

Formal Request for Parliamentary Clarification on the Planning & Infrastructure Bill

Madeleine Hunt
General Secretary, Heritage Party
On behalf of the Heritage Party
Heritage Party Head Office, Unit 77,
26 The Hornet, Chichester, PO19 7BB

Dear Deputy Prime Minister Angela Rayner, Housing Minister Matthew Pennycook, Energy Minister Ed Miliband, and All Parliamentary Ministers,

Subject: Urgent Concerns Regarding the Planning & Infrastructure Bill

I am writing on behalf of Heritage Party members and supporters across all constituencies in the United Kingdom. Given this, we request formal clarification on the implications of the Planning & Infrastructure Bill, which is currently under discussion in Parliament.

This bill appears to be a continuation of the Climate & Nature Bill under a new name, introducing sweeping changes that undermine democratic oversight, property rights, and local governance. Given the serious consequences of these policies, it is imperative that MPs fully understand what they are being asked to support.

As the proposed changes fundamentally alter the political system, this bill must first be scrutinized in the context of historical fact—specifically, the consequences of similar policies in nations that have implemented centralized control over land, planning, and property rights. I have personally lived through and experienced such policies under a socialist (communist) dictatorship, where similar regulations resulted in the erosion of democracy, mass government overreach, and severe restrictions on personal freedoms.

1. Centralized Control Over Local Planning Decisions

P&I Bill Provisions:

- Introduces a “national scheme of delegation” – removing local councils’ discretion over planning applications.
- Transfers decision-making from elected representatives to unelected planning officers.
- Limits public objections by banning "large and unwieldy" planning committees.

Parallels to Communist Systems:

- **Soviet Union (1920s–1980s):** Central planning committees controlled all housing, infrastructure, and land use, ignoring local needs. Public consultation was a mere formality, with decisions imposed from the top.
- **East Germany (GDR, 1949–1990):** The State Planning Commission (SPK) dictated all urban planning, enforcing developments that disregarded public opposition.
- **China (1958–present):** The Chinese Communist Party controls land development through State Councils, ensuring that all property and urban planning serve the party’s long-term strategy, not local communities.

How is this bill any different from what authoritarian regimes have done in the past?

2. Councils Setting Their Own Planning Fees – A Pay-to-Play System

P&I Bill Provisions:

- Grants councils the power to set their own planning fees, creating an uneven, unregulated system.
- Allows large developers to buy influence, while small businesses and homeowners are priced out.
- Government claims this will address a £362 million deficit, yet no transparency is provided on who benefits financially.

Parallels to Communist Systems:

- **Soviet Union (NEP, 1921–1928):** Local commissariats set arbitrary economic conditions that favoured large, state-approved industries while taxing independent businesses into extinction.
- **China's "Pay-to-Develop" Policy (2000s–present):** Local authorities profit by inflating land and planning costs, ensuring that only government-linked developers can afford projects.
- **Cuba's "Revolutionary Taxes" (1960s–present):** Business permits and operating fees are set so high that only state-approved companies can function—ensuring total control over commerce and land use.

Why is the UK shifting toward a model where local governments can financially manipulate the planning process?

3. Expansion of Compulsory Purchase Orders – Forced Land Seizures

P&I Bill Provisions:

- Makes it easier for councils and developers to seize private land for infrastructure projects.
- Follows the Climate & Nature Bill's push for "rewilding" and forced land repurposing.
- Threatens private landowners' rights, as compulsory purchase can now be fast-tracked.

Parallels to Communist Systems:

- **Soviet "Dekulakization" (1929–1932):** Farmers' land was seized under the claim of "national agricultural reform," with little compensation.
- **Mao's Great Leap Forward (1958–1962):** Private land was confiscated to build state-controlled farms and industrial projects, leading to mass starvation.
- **Poland's Post-War Land Reform (1944–1950):** The government confiscated large estates under the guise of "fair redistribution", but much of the land was given to political loyalists instead of the public.

If the UK government is making forced land grabs easier, how is this different from what communist regimes did?

4. Suppression of Legal Challenges Against Infrastructure Projects

P&I Bill Provisions:

- Introduces barriers to legal challenges, limiting public objections to large-scale developments.
- Shifts decision-making to unelected officials, blocking local councils and legal bodies from reviewing key projects.
- Removes important checks and balances, making it harder to hold planners accountable.

Parallels to Communist Systems:

- **Soviet Legal System (1920s–1980s): Courts were merely state tools—ordinary people had no ability to challenge major government projects.**
- **East Germany's "Building Socialism" Policy (1950s–1980s): All housing and infrastructure projects were approved by the Socialist Unity Party, and legal opposition was impossible.**
- **China's Modern Legal Suppression: Developers linked to the Communist Party face little-to-no legal opposition, and dissenters are swiftly silenced through bureaucracy.**

If public legal challenges are restricted, how can this government claim to be upholding democracy?

5. Integration with the "Clean Energy Superpower" Agenda

P&I Bill Provisions:

- Prioritizes fast-tracking EV charging infrastructure and grid expansion for clean energy projects.
- The government has not disclosed how much of this infrastructure is funded by private stakeholders vs. taxpayer money.
- Introduces taxpayer-funded incentives for those living near new energy infrastructure to discourage opposition.

Parallels to Communist Systems:

- **Soviet Industrialization & Forced Electrification (1920s–1950s):** The government justified massive energy projects under the claim of "modernization," forcing communities to accept them without compensation.
- **China's Energy Expansion (2000s–present):** Entire villages have been relocated or demolished to make way for "green energy" projects, often with little say from residents.
- **Mao's "Great Leap Forward" (1958–1962):** The Chinese Communist Party massively expanded state-controlled industries, forcing communities to abandon traditional energy sources for inefficient, state-approved alternatives, leading to mass suffering and economic collapse.

Who really benefits from these rushed energy infrastructure projects, citizens or corporate interests?

Final Questions for MPs

- 1 Are you aware that this bill removes democratic oversight and weakens local control?
 - 2 Who advised the government to introduce this bill? Were private developers or corporate investors involved?
 - 3 Why is this bill limiting legal challenges against major infrastructure projects?
 - 4 How is this different from past communist land seizure policies?
-

This Bill is a Direct Threat to Democracy

The Planning & Infrastructure Bill is a repackaging of the Climate & Nature Bill, advancing the same centralization of power, restrictions on public objections, and forced development agendas under the guise of "planning reform."

These are the exact strategies used in authoritarian communist states. If MPs vote for this, they are enabling the erosion of private property rights, local democracy, and public resistance to government overreach.

We demand full transparency and accountability before any MP considers supporting this legislation.

Yours sincerely,

Madeleine Hunt

General Secretary, Heritage Party

On behalf of The Heritage Party members and supporters across the UK