FORMAL OBJECTION – MOD BICESTER SITE A

Application Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Name: Simon Maxted
Address: [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
Date: 13th September 2026

Dear Crown Development Casework Unit,

I am a [redacted] resident and homeowner who managed to find my forever home in a quiet hamlet/village location with no crime and a reasonable commute to work. I have had previous mental health concerns delt with and am in a good place to keep them at bay after settling here.

My damaged hearing levels are easier to control here after struggling in noisy surroundings. Along with the lovely people of Piddington and its location, it is a wonderful place to be and fit in with all the hard work that has led them and myself to be here.

All of what has been assessed and proposed for this SITE A development, has been rushed and not conducted in a reasonable manner. Everything the government has TOLD us is going to happen, I am against. I have shown my objection to the site on the grounds of noise pollution both to and from. As below.

1. Noise Assessment – assessed by noise *into* the development, not noise *from* the development

I am concerned that the submitted Noise Impact Assessment does not adequately assess the effect of the proposed development upon existing residents and surrounding communities.

The assessment principally considers the existing acoustic environment, particularly noise from the B4011, and whether future occupants of the proposed accommodation would experience acceptable internal and external noise levels. Its conclusion is that the site is subject to negligible-to-medium risk from existing road traffic noise and that sound insulation may be required in parts of the development.

However, this does not appear to constitute an assessment of **noise generated by the development itself at existing off-site noise-sensitive receptors**.

The proposal includes or potentially includes generators, wastewater-treatment and pumping infrastructure, kitchen and servicing activity, refuse collection, vans, HGVs, coaches, shuttle minibuses, car parking, recreational facilities and accommodation for up to 1,256 people. The separate Home Office correspondence also specifically contemplates mitigation to control generator noise.

I have been unable to identify within the Noise Impact Assessment or any other documents predicted operational noise levels at representative existing residential properties arising from these sources. Nor does the assessment appear to contain a substantive construction and demolition noise assessment.

This is particularly concerning because only two baseline monitoring locations were used, both within or immediately adjacent to the application site, and the survey was undertaken over approximately one weekday 24-hour period. The survey itself demonstrates that areas away from the B4011 experience a substantially quieter acoustic environment.

The baseline monitoring used only **two locations**:

- LT01 on the western boundary adjacent to the B4011; and
- LT02 in the middle of Site A.

The monitoring map on page 18 confirms those locations [Noise impact assessment.pdf]

These do not show an assessment receptor representing an existing dwelling in Piddington, Arncott or another nearby residential location.

Indeed, a search of the Noise Impact Assessment finds no identified external "receptor" at all.

Where is the assessment of operational noise generated by the proposed development at existing residential and other noise-sensitive receptors outside the site boundary? What will be the effect on existing residents if no representative existing residential noise-sensitive receptors appear to have been assessed?

The report says planning decisions should consider the likely effects of pollution, including cumulative effects, upon health, living conditions and the natural environment and should minimise adverse noise effects – this should be considered for **both** residents within Site A and surrounding areas.

Potential Issues:

Generator noise - a potential omission from the report.

It has been acknowledged that generators may be used and the Home Office discuss locating generators further from sensitive receptors, temporary acoustic screening, operating controls and generator fuel management. However, the planning Noise Impact Assessment contains no generator assessment.

There is no information or modelling on: generator sound power; number of generators; location; operating hours; night-time operation; tonal or low-frequency characteristics; cumulative operation of multiple units; predicted levels at existing homes. This to me is significant as the Utilities and Infrastructure Assessment acknowledges uncertainty over the permanent electrical supply.

What concerns me is, if generators form any part of the normal or contingency electricity strategy, why have their noise emissions not been modelled at the nearest existing residential receptors?

Could generators operate during the night-time period, and if so, what are the predicted façade noise levels at the nearest dwellings? I believe this needs to be assessed and shared openly.

<u>Wastewater treatment and pumping noise have not been assessed</u>

The drainage strategy potentially requires: an on-site wastewater treatment works; inlet pumping; surface-water pumping stations; associated mechanical equipment. However, the Noise Impact Assessment contains no information or assessment of a fixed plant.

If we consider that wastewater treatment plant and pumping equipment can operate for long periods, potentially including overnight, what will be the predicted noise impacts of the proposed treatment plant, including sewage pumping stations and surface water pumps particularly during the night?

Consideration as to whether these types of installations are essential to making the scheme operation should be known before permission is provided.

Transport - Service vehicles, deliveries, coaches and minibuses

The Travel Plan identifies a substantial variety of operational vehicle activity:

- vans; rigid HGVs; articulated HGVs; kitchen deliveries; refuse collection; coaches transporting Service Users; shuttle minibuses.

There may also initially be wastewater tanker movements depending upon the drainage solution.

The Noise Assessment's criteria table recognises goods vehicle deliveries, servicing, forklift movements and car parks as potential noise sources. However I cannot see those proposed development sources being modelled at surrounding homes.

What assessment has been undertaken of early-morning or late-evening deliveries, waste collections, coaches, shuttle buses, reversing alarms, vehicle doors, loading/unloading and car-park activity?

This is especially important where such events are intermittent.

Construction and demolition noise appears significantly unassessed

Another potentially important gap is construction.

The report does not provide what I would regard as a construction noise impact assessment of:

- demolition; breaking existing concrete/hardstanding; earthworks; piling if required; construction traffic; modular-unit installation; generators/temporary equipment; working hours.

A search of the document finds references to “construction” essentially in the context of building construction methods and acoustic terminology, rather than a substantive construction-noise assessment.

Given the scale of the scheme and its phased delivery, **where is the assessment of construction and demolition noise at surrounding residential receptors, including cumulative effects over the entire construction programme?**

A Construction Environmental Management Plan can control details, but the Crown Development should still understand the likely magnitude and duration of the effects before granting permission.

Conclusion:

The need for accommodation may be urgent, but urgency does not remove the need for sound planning evidence. Whilst I have focused my objections on noise impact this proposal would introduce a substantial residential population into a rural site for an anticipated period of at

least ten years, with infrastructure that may need to operate continuously and with potential consequences extending beyond the application boundary.

Whilst my points focus on Generators, Waste Water, Transport and Construction all of these areas have other open questions which need to be taken into consideration which I am sure will be raised by other objections including but not limited too:

- foul-water solution remains unresolved, existing flooding is acknowledged, surface-water outfalls remain unconfirmed, and an on-site wastewater-treatment option may require third-party land and an as-yet-unidentified discharge location.
- Travel Plan separately acknowledges that the site's sustainable transport accessibility is not ideal, that pedestrian infrastructure is limited, and that the Travel Plan principally addresses staff and visitors rather than the 1,256 Service Users who will occupy the site.
- Finally, the Air Quality Screening Note concludes that detailed operational modelling is unnecessary only because predicted traffic is expected to remain below screening thresholds. It is therefore essential that the Council confirms that those traffic forecasts include the full range of Service User shuttle journeys, coaches, staff and visitor traffic, deliveries, refuse collection and any wastewater tanker movements required by the drainage strategy.

My question is:

Has sufficient evidence been provided to give reasonable confidence that this site can safely, sustainably and appropriately accommodate 1,256 people without unacceptable consequences for residents, infrastructure, highways, flooding, wildlife and wider environment?

Based on the urgent Crown Development application and supporting documents, I believe this has not yet been demonstrated and therefore ask that permission is withheld until sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate the suitability of Site A. I believe currently this is not the right site for non-detained asylum accommodation.

I would appreciate my objection being placed on the official case file and be taken into account as part of the application decision.

Yours faithfully

Simon Maxted
[redacted]