[redacted]

13th September 2026

To Crown Development Casework Unit
And Cherwell District Council

Application Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Dear Sirs

Site A Piddington

I am writing to object to the proposed asylum centre at Site A. The proposal is inconceived and lacking in detail with no appreciation of the local environment and the nearby village of Piddington.

As part of my objection I wish to reference the scale of the project as the proposed bedspaces of 1256 is more than four times the number of residents in Piddington, which is the nearest village to the site. I am concerned by reference in the site's own preliminary Unexploded Ordnance Risk Assessment that refers to "accommodation for 3510 service users". This suggests the eventual scale may be considerably larger than the figure that we have been told. Is this a mistake or a cover up of the actual figures - greater clarity is needed on the government's actual intent. Additionally, the applicant's own geo-environmental assessment mentions the historical use of the site for wartime ordnance and also flags asbestos containing materials as a further contamination risk in the ground but also this exists in the buildings.

Further to my objection is the lack of and inconsistency of information concerning site layout, external lighting, security fencing, parking facilities etc. The site gives onto a fast moving important road connecting Bicester and Thame and the proposal's own Transport Assessment's baseline traffic and speed data relate to a road in Essex! This has been transferred from a comparable scheme in a completely different part of the UK!. This surely invalidates the data regarding traffic and missing data.

No site specific assessments seem to have been made with the local services, (fire, police, ambulance) nor Highways regarding the additional traffic load nor the flood authority and this is a low lying area with regular flooding, evidenced in the applicant's own data as happening within the site where they propose putting the accommodation blocks.

I would like to ask for more information to why the applicant believes this to be a suitable site given independent evidence available, including High Court findings that this type of site ie large-scale, isolated institutional accommodation of this kind carries a high risk of mental

health deterioration among the occupants. Surely the Home Office must be required to assess the equalities impact of its own allocation policy? Can the Home Office really ignore a High Court judgement against it earlier this year concerning the policy that governs how people are allocated to sites such as Site A? I believe that welfare and safeguarding risks at this site are foreseeable and must be properly assessed in advance of occupation.

Leading on from this is the fact that no welfare and safeguarding risk assessment has been carried out in respect of the villagers and in particular the women and children. This refers back to the number of service users at the site that could be between 1250 and 3500 which vastly outnumbers the local villagers. As the site will be an open site, this raises concerns with local residents. There are only just over 6000 people in the entire Launton and Otmoor so the proposed occupation level adds a great many people to the area.

There is conflict with local planning policy as the proposal is difficult to reconcile with policies adopted in the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 including Policy PSD1, Policy SLE4 and Policy INF1 as well as the environment and heritage protection policies.

No evidence has been published of a proper options appraisal that explains why this site is deemed the most economical and suitable site compared to other alternatives (dispersed housing, smaller sites or repurposed buildings). A comparable Home Office accommodation programme in the early 2000s was discontinued due to the spiralling costs and value for money concerns recorded by the National Audit office. Why is this not mentioned in the proposal and where is the cost analysis?

I am very concerned that there do not seem to be any published plans on the day to day running of the site and the management programme and I am also concerned by the large volume of redacted information within the Proposal.

The environmental assessment is skimpy and lacks enough detail to really be of use to the proposal and it states therein that there are a number of protected species surveys remaining outstanding. The submission of a proposal of this scale without the full surveys raises questions as to the standard of care that has gone into the proposal which seems very rushed and incomplete.

These are only examples of why this proposal should be rejected as unsuitable and I will look forward to hearing that this huge project will be scrapped.

Yours faithfully

Terence J Swift