[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 18:45
To: Crown Casework; planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Objection to Planning Application mod Bicester site A **

[redacted]

[redacted]

Reference:- PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Dear Sir/Madam,

I [redacted] am writing to formally object to planning application concerning the proposed use of the former MOD Bicester Site A for asylum accommodation for up to approximately **1,256 people**.

I object because I believe the site is fundamentally unsuitable for a development of this scale. The application has not adequately demonstrated that the environmental, infrastructure, drainage, transport, public-service and residential-amenity impacts can be satisfactorily addressed.

1. Unsuitable and isolated location

The proposed development is located on a former military site in an isolated rural location, immediately affecting the small community of Piddington.

Accommodation for more than 1,000 people would be disproportionate to the size and infrastructure of the surrounding villages. Piddington does not appear to have the services, transport infrastructure or facilities required to support a development of this scale.

I am concerned about additional pressure on local roads, emergency services, healthcare, policing and other public services.

I request that the Council require:

- a detailed assessment of the capacity of local services;
- evidence from the relevant service providers, including healthcare, policing, fire and ambulance services;
- a full assessment of the development's effect on Piddington and nearby villages; and
- a clear infrastructure and service-management plan, secured by an enforceable planning condition or legal agreement.

2. Traffic, access and road safety

The local roads around Piddington are rural and are not designed to accommodate the additional traffic associated with a site of this size.

There will be movements by staff, contractors, deliveries, waste vehicles, emergency vehicles and other traffic. I am concerned that the existing road network does not provide adequate capacity or safe facilities for this level of activity.

The safety of pedestrians, cyclists and local residents is particularly important because the surrounding roads are narrow and have limited pedestrian infrastructure.

I request that the Council require:

- a comprehensive transport assessment based on the maximum proposed occupancy;
- traffic counts and modelling for staff, deliveries, waste collection, visitors and emergency vehicles;
- a road-safety audit covering all affected routes and junctions;
- details of pedestrian and cycling routes, lighting and crossing facilities;
- a construction traffic-management plan;
- an operational traffic-management plan; and
- enforceable conditions controlling delivery times, vehicle routes, parking and site access.

No development should commence until the Highway Authority confirms that the access arrangements and surrounding highway network are safe and adequate.

3. Diesel generators, air pollution and noise

I am extremely concerned about the proposed use of diesel generators and the resulting emissions and noise.

If diesel generators are required to provide substantial power for a development of this scale, the application should provide clear, independently assessed evidence regarding:

- the number, type and capacity of generators;
- their proposed locations;
- expected operating hours and frequency;
- nitrogen dioxide, particulate and other emissions;
- noise levels at nearby homes;
- cumulative noise and air-quality effects;
- fuel-storage and delivery arrangements; and
- emergency procedures in the event of generator failure or fuel leakage.

Piddington is a rural community, and residents should not be expected to accept continuous industrial-scale generator noise and emissions close to their homes.

I request that the Council require:

- a detailed air-quality assessment;
- a BS 4142 noise assessment and construction-noise assessment;
- a generator-management plan;
- continuous monitoring of noise and air quality where appropriate;
- limits on generator operating hours, except where required for genuine emergencies;
- suitable acoustic enclosures and silencers;
- safe fuel-storage arrangements; and
- a condition requiring the use of the cleanest practicable power source and connection to the electricity grid where feasible.

The Council should not approve the proposal unless it is satisfied that generator emissions and noise would not cause unacceptable harm to residents or the environment.

4. Light pollution

The proposed facility would operate 24 hours a day and would require security lighting, accommodation lighting, lighting for roads and parking areas, access-point lighting and other external illumination.

This could substantially increase artificial light in a relatively dark rural environment and adversely affect residents, wildlife and nocturnal species.

I request that the Council require:

- a full external-lighting assessment;
- a lighting plan showing the location, height, intensity, colour temperature and operating hours of all lights;
- evidence that lighting will be directed downwards and away from homes, roads and wildlife habitats;
- shielding and dimming controls;
- motion sensors where appropriate;
- a condition preventing unnecessary all-night lighting; and
- a post-installation lighting review, with corrective measures if unacceptable light spill occurs.

The lighting assessment should specifically consider the effect on protected bats and other nocturnal wildlife.

5. Drainage, flooding and wastewater

The area has a history of standing water and flooding, and the local ground conditions and drainage characteristics make this a particularly important concern.

The proposed development would introduce accommodation, roads, parking, hardstanding and associated infrastructure. These could increase surface-water runoff and place additional pressure on existing drainage systems.

The application proposes a wastewater treatment plant, but this does not remove my concerns. The Council must be satisfied that the proposed wastewater and surface-water systems can operate safely and reliably during heavy rainfall, high groundwater and flooding.

There must be no risk of untreated or inadequately treated wastewater entering surrounding land, drainage ditches or watercourses.

I request that the Council require:

- a site-specific flood-risk assessment;
- evidence of historic flooding and groundwater conditions;
- detailed surface-water drainage calculations;
- a sustainable drainage strategy;
- details of attenuation, storage and discharge rates;
- evidence that the drainage system can cope with extreme rainfall events;
- details of the wastewater treatment plant's capacity, maintenance and emergency arrangements;
- monitoring of treated effluent and discharge quality;
- a contingency plan for treatment-plant failure, power failure or flooding;
- confirmation from the relevant drainage and environmental authorities that the proposals are acceptable; and
- a condition preventing occupation until the drainage and wastewater systems have been installed, tested and approved.

The Council should also require a long-term management and maintenance plan identifying who will be responsible for the systems and how failures will be reported and remedied.

6. Wildlife and protected bats

I am extremely concerned about the demolition of existing buildings and the potential impact on protected bat species.

There are bats associated with buildings on the site, and I understand that some of the buildings proposed for demolition may have ecological value. Bats and their roosts are legally protected.

Demolition should not proceed unless a proper ecological assessment has established that there would be no unacceptable impact and that all necessary licences, mitigation and compensation measures are in place.

I request that the Council require:

- an up-to-date bat survey covering all buildings proposed for demolition or alteration;
- surveys undertaken during appropriate seasons and in accordance with current best practice;
- an assessment of potential roosts and commuting routes;
- confirmation that any required Natural England licence has been obtained before works begin;
- a detailed mitigation and compensation strategy;
- a lighting plan designed to protect bat flight paths and feeding areas;
- an ecological clerk of works during demolition and construction; and
- a condition preventing demolition until all ecological requirements have been satisfied.

The ecological evidence should be independently scrutinised before permission is granted . The scale of the proposal is disproportionate to its rural setting. Accommodation for up to 1,256 people would effectively create a substantial new community in a location that lacks the infrastructure normally expected to support a development of this magnitude.

The fact that the proposal is described as temporary does not remove the need to assess its full impacts. Temporary development can still cause significant environmental, traffic, infrastructure and community consequences.

I am concerned about the substantial cost to taxpayers associated with establishing and operating accommodation of this scale.

I appreciate that financial considerations alone may not determine a planning application. However, given the exceptional scale of the proposal and the public expenditure involved, there should be transparency regarding the cost, duration and necessity of the proposed arrangements.

It would be inappropriate for a development potentially costing hundreds of millions of pounds to proceed at an unsuitable location without demonstrating that the site represents a properly considered and sustainable

The individual impacts of the proposal should not be considered in isolation. The combined effects of additional traffic, generator emissions and noise, artificial lighting, wastewater and drainage infrastructure, flood risk, demolition of existing buildings and potential impacts on protected wildlife could be significant.

I request that the Council require a cumulative-impact assessment covering all of these matters.

[redacted], I believe the local community should not be expected to bear these consequences without compelling evidence that this is a suitable location and that all associated risks can be satisfactorily mitigated.

For these reasons, I strongly object to application **26/01833/CROWN** and request that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

**Malcolm **Tipping

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for iOS