## The main needs for the human race are food, shelter and water.

## But we have hunger, homelessness and dirty water.



Why are so many people obsessed with property values, Its the cost of property that's causing many of the issues. If we paid more for our food and less for housing much would be improved.

Nearly 50 years ago, Mrs Thatcher spoke of the Conservative commitment to a property owning democracy We now have many renting, who will never be in a position to buy their own home. There are young professional workers with good salaries, having a job to pay the monthly bills.

Between the world wars, the average family spent 50% of their wages on food and 10% on housing, mainly rent at that time. Today we spend 50% of our wages on Housing & 10% on food. If we were to spend more on food and less on housing all would benefit.

It is reported we need to build more homes to make the market prices more affordable but ,if more can make them less expensive, why can't they be less in the first place? The answer is simple, but either politicians don't understand or are choosing not to for some reason, they still want this system to continue.

We are experiencing an increase in depression and mental health issues, food banks are seeing more families in need of help in feeding themselves. Many are finding it difficult to buy or rent a house, with some having suicidal thoughts, There are flooding and sewage disposal issues. While developers believe they can build anywhere they please. The developers can advertise the market homes to attract families who have sold a property in London for example, with vast sums of capital to spend. Any so-called affordable homes can be advertised anywhere in the country often to break up the gangs in run down areas. For many its the cost of market housing and high rents causing the many issues we have in villages & Towns. Do we need this?

If each District were to create a Community Land Trust, where one could purchase a home, but not be allowed to sell it onto the open market, and only sell the home back to the Trust, we would have a fairer system.

There could be a levy on each house to be given to the Local Council to use for enlarging the village shop, or replacing the shop, so as to be able to supply the needs of the village residents saving families travelling to the nearest town to shop.

An employment hub is needed on new developments so residents can work close to home, not at home, as there can be many distractions while working from home entirely.

The enclosed design would be used. This would be built on a steel frame off the ground, so saving much flooding we are experiencing of recent times, with underground water

There would be tanks to use the water for flushing the toilets, and watering the self-sufficient gardens in the dry times. There would be solar panels on the long roof.

Some Councils are creating museums in villages by not allowing new homes in villages.

If one considered a Parish Council ,and asked how many children they were responsible for, it would probably be at least 12. They would equate to eventually the need for 6 more homes, that's just the Parish Council. <u>There is a need for Workers on the land to be able to live on site or close to their working place, with some small business working units, in the villages,. This brings in sporting activities as well as employment.</u>

For example, the HS2 land that was compulsory purchased ,and now will be sold, this could be used to house those in need of a home. It is said there could be 10,000 homes at the Euston Quarter and 4,000 at Earls Court London, all these could be real affordable homes, and could be as in the enclosed presentation.

If the Government wants to end homelessness and house the one million people on the housing waiting list, the enclosed would be a way forward to achieve this. Building 30% affordable housing will need 2 million unaffordable houses for the majority. While we don't have enough land now to feed a growing population! If we look back 100 years, one spent 50% of one's income on food and 10% on housing. Now it is 50% on housing & 10% on food. If we spent more on food and less on housing all would benefit.

If one had purchased a house for £25,000, say 50 years ago, and sold it now for £225.000 it may give them a feel good factor, as the £200,000 would be a gift. But, if they sold the house to a young family that becomes a debt, and it would take several years to pay it off, creating traffic gridlock & air pollution on the way, plus the stress mentioned above.

The £36 Billion we spend on Housing benefit would build all the homes we need. The capital would be used over & over again .Instruct developers to build what is needed, not what they can sell for maximum gains.

We need to stop building to rent, as rent never ends, and not selling new builds on to the market.

Adding to that, there is a campaign group asking for a four day working week. If houses continue going up, and rents keep increasing we will need to be working a six day week!

If we were to have a cheaper housing system, as enclosed, we could work a four day week, once the mortgage is paid off. A family Care plan could come into play after the mortgage has been paid. I am inviting housing charities to group together to campaign for

a new way for housing the population There ought to be a survey with young people to ask if they rather not be on a property ladder.

If you visit my website at, <u>www.theplanetandpeoplecoalition.co.uk</u> see heading Think Global Live Local, you will find what I am suggesting.

You can contact me by email at lvkeeley45@gmail.com

We are now told some middle age people may have to work until 71. With a cheaper housing plan, incorporating Home grown food, with open space & sporting activities,

Its just possible we could be healthier. live longer and not have so many health issues.

Maybe eliminate the big three Cs,, Cancer, Communism & Capitalism.

Laurence Keeley., 6 Fairfield Herstmonceux, East Sussex, BN27 4NE,

