

# Mr Dave Putson comments

Page: [Draft New London Plan](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I attended the LGA meeting on The New London Plan in LB Bexley on 1st February 2018.

I was generally accepting of the ambitions of the proposals. However, despite having stated that parties had to be careful with their language to describe the proposals I found some of the language less than accurate. let alone acceptable.

We all know that the term "Affordable Housing" is a Tory definition and means that rents would be 80% of the "market rate", whatever that variable is dependent upon location . And of that 80% any affordable housing would only be available in building units of more than 10 homes. Any such development should generally have 35% "affordable homes". Of this allocation 70% should be "social", 30% intermediate. This in real terms offers less than 25% for social housing. The New London Plan offers three newer elements still dubbed "affordable" with lesser criteria, as set by the Mayor. However, everybody already accepts the Tory version of "affordable" so attempting to redefine the terminology will be lost in a sea of semantics. To clarify the London Mayor's position on housing the term "affordable" should be dropped entirely and replaced with the already accepted and understood term "social housing" . This being understood to mean council housing.

The concept still being offered of a "Housing market" to be addressed and should also be challenged. Housing is a right. The right to have a home. The Tories should not be allowed either the terminology or attitude to promote the concept of commodification or monetising of Housing. Council Housing should be a requirement of all builders up to the Mayors specified building numbers, before any private allocations are accepted over and above our housing need.

In Bexley we previously had less than 500 families placed in temporary accommodation, this has now soared, in short order, to 1200 at a cost of £5 million per year. Each family and families children are then detrimentally impacted by the dire consequences of this social status and the attributable poverty. This has impacts on health and well being for the rest of these families lives with consequent shorter life expectations (Michael Marmot : "The Health Gap"). To provide a home for all Londoners is imperative, to eliminate the necessity for temporary housing requirement is imperative, to disown Tory terminology and the attitudes it implies, and imbues debate with, is essential.

If the Mayor's New London Plan does anything it should, I agree, be careful about its use of language. A Labour London Mayor should ensure that he does not use, in a lazy manner, Tory terminology which can effect, and implies an acceptance of, offensive terminology such as those referenced above.

Page: [Policy H7 Affordable housing tenure](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I attended the LGA meeting on The New London Plan in LB Bexley on 1st February 2018.

I was generally accepting of the ambitions of the proposals. However, despite having stated that parties had to be careful with their language to describe the proposals I found some of the language less than accurate. let alone acceptable.

We all know that the term "Affordable Housing" is a Tory definition and means that rents would be 80% of the "market rate", whatever that variable is dependent upon location . And of that 80% any affordable housing would only be available in building units of more than 10 homes. Any such development should generally have 35% "affordable homes". Of this allocation 70% should be "social", 30% intermediate. This in real terms offers less than 25% for social housing. The New London Plan offers three newer elements still dubbed "affordable" with lesser criteria, as set by the Mayor. However, everybody already accepts the Tory version of "affordable" so attempting to redefine the terminology will be lost in a sea of semantics. To clarify the London Mayor's position on housing the term "affordable" should be dropped entirely and replaced with the already accepted and understood term "social housing" . This being understood to mean council housing.

The concept still being offered of a "Housing market" to be addressed and should also be challenged. Housing is a right. The right to have a home. The Tories should not be allowed either the terminology or attitude to promote the concept of commodification or monetising of Housing. Council Housing should be a requirement of all builders up to the Mayors specified building numbers, before any private allocations are accepted over and above our housing need.

In Bexley we previously had less than 500 families placed in temporary accommodation, this has now soared, in short order, to 1200 at a cost of £5 million per year. Each family and families children are then detrimentally impacted by the dire consequences of this social status and the attributable poverty. This has impacts on health and well being for the rest of these families lives with consequent shorter life expectations (Michael Marmot : "The Health Gap"). To provide a home for all Londoners is imperative, to eliminate the necessity for temporary housing requirement is imperative, to disown Tory terminology and the attitudes it implies, and imbues debate with, is essential.

If the Mayor's New London Plan does anything it should, I agree, be careful about its use of language. A Labour London Mayor should ensure that he does not use, in a lazy manner, Tory terminology which can effect, and implies an acceptance of, offensive terminology such as those referenced above.