From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 MOD site A Near Ploughley Road OX25 2LD
Date: 15 September 2026 10:48:55
Attachments: Ojection letter Site A Piddington[redacted]

You don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important

I write with objections to the above proposal.. I also attach a word copy of my proposal for your file.

[redacted] Contact details below. Please acknowledge receipt of the objections and that it has actually been read.

1) The address on the proposal is wrong. This makes the application invalid. No planning authority would register an application with an incorrect address. There is no reason that The Home Office should.

Without prejudice to the application being valid I wish to make the following points;

2) The time line for objections to be received is not sufficient. The Home Office announced under emergency powers on 24th June that this application would be made. It took until September to publish. There is no reason at all why emergency powers were used. It is an abuse of the democratic planning system. To only allow two weeks for objection is unreasonable and undemocratic. The Home Office is abusing powers it holds to bypass the planning process

3) By the application's own description there are no public footpaths to allow pedestrian access to and from the site. **The proposal therefore is putting the lives of the service users in danger** with the only access onto a busy main road with no footway or footpath.

4) There are no local facilities. Service users will therefore be isolated from communities, facilities with no local facilities. This will encourage service users to have to walk and put theirs and others' lives in danger.

5) The site is isolated. A previous attempt to use the site for a similar purpose in 2003 was refused because of the lack of facilities and isolation of the site. It is totally disproportionate in size for the amenities and local area.

6) The planning history cited in the proposal is totally misleading and NOT relevant to the current application. It was for a totally different concept on a much smaller scale and was ultimately abandoned because the project was deemed too isolated and NOT fit for purpose.

7) The environmental research included in the proposal is a direct misrepresentation of the facts and truth. Searching a Buckinghamshire database for a project in Oxfordshire is incompetence at best. Furthermore, a desk top study is NOT acceptable.
The proposal concludes from the preliminary ecological Appraisal (PEA) that there are virtually no species within 2km of the site. this is simply NOT TRUE and a total misrepresentation of the facts. In reality a simple search of the database held at ThamesValley Environmental Record (TVERC)s centre shows;
Bats: the PEA reports no bat records whereas TVERC shows 12 protected species within 2 km, several within 1 km of the site, including a confidential record of the rare Bechstein's

bat. •
Great Crested Newt: the PEA reports no records whereas TVERC shows a record effectively on the application site (at the Piddington Depot), a breeding cluster with juveniles roughly 350 m away, and mapped pond/wetland habitats in and around the site — corroborated independently by the applicant's own Drainage Design Statement, which documents on-site ponding, ditches and watercourses. • Similar issues exist for hazel dormouse, otter, polecat, badger, reptiles, amphibians, priority birds (66 species recorded vs the PEA's 25) and notable invertebrates (133 Black Hairstreak and 161 Purple Emperor records). • Flora: the PEA reports no records for protected or notable plants. TVERC shows 188 records across 29 species, including two Red List species within 1 km of the site and a Nationally Rare sedge nearby — one of which also has its own dedicated species-recovery measure in the Oxfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy.
This is only touching the surface of the inaccurate and misleading representation of the proposal.

8) It is simply NOT possible to make an accurate assessment of the proposal with a significant portion of the proposal redacted.This is the section that the Home Office do not want the public to made aware of and leads on to;

9) Security
Should this proposal be accepted, whoever authorises the same should be held personally responsible for the serious crime in the area carried out by a service user allowed access into and out of the site at will. Already the women in the area are, quite rightly, concerned for their safety. The service users proposed will be from a different culture and totally ignorant of laws and the way to behave in British Society.
Lives will be put in danger
Women are in fear of RAPE.
Our local Church in Ludgershall will be locked. Village facilities will be closed such as a childrens' play area and benches removed.
The local communities should not be made to suffer or put in fear because of this unacceptable, ill thought out and totally disproportionate application.

10) Services
By the proposal's own admission there is not enough sewerage on site and certainly not enough power. **The proposed solution to this is diesel generators. This is in direct contradiction of Government Policy.**
We are all being forced to use 'green' power and yet here we have a proposal where there is not a sufficient power supply. **The solution in the proposal is to pollute** the atmosphere and land with diesel generators running 24/7 and by definition increasing traffic flow due to diesel deliveries and danger to service users and staff having such oil stores and generators on site.

For the above reasons and others too numerous to count I strongly urge that this proposal is REFUSED. Wrong site. Wrong plan.

11) One final comment that a similar proposal has been refused in Scotland , A precedent has been set. . **The scale of the facility relative to the local populations poses risks to community adhesion.**

The same principle applies to this application. It adjoins the ONLY local facility being the village play ground.
This site is isolated and if implemented will change the nature and character of the village and culture in the area.

Thank you for reading and ask for confirmation that indeed, this email has actually been read,

[redacted]