From: Stephanie Maria
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Formal objection- Piddington
Date: 13 September 2026 21:10:57

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

FORMAL OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL TO ACCOMMODATE APPROXIMATELY 1,250 MIGRANTS AT THE MOD SITE, PIDDINGTON

I am writing to formally object to the proposal to use the MOD site at Piddington to accommodate approximately 1,250 migrants.

My objection is not based upon the nationality, ethnicity or immigration status of those who may ultimately be accommodated at the site. My objection is based firmly upon the **exceptional scale of the proposal, the suitability of the location, the severe pressure it would place upon existing infrastructure and public services, and the likely consequences for Piddington and the surrounding rural communities**.

The proposed development cannot reasonably be considered in isolation from the village and wider area in which it is situated. Accommodating approximately 1,250 additional people in a community of approximately 315 residents would represent an extraordinary and unprecedented increase in population. The consequences of such an increase require detailed, independently evidenced assessment before any decision is made.

1. The scale of the proposal is fundamentally disproportionate

Piddington is a very small rural community with approximately 315 existing residents.

The proposal would introduce approximately 1,250 additional people — **almost four times the current population of the village**.

The resulting population would be approximately 1,565 people. In practical terms, this would mean that a community of 315 people would suddenly be expected to accommodate a population almost **five times its existing size**.

This is not a marginal or modest increase. It is a fundamental change to the scale, character and functioning of the settlement.

The question therefore cannot simply be whether the existing MOD buildings are physically capable of housing 1,250 people. The far more important question is whether **Piddington and the surrounding area are capable of safely, sustainably and reasonably supporting a population of this magnitude**.

I strongly believe that the proposal fails this fundamental test unless compelling evidence is produced to demonstrate otherwise.

2. Piddington does not have the facilities required to support a population of this size

Piddington is a small rural settlement with very limited local facilities.

There is no village shop, no public house and no comparable local centre providing everyday access to basic goods and services.

It is therefore unrealistic to assume that 1,250 additional residents could live at the site without creating substantial additional movement into neighbouring communities.

A population of this size would inevitably require access to shopping, healthcare, recreation, public transport and other essential services outside the immediate site.

This raises serious and unanswered questions concerning:

- the availability and capacity of public transport;
- increased traffic;
- pedestrian safety;
- access to healthcare;
- pressure upon neighbouring villages;
- access to shops and essential services;
- capacity within existing public services; and
- the ability of the wider area to absorb such a substantial additional population.

The impact assessment must therefore extend well beyond the MOD site's boundaries.

It would be wholly inadequate to approve the proposal on the assumption that impacts occurring outside the site are someone else's problem.

3. Serious pedestrian and highway safety concerns

One of the most significant concerns is the lack of suitable pedestrian infrastructure within Piddington and on surrounding roads.

Piddington is a rural settlement and does not have a comprehensive network of pavements capable of safely accommodating large numbers of additional pedestrians.

Introducing approximately 1,250 additional residents would inevitably result in a significant increase in pedestrian movement between the accommodation site, public transport, neighbouring settlements and local facilities.

People should not be expected to walk substantial distances alongside rural roads without adequate pedestrian infrastructure.

This creates legitimate and potentially serious concerns regarding:

- pedestrian safety;
- road crossings;

- traffic speeds;
- visibility;
- interaction between pedestrians and vehicles;
- accident risk;
- access to public transport; and
- the suitability of existing routes for substantially increased pedestrian numbers.

Before any decision is made, there should be a detailed and independent highway and pedestrian safety assessment addressing the actual routes that would be used and the likely level of pedestrian and vehicle movement generated by the proposal.

That assessment should specifically establish:

1. anticipated pedestrian numbers and movements;
2. likely routes between the site and neighbouring settlements;
3. the adequacy of existing footways and verges;
4. road-crossing requirements;
5. traffic speeds;
6. visibility and sight lines;
7. accident and collision risks;
8. public transport access; and
9. what additional pedestrian and highway infrastructure would be required.

Without such evidence, it would be premature and irresponsible to conclude that the location is suitable.

4. Inadequate overnight lighting creates additional safety concerns

There is also a significant concern regarding street lighting, particularly where lighting is switched off overnight.

The combination of:

- a very large additional population;
- rural roads;
- limited pedestrian infrastructure; and
- inadequate overnight lighting

creates a foreseeable safety issue.

It cannot reasonably be assumed that substantial numbers of people will be able to travel safely on foot through an unlit rural environment, particularly during winter months and hours of darkness.

A specific night-time pedestrian and highway safety assessment should therefore be undertaken.

That assessment should examine the routes likely to be used after dark and determine whether adequate lighting, footways, crossings or other safety measures would be required.

5. Unanswered questions regarding healthcare and public services

An additional population of approximately 1,250 people will inevitably generate additional demand for local services.

It must not simply be assumed that existing services have sufficient spare capacity.

Clear evidence should be provided regarding the ability of local services to accommodate the additional demand, including:

- GP surgeries;
- dentists;
- pharmacies;
- hospitals;
- ambulance services;
- mental health and welfare services;
- police;
- fire and rescue services; and
- other relevant public services.

The relevant service providers should be demonstrably consulted, and the additional demand should be quantified rather than addressed through general assurances.

If additional resources, staff, facilities or funding are required, those requirements should be identified and secured **before the proposal is implemented**, rather than relying upon already stretched services to absorb the consequences afterwards.

6. Emergency access and public safety

The rural nature of Piddington raises further concerns regarding emergency access.

The authorities should provide clear evidence demonstrating that emergency services can effectively serve an additional population of approximately 1,250 people at this location.

This should include specific consideration of:

- emergency vehicle access;
- response times;
- evacuation procedures;
- fire safety;
- medical emergencies;
- policing;
- safeguarding; and
- emergency communications.

The additional demand must be assessed against the **actual existing capacity** of emergency services.

It should not be assumed that existing arrangements will automatically remain adequate following such a dramatic increase in population.

7. The impact on neighbouring communities must be fully assessed

Given the lack of facilities within Piddington itself, it is inevitable that many of the proposed residents will use facilities and services in neighbouring communities.

The consequences could therefore extend well beyond the immediate site.

Potential additional pressure could fall upon:

- local shops;
- supermarkets;
- GP surgeries;
- dentists;
- pharmacies;
- bus services;
- railway stations;
- local roads;
- public spaces; and
- emergency services.

The cumulative impact across the wider area must therefore be assessed.

It would be a serious failure of the decision-making process to assess the proposal solely within the physical boundary of the MOD site while ignoring the predictable consequences for surrounding communities.

8. The character and functioning of Piddington would be fundamentally altered

Piddington has developed as a small rural community.

The introduction of approximately 1,250 additional residents would fundamentally alter its demographic, physical and social scale.

A population increase of this magnitude cannot reasonably be characterised as having little or no effect on the existing community.

This is not an argument against newcomers or against providing people with appropriate accommodation. It is an argument that **scale matters**.

Successful integration and community cohesion require appropriate infrastructure, transport, facilities, services and resources.

A development that increases the population of the village by almost four times requires a clear and credible strategy for supporting both the existing community and the people who would be accommodated at the site.

9. The suitability of the site must be considered in its entirety

The fundamental issue is whether the MOD site at Piddington is an appropriate location for accommodation on this scale.

The fact that existing MOD buildings may be capable of being converted or adapted for accommodation does not establish that the **location itself is suitable for approximately 1,250 residents**.

A building can be physically capable of housing people while the surrounding community remains completely unsuitable for supporting the resulting population.

The suitability assessment must therefore consider the entire environment in which residents would live, including:

- transport;
- healthcare;
- pedestrian infrastructure;
- road safety;
- lighting;
- shops and essential services;

- emergency services;
- recreation;
- support services;
- utilities;
- waste management; and
- the impact upon neighbouring communities.

Physical capacity is not the same thing as sustainable capacity.

A site that can physically contain 1,250 people is not necessarily a site that can safely, sustainably or appropriately accommodate them.

10. Full evidence must be provided before any decision is made

Before any decision is taken, I request that the relevant authorities publish or make available the evidence and assessments upon which Piddington has been identified as a suitable location.

In particular, I request detailed evidence addressing:

1. Highway and traffic impact;
2. Pedestrian and road safety;
3. Night-time pedestrian safety;
4. Public transport capacity;
5. Healthcare capacity;
6. Police and emergency service capacity;
7. Fire safety and emergency evacuation;
8. Safeguarding;
9. Waste and refuse management;
10. Water, sewage and other utilities;
11. Environmental impact;
12. Community cohesion;
13. Impact upon neighbouring settlements;
14. The cumulative impact of the proposed population increase; and
15. The evidence demonstrating why accommodating approximately 1,250 people is

considered proportionate and appropriate in a community of approximately 315 existing residents.

These should be substantive, evidence-based assessments rather than broad assurances.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I strongly object to the proposal to accommodate approximately 1,250 migrants at the Piddington MOD site.

The issue is not whether migrants should receive appropriate accommodation. **They should.**

The issue is whether it is reasonable, safe and sustainable to place approximately 1,250 additional people in a small rural community of approximately 315 residents which has very limited local facilities, no village shop, no public house, limited pedestrian infrastructure and limited overnight street lighting.

Such an extraordinary population increase requires far more than buildings capable of providing accommodation.

It requires sufficient transport, healthcare, emergency provision, pedestrian infrastructure, road safety measures, public services, utilities, recreation and support services. It also requires a credible and properly resourced strategy for protecting the interests of the existing community and ensuring that the people being accommodated can live safely and access the services they require.

At present, there are serious questions as to whether Piddington has the infrastructure or capacity necessary to support a development of this magnitude.

The burden should be on the proponents of this proposal to demonstrate, with clear and independently verifiable evidence, that the site is suitable — not on the local community to prove that it is not.

In the absence of compelling evidence that the substantial impacts identified above have been properly assessed, mitigated and adequately resourced, I believe there are strong grounds for concluding that the proposed site is unsuitable for accommodation on the scale proposed.

I therefore respectfully request that:

1. this objection is formally recorded and fully considered;

2. the proposal to accommodate approximately 1,250 people at Piddington is refused or reconsidered;

3. all relevant impact assessments and supporting evidence are made publicly available; and

4. alternative, more proportionate locations are properly considered.

A decision of this magnitude should not be based simply upon whether accommodation can physically be provided at the MOD site. It must be based upon whether the **location, infrastructure and surrounding communities can realistically and safely sustain the proposed population**.

I respectfully ask that these concerns are given full and proper consideration before any decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

Stephanie Kardos

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]