

GLA Planning

Consultation summary

Support for Housebuilding London Plan Guidance

March 2026

Support for Housebuilding London Plan Guidance consultation report

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Who took part?.....	2
3.	Consultation feedback and GLA response	4
3.1	Cycle parking	4
3.2	Changes to housing design standards.....	7
3.3	Affordable Housing	8
4.	Next steps	18
Appendix 1	Consultation and engagement events	19
Appendix 2	Organisation consultation responses.....	20

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 In October 2025 the government and Mayor announced a series of measures to support housebuilding in London. This responds to the current challenging macro-economic circumstances and the changing national regulatory landscape which have led to a reduction in housebuilding in the capital.
- 1.1.2 The London Plan Guidance (LPG) consultation proposed time-limited changes to cycle parking requirements and changes to housing design guidance, together with a new time-limited planning route for the delivery of affordable housing.
- 1.1.3 The government separately developed and consulted on a time-limited approach to Borough Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) relief and introducing additional planning powers for the Mayor.
- 1.1.4 Between 28 November 2025 and 22 January 2026 the Greater London Authority (GLA) carried out a consultation on the Mayor's draft Support for Housebuilding London Plan Guidance (SHBLPG).
- 1.1.5 In total, there were 281 email responses to the consultation. All consultation responses have been considered in the writing of the final SHBLPG 2026. This document provides a summary of consultation responses received. The Mayor would like to thank everyone who took part.

2. Who took part?

2.1.1 This section shows the breakdown of email respondents, whether they were writing as an individual or on behalf of an organisation.

2.1.2 As part of the engagement on the draft guidance, respondents replied via email. While there were 11 questions in the LPG, due to the free format response, a large proportion of respondents did not reply to individual questions, either grouping by topic or responding to particular areas in which their interests lie. All the responses have been viewed by officers and summarised below, with GLA responses from planning officers.

Table 1. Consultation Respondents

Respondent type	Number	Percentage
Resident (Individuals)	108	38.4%
Developer	76	27%
Local Authority	31	11%
Campaign Group	17	6%
Professional Body	11	3.9%
Registered Provider	9	3.2%
Community Organisation	7	2.5%
Planning Consultancy	5	1.8%
Financial Institution	4	1.4%
Charity	4	1.4%
Political Affiliate	4	1.4%
Think Tank	3	1.1%
Public Sector Other	2	0.7%

Respondent type	Number	Percentage
Total	281	100%

See Appendix 1 for a list of organisations who responded to the consultation.

*Many developers and one registered provider sent responses through planning consultants, in this case the organisation was counted for who the email intended (i.e. developer), but all planning consultancies and counts are available in Appendix 1.

3. Consultation feedback and GLA response

3.1 Cycle parking

3.1.1 Question 1: Are the proposed changes to the cycle parking standards, in conjunction with the wider package proposed by this consultation, likely to make a material difference to the viability of residential schemes while still providing sufficient cycle parking to enable sustainable growth in London and mode shift?

3.1.2 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- There was a mix of views about the impacts to viability with some welcoming the measures, and large proportion suggesting the impacts on viability are likely to be low – this was deemed to be largely location, site conditions and development type dependant.
- Responses suggested that standards should be increased, including for student accommodation; and that standards should be reduced, particularly in inner and central London. Suggested impacts include that cycling will be reduced and it will be more difficult to provide parking for larger cycles, however all the consequences have not been sufficiently evidenced. Many developer responses provided evidence of the significant underuse of current provisions, demonstrating sufficient space for projected growth.
- Responses suggested the measures do not align with the vision-led approach of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, or the Government’s ambition of more development around stations, and contradicts the UK’s commitment to climate change.
- The standards are inappropriate as: without funding for major transport schemes, more, not less cycle parking will be required, and they are highest in the most accessible areas of the city rather than where public transport accessibility is lower. There should be further analysis of borough-level cycling uptake and there should be more specific approaches for Opportunity Areas and town centres.
- There could be other reasons for parking not being used, including security, maintenance and poor design. However, lower requirements mean parking could be integrated better into developments.
- While some comments included that boroughs should retain discretion to require higher provision, other comments stated that allowing borough discretion adds uncertainty.

- Clarity is needed on whether the proposals will be continued in the next London Plan with some suggesting that the measures should not be time-limited.
- Applicants should demonstrate the potential to increase parking in the future; they should monitor the impact of the proposals and the impact on cycle parking quality.
- There should be further guidance on the following: the London Plan specialist older persons' housing requirement should be reconfirmed; space for storage of prams and mobility aids; short-stay parking; and charging of e-bikes.

3.1.3 Question 2: Do you consider that the guidance on flexibility and quality in sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the guidance will address development viability and cycle parking quality challenges?

3.1.4 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- Respondents suggested that the additional flexibility should be removed, or the new minimums should be removed: both are not required. Others suggested that flexibility is unlikely to be used.
- It should be explicit that all the types of parking are definitely acceptable in lieu of long-stay parking (so change 'may' at paragraph 2.3.1 to 'should').
- Clarity on the level of evidence and criteria for flexibility should be provided.
- Additional guidance should be added on phasing provision over time (such as is currently required for disabled persons' car parking) and require conversion of car parking spaces for this.
- Flexibility should not be offered for the following: high-density or large-scale developments, and basements, because parking can still be provided above the ground floor.
- On-street parking should not be allowed (as it means losing control of public land, which is already constrained, and it would not provide for all cycles and accessories); on-street parking should be allowed only for listed buildings or upper floor conversions; on-street parking should be at the discretion of highway authorities.
- Respondents supported the recognition of hire in lieu of ownership; that hire operators' continued operation cannot be guaranteed; hire provision should be required regardless of long-stay parking requirements being met and that hire provision should not be allowed in lieu of long-stay parking.

- Cycle storage within flats is unacceptable because of space and manoeuvring and cleanliness requirements, lift requirements would reduce viability and folding cycles are already kept in dwellings.
- More guidance should be provided on the following: a presumption in favour of long-stay cycle parking; mezzanines; active frontages; safety and security; access; types of parking; e-bikes; larger cycles; fire risks; and mobility scooters.
- Better guidance than the 'London Cycling Design Standards' is needed given its age and it does not address inclusion and safety issues adequately.
- The guidance is welcomed as Transport for London is too prescriptive about requirements, such as not accepting two-tier parking; the 'London Cycling Design Standards' should be a starting point and not applied rigidly.
- Respondents stated that the rule of thumb on space required for cycle parking is too rigid, as shape and layout of space are also important and that the rule of thumb should be adopted as standard requirements, with details secured through planning conditions.

GLA response to Q1 and Q2

- 3.1.5 The mix of views on the impact of the changes are noted. The guidance has considered the balance of aims set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and is informed by evidence as set out in the 'Background information' document. While this is based on the best available London-wide evidence of the London Travel Demand Survey, the proposal allows for more specific evidence to be applied by boroughs where this is available. The proposal provides for cycling need as well as a step a change in cycling. Where evidence of need for users such as students is not available at a robust, London-wide level, the guidance offers flexibility of provision (such as hire or shared cycle in lieu of long-stay parking). Borough discretion is primarily enabled through the planning application process rather than the wording of the guidance.
- 3.1.6 Comments on additional requirements for applicants or other areas of guidance that may be useful are welcomed; these will be explored through the cycle parking standards and policies in the next London Plan, which will be subject to a separate examination process.
- 3.1.7 A table of borough's bands as well as a map will be included in the final guidance as requested. The boundaries will remain as borough rather than local planning authority boundaries (such as in the case of Mayoral Development Corporations) given the limitations of the data sources used, however we will acknowledge this issue in a minor modification to the LPG.

3.1.8 The mix of views on the benefit and impact of the flexibility and quality guidance are noted. The comments on where the guidance could be more precise are welcomed and will be explored through the next London Plan and any future guidance, but a case-by-case assessment of parking requirements is still considered necessary for most proposals. On-street parking would remain at the discretion of boroughs as highway authorities.

3.2 Changes to housing design standards

3.2.1 Question 3: The GLA welcomes views on the proposed changes to the housing design standards.

3.2.2 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- Some responses provided support for the measures but the measures don't go far enough, and more design standards should be removed or applied flexibly.
- Some responses suggested the proposals will increase site viability; others suggested proposals will not help to unlock stalled sites or improve viability.
- Some responses suggested that the measures should be adopted long term; others emphasised the importance of the measures being time-limited and temporary.
- The GLA needs to ensure that boroughs are implementing the changes and applying the flexibility in the updated guidance.
- Boroughs already apply the standards flexibly and allow discretion depending on design.
- There were objections to changes to dual aspect and number of dwellings per core as these will result in poor design outcomes such as lack of ventilation in flats, or long communal corridors.
- There were concerns expressed that larger family units will be disproportionately affected by single aspect.
- Fire safety and building regulations will compensate for removal of core standard.
- The removal of standards won't help stalled sites with extant permission and may cause delays whilst developers seek to revise schemes to reduce costs.

GLA response Q3

- 3.2.3 The GLA notes the support for the proposed changes and the mix of views that these measures will or won't affect site viability or deliverability. Many of the objections to the proposed removal of design standards thought that these changes were removing any policy requirement for dual aspect dwellings. However, the policy requirement for dual aspect dwellings in the London Plan is not being changed, thus the revised LPG has been amended to be clearer on this point, to address guidance in the LPG which was resulting in an overly rigid application of London Plan Policy D6. As the London Plan policy on housing design will continue to apply and it covers dual aspect and overall housing design and quality, the negative design consequence of the proposed changes that have been raised in the responses are not considered likely to occur. Therefore, the final LPG removes design standards C4.1 and B2.5 from the Housing Design Standards London Plan Guidance 2023.
- 3.2.4 It is also noted that recent building regulations requirements for fire safety directly influence the design of corridor lengths and number of stair cores and these requirements influence the number of homes per core per floor more than planning design guidance.
- 3.2.5 The risk of schemes with planning permission being revised and delaying delivery on the basis of the proposed changes to the design standards in planning guidance is considered to be small as they would still be assessed against the London Plan housing design policy.
- 3.2.6 The changes to the cycle parking standard are related to the changes to cycle parking section of the LPG and the consultation comments on that matter is addressed above in section 3.1.

3.3 Affordable Housing

- 3.3.1 **Question 4: The GLA welcomes views on the time-limited planning route. Do you agree that this will support the early delivery of housing development whilst also maximising affordable housing provision in the short term? Are there any changes to the approach that would more effectively achieve these objectives?**
- 3.3.2 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:
- The time-limited planning route is welcomed but the timeframes are considered too constrained and should be extended further to align with the proposed CIL relief measures (separately consulted by MHCLG) and the 2026-2036 Social and Affordable Homes Programme, or until targeted housing delivery rates are achieved.

- The time-limited measures would be best focused on consented, but currently stalled developments.
- The time-limited measures are more likely to support the delivery of smaller schemes (200 units or less), but less effective in supporting the delivery of large, phased developments.
- The time-limited measures will not be effective as the predominant issue is a lack of demand-side measures to support delivery. Higher proportions of market homes under the reduced thresholds are unlikely to drive housing delivery due to issues with market 'absorption rates' and affordability pressures.
- The time-limited measures would negatively impact affordable housing delivery by inflating land values, locking in lower affordable housing expectations and weakening the negotiating power of LPAs.
- The wider impacts of the proposed measures have not been appropriately assessed.
- The time-limited measures are overly complex, which could drive applicants down the Viability Tested Route and further reduce affordable housing.
- The blanket threshold of 20 per cent affordable housing is considered arbitrary and should be better supported by viability evidence.
- The amendments should be made to include a mechanism that allows affordable housing levels to be reduced below 20 per cent where CIL relief and grant funding is not obtained.
- The gain-share review mechanism should be removed as this creates uncertainty and deters investors.
- The inclusion of gain-share review mechanism is supported as this would incentivise early delivery and operate to increase affordable housing.
- The time-limited route should emphasise the requirement for developers to engage with RPs prior to submission of a planning application or obtaining a planning consent.
- The performance of the time-limited measures should be robustly monitored.

3.3.3 Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed eligibility criteria for the time limited planning route? The GLA welcomes any views on whether this will, and how this better can, help to achieve the objective of

increasing housing supply and supporting early delivery whilst also maximising affordable housing provision in the short term.

3.3.4 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- There was support for the inclusion and for the exclusion PBSA and Co-Living schemes to be eligible for the time-limited planning route.
- There was support for sites sitting on Green and Grey belt and Metropolitan Open Land to be eligible for the time-limited planning route and also support for the exclusion of sites sitting on Green and Grey belt and Metropolitan Open Land from the time-limited planning route is supported.
- More clarity should be provided on how phased schemes and sites with existing permission could progress down the time-limited planning route. More clarity should be provided on how the time-limited route would apply to Build-to-Rent schemes, particularly in terms of grant funding.
- More clarity should be provided on whether sites designated as industrial land but do not have a lawful industrial use would be treated as private land under the time-limited planning route.
- LPAs should have discretion over affordable housing tenure split and expectations on affordable housing levels on public land. Flexibility should be allowed on the 60% Social Rent requirement to adjust for local needs and RP uptake.
- Some LPAs and third sector organisations consider that the proposed time-limited threshold at 20% is too low, while some developers consider that this can be further reduced. The proposed time-limited threshold for public land at 35% should be further reduced to 20% in line with the rest.
- There should be more clarity on how the threshold for land that is part public, part private would be calculated.
- The equivalency approach set out in the GLA's December 2024 Practice Note should also apply to the time-limited route to enable schemes to provide less than 20% affordable housing where this consists of a higher proportion Social Rent units.

3.3.5 Question 6: Do you agree that the proposed approach to grant will help to achieve the objective of increasing housing supply and supporting early delivery, whilst also maximising affordable housing provision in the short term? To what extent will this help to support the acquisition of affordable homes secured through the planning process by Register Providers?

3.3.6 A summary of all responses relating to the question is below:

- There is support for higher levels of grant funding to support the delivery of schemes comprising 35 per cent or more affordable housing. Some respondents suggested the proposed approach to grant is insufficient to address increased development costs.
- Respondents stated that there was a need for more certainty to be provided on grant eligibility earlier in the application process. There was suggestion that schemes that are eligible for the time-limited planning route should automatically qualify for grant at benchmark rates.
- Respondents suggested that grant funding should be available for all affordable units, not just those above 10 per cent; that time-limited planning route should be amended to enable the affordable housing threshold to be lowered to 10 per cent where no grant is allocated and the nil grant threshold should be revised to the first 10 per cent of affordable homes per phase.
- A reliance of grant allocation to specific Registered Providers is not feasible given that the timing of the commitment to investment in planning precedes Registered Partners partnership for strategic sites.
- It was suggested that grant funding should be calculated on a habitable room basis for consistency and to avoid disadvantaging larger, family-size homes and in fact, measures around grant funding should be designed to incentivise the delivery of larger homes.
- More flexibility should be allowed for Build to Rent developers to secure grant funding on Discount Market Rent (DMR) units.
- Some suggested more flexibility should be allowed around the 60% Social Rent requirement, while other groups emphasised that grant funding should be targeted towards Social Rent homes built by councils or RPs.
- PBSA and co-living schemes that incorporate C3 housing should be eligible for grant funding.
- Evidence of early engagement with RPs should be made into a requirement for developers to access grant funding.
- Grant funding, along with CIL relief, would be better directed towards maintaining present threshold levels of affordable housing (35%/50%).
- Higher levels of grant funding could give a direct subsidy to developers and serve to generate significant profits and inflate land values.

- Robust viability assessment and cumulative subsidy statement should be mandatory to calibrate public spending.
- Schemes with existing permissions should be subject to review mechanisms if they secure additional grant funding under the proposed measures.
- Greater flexibility over the use of Recycled Capital Grant Fund (RCGF) should be allowed to unlock stalled sites, including complex regeneration projects and schemes affected by contractor insolvency.
- Further assessment is necessary to understand the wider implications of the proposed approach.

3.3.7 Question 7: The GLA welcomes views on the approach to reviews under the time limited route, including whether any further criteria should be applied which would a) incentivise early delivery, or b) help to ensure that, if reviews are triggered, additional affordable housing contributions are provided where viability improves over the lifetime of the development.

3.3.8 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- The time limited planning route should include both early and late reviews and should be strengthened to ensure any additional profit goes towards affordable housing.
- Review mechanism should operate on the principle that only profits above the target levels are captured, and that surplus is shared between the developer and the LPA.
- Schemes which follow the time-limited route should be subject to an early review rather than the proposed gain-share review.
- The proposed review would only secure financial contributions rather than on-site delivery.
- The proposed review should include all surplus profit going to the LPA and a much lower percentage retained by the developer.
- There was support for an additional review on unimplemented planning consent if there is no substantive start on site within 12 months of consent being granted.
- Review mechanisms disincentivise investment and create risks and uncertainty on the level of return and the proposed review makes the time limited planning route more onerous than the existing viability tested route.

- Review mechanism hurdle rates must be evidence-based and set at level commensurate with the risk.
- The proposed review should not be applied if schemes meet the affordable housing thresholds or if the scheme is sufficiently high risk or complex that would result in a delay to commencement.
- The proposed review should be carried out at stabilisation and not practical completion.
- The proposed review is too rigid and would place too much burden upon LPA resources.
- There were queries as to whether the proposed review would be a full review of the viability or a formula approach.
- Clarity is needed on how the proposed review would operate for schemes that have existing consents.
- Clarity is needed on the Affordable Housing threshold at which reviews take place.
- Inputs for reviews should be using actual outturn costs, hence the developers' figures can be audited to ensure they are accurate.
- The proposed review should be limited to large strategic (250+ unit) phased schemes and use a simple formula-based approach rather than full open-book reviews.

3.3.9 Question 8: Recognising that the substantial implementation milestone of the first floor set out in 4.6.1 may not be appropriate in all instances, are there any circumstances in which an alternative review milestone to completion of the first floor would be necessary and justified, in a way that continues to incentivise fast build out?

3.3.10 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- If milestones are to be used, they should be tied to implementation of the planning permission which is a clear and within the developer's control.
- The reliance on rigid milestones and review mechanisms poses serious risks for SMEs, who lack the buffer capacity of larger developers and are more exposed to delays caused by third parties.
- Comments on the milestones and timelines included: providing clarity in the definition of the milestones and triggers in the s106, such as the first-floor level; the milestones should be based on letting of a piling or golden brick; the timeline should account for Building Safety Regulator delays; the milestones need to be clear and avoid placing an additional burden on LPAs; and, introducing a completion of ground floor slab milestone.
- The timescales for 2028 to obtain the main planning permission and 2030 for the first floor to be built are unrealistic and subject to risk outside the control of applicants, which will reduce confidence and investor appetite.

3.3.11 Question 9: An alternative approach for phased schemes would be for boroughs, and the Mayor for referable applications, to have discretion to agree forward dates and milestones for future phases if it would support the faster build out of the scheme, which if met mean that no review is required for that phase. Do you agree with this and what measures would be required to ensure that this resulted in faster build out than may otherwise be the case?

3.3.12 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- There was recommendation to propose a more proportional approach to the milestones, potentially requiring a defined percentage (e.g. 50 per cent) of each phase to reach the first-floor slab.
- Support was expressed for the principle of having milestones, but alternative milestones may be necessary to the completion of the first-floor trigger, for phased delivery, atypical layouts, and modular or off-site construction projects.

- Larger developments will require more milestone discretion, but this should remain time-limited.

3.3.13 Question 10: The GLA welcomes views on any additional measures that would support the delivery of schemes with existing planning consents which provide 35 per cent or more affordable housing. Do you agree that the time limited planning route would support schemes which have been granted planning consent but are currently stalled?

3.3.14 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- Stakeholders from the development industry mostly agreed that schemes with existing planning permission that have not achieved substantial implementation may benefit from the proposed measures.
- However, most stakeholders from all industries including developers, council and advocacy bodies noted that the time-limited route may unlock some marginal schemes, but its impact is likely to be limited by wider viability pressures, including rising build and labour costs and infrastructure funding gaps.
- Some concerns were raised by stakeholders that the time-limited measures have in of themselves paused development in London while developers and industry wait to see where the policy lands.
- Stakeholders noted that in addition to the time-limited measures other measures will need to be pursued to achieve higher levels of affordable housing in the long run, these comments include utilising grant funding through the affordable housing programme, flexibilities in CIL payments schedule, and introduction of demand side measures such as Help to Buy which would improve the viability of schemes.
- Some respondents sought flexibility in affordable housing requirements, including tenure reconfiguration or linking eligibility for review exemptions to delivery of a defined proportion of affordable homes.
- For large or multi-phase schemes, site-specific delivery milestones beyond “substantial commencement” should be agreed between boroughs and developers to support build out.
- Additional support measures were suggested, including low-cost infrastructure or government backed loan funding, support for local authority acquisition of affordable homes on stalled sites, removal of PBSA and co-living exclusions, and greater certainty where no Registered Provider is available.

- Concerns were raised that lowering affordable housing thresholds could inflate land values, benefiting landowners rather than accelerating delivery.

3.3.15 Question 11: Are there any further measures that would help to prevent the level of affordable housing being reduced in consented schemes where this is not needed to enable the development to progress?

3.3.16 A summary of all responses relating to this question is below:

- The GLA should work with boroughs to take on and manage a greater proportion of social housing, reducing reliance on housing associations.
- Measures should be introduced to ensure boroughs are incentivised to determine applications expeditiously. Some stakeholders also called for stronger Mayoral powers to intervene where boroughs are not meeting performance criteria.
- Some stakeholders noted that the proposed measures focus primarily on private developers and argued that greater support should be provided to social housing providers to enable delivery.
- A differentiated approach to affordable housing thresholds was suggested, reflecting varying market conditions across London (for example, 35% in Inner London and 20% in Outer London).
- Additional support measures were proposed, including low-cost infrastructure loans, flexibility in Mayoral CIL instalments, and tenure equivalency where higher proportions of social rent are delivered.
- Continued investment in the construction workforce was highlighted as necessary to ensure London has the skills capacity to deliver both new homes and retrofit programmes.
- Respondents suggested that measures should also focus on maximising the use of existing housing stock, including coordinated action across London to address short term lets and protect homes for long term residential use.
- Some stakeholders from the development industry and local authorities suggested deferring CIL and Section 106 payments to later stages of development as an alternative to reducing contributions.
- Greater transparency around viability information and clearer buildout expectations were called for to prevent unjustified reductions in affordable housing.

- Some LPAs suggested that the GLA facilitate resource pooling across London authorities to address increased legal pressures associated with varying and completing Section 106 agreements and raised concerns about potential restrictions on the use of Section 73 applications.

GLA response Q4 to Q11

- 3.3.17 The GLA notes a number of respondents expressed support of the proposed gain-share review mechanism and also acknowledges that other respondents have raised concerns in relation to the proposed gain-share review, particularly from the development sector.
- 3.3.18 In particular, a number of respondents consider the gain-share review mechanism proposals to be complex and not provide the certainty needed to incentivise their investors to being forward development in the current market.
- 3.3.19 Having considered the responses, we propose to replace the ‘gain share’ review mechanism as originally proposed in the Draft SHBLPG with a single Early-Stage Review which follow the existing requirements in policy H5 of the London Plan (even where the scheme is a multi-phased scheme). Under the Early-Stage review 100% of any surplus beyond the target profit would be used to provide additional affordable housing on site.
- 3.3.20 An ESR would be triggered where an agreed level of progress on implementation (default is first floor slab) is not made within 30 months of the permission being granted - or an alternative period (and / or implementation definition) agreed by the borough.
- 3.3.21 A ‘long stop date’ to achieve the substantial implementation milestone, serving as a cut-off date, will apply to all schemes following the time-limited planning route. This would be set at 5 years from the date of planning permission. The purpose of the ‘long stop date’ is to provide an endpoint at which the substantial implementation must be achieved under the time-limited planning route.
- 3.3.22 Both developers and boroughs support amending the eligibility window to require a validated application (rather than planning permission) to address the time and resources required to prepare suitable schemes and obtain a full consent. Both groups also shared concerns over the potential impact of local elections and agreed a more permissive timeline may be necessary to maximise the impact of the route in spite of any immediate disruption. Amending the eligibility window to validation of a planning application by 31 March 2028, by which time the new London Plan is expected to have been adopted, would better reflect the fact that there may be delays outside the

control of applicants in terms of securing planning permission. The local elections and the timescales associated with the Building Safety Regulator.

4. Next steps

4.1.1 The revised LPG will be published in March 2026, alongside the EqIA.

Appendix 1 Consultation and engagement events

Date	Type of event	Where
Thursday 4th December 10:00-11:00	Developer Session	DP9,100 Pall Mall, SW1Y 5NQ
Tuesday 6th January 12:00-13:00	London Planning Officers Session	Online
Thursday 8th January 12:00 – 1:00	Wider Audience Session (London Plan Database subscribers)	Online
Wednesday 14th January	Borough Housing and Planning Directors Session	Online

Appendix 2 Organisation consultation responses

*The number in brackets shows where an organisation sent multiple responses, on the behalf of other organisations or through subsidiaries.

Campaign Group

Cap the Towers

Our North Finchley Coordinating Group

Race on the Agenda

Transport Action Network

Latin Elephant Team

Protect Our Places

Inclusion London

Just Build Homes

London Cycling Campaign

Southwark Pensioners Action Group

Just Space

London Tenants Federation

35% Campaign

Haringey Defend Council Housing

Southwark Defend Council Housing

Friends of Shepherds Bush Market

Ealing Cycling Campaign

Charity

Crisis

Southwark Law Centre

Shelter

The Countryside Charity

GLA Planning

Community Organisation

Enfield Road Watch Action Group

Friary Park Memorial Group

G15 Residents' Group (Southern Housing)

Federation of Enfield Residents' & Allied Associations

PLUSHSE16

A Social Democratic Future

Bexley Civic Society

Developer

Aitch / YourTRIBE Group

Arada

Barratt Redrow plc

Bellway Homes Plc

Berkeley

Bishopsgate Goodsynd Regeneration Ltd

BlackRock and NEAT Developments

British Land

Caerus Developments

Canary Wharf Group

Chrisp Street Developments Ltd

Croydon Gateway Limited Partnership

Delancy

Derwent London

Derwent Valley Property Developments Ltd

Dominus

Earls Court Development Corporation

GLA Planning

EWL Living

Fairview New Homes Ltd

Folgate Estates

Galliard Homes

Grainger Plc

Hadley

Halycon

Hill Group for Hill Residential

Hollybrook Neasden Ltd

Innova partnership

Kier Property

KMDC

Knight Dragon

Lands Improvement Holdings

Landsec

Lendlease (4)

VSM

London Square

Moda Living

Native Land and Samson House

Ocubis

Fusion Group

Pentland Group

PineBridge Bension Elliott and URBDV

Places for London (TfL)

Places for People

GLA Planning

Mac Mic Land

Platform 4

Pocket Living

Poppymill

Quitain

Reef and Partners

Related Argent

Renewal New Bermondsey

Unite

Ballymore

Scape/Morro

Seven Capital

Shurgard UK Ltd

Stories

Taylor Wimpey

Telford Homes

The Arch Co

Tide

Trilogy

Interland Group

Muse Places

TT Group

Unibail-Rodamco-Westfield

Urban Nest

Vistry Group

Wanis Ltd

GLA Planning

Wates Residential

Watkin Jones

Weston Homes Plc

YT Realty Group Ltd

Financial Institution

Aviva Capital Partners

CAIN

Downing

Greystar Europe Holdings

Local Authority

City of London

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

London Borough of Barnet

London Borough of Bexley

London Borough of Brent

London Borough of Camden

London Borough of Croydon

London Borough of Ealing

London Borough of Enfield

London Borough of Hackney

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

London Borough of Haringey

London Borough of Harrow

London Borough of Hillingdon

London Borough of Hounslow

London Borough of Islington

GLA Planning

London Borough of Kingston Upon Thames

London Borough of Lambeth

London Borough of Lewisham

London Borough of Merton

London Borough of Redbridge

London Borough of Richmond and Wandsworth

London Borough of Southwark

London Borough of Sutton

London Borough of Waltham Forest

London Borough of Westminster

London Borough of Tower Hamlets

London Councils

Old Oak and Royal Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC)

Royal Borough of Greenwich

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Consultancy

Avison Young

Bidwells

Boyer Planning Ltd

CMA

DP9 (12)

Field

hgh10 (2)

Introba

Lanpro

Lichfileds (2)

GLA Planning

Nexus Planning

Pearce Planning

Planning Potential

Quod (5)

ROK Planning

Rolfe Judd

Savills

Turley (5)

Professional Body

British Property Federation

Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologists

Chartered Institute of Housing

London Borough Design and Delivery Teams

Retirement Housing Group

Planning Officers Society

National Housing Federation

Home Builders Federation

London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

Land, Planning and Development Federation

Business LDN

Political Affiliate

South Bermondsey Ward Labour Party

Bermondsey and Old Southwark Constituency Labour Party

Labour Housing Group

Zoë Garbett - Assembly Member

Public Sector Other

NHS Property Services

National Highways

Registered Provider

The Hyde Group

Peabody (on behalf of G15 group)

Clarion

Southern Housing

L&Q

QMUL

Sovereign Network Group

Anchor

Poplar Harca

Think Tank

Centre for London

Highbury Group for Housing Delivery

Commonweal

