

Ms J De Rosa response to Ministerial Statement

Contents

Section 1	“On the surface”
Section 2	“Of the Ministerial Statement”
Section 3	Ministerial Statement and HM Treasury, are contradictory and, National Planning Policy irrationality
Section 4	Conclusions

Section 1 “On the surface”

On the surface, of the Ministerial Statement appears beneficial to rural environment and rural towns, communities, Green Fields, however. The section 106 Planning obligations is a big issue, to the Minister of concern. The ss. 106, or 106A, 106B “planning obligations” of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, verse Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010: para 122 – 123, are “further limitations on use of planning obligations”.

Section 2 “Of the Ministerial Statement”

The Bridgnorth needs reasonable affordable housing is clear *object*, does the Town and Country Planning Act 1990: ss. 106, 106A, 106B, or Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010: para 122 – 123 benefits Bridgnorth interests? Town and Country Planning Act 1990: ss. 106 – 106B 'planning obligations' upon, developers to build affordable houses and ought to, balance environmental damage of building affordable houses, employment lands. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010: para 122 – 123 'further limits planning obligations', no responsible developers is a consequences of, the Ministerial Statement.

(Units 5 equals 500 sqm verse unit 10 equals 1000 sqm) *1st consideration* combined environmental consequences of building units 5 – 10 *2nd consideration* verse, unit 4 equals 100 sqm or less unit 5, means no affordable houses and no levy *3rd consideration*, since land (and businesses, houses are contained) within the Real Estate and Real Estate price *4th consideration*. And financial cost and benefits, of unit 5 equals 500 sqm nor unit 10 equals 1000 sqm, each sqm is a house, equals equity and price of the said house *5th consideration*. Five considerations, I have identified to respond to Ministerial Statement.

Numbers of considerations	Considerations	Rational test
1	(Units 5 equals 500 sqm verse unit 10 equals 1000 sqm)	<p>Each unit, is built on land and is further less, ecosystem and to capture CO2 omissions.</p> <p>I am fully aware, my own house is itself a unit, a plot of land, and a prior this Housing Estate, it was a field with biodiversity, ecosystem, capturing CO2 omissions, e.g., grass, hedges.</p> <p>While, units 5 equals 500 sqm</p>

		<p>is less damaging to immediate environment, compared to disproportionate units 10 equals 1000 sqm, is more damaging to immediate environments. Its a choice, out of two evils, one unit 5 equals 500 sqm or two, unit 10 equals 1000 sqm.</p> <p>Unit 5 equals 500 sqm, is reasonable for the context of Bridgnorth and Shrewsbury, all Shropshire towns and villages.</p>
2	Combined environmental consequences of building units 5 – 10	<p>The “environmental consequences” is the result, of irresponsible MPs and irresponsible Councillors’.</p> <p>The HM coalition Government and the Shropshire Council, has persistently failed to do, a Ecological Impact Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment, means whatever policy is flawed, permanently unsound! National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) remains, unsound in my eyes and it fails, the soundness test.</p>
3	Unit 4 equals 100 sqm or less unit 5, means no affordable houses and no levy	<p>Unit 4 equals 100 sqm, keeping housing development contained and affordable housing within.</p> <p>I remain skeptical, of this Ministerial Statement.</p>
4	The land (and businesses, houses, are contained) within the Real Estate and Real Estate price	<p>What real Estate? What is, the real Estate price? The housing market prices, are currently HIGH means, a unsustainable prices, and the cost of living is high, because of misguided, deluded policy makers and bias ideological views.</p> <p>The conservative party, has already ruined NHS, Shropshire environment, as well also innumerable disable people, and ruined UK education, mess up planning system. The conservative party changes to,</p>

Ecological Impact Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment against whatever policy, legislative impacts.

The Ministerial Statement is simply Deficit Expenditure, like the above on this planning reforms and damaging, the environment has a consequences of Conservatism irresponsibility.

The Builders Finance Fund, says 15,000 housing units inside HM Treasury Budget 2014, means (10 units = 1000 sqm) and what is the sum? $15,000 \text{ housing units} \times 1000 \text{ sqm} = 1,500,000,0 \text{ sqm}$ across, the United Kingdom, of the environmental damage has a consequences of this policy. The HM Government is insolvency, waiting to hear the HM Conservative Governments and the HM Coalition Government will default, the HM Sovereign default. The HM Government can't fund, this planning policy and can't fund itself, nor the HM Government can't fund, the National Health Service (NHS), benefits to disabled and pensioners, so forth. The Labour party, the Conservative party and the Liberal Democrats party, every political party are stupid at managing the UK Budget, I won't entrust them to manage anything.

HM Government is the DEBTOR! The constituencies citizens', should not service HM Government debt and the Ministers of the Crown, the MPs and the Crown, the Westminster Parliamentary Sovereignty should service, their own debt.

P.S., The constituencies citizens' and the businesses, the banks, should not fund or not bail out, the Crown and the HM Governments. Protect the constituencies citizens' and the NHS, disabled, vulnerable people, LGBT.

Section 4 Conclusions

Do I support or object to, this Ministerial Statement?

I *support* unit 5 equals 500 sqm, for affordable homes designated for Shropshire residents only (and Bridgnorth local residents) and limited impact upon local ecology systems, biology of Shropshire, but I *object* to Ministerial Statement and Shropshire Council failures of not, doing a Ecological Impact Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment, connected to whatever national policy, Shropshire Council strategy and policies.

The Ministerial Statement is unsound, irrationality and contradictory in places, also fails to do Ecological Impact Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment.

The HM Coalition Government, all previous HM Governments IS THE PRINCIPAL DEBTOR.

- 9 FEB 2015

		planning policies has impact on ordinary constituencies, are the persons will start on housing ladder.
5	And financial cost and benefits, of unit 5 equals 500 sqm nor unit 10 equals 1000 sqm, each sqm is a house, equals equity and price of the said house	<p>The Ministerial Statement, utterly fails to presents the financial cost and benefits of each unit, each sqm, each house price.</p> <p>The Ministerial Statement is a fixation on, reduction of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990: ss. 160 <i>costs</i>.</p>

The Ministerial Statement has holes in to, seems irrational in places and reduction of Section 160 costs, while HM Government is the DEBTOR!

Section 3 Ministerial Statement and HM Treasury, are contradictory and, National Planning Policy irrationality

Investments	Funds	Ministerial Statement: £ million	HM Treasury: Budget 2014 (Published)	HM Treasury: Budget 2014 Planning reforms (Spending)
1	Custom build houses	30 million		
2	Loan	£13 million		
3	Service building plots	£150 million		
4	Community led custom projects	£65 million		
5	Builders finance fund	£252 million	£500 million	£248 million
6	Project support funding	£14 million		
7	Right to build			£150 million
8	Equity fund			?
		Total £524 million		Total £398 million
		<i>Deficit Spending</i>		

The Ministerial Statement is contradictory to, Budget 2014 and the planning policy don't explains, where the £ million came from, as well also the funding of new builds, etc., seems incomplete. The funding of housing planning reforms has gaps, also the national planning policy does fail to do, a