" along with the noise resulting from temporary infrastructure eg

electrical generators would introduce loud and intrusive noise into what the Noise Impact Assessment has identified as a currently very quiet rural environment where currently there is a low level of road noise and some bird song.

At the very least, some effort must be made to simulate the noise of the proposed site and measure its impact on the surrounding communities and to take this impact into account.

Conservation of Wildlife

The whole approach to the Conservation of Wildlife is this proposal is inadequate.

The entire ecological evidence base for a 1,256-person development on ten hectares of a wildlife-rich former ordnance depot is one field survey, carried out between 26 March and 10 April 2026, with restricted access, outside the optimal window.

The desk study was run against the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Environmental Records Centre. Piddington is in Oxfordshire. There is no reference anywhere in the application to a search of the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre, which is the records centre for Oxfordshire.

No proper assessments have been undertaken as is illustrated by the Planning Proposal Statement, paragraph 7.34, which lists in the future tense:

1. Arncott Bridge SSSI Impact Zone: “mitigation requirements to be discussed with Natural England”
2. Badgers: pre-construction checks recommended
3. Hazel dormouse: “further site surveys are required”
4. Bats (roosting): survey required
5. Bats (in trees): survey required
6. Bats (foraging and commuting): activity survey required
7. Breeding birds: “further surveys … are required”
8. Great crested newts: “further assessment required”
9. Reptiles: “a reptile survey is required and will be carried out

This application cannot be considered until all these Surveys and studies are completed without multiple conservation Laws being broken.

Lack of Detail Consistency and Accuracy in the application and its supporting documents.

This application is incomplete in multiple areas eg Wildlife Conservation Surveys and assessments.

It is inconsistent and incorrect in other areas. eg The site actually adjoins the B4011 road, not the B1104 (transport assessment, ten times); B0411 (planning statement); B4001 (geo-environmental); A4011 (heritage, three times).

If a commercial organisation were to make a planning application with a similar level of incompleteness inconsistency and inaccuracy it would not even be accepted for consideration by any competent Planning Authority.

Mike Ashton

