

Affordable Housing survey

Respondent ID	The Mayor of London's guidance sets out a "fast track route" to determine planning applications, removing the need to provide affordable housing viability assessments in these two circumstances: a) developments on privately owned land without any public subsidy that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 35% of the total number of homes proposed b) developments on publicly owned land without any grant funding that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 50% of the total number of homes proposed. What are your views on this approach, and should it be adopted in Merton's Local Plan?	Merton's Local Plan affordable housing policy is assessed using the number of affordable homes proposed rather than habitable rooms (e.g. an application proposing two 2-bedroom units would be assessed as providing two affordable homes rather than six habitable rooms). Merton's local housing need indicates that there is equal demand for one, two and three bedroom homes. The Mayor of London's guidance defines the provision of affordable housing as habitable rooms rather than number of homes. The advantage of measuring provision by habitable rooms is that it encourages more larger sized affordable homes (i.e. 3 bedrooms and above). The disadvantage is that it can result in a lower total number of affordable homes provided. Should we count proposed affordable homes based on which of the following (tick all that apply):	Merton intends to publish developers' viability assessments submitted with planning applications so that everyone can see them. What are your views on this approach?	Merton's existing Local Plan affordable housing policy says that small site developments (10 homes or less) must provide affordable homes as part of these schemes. In November 2014 the government issued a change to national planning policy by setting a threshold of 11 homes and above which affordable housing requirements would be applicable. This change stemmed from government's concerns about adverse viability affects of local plan affordable housing requirements on small sites coming forward for development. What are your views on Merton's Local Plan affordable housing threshold requirement? Should it be retained or changed and if so to what and why?	Where proposals for student accommodation meet specific requirements set out in Merton's Local Plan, including those to ensure that the accommodation is designed, secured and managed exclusively for students, such proposals are currently not usually required to provide a proportion of affordable housing. Should this remain the case or should new student accommodation be required to contribute to affordable homes?	Please tell us if you have any other comments							
	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Total number of proposed affordable homes - Yes/No	Total number of proposed habitable rooms - Yes/No	Mix of both of the above - Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Open-Ended Response
6624298462	No	Development on private land should also provide 50% affordable before the fast track procedure can be used.			Yes		Yes	This transparency would allow those of us with expertise in housing development to provide additional challenge over and above Merton's own to viability assessments provided by housing developers.	Yes	Small sites which are 'for profit' sale - i.e. which are not developed by community groups, self-builders, RPs etc. should be required to provide affordable homes on the basis of a viability assessment (i.e. they should provide what they can afford whilst giving an acceptable margin of profit, not necessarily 20%).	Yes	Remain the case	
6621820929	No		Yes	No		This is semantics - just be consistent so we can all see how much of what is being provided. Encouraging larger homes is necessary.	No	Would oppose to such assessment being published due to the sensitive commercial data they contain	Yes		No		
6617282763	Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	don't really understand the issue.....	Affordable doesn't mean 'Social' housing. I would like to see targets for SOCIAL housing on all sites.
6617010995	Yes	Yes, but this does risk that assessment of consequential impacts such as increased demand for school places, transport and other infrastructure will be neglected.			Yes		Yes	Yes, and the process to assess viability should continue for, say 4 years, after construction to confirm that the assessment was broadly correct. The farcical situation where Wandsworth Council has swallowed the revised viability statements for the Battersea Power Station development, yet the developer's profits are maintained (and likely to rise) should not be allowed.	No	Clumsy question, as Yes/No doesn't easily match the retained/ changed phrasing of the question. The answer should be determined by the local situation. The risk is that some land owners/ developers will parcel a site into separate developments in order to get around the policy.	Yes		Given demand for affordable housing, and new "council housing", I think the local housing associations should be encouraged and assisted by the council to review their estates and see what additional housing could be sensitively added. For example, across the Phipps Bridge estates, there are small, often scruffy, postage stamp bits of green space at the end of existing blocks which could be developed with small blocks of e.g. 4-6 additional apartments. The big, valuable expanses of green space shouldn't be touched. Such little incremental developments would make a useful contribution to the affordable housing shortage.
6616998757	Yes				Yes		Yes	Developers need to be accountable and plans transparent too.	Yes	Smaller sites within a development enables an overall (larger) site to have adaptability. One overall larger site of continual design brings about monotony.	No		
6616954599	Yes	as long as it only refers to the need for a viability assessment. all other aspects of planning consideration should not be rushed.	Yes	No			Yes	yes, open transparent governance is key. for too long this has been denied, even to planning committee councillors.	Yes	changed to fall in line with the government target. otherwise developers would deliberately appeal decisions against us and would win. if the government changes its mind then we can fall in to line.	Yes	remain the case	
6616901156	Yes	As long as the affordable proportion meets certain minimum quality and environmental performance parameters.			Yes		Yes	Will help aid transparency of decision making.	Yes	Retained as there are probably a larger proportion of small sites in Merton compared to some other localities.	Yes	Student accommodation should remain exempt.	
6616896851	No			No	Yes		Yes		Yes	Reduce threshold to 6 homes or less, to increase the amount of affordable housing.	No	Student accommodation should include a proportion of affordable housing.	
6616806251													
6616803235	Yes				Yes	People should be able to choose whether to share houses or not; we need both	Yes	Yes, of course. If the application depends on viability, we should be able to see and question it.	Yes	Retain	Yes		
6616677303		I agree to these proposals as long as/with the following modifications:- 1. other planning policies are still followed and it is not a shortcut to passing appalling planning applications. 2. 35% total homes on private land should apply up to a certain size of development. Above a certain size, a higher % of affordable homes should be provided to relieve the need for affordable housing viability assessments. 3. ditto for publicly owned land - up to a certain size of development 50% affordable housing. Above a certain size, a higher % of affordable homes should be provided to relieve the need for affordable housing viability assessments.			Yes	Just using affordable homes does not provide the scope of home sizes needed. Especially if Merton does not want younger adults (25-35yrs) to leave the borough which will ultimately result in a reduction in not only younger adults and therefore children (which would make all the increases in school places redundant!) and an ongoing increase in the number of older people (65+). Homes must be provided for families with suitable/adequate room numbers, sizes and layouts. ie sufficient bedrooms for children, having proper family space than one open plan room with kitchen, dining room and living room in one which means a separate kitchen to living room.	Yes	Excellent idea. It appears as though it is too easy for developers to say it is not viable to provide affordable housing. This needs more scrutiny.	Yes	Maybe make other financial allowances - CL - increase viability of providing affordable housing for small developments.			Every effort must be made to provide affordable housing. This housing must be of good design externally and internally, good location, and constructed well. There are too many developments that are not properly monitored, constructed hurriedly with insufficiently trained workforce re construction rules and regulations, corners are cut and problems emerge once the properties are occupied. Developments must be properly constructed and properly monitored to ensure they are properly constructed.
6616292643	No				Yes		Yes						
6616271126	No		Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes		
6616258078	Yes	Maintain a variety of retail outlets, including local shops Buildings to be limited in height to a max of 6 stories Quality of Building design and construction to be high Density of development to be limited to protect nearby residential areas Provide new cultural venues including a new performance space Soft landscaping to be planned in i.e trees and flower beds Evening economy should be mixed and take into account quality of life of existing residents Improvement in the public highway in the town centre to learn lessons from Kingston to ensure it remains pedestrian friendly	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		No		Respect Conservation areas including South Park Gardens Retain all historic buildings including the facade of Centre Court
6616179358	Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		
6616176302	No	Part (a) seems acceptable. Part (b) does not seem demanding enough, considering it is publicly-owned land and the non-affordable homes may still take up most of the space by being larger.			Yes	I am confused as to how 2 two-bedroom homes are considered to have 6 habitable rooms between them.	Yes			Retain requirement for small sites	Yes	New private student accommodation developments are not accessible housing, they usually have very high rents.	
6616153438	Yes	How will Merton assure that the % of affordable housing will be provided?		No	Yes		Yes		Yes	Changing to 11+ homes requiring affordable housing may encourage smaller developments. Perhaps in changing, a greater % of affordable homes could be expected in larger developments.	No	Stay the same	
6616148028	Yes		Yes				Yes		Yes				
6616090915	No	"Affordable" housing already provided in Colliers Wood has been financially out of reach for the people it is aimed at helping. The Council is too quick to reduce the amount of affordable housing to appease developers. Colliers Wood is already densely populated with one small doctors surgery, over-subscribed primary school, pollution from too many cars. Already every spare piece of land is being built on. The Council assured us on more than one occasion that only Professional people, not families, would move into the Black tower, so there would be no concerns about school places. One of the first to rent a flat on the Tower is a family with two small children who will be a aboe-in for the school.	Yes	No		The habitable rooms approach will lead to people renting by the room and over-crowding.	Yes	There needs to be more transparency with regard to developers and local residents need to be given more of a say so we don't end up with 7 storey developments that dominate the High Street and over-shadow local houses like the library development on Colliers Wood High Street	Yes	Retain it. The Library development in Colliers Wood was all marketed at overseas investors at over-inflated prices. £450,000 for a one-bed flat is not affordable	Yes		Please make affordable housing truly affordable and stop allowing developments to be sold of to overseas investors. It was one of the Mayor of London's election promises which he has conveniently forgotten about.
6616024686	Yes		No	Yes			No		No		Yes		
6615999165	No				Yes		Yes				No		
6615978895	Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		
6615921320	No	I believe there examples where private companies have submitted plans and had them approved on the basis of agreeing to accommodate a percentage of 'affordable' housing only to ho ahead and completely ignore it. Can developments be monitored at late stages to ensure private building companies are abiding ny their commitment to affordable housing?	Yes			Surely 'affordable' is determined by the cost comparable to other properties of that size ie no. Of bedrooms in that area. Would like to see more 'affordable' housing for key workers: police, fire, NHS, nursery nurses, carers etc.	Yes	To be viewed at local libraries presimably? This would be good. What are the implications? We would be able to comment? Make objections?		Don't gave enough insight to comment. Im sure youve done the maths and this is reasonable.	Yes	Students of all people in society surely need affordable housing. So yes it should be included.	
6615888458	Yes												
6615887445	Yes												
6615877427	No				Yes		Yes						
6615867653	No				Yes		Yes						
6615864592	Yes		Yes	No			Yes		Yes	It should be changed in line with national planning policy	No		Fly tipping is a huge issue in Colliers Wood and needs urgent attention from the council

Affordable Housing Survey

Respondent ID	The Mayor of London's guidance sets out a "fast track route" to determine viability assessments, removing the need to provide affordable housing viability assessments in these two circumstances: a) developments on privately owned land without any public subsidy that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 35% of the total number of homes proposed b) developments on publicly owned land without any grant funding that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 50% of the total number of homes proposed. What are your views on this approach, and should it be adopted in Merton's Local Plan?	Merton's Local Plan affordable housing policy is assessed using the number of affordable homes proposed rather than habitable rooms (e.g. an application proposing two 2-bedroom units would be assessed as providing two affordable homes rather than six habitable rooms). Merton's local housing need indicates that there is equal demand for one, two and three bedroom homes. The Mayor of London's guidance defines the provision of affordable housing as habitable rooms rather than number of homes. The advantage of measuring provision by habitable rooms is that it encourages more larger sized affordable homes (i.e. 3 bedrooms and above). The disadvantage is that it can result in a lower total number of affordable homes provided. Should we count proposed affordable homes based on which of the following (tick all that apply):	Merton intends to publish developers' viability assessments submitted with planning applications so that everyone can see them. What are your views on this approach?	Merton's existing Local Plan affordable housing policy says that small site developments (10 homes or less) must provide affordable homes as part of these schemes. In November 2014 the government issued a change to national planning policy by setting a threshold of 11 homes and above which affordable housing requirements would be applicable. This change stemmed from government's concerns about adverse viability affects of local plan affordable housing requirements on small sites coming forward for development. What are your views on Merton's Local Plan affordable housing threshold requirement? Should it be retained or changed and if so to what and why?	Where proposals for student accommodation meet specific requirements set out in Merton's Local Plan, including those to ensure that the accommodation is designed, secured and managed exclusively for students, such proposals are currently not usually required to provide a proportion of affordable housing. Should this remain the case or should new student accommodation be required to contribute to affordable homes?	Please tell us if you have any other comments							
	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Total number of proposed affordable homes - Yes/No	Total number of habitable rooms - Yes/No	Mix of both of the above - Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Open-Ended Response
6615862614	No	We should wait until Brexit as many foreign workers are already leaving UK. This will free up housing. ALSO, if there are more houses there needs to be more community facilities like Doctors, Dentists, school places etc. There will be more cars doing planetary wrongs and even more cramped public travel. I've seen what has happened so far and there seems to be an obsession with more houses. This makes the residents wonder who at the Council is benefiting from such deals.					Yes		No	We need facilities that support a growing population not just more houses. Needs higher percentage of affordable homes.		No more student accommodation because Colliers Wood is already too crowded.	
6615861491	Yes				Yes		Yes			Question isn't clear! (Should it be retained or changed - yes or no). Policy should be retained			
6615822446	Yes				Yes	assessment mechanism must take into account the need, as well as the outcome	Yes	I would also support publishing pre-application advice.	Yes	10 is a relatively small number and probably disadvantages smaller developer who are able to develop smaller plots overlooked by larger developers. I would perhaps prefer to see a contribution made to an affordable housing building fund that would enable the council or RHP to build more homes for social rent.	Yes	Student housing of this type is run as a business for long term profit. It should not be exempt from providing affordable housing.	
6614952611	Yes		Yes	No			Yes		Yes		Yes		
6614951947	Yes		Yes	No			Yes		Yes	Keep at 10	No		
6614377135	No		Yes				Yes		Yes	small developments should be exempt	Yes		
6614245251	Yes				Yes		Yes	A good idea	Yes	Don't want to encourage loopholes allowing ways out of providing affordable housing	Yes	Student housing should be affordable	
6613583751	Yes		Yes				Yes		Yes		No		
6613544858	Yes												
6612010969	Yes	With the proviso that the type of affordable housing proposed is in line with the needs of the population ie family homes as well as starter homes.			Yes		Yes		No	Retaining the affordable homes requirement on small sites means that they may not be developed at all.	Yes		
6611989879	Yes	Merton needs to review the luxury flats developments already given planning approval to ensure affordable housing is at least 35%. For example, Plough Lane development by Galliard has only 9% affordable housing ensuring a huge profit for Galliard with no payments towards infrastructure costs like schools, roads, transport and healthcare.			Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Any developments should be constructed using high quality materials, preferably London stock to ensure the development will not look shabby & derelict after a short time. Height should not be above 5 stories as we wish to preserve the character of the borough and not turn into high rise Croydon
6611635982	Yes				Yes	This option enables flexibility suited to the location and size of the site	No	Viability assessments can be difficult to interpret. A standard format with clear recommendations is paramount if they are to be published	Yes	Small site where only one or two units are affordable are often difficult to manage and there is a reluctance from Housing Associations to take these on. This is especially problematic on very high value developments. Commuted sums to offset the provision of affordable would be preferable	Yes	Student accommodation should not be required to provide affordable provision	A more robust approach to securing shared ownership on sites would be welcomed. Clear and consistent advice from the outset should also be a priority
6610384560	Yes						Yes						
6610361581	No		Yes				Yes						
6610273076	Yes			Yes			Yes			Should be retained	Yes		
6610230505	Yes		Yes	No			Yes		Yes	Retained - small site exemption encourages inefficient site development in marginal cases to remain below threshold	Yes	Continue exemption from affordable requirement	
6610035103	Yes		No		Yes								
6610034817	Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes	It is too easy for developers to claim they can't "afford" to include affordable housing in new developments. Merton should stick to the Merton Rule at all times. Also, Merton, like the rest of London, needs more social housing for low rents. "Rent to buy" has just provided a way for developers to line their pockets at tax payers' expense.	Yes	It should be a condition of building/changing buildings to student use that they should be used for social and affordable housing only, if the number of students wanting to rent rooms decreases. 240 Burlington Road springs to mind.	
6608575623	Yes	Local Plan will be required to comply with the London Plan. The delivery of affordable housing must be a strategic priority in the Local Plan. It will be important to establish a clear policy framework and for the Council to work with developers to maximise provision. Viability appraisals have been used to justify lower levels of affordable housing provision and a new and more proactive approach is required. The policy needs to be clearer with regard to the mix of housing types and tenures that will be acceptable.	Yes	No		The mix of affordable homes should be determined taking into account local needs. The application of habitable rooms rather than number of units as a measure of affordable housing provision raises concerns as this could result in a lower level of provision. A mix of the two approaches could provide an element of flexibility to respond to identified needs. An overall housing strategy is required.	Yes	I would support the publication of viability assessments given that these have been used to justify lower levels of provision and there is a need for thorough scrutiny in order to maximise future provision. This issue has been highlighted by the current application for the redevelopment of the High Path Estate. A net increase of over 1000 new homes is proposed without any increase in the number of affordable housing units and this has been justified on viability grounds.	Yes	It should be retained where redevelopment will result in a net increase in the number of housing units on a site but recognised that on smaller sites this may take the form of a financial contribution rather than on-site provision.	No	The Council should work with providers to ensure rents are charged at an affordable level. There should also be controls about conversion to general housing at a future date without the requirement for planning consent and associated planning obligations including affordable housing provision.	
6608337413	No		No	Yes			Yes	These documents are incredibly complex. By all means publish them but they still need to be professionally scrutinized and analysed.	No	Developers will always try and get just under the threshold. Make it 6 and they will build in blocks of 5.	No		The estate redevelopment plans in Merton are set to destroy what affordable housing there is left. Why? Looks like social cleansing. Sound, well built blocks with decent room sizes on High Path are set to be demolished to make way for tiny affordable flats and expensive homes to meet the development costs. Best to leave what is there and make sure it is being occupied by the right people - which a lot of it isn't at the moment.
6607794035	Yes												
6606823477	No		Yes	No			Yes	Ensure transparency in the process	Yes		Yes		The Local Plan should include specific proposals for the building of social housing at rent-levels linked to the London Living Wage.
6605541924	No	I think that the Mayor of London isn't thinking of the community when he speaks about residents building in back gardens or relaxing planning laws that were set up for a purpose to prevent greedy landowners from building whatever they want for sole purpose of making money. He spoke recently about building houses in 'back gardens in Suburbia' which I feel is a very insensitive remark as most people who have moved out to Morden did so as they could not afford a property in Tooting. I have had many people in the Morden area who have experienced landowners building houses in the rear garden and then sell them on. This has been detrimental to the family, the area & the community. My own family have had to endure three years of living next door to an illegal B&B accommodation (the first 9 months the property was a major building site, with no regard to the neighbours in the road). The owners do not want to speak / be a part of the community they just are interested in making money with sometimes over six cars parked outside on the road. People are coming and going all day long, every day. Does Sadiq Khan think this is an acceptable way to build a community? I would like to hear his comments. Mary Gell	Yes	No		Young people in Merton cannot afford to buy in the Borough there should be more affordable Housing for them. We are seeing many of our talented youngsters moving to areas like Manchester, Leicester & Birmingham. This isn't fair as they grew up in this borough and are now priced out of the Area.	Yes	There needs to be more transparency around Planning.	Yes	I agree with this as it will allow young people to be able to bid for properties that they could afford.	Yes		Having been through the Planning process, there is very little feedback from the Planning Dept or the Planning Inspectorate on decisions that have been made. I would like more transparency from these departments and it would be useful to be advised what neighbours are intending to build & the time limits that need to be adhered to, so that neighbours can put their concerns into Planning. It would be helpful to know who neighbours can contact for help and advice for Planning.
6605193449	Yes		Yes	No			Yes		Yes		Yes		
6599205877	Yes		Yes	No			Yes		Yes		Yes		

Affordable Housing survey

Respondent ID	The Mayor of London's guidance sets out a "fast track route" to determine planning applications, removing the need to provide affordable housing viability assessments in these two circumstances: a) developments on privately owned land without any public subsidy that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 35% of the total number of homes proposed b) developments on publicly owned land without any grant funding that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 50% of the total number of homes proposed. What are your views on this approach, and should it be adopted in Merton's Local Plan?	Merton's Local Plan affordable housing policy is assessed using the number of affordable homes proposed rather than habitable rooms (e.g. an application proposing two 2-bedroom units would be assessed as providing two affordable homes rather than six habitable rooms). Merton's local housing need indicates that there is equal demand for one, two and three bedroom homes. The Mayor of London's guidance defines the provision of affordable housing as habitable rooms rather than number of homes. The advantage of measuring provision by habitable rooms is that it encourages more larger sized affordable homes (i.e. 3 bedrooms and above). The disadvantage is that it can result in a lower total number of affordable homes provided. Should we count proposed affordable homes based on which of the following (tick all that apply):	Merton intends to publish developers' viability assessments submitted with planning applications so that everyone can see them. What are your views on this approach?	Merton's existing Local Plan affordable housing policy says that small site developments (10 homes or less) must provide affordable homes as part of these schemes. In November 2014 the government issued a change to national planning policy by setting a threshold of 11 homes and above which affordable housing requirements would be applicable. This change stemmed from government's concerns about adverse viability affects of local plan affordable housing requirements on small sites coming forward for development. What are your views on Merton's Local Plan affordable housing threshold requirement? Should it be retained or changed and if so to what and why?	Where proposals for student accommodation meet specific requirements set out in Merton's Local Plan, including those to ensure that the accommodation is designed, secured and managed exclusively for students, such proposals are currently not usually required to provide a proportion of affordable housing. Should this remain the case or should new student accommodation be required to contribute to affordable homes?	Please tell us if you have any other comments							
	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Total number of proposed affordable homes - Yes/No	Total number of proposed habitable rooms - Yes/No	Mix of both of the above - Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Open-Ended Response
6547604115	Yes		Yes		No	I want newly built affordable accommodation to be concentrated on starter homes to allow young people to live and work in London. For this purpose smaller homes are ideal.	Yes		No	A greater supply of housing will, of itself, assist with affordability. For this reason only essential barriers should be erected to any developments. This restriction is not essential.	No		
6547339499			Yes	No			Yes		No		No		
6547238816	Yes		Yes	No			Yes			keep it the same	Yes		Student accom should be required to contribute to affordable homes
6546385304	Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes		Yes		Student accommodation is unique and should be fit for purpose to accommodate students and not try to be all things.
6546218184							Yes		Yes	It should be retained.	No		
6546205425	No	Agree with (a) but not (b). 50% seems an awful lot of affordable homes. Worried we will end up with only the rich and people on benefits living in the area. Will working families be catered for?			Yes	We need to encourage young people who work and are in their 20s an early 30s to live in the area. They need help to buy 2 bed units.	Yes	not sure what this is	Yes	You have phrased an open question with a closed answer - to be clear drop Merton's and go with gov 11 units	Yes		I would like an assurance from Merton that no parkland will be sacrificed for new housing.
6545810224	No				Yes		Yes			I think the government threshold of 11 homes seems fair.	No		
6545776174	Yes				Yes	I would prefer it to be based solely on proposed homes but if a third of Merton's needs are 3-bedroom homes, then a mix sounds necessary to ensure these homes get built.	Yes	Transparency would be useful	Yes	This should be retained if small site developments are going to be the main way homes get built. If 11+ developments are the norm, I would be fine changing the rules.	No		
6545577726	Yes				Yes		Yes						
6545459766	No												
6542820427	Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes		No		
6541925222	Yes		Yes				Yes	Transparency is often lacking in planning applications. It is important that developers be required to be fully transparent with their plans.	Yes	The threshold of 11 homes is too high. It is easy for developers to circumvent any requirements by breaking up developments into smaller pieces.	No		Student housing should not be such a priority for the Borough that affordable housing is neglected.
6541413409	Yes	We need key workers. We should support them to keep our community healthy, wise and diverse.	Yes	No			Yes	Ok but needs folk to engage. Limited. Needs publicity and outreach.	No	We need to encourage maximum affordable housing	Yes		Support affordable homes for students but not at expense of non-student longer term residents.
6540842648	No		No	Yes			Yes		Yes	Change is to encourage young professionals as well and not only social housing	Yes		
6539448607	Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	Small developments may not be appropriate for affordable homes depending on location / space etc. Larger developments should have more flexibility to accommodate	Yes		
6539252999	Yes		Yes	No			Yes		Yes	Merton's local plan affordable housing should be kept as it is. The Government's plan would reduce affordable housing as developers may use to their financial advantage for just private sector.	Yes		Student living is very fluid, best not to include this. Keep as student living only, usually relatively only short lets.
653785968	Yes			No									
6533101100	No		Yes	No			Yes		Yes		Yes		
6530645319	Yes												
6530212761	Yes		Yes				Yes		No		Yes		
6527645763	Yes				Yes		Yes				No		
6525852932	Yes	It seems as if this is saying no public subsidy for affordable housing. In principle I agree with this.		Yes	No		Yes	Seems as if this would highlight the previous successes of building companies.	Yes	The existing policy for small sites of 10 homes or less should stand.	Yes		Because there will be some students who may require affordable homes and should not just be a revenue stream.
6523456429	No				Yes		Yes		No		Yes		
6522378278	No				Yes		Yes	very important	Yes	all developments should provide affordable home or pay a premium if they aren't included	No		new student accommodation should be required to contribute to affordable homes
6522287838	Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes	Merton's history of affordable and social; housing is not good e.g the Plough lane development when they provided only 10% of affordable housing when the demand was for 40%. We need to see transparent plans - not confused with the 106 money.	Yes		
6521716122	No	The information is unclear in its current wording and in its implications. Above all: what is meant by affordable housing? We surely need the construction of a significant number of dwellings that provide SOCIAL housing. Affordable housing in many parts of Merton is not a realistic concept, given the greed of developers. The local planning framework must always be respected.				All planning needs to take account of infrastructure needs eg traffic movement, school places, doctors' surgeries. The implications of Merton's affordable housing policy in relation to affordable homes is not clearly explained above.	Yes	The more transparency, the better.	No	If it is retained, it must be rigorously implemented, so that developers are required to comply and so that the affordable homes actually do materialise from all developments. It would be a valuable element of transparency if the Council were to publish how many affordable homes were produced as a consequence of every single development which was completed in a given time period.	No		Not unconditionally. It isn't clear that all student accommodation in London is affordable for the vast majority of UK students. Much student accommodation is priced for the external/foreign student market and is rented or bought by rich students or speculators from abroad. Policies on student housing should be carefully framed to make sure that the housing is available to UK students on limited budgets, bearing in mind how much is available to these students to pay rent from their maintenance loans.
6521581590	Yes		Yes			However this should then reduce the % of affordable homes to be provided compared to that proposed by the Mayor of London	No	Viability assessments are complicated and should be reviewed by experts within or working for the Council. These assessments are capable of many differing interpretations many of which will be misleading	Yes	The council should stay with the national planning policy ie no affordable homes for developments of 11 homes and below	Yes		Stay with the current Local Plan
6520194973	Yes		Yes	No		There seems opportunity to misuse property where affordable homes are defined by habitable rooms and spaces. I have seen property where too many people have been crammed into poor living conditions to create income for wealthy landlords. Can we ensure that this would not be done?	Yes	I would be very interested to read the background to an application.					
6519866107	Yes												
6518428423		Developers are coming back to the Council halfway through the building process to claim that the agreed provision of social housing is uneconomic and the social housing requirement is relaxed. On all future grants of planning permission, and before any fast track proposals are adopted, it must be made clear to developers that social housing conditions will not be relaxed. That way developers will know they must be more careful not to bid up the prices they pay for sites.			Yes	A common sense approach to a mix should be taken. Whilst not necessarily talking about overcrowding, we are aware of existing units where the accommodation is less than ideal for the size of families occupying them. Adequate provision of 3 bedroom units should be given due priority.	Yes	This approach is long overdue however the council will need staff qualified to judge viability assessments. As stated above developers will need to know that commitments to social housing cannot be varied subsequently.	Yes	Sites with 5 home or less could be excluded from affordable homes provisions. Those with 6 or 7 should provide one, and those with 8 or 9 two.	Yes		
6518352169	No	Fast tracking developments means their potential impact on issues including transport, air quality etc will not be properly investigated or considered, affordable housing is important but should not come before the need for proper consideration of planning applications.			Yes	Developers currently cram in as many units as possible. It is important to offer a mix of homes at affordable rates or population will become skewed.	Yes	Definitely.	Yes		No		Transparency is critical.
6516969115	Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	Should be retained and ENFORCED.	No		Student accommodation should be required to contribute to affordable homes. Or at least rented on short term leases to homeless people instead of term time.
6516074547	No				Yes	It is not an either or situation - demand needs to be tailored to what is actually needed eg Family with 2 young children needs, say, at an early age of children 2 bedrooms of decent size but a family with older children would need probably 3 bedrooms and also looking to the future with mortgage rates rising, people might not be able to afford to move houses with a growing family, so easily							

Affordable Housing survey

Respondent ID	The Mayor of London's guidance sets out a "fast track route" to determine viability assessments, removing the need to provide affordable housing viability assessments in these two circumstances: a) developments on privately owned land without any public subsidy that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 35% of the total number of homes proposed b) developments on publicly owned land without any grant funding that provide affordable housing meeting or exceeding 50% of the total number of homes proposed. What are your views on this approach, and should it be adopted in Merton's Local Plan?		Merton's Local Plan affordable housing policy is assessed using the number of affordable homes proposed rather than habitable rooms (e.g. an application proposing two 2-bedroom units would be assessed as providing two affordable homes rather than six habitable rooms). Merton's local housing need indicates that there is equal demand for one, two and three bedroom homes. The Mayor of London's guidance defines the provision of affordable housing as habitable rooms rather than number of homes. The advantage of measuring provision by habitable rooms is that it encourages more larger sized affordable homes (i.e. 3 bedrooms and above). The disadvantage is that it can result in a lower total number of affordable homes provided. Should we count proposed affordable homes based on which of the following (tick all that apply):				Merton intends to publish developers' viability assessments submitted with planning applications so that everyone can see them. What are your views on this approach?		Merton's existing Local Plan affordable housing policy says that small site developments (10 homes or less) must provide affordable homes as part of these schemes. In November 2014 the government issued a change to national planning policy by setting a threshold of 11 homes and above which affordable housing requirements would be applicable. This change stemmed from government's concerns about adverse viability affects of local plan affordable housing requirements on small sites coming forward for development. What are your views on Merton's Local Plan affordable housing threshold requirement? Should it be retained or changed and if so to what and why?		Where proposals for student accommodation meet specific requirements set out in Merton's Local Plan, including those to ensure that the accommodation is designed, secured and managed exclusively for students, such proposals are currently not usually required to provide a proportion of affordable housing. Should this remain the case or should new student accommodation be required to contribute to affordable homes?		Please tell us if you have any other comments
	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Total number of proposed affordable homes - Yes/No	Total number of proposed habitable rooms - Yes/No	Mix of both of the above - Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	Yes/No	Other (please specify)	Yes/No	Please use the box below to tell us more (optional)	
6511393674	No	My concern would be that the "fast track" could be abused by developers. Detail would be needed on what would be excluded to "fast track" to ensure this does not happen.	Yes			It appears that Merton primarily needs 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes and so measuring the number of affordable homes seems most sensible.	Yes		Yes	This question isn't answered with a yes or no answer. Poorly worded. Yes, Merton should keep the 10 homes or less providing affordable housing. Affordable housing is what is needed in the borough. There will be developers who will develop small sites.	Yes	...with the caveat that these properties will presumably be built as 'buy-to-let' properties and then rented to students. As such they'll be bought by individuals/companies with the capital to buy property as investment. They should therefore not be "affordable".	
6503134408	Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes	I think at least a third of all new developments should be a mix of affordable and social rented units. eg a build of 3 units, 1 has to be affordable, 9 units then 2 have to be affordable and 1 social rent	No		
6495942998	Yes												
Email	Yes		No	No	Yes	The extremes of both options would produce ridiculous outcomes therefore common sense should prevail and a mix of both options should be applied in a sensible fashion	Yes	This is only useful if there is the right to appeal against any planning application based on the viability assessment.		I do not understand the issue. More information on the impact of threshold levels is required to give a valid response	No	This is on the assumption that the student accommodation is affordable to all students	