Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO1
Response Date	23/09/14 17:37
Consultation Point	Question 8 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 8

Do you have any comments as to what this Local Plan should contain?

Less irrelevant stuff.

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO2
Response Date	23/09/14 17:37
Consultation Point	Question 1 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 1

Do you have any comments regarding the use of a 5 dwelling threshold, in relation to the provision of affordable housing?

I think this is too low, as it results in just one low-cost unit. And the people in it may feel socially isolated. I feel the development at Gorsedene Close, Crowborough with, I think, 2 lower-cost dwellings plus 7 more-expensive ones is a better example (even if this example is NOT of social housing).

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO3
Response Date	23/09/14 17:37
Consultation Point	Question 2 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 2

Do you have any comments regarding the use of a threshold of 0.2 hectares, in relation to the provision of affordable housing?

I don't think a site-area criterion is appropriate. If someone wants to build a small number of houses on a small number of large plots such as 3 on a hectare then I don't see why you should try to add an affordable dwelling. I see the objective of increasing housing density as fair enough for affordable housing but think it's entirely wrong for the planning authority to enforce this for all housing. I like a big garden. Why shouldn't I have one? I live in the old Wythiam area in what's not Crowborough: minimum plot size of 0.25 acres when my house was built in 1977 or so.

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO4
Response Date	23/09/14 17:38
Consultation Point	Question 3 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 3

Do you have any comments regarding the general requirement of 35% affordable housing?

It sounds at about the right level but I think it's important to NOT cast this is stone until you see how it works out over a few years. May be unworkably or unaffordably high.

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO5
Response Date	23/09/14 17:38
Consultation Point	Question 4 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Question 4	

Do you have any comments regarding the general tenure requirement of 80% social rent and 20% intermediate accommodation, and the use of affordable rent products?

I think this is far too much social and not enough intermediate. You have the objective of boosting the local economy and many units of social will not contribute to that. And then there's the case of my friend's builder who was buying a flat to rent out while living in social housing....

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO6
Response Date	23/09/14 17:38
Consultation Point	Question 5 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 5

Do you have any comments regarding the the tenure requirement of 40% social rent, 40% affordable rent and 20% intermediate accommodation for strategic sites?

That sounds a better mixture for ALL large sites. Not of course for small ones as you can't subdivide a small number that finely. An therefore I think you should be flexible in what mix you require for small sites: all social or all affordable, for instance. What matters is that you get a good mix across the district.

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO7
Response Date	23/09/14 17:38
Consultation Point	Question 6 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 6

Do you have any comments regarding the use of affordable rented products in relation to larger sites?

I think that's where there's the opportunity to fit these in and avoid problems of allocation between very small numbers. Indeed I think that to meet your objectives that's where you should be focussing on hitting the 35% overall target.

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO9
Response Date	23/09/14 17:39
Consultation Point	Question 1 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 1

Do you have any comments regarding the use of a 5 dwelling threshold, in relation to the provision of affordable housing?

I think this is too low, as it results in just one low-cost unit. And the people in it may feel socially isolated. I feel the development at Gorsedene Close, Crowborough with, I think, 2 lower-cost dwellings plus 7 more-expensive ones is a better example (even if this example is NOT of social housing).

Comment

Consultee	Mr John Cole (620259)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr John Cole
Comment ID	AHDIO8
Response Date	23/09/14 17:38
Consultation Point	Question 7 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 7

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

If I look at the list of objectives set out in the Sustainability document I lose confidence in the process: how on earth do you think you can simultaneously pursue 22 objectives? Fortunately for you most of them seem irrelevant in this case as they are (at least marked as) they are neutral across all options: this applies to 18 of the 26. The only ones YOU mark as differentiating are : Social 1: opportunity for a home Social 2: improve health Social 3: promote inclusion Economic 19: high employment so all the rest is a waste of space. You give no logic or data to support you ratings on these 4 criteria and I think they do not stand up to examination. For instance, you say that more affordable housing will support high employment. But is this true? Many of those in such accommodation are pensioners or not in work. Increasing the numbers of such people in an area will NOT improve economic activity as they don't generate wealth, only consume it. It's GENERATING wealth that increases prosperity, and although I support the building of social housing for people who need it I do this on the basis that it's good for society but one that takes a lot of wealth OUT if the community. We can afford it, but let's not be silly and pretend it makes ua=s economically better off.