From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Formal Objection to the use of Site A as an Illegal Migration site
Date: 12 September 2026 12:49:45

[redacted]

Dear Sirs,

I am in writing formally objecting to the proposed use of Site A as an illegal immigration facility adjacent to the village of Piddington, [redacted]

My objection is not based of the demographics or ethnicity of the proposed residents other than they are all proposed to be of male gender and of army service age.

My objection is based on the scale of the proposed facility which at its lowest occupancy level of 1256 will absolutely dwarf our community of a tad over 300 residents.

Our village has extremely limited facilities, namely a church, a village hall and our village owned playing field. No shops, limited pedestrian infrastructure and our overnight lighting only covers part of the village and is proposed by our local council to be switched off overnight.

The main access road from the village to the B4011 is narrow, allows two cars to pass carefully, but anything larger needs one vehicle to significantly slow down or stop. Pedestrians need to be extremely careful.

Due to the remoteness of the proposed location, and how dangerous the B4011 is to both pedestrians and cyclists, there is bound to be a gravitational pull from the proposed residents to our village. Evidence from existing sites, confirm that large groups often congregate and take their leisure for lengthy periods of time.
Both from a safety aspect of the proposed site residents, and most certainly our residents which include 46 children this could be considered very intimidating. The Home Office clearly validate this point, as they have produced a written document which is to be handed to each Illegal Immigrant explaining the accepted behaviour towards woman and children in the UK. This assumes, the recipient can both read, and understand English, which again existing sites demonstrate is most certainly not the case.

Many of our residents own dogs, and it's a regular daily occurrence to see lone dog walkers, often woman walking their dogs as dogs require, around our local environment, often out of sight, including at night, on dark miserable winter days etc. I see nothing in the submission concerning provision for the safety of our villagers. There is no permanent police station now in Bicester, our nearest town, 5 miles away, and we have already been informed by our local community police liaison, that prior to this proposal we would be unlikely to see a police presence to anything other than violent crime. I again refer to the written document are issuing to the Illegal Immigrants, this suggests there is clearly a risk to our villagers, and history and recent court cases confirm this.

You will in effect make a significant proportion of our residents prisoners in their own homes, children will be unable to use our playing field, the daily dog walk or just basic exercise as part of managing personal mental health will be severly restricted.

As to the detail of your proposal.

As you are proposing to increase the local population by a minimum of 300% and up to 600% if the higher figure suggested is reached, then as with any other residential growth plan, this will increase pedestrian movements between the proposed site, local communities, facilities in the immediate area and the very limited public transport.
This is significantly magnified in a rural community where pavements do not exist, roads are narrower or single file, and on a busy road the B4011 which is the primary link between Thame and Bicester for HGV and LGV traffic movements as well as private vehicles. There is significant traffic on this road for example to the prison, which has significantly expanded its capacity in recent times. Employees and visitors alone to the prison at peak times, make this a very busy road.

Therefore prior to any commencement the following should be independently established and validated.
Forecasted pedestrian movements
Modelling of the pedestrian density on the roads surrounding the proposed site.
Upgrading requirements for footpath provision
Traffic speed limitations, the B4011 has a 50mph limit, and is a dangerous road, with multiple accidents and recently a death occurred very close to the proposed site entrance
Visibility. The council do not have funds to provide the grass cutting required on many of our local roads which impacts line of site on many bends, this is especially true of the B4011 as it has windy twisty sections in close proximity to the proposed site. You never see pedestrians on this road, its simple to dangerous
Therefore accident risk modelling is required.

In order to allow safe passage to walk on primarily unlit rural roads surrounding the proposed site, then a full safety assessment should be undertaken.

Now we move to healthcare. Although the proposal refers to full health care on site, including dental care, where are these doctors and dentists coming from. Bicester is the fastest growing town in Europe I understand, with vast new swathes of housing. This is putting significant pressure on the supply of the local GP surgeries and dentists. You cannot get an NHS dental appointment in the town.
So more detail is required to explain exactly how the proposed site is going to be fully self sufficient in this area.

Regarding the broader service provisions.
Hospitals
Police Resource
Welfare Services and mental Health
Where is the modelling document showing how the expansion to the local requirement can be accommodated. What has the Chief Constable of Thames Valley committed to in terms of additional resource, given my earlier comment on this subject.

The site itself has never been used for accommodation, it has no barracks, and has been a storage area for munitions as far back as WW1.
Health and safety in previous times was very different, and there should be a genuine concern as what is actually in the ground, or has potentially been buried and long forgotten. The existing storage buildings definitely have asbestos roofs, and are in partial decay. These would certainly need to be at least made safe, with all the asbestos removed as per national regulations.

We then come to the ecological impact on the site. It appears you are intending to process without doing the work required in this area, as these documents are incomplete.
Your fieldwork on 26th March and 10th April was taken outside optimum survey periods.

Access was limited, some areas were not even inspected and buildings were viewed externally only.
The work needs to be done, to complete this survey in significantly more detail and by wildlife ecologists.
Our Parish council submission to you will give a lot more detail on what our ecologists have uncovered, including endangered and protected in law species.
The site is partially affected by the winter flooding that makes the single road from the village to the A41 impassible during heavy rains. Has this been factored in

Finally to your Utilities and Infrastructure Assessment.

It suggests that 2.16 MVA of electricity will be required, on the initial number of residents. The existing local infrastructure is unlikely as you say to have capacity, so you propose temporary and/or permanent generators
A likely cost scenario of that as verified by an independent engineer is as follows
A requirement of 4, 1MV generators, three in daily service, the fourth as back up or resilience. Using published mfrs consumption figures, that equates to 20,000 litres every 24 hours 7.3 million litres per day
That's a 40,000 litre tanker delivery every two days. At current prices, which are forecast to rise significantly that is £700k per moth, over 8 million annually
That figure of course does not account for the purchase and ongoing maintemnace of said equipment.

Using the Government 2026 greenhouse gas conversion table, thats 19,000 tonnes of CO2e annually. Where does that equate in any way with the hard driven government green agenda ?
You have omitted the emissions from this out totally from your Air Screening Technical note. This needs added in and included in noise pollution calculations.

The site is unable to connect to the existing water supply which is at full capacity, and the village has had low water pressure already for months. The same as the oil comments really, the cost of supplying fresh drinking water, general water requirements as required to run such a facility, and then the subject of waste, both in terms of capture, removal and the odours released in such close proximity to the proposed residents, unless significant groundworks are planned to bury the tanks ?

In summary, this is not a suitable site, even though it is MOD land, as it was never created as a barracks with all the correct infrastructure, the costs are eye watering when we are told we may all have to contribute more in taxes in the upcoming budget. I suggest the cost alone of setting this proposed site up is multiples of tens of millions, and will quite literally destroy the lives of the residents of our village, who as stated will become prisoners in the own homes.

