[redacted]

From: Trish Abbott [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 10:55
To: Crown Casework
Cc: [redacted]; calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject: Objection to Urgent Crown Development Application - PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Categories: [redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Urgent Crown Development Application – MOD Bicester (Site A)

I am writing to formally submit my objection to the Urgent Crown Development application for the proposed asylum accommodation centre at MOD Bicester (Site A).

I strongly object to this development on the grounds of severe conflict with active defense infrastructure, the unacceptable loss of strategic Ministry of Defence (MOD) surge capacity, and profound procedural failures, data contradictions, and unmitigated safety and environmental risks within the application itself.

I urge the Secretary of State to refuse the application based on the following material considerations:

- **Incomplete Application and Missing Material Risk Assessments:** The fast-tracked nature of this submission has resulted in an incomplete planning file. The application entirely lacks transparent, comprehensive Community Safety Risk Assessments and detailed local highway capacity risk models. Furthermore, independent reviews have highlighted major gaps and flaws in the published ecological and environmental assessments. A decision of this national magnitude cannot legally or safely be determined on partial or absent risk data.
- **Severe Inconsistencies and Anomalies in Resident Capacity:** The application introduces data anomalies that severely compromise its legitimacy. While the main planning statement seeks permission for 1,256 service users, critical internal technical documentation—specifically the site's Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) risk assessment—reveals that the operational safety footprint was evaluated against a capacity of 3,510 residents. This threefold discrepancy makes it impossible to accurately calculate the true risk and impact on water, sewage, local healthcare, and emergency services.
- **Factual Inaccuracy Regarding Baseline Site Activity:** The application incorrectly states that Site A is "unused" or "no longer in active use". While the indoor warehouses have no current utilisation, the extensive external hardstanding footprint is an active operational asset. Basing a fast-track planning decision on an incorrect baseline assessment of active land use undermines the legal validity of the submission.
- **Massive Displacement of Strategic Materiel:** Because the site is actively utilized, facilitating this development requires the immediate, highly disruptive removal of an estimated 900 lorry loads of large, non-palletised military emergency kit currently staged on the hardstanding. The transport burden of clearing this area has been completely omitted from the applicant's traffic and environmental figures.
- **Compounding Strain on a Consolidated Defence Estate:** Displacing 900 lorry loads of equipment ignores the reality of a modern, streamlined MOD logistical network that relies

heavily on key primary hubs like the MOD Donnington and Longtown facilities. Forcing Bicester's active storage inventory into these already lean facilities compromises strategic national readiness.

- **Severe Adverse Impact on Community Cohesion and Rural Balance:** The proposed scale of the facility completely dominates the nearby rural settlements. Introducing a transient population of this magnitude next to small villages like Piddington entirely overwhelms the local demographic baseline. This creates an unsustainable spatial imbalance that undermines community cohesion. This directly mirrors the findings of the 2003 Planning Inspector's report, which formally rejected an identical proposal on this exact site due to its isolation and severe social cohesion risks.
- **Severe Environmental, Acoustic, and Fire Risks from Temporary Utilities:** The applicant's reliance on heavy-duty diesel generators to overcome the site's insufficient grid power supply introduces unacceptable environmental and safety impacts. Operating industrial generators continuously creates constant acoustic pollution and significant particulate emissions, severely degrading air quality in this rural setting. Furthermore, the massive on-site bulk fuel storage required to run these generators introduces a major fire and hazardous installation risk that has not been adequately assessed or reconciled with the capacity of local emergency services.
- **Excessive Redaction Undermining Public Examination:** The level of redaction across the published consultation documents is excessive and goes far beyond necessary security protocols. Crucial operational data, environmental impact figures, and third-party reporter details have been blanked out. This extreme lack of transparency prevents local authorities, statutory consultees, and the public from executing their democratic right to properly scrutinize the proposals.

The combination of heavily redacted documents, missing risk assessments, temporary power emissions and fire hazards, a chaotic data conflict between 1,256 and 3,510 residents, and the unmitigated displacement of 900 lorry loads of strategic defense kit means this application fails to meet basic planning and administrative standards. I urge the Secretary of State to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,

Patricia Wills

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from my iPad