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1.0 The inquiry’s interim findings November 2014 are disappointing to Tutbury Parish Council because the question seems only to be ‘should more houses be allocated?’ rather than ‘are there too many?’ or even ‘does the allocation meet the need?’

2.0 It is our contention that proven need for new houses by social sections such as workers on low incomes, those with middle incomes, pensioners, single persons or footloose transient workers are not matched to annual to demand house building numbers. In fact the exclusion of poorer people the ESBC market model of house building is made even worse by a reduction in the number of ‘affordable’ houses; the discussion seems to be concentrated on how to get out of making such provision rather an assessment of site location and how it may effect different social groups.

3.0 ESBC’s latest graphical representation of possible population trends shows that the rate of growth is how expected to slow down when compared to previous forecasts. If predicted trends are used to plan the quantum need for new houses that number itself should now be reduced by at least 2,000 (to around 10,000 over the local plan period.

4.0 Forecasts are not statistics and population trends do not represent the quantum need for new houses. Tutbury Parish Council pointed to the history of building houses for sale in the years leading to this local plan period because those figures are ‘statistics’ in that they represent what happened, they represent ‘market forces’ for such developments.

5.0 The pressure to ignore actual performance in favour of changeable forecasts (that in any event measure possibility of population change rather than the likelihood of house purchases) comes from developers and as such is nothing more than speculative. Should such speculation not prove to become reality will those those same speculative developers be called to account for the loss of countryside or for the inadequacy of infrastructure to support the cost of people living in isolated colonies away from social support?

6.0 The potential for profit by developing real estate, or by merely obtaining planning approval is corrupting the planning process in both number of houses and in location.

7.0 Protection of countryside and farm land is set aside as a norm in favour of yet more houses to meet the biased ‘5 year rule’ in the National Planning
Policy Framework (NPPF) and no matter how much the ESBC housing trajectory is changed the truth remains that delivery of numbers is not under local authority control, that the power lies with developers and buyers.

8.0 At any time up to 2031 it will be possible for speculative developers to contest compliance with the 5 year rule and claim a right to approval for whatever additional houses they propose wherever they want to build them.

9.0 Councils are being intimidated by the knowledge that appeals will be won by developers. Should a planning committee dare to refuse major sites contrary to officer recommendation the financial cost will be high, it will in fact represent a penalty, a punishment for not allowing land speculation to be rewarded.
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