From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 16 September 2026 20:18:57

[redacted]

16 September, 2026

To whomever it may concern

I am a resident of [redacted] I live approximately [redacted] from Piddington and share the same road network, health services, and policing coverage as the communities immediately adjoining the application site.

I object to this application in its current form. I am not asking the Secretary of State to refuse it outright. I am asking that it be refused as submitted, or deferred, until the matters set out below have been properly assessed and the affected communities have had a genuine opportunity to be heard. My objection concerns the scale of the proposal relative to its setting, the complete absence of the infrastructure needed to support it, and the process by which it is being determined. It has nothing to do with who would be accommodated there.

1. The use of the urgent procedure is not justified by the circumstances.

The Urgent Crown Development route compresses the local planning authority's response time and removes the public consultation requirements that would apply to any comparable development. Cherwell District Council has stated that it was not consulted on these proposals and became aware of them only hours before they became public. The consultation window on the application itself ran from 7 to 17 September 2026.

A development of this scale, with a permission sought for ten years, does not become urgent simply because the applicant would prefer not to wait. If the site was under consideration well before the council was informed, the compression of the consultation period is a consequence of the applicant's own timetable, not of any emergency. Using an emergency procedure to deliver a decade-long development sets a poor precedent and denies affected residents the participation they would be entitled to in any other circumstance.

2. The site has none of the basic infrastructure required to support a resident population.

Site A is a semi-derelict storage and distribution site. It has never been used for accommodation. It has no mains power, no foul drainage and no fresh water supply. The application anticipates temporary provision in the interim, including generators for electricity and water delivered by tanker.

This is being described as temporary use, but the permission sought runs for ten years. A

settlement of up to 1,256 people cannot reasonably be serviced by generators and water brought in by tankers on anything other than a genuinely short-term basis. I ask that the Secretary of State require a fully costed, phased utilities strategy, with committed delivery dates for permanent mains connections, as a condition of any consent, and that the proposal be assessed against the ten-year period actually applied for rather than against the word "temporary".

3. The highway network cannot safely accommodate the pedestrian movement this proposal will generate.

This is non-detained accommodation. Residents will be free to come and go. That is the correct approach, but it means the surrounding highway network must be assessed as it would be for any new settlement of comparable size.

The site sits between Piddington and Upper Arncott, on rural roads that have no footways, no street lighting, and national speed limits along significant stretches. A resident population of this size, without private vehicles, with limited means, and several miles from the nearest shops, services or transport interchange, will generate substantial pedestrian movement on roads that were never designed for it. The local Member of Parliament has already raised the absence of pavements on a busy road as a direct safety concern.

I ask that no consent be granted without a pedestrian and cycle movement assessment covering the realistic routes between the site and Bicester, Upper Arncott, Piddington and Ambrosden, and without committed funding for the lighting, footway and crossing improvements that assessment identifies. Without this, the foreseeable outcome is serious injury or death on those lanes, and the risk falls on site residents and local road users alike.

4. The scale of the proposal is disproportionate to the settlements that would absorb its effects.

Piddington has a population of around 350. Upper Arncott and the surrounding villages are of a similar order. The proposal would place up to 1,256 people immediately adjacent to them. There is no comparable precedent in this district for a population increase of that magnitude in that location.

I ask that a cumulative impact assessment be required, covering primary care capacity across the Bicester practices, ambulance and emergency response times to this location, school places, public transport provision, and the capacity of the local highway network. I make no claim that these services are currently failing. My point is that the application should be required to demonstrate they can absorb the additional demand before consent is granted, not afterwards.

5. Policing, on-site provision and community safety.

A large resident population with no transport, limited funds and little to occupy them, placed several miles from the nearest town, will place demands on rural policing coverage

that does not currently exist at that level. Thames Valley Police response times to this part of the district reflect its rural character.

I ask that consent be conditional on a stated and funded policing plan, agreed with Thames Valley Police and the Police and Crime Commissioner, and on substantive on-site provision, i.e. recreational, welfare and everyday amenities, is sufficient that residents are not obliged to travel long distances on unsuitable roads to meet basic needs. Adequate on-site provision is the single most effective mitigation available here, and it should be secured by condition rather than left to good intentions. Residents of the surrounding villages, many of them living alone and a long way from the nearest police response, are entitled to know what arrangements are in place before a development of this scale is approved, not after it opens.

6. What I am asking for.

I ask that the Secretary of State refuse the application as submitted, or defer determination, and require the applicant to provide:

· a justification for the use of the urgent procedure, given the timeline on which the site was identified;

· a phased utilities strategy with committed dates for permanent connections;

· a pedestrian and highway safety assessment with funded mitigation;

· a cumulative impact assessment covering health, emergency services, schools and transport;

· a funded policing and community safety plan agreed with Thames Valley Police;

· a specification of on-site provision sufficient to reduce off-site dependency;

· and a meaningful consultation period, conducted properly, before any decision is made.

If the government intends to proceed with this site, then it should proceed on the basis of evidence, with the infrastructure in place and with the affected communities included in how it is delivered. That is not an unreasonable thing to ask, and it is what the normal planning process would have required.

[redacted]

