From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: URGENT Crown Application CDC Reference 26/01833/CROWN and MHCLG reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 10 September 2026 20:27:45

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

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal to accommodate approximately 1,250 asylum seekers at the proposed site adjacent to a village with a population of only around 350 people.

I want to be clear that my objection is not based on hostility towards asylum seekers as individuals. People seeking asylum should be treated humanely and with dignity. However, humane treatment of asylum seekers and responsible planning for local communities are not mutually exclusive. I believe that this particular proposal is inappropriate because of the extraordinary scale of the development in relation to the existing community and the lack of suitable local infrastructure.

The proposed population would be more than three times the size of the existing village. If a conventional residential development proposed to introduce approximately 1,250 additional residents next to a village of around 350 people, there would rightly be serious consideration of the impact on roads, transport, healthcare, emergency services, shops, pedestrian access and other local infrastructure. These same considerations should not be disregarded simply because the proposed residents are asylum seekers.

A population of this size will inevitably have everyday needs. People will need access to healthcare, shops, transport, recreation, support services and opportunities to participate in ordinary community life. The surrounding area does not appear to have the facilities or infrastructure required to absorb such a substantial and sudden increase in population.

The location itself is also a serious concern. If residents are placed in an isolated location with limited access to local amenities and inadequate safe pedestrian routes, this risks creating difficulties not only for the existing community but also for the asylum seekers themselves. Accommodation should support dignity, wellbeing and eventual integration rather than simply concentrating large numbers of people in a location because suitable buildings happen to be available.

I am also concerned about the potential impact on local roads, public transport and emergency services. A community of approximately 350 people is not

currently designed to support the needs generated by an adjacent population of approximately 1,250 additional residents. It is essential that the capacity of GP services, hospitals, policing, ambulance services, fire services and transport infrastructure is properly assessed and adequately funded before any decision is implemented.

Community cohesion must also be considered. Introducing a population several times the size of the existing village into a small and isolated area is an extreme approach. This is not an argument that asylum seekers are inherently problematic or dangerous. Rather, it is a recognition that any sudden and substantial increase in population, particularly where there is little existing infrastructure or opportunity for integration, can place pressure on both new and existing residents.

I am particularly concerned that local people may feel that decisions of this scale are being imposed upon them without sufficient consultation or consideration of the long-term consequences. Communities should not be expected simply to absorb a population increase of this magnitude without meaningful engagement, transparent impact assessments and clear commitments regarding infrastructure and funding.

I therefore urge the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to reconsider the suitability and scale of this proposal.

- The impact on local healthcare, including GP and hospital capacity.
- The capacity of police, ambulance and fire services.
- Road safety, traffic levels and public transport provision.
- Safe pedestrian access to local amenities and services.
- The availability of shops, recreational facilities and other essential amenities.
- The impact on the existing local community and community cohesion.
- The suitability of the site for supporting the wellbeing and integration of the people who would be accommodated there.

- Whether a smaller-scale or more geographically dispersed approach would be more appropriate and sustainable.

- The level of additional funding and infrastructure that would be guaranteed to the local area.

The need to provide accommodation for people seeking asylum does not remove the responsibility to make sensible, proportionate and sustainable decisions about where and how that accommodation is provided.

In my view, placing approximately 1,250 people beside a village of approximately 350 residents, without sufficient existing facilities and infrastructure, represents a disproportionate and poorly planned approach. Both the existing community and the people being accommodated deserve a solution that is properly planned, adequately resourced and sustainable in the long term.

I respectfully ask the Ministry to reconsider this proposal and to ensure that any decision is based on a full and transparent assessment of local infrastructure, service capacity, community impact and the suitability of the location.

Madara Lazda
[redacted]
10.09.202[redacted]