[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 00:30
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Reference - PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 RE Planning Application 26/01833/CROWN

[redacted]

Apologies... but my original submission was the template, unintended and unsigned.
The following is my personal submission 😊

Objection to Planning Application 26/01833/CROWN – MOD Bicester Site A, Piddington
Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Dear Sir/Madam,
I wish to register my strongest objection to planning application **26/01833/CROWN** for the proposed temporary asylum accommodation centre at MOD Bicester Site A, immediately adjacent to Piddington.

I live at [redacted] and have lived with the consequences of proposals for this site before. I also objected to the previous asylum accommodation proposal in **2002–2003**.

My objection is to the **scale, location and physical consequences of the proposed development**, rather than to the nationality or immigration status of its future occupants.

Scale and location:
The proposal is for **up to 1,256 people**, immediately alongside a village of approximately 350 residents. Piddington has no shop, pub, GP surgery or regular bus service, very limited pedestrian infrastructure and few community facilities. The surrounding roads are narrow rural roads, with sections having little or no footway.

The Council should therefore carefully consider whether a development of this exceptional scale is appropriate immediately beside such a small and poorly serviced rural community, rather than assuming that the site's former military use makes it suitable for this purpose.

Highway and pedestrian safety:
I am particularly concerned about pedestrian movements between the site, Piddington and Bicester. The application should not rely on organised transport as the sole answer to this issue.

The surrounding roads were not designed for large numbers of pedestrians and include routes with little or no footway.
The application should properly assess **realistic pedestrian desire lines and the consequences of people walking from the site**, including after dark.

The cumulative effect of additional pedestrians, vehicles, staff and service traffic also needs to be assessed.

Village playing field:
The proposed accommodation is extremely close to Piddington's children's playing field.

The relationship between the development and this established village facility should be specifically assessed in terms of **pedestrian movements, safeguarding, security, lighting, supervision and emergency access**.

Local children should be able to continue using their existing facility without the development materially compromising its amenity or safe use.

Security, emergency services and major incidents:
The scale of the proposed development creates significant requirements for site security, safeguarding and emergency response.

I note that **Thames Valley Police and Oxfordshire Fire Service are formally consulted on the application**. Their assessments should be given full consideration.
The application should demonstrate that there is adequate provision for:

- site security and incident management;
- safeguarding and emergency call-outs;
- emergency vehicle access, including during congestion;
- evacuation of a very large number of people;
- fire-fighting facilities and water supplies;
- major medical incidents;
- power failure and severe weather; and
- incidents requiring police, fire and ambulance resources simultaneously.

These matters are particularly important given the narrow surrounding road network and the site's immediate proximity to Piddington.

Noise, generators, air quality and lighting:
The development will introduce substantial infrastructure into what is currently a relatively quiet rural environment.
The Council should establish the **type, capacity and operating arrangements of generators and other plant**, including pumps, ventilation, heating, wastewater equipment and security systems.

Noise should be assessed at the **nearest residential properties in Piddington**, particularly at night, and should consider cumulative and emergency operation rather than simply normal daytime conditions.
Similarly, any diesel generation should be properly assessed for emissions and operating hours.
The development will also introduce substantial security, access, accommodation and car-park lighting.
The lighting assessment should address **light spill towards Piddington, the surrounding countryside and effects on nocturnal wildlife**, including bats.

The existing rural character and relatively dark night-time environment should be protected.

Ecology and protected species:
I am particularly concerned that the ecological assessment adequately reflects what is actually present on and around the site.

I have personally observed bats entering my property immediately adjacent to the site, including one which flew into my bedroom and another observed recently. I appreciate that this does not by itself establish a bat roost, but it demonstrates that bats are present locally and makes proper assessment particularly important given the proposed demolition, construction and lighting.

I therefore ask that the ecological information is independently scrutinised and, where necessary, supplemented by **up-to-date bat surveys and appropriate roost assessments**, together with assessment of other protected and priority species.

The ecological assessment should also consider the wider network of hedgerows, woodland, ponds, drainage features and surrounding countryside rather than treating the application boundary as an ecological boundary.

Drainage and wastewater:
I am concerned about the proposed drainage and wastewater arrangements and their potential consequences beyond the site.
The application documentation raises the question of the site's hydrological relationship with **Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI**. The drainage strategy should therefore demonstrate that surface-water and foul-water systems are properly designed, have adequate capacity and resilience, and cannot result in pollution of surrounding land or watercourses.
The Council should also establish the arrangements for system failure, emergency storage and maintenance.

Construction impacts:
If substantial demolition, clearance or enabling works are already taking place, the Council should establish exactly what works have commenced and under what authority.

It should also establish whether appropriate ecological checks were undertaken immediately before those works and what measures are being used to protect bats, nesting birds and other protected species.

The construction phase itself will require effective controls for **HGV movements, traffic, dust, noise, vibration, lighting, waste and ecological disturbance**. A robust and enforceable Construction Environmental Management Plan should be required.

Transparency and future expansion:
I am concerned that a number of documents on the planning register are expressly marked **"redacted"**, including material concerning Natural England and the ecological assessment. Where environmentally relevant information can lawfully be disclosed, I ask that it is made available so that residents and consultees can properly understand the environmental implications of the proposal.

I am also concerned about the potential for a facility described as temporary to become extended or expanded.
The Council should make clear the **precise duration of the proposed permission and what planning process would be required for any increase in capacity, additional accommodation, change of use or extension of the operating period**.

This is particularly important because the applicant's supporting material refers to the proposed development in terms of '…**phased expansion and longer-term operational capacity'**. Any future expansion should require proper planning scrutiny rather than being regarded as an automatic continuation of this proposal.

Cumulative impact:
Finally, these matters should not be considered individually.
The combined effect of **1,256 occupants, staff, vehicles, pedestrians, security infrastructure, generators, wastewater infrastructure, artificial lighting, construction activity and additional demands on emergency services** must be assessed in the context of a small rural village immediately adjoining the site.

The cumulative impact on highway safety, residential amenity, the rural character of Piddington and the surrounding environment is the central planning concern.

Conclusion:
I strongly object to application **26/01833/CROWN** because of the exceptional scale of the development and its immediate proximity to Piddington, together with the unresolved concerns regarding:

- highway and pedestrian safety;
- the proximity of the children's playground;
- emergency access, evacuation and major-incident planning;
- noise, generators and air quality;
- artificial lighting and the rural night environment;
- bats and other protected species;
- ecological disturbance;
- drainage, wastewater and potential effects on surrounding watercourses;
- construction impacts; and
- the potential for future expansion or extension.

I therefore ask that - **planning permission be refused**.

If the proposal is nevertheless progressed, I ask that no substantive works or occupation take place until the outstanding matters concerning ecology, protected species, highways, emergency access, fire safety, drainage, noise, air quality and lighting have been properly assessed and satisfactorily resolved.

I also ask that any future increase in capacity, expansion or extension of the operating period is subject to the appropriate planning process and public consultation.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]