MAYOR OF LONDON

Draft London Plan
Consultation Report

July 2026

Draft London Plan Consultation Report

Copyright

Greater London Authority

July 2026

Published by:
Greater London Authority
City Hall
Kamal Chunchie Way
London E16 1ZE

www.london.gov.uk
enquiries 020 7983 4000
Email Londonplan@london.gov.uk

Other Formats

If you require this document in a more accessible format, please get in touch via our online form and tell us which format you need.

Maps contain OS data © Crown Copyright and database right (2026)

Table of contents

1 Introduction 1
About this Document 1
Next Steps 1
2 Planning for London Programme 2
Call for Evidence 2
Deliberative Events 2
Talk London Campaign 2
Borough Events 3
Themed Roundtable Events 3
Topic-Based Events 3
Design Future London Event 3
New London Architecture (co-design event) 4
London Housing Panel (co-design event) 4
London Sustainable Development Commission (co-design event) 4
Key Themes from P4LP Consultation 4
3 Towards a New London Plan 5
Consultation Activities 5
Who Responded 7
Comments from Talk London and Engagement Workshops 7
Responses to Good Growth, Viability and Delivery 8
Responses to Increasing London's Housing Supply 9
Responses to Growing London's Economy 13
Responses to London's Capacity for Growth and Design Quality 15
Responses to London's Infrastructure, Climate Change and Resilience 18
Key Themes from TNLP Consultation 22
Appendix A Talk London Survey Questions 26
Appendix B TNLP Housing and Economy Engagement Workshop Summary 30
Appendix C TNLP Easy Read Engagement Workshops Summary 41
Appendix D TNLP Easy Read Survey Summary 51

1 Introduction

1.1 The Mayor is preparing a replacement London Plan, which will guide how the city grows and evolves over the next 20 years. This document provides an overview of the engagement activities that have taken place over the past several years, through which inputs and comments have been provided to inform preparation of the draft London Plan.

1.2 Engagement responses have helped shape the direction of the new London Plan and represent an important input to policy development, alongside Mayoral priorities, national policy, evidence, and other statutory requirements. Not every suggestion or view expressed will be reflected in the Draft Plan as the London Plan can only address strategic planning matters; views often diverged on matters; and engagement feedback is one factor amongst a range of considerations.

About this Document

1.3 Since publication of the current London Plan in 2021, the GLA has engaged with Londoners in a variety of ways on strategic planning matters. These were not statutory consultation stages. They were undertaken to provide valuable insights to inform the development of the Draft Plan. Engaging early and meaningfully with stakeholders aimed to ensure that the Plan reflects a broad range of perspectives. This consultation summary has been prepared to support the ongoing process (there is no statutory duty to produce a formal consultation statement).

1.4 The bulk of this engagement was undertaken during two periods:

- The **Planning for London Programme (P4LP)** focused on key planning issues and options that a future review of the London Plan could consider. This is described in Chapter 2.

- The **Towards a New London Plan (TNLP)** consultation document presented a range of potential future policy options and strategic matters that were being considered for the new London Plan. This is described in Chapter 3.

Next Steps

1.5 Consultation on the Draft London Plan will be open for 13 weeks from 16 July to 15 October 2026. This is a statutory consultation on the Draft Plan and specifically invites formal comments ('representations') on the legal compliance and soundness of the Draft Plan.

1.6 The GLA will review and consider all representations received during consultation on the Draft Plan. This process will include meeting all statutory requirements under the relevant regulations. The findings will inform proposed modifications to the Draft Plan, which will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in Public (EiP) in 2027. All written representations received during the statutory consultation on the Draft Plan will be published.

2 Planning for London Programme

2.1 The Planning for London Programme (P4LP) aimed to involve Londoners in early conversations about planning issues, to inform the next review of the London Plan. The P4LP comprised multiple different engagement activities including several that were co-designed with other partners. The P4LP began in December 2021 and was active until December 2023. The Call for Evidence was open beyond the end of the P4LP programme, spanning the Towards a New London Plan consultation period. The P4LP received over 3,000 responses through various engagement activities, which included deliberative engagement events, stakeholder conferences, borough sessions, and co-designed events.

Call for Evidence

2.2 In December 2021, Londoners and other stakeholders were invited to submit evidence to inform development of the new London Plan. This remained open until 22 June 2025, when the Towards a New London Plan consultation closed. A wide range of documents were received including reports, research, best practice, personal accounts and suggestions of how engagement could reach a more diverse range of Londoners. In total, over 500 documents were submitted as part of the Call for Evidence. All documents received have been published on the GLA's P4LP engagement portal call for evidence webpage, organised by theme.

Deliberative Events

2.3 Four in-person deliberative events were held between December 2022 to March 2023. The purpose of the events was to undertake early and inclusive engagement to understand the breadth of views about the challenges facing London, rather than to talk specifically about the London Plan itself. Each event lasted 6 hours and was attended by 40 Londoners who were recruited specifically to be representative of Londoners as a whole. The four events covered the following themes:

- Green and fair economy
- Housing
- Transport and Public Spaces
- Places and communities

2.4 Information related to the events and a summary of what participants told us can be found on the GLA's P4LP engagement portal deliberative events webpage.

Talk London Campaign

2.5 Talk London is the GLA's online platform which is used to discuss topics affecting London. A survey was launched on Talk London during June and July 2023, which sought views on the future of London. Questions invited views on where and how new homes should be built, where businesses could create new jobs, how we use our town centres and high streets and what public spaces, parks and streets should look like. A total of 1,246 surveys were completed during this period, and over 400 comments received in discussions.

Borough Events

2.6 Two half-day events were held in Summer 2023 – one for borough planning lead councillors and Chairs of Planning committees, and the other for Chief Planners and Heads of Planning.

Themed Roundtable Events

2.7 Two conference-style day-long events were held in Summer 2023 to bring together stakeholders and Londoners to discuss a range of issues relevant to the London Plan. The first covered infrastructure, design, climate change and the environment. The second covered housing and the economy. The materials used as well as engagement summary reports can be found on the GLA's P4LP engagement portal stakeholder events webpage.

Topic-Based Events

2.8 A series of 15 topic-based in-person events were held between November and December 2023. These events were open to all and were attended by a range of stakeholders including Londoners, local planning authorities, statutory stakeholders and industry professionals. The findings of these topic-based events can be found on the GLA's P4LP engagement portal stakeholder events webpage. Each event covered one of the following topics:

- Use Class E and Affordable Workspace
- Industrial Land
- Growth Corridor – Bakerloo Line Extension
- Growth Corridor – Elizabeth Line (East Branch).
- Growth Corridor – Thames Estuary
- Growth Corridor – Upper Lea Valley
- Growth Corridor – West London Orbital
- London Plan – Components of a Spatial Strategy
- Inclusive Design
- Climate Change
- Small Sites
- Building Heights and Tall Buildings
- Specialist Housing and market innovation
- Affordable Housing
- Infrastructure and Utilities Challenges and opportunities

Design Future London Event

2.9 As part of the Design Future London Programme, an external social enterprise company focussed on young people ran a two-day in person event in December 2023 to engage young Londoners about the future of London. Children and young people from eleven schools took part in a challenge to design what they thought the future of London could and should be. This gave young Londoners the opportunity to think about where they live, how places are shaped and influence how they could be involved. A snapshot summary of this engagement can be found on the GLA's P4LP engagement portal See what young Londoners are saying webpage.

New London Architecture (co-design event)

2.10 Starting in September 2023, the NLA hosted 15 events with their 'Expert Panels'. Each panel looked at one of the following themes, with their discussion being summarised in a 'whitepaper': Built Environment; Education; Healthcare; Highstreets; Housing; Industrial and Logistics; Innovation Districts; Net Zero; Planning; Public Realm; Tall Buildings, Technical Competency, Transport and Infrastructure; Wellbeing; and Work.

London Housing Panel (co-design event)

2.11 In early 2025, the London Housing Panel supported a series of 10 conversations with those that are less often heard in planning decision making. They include people in the middle of a crisis e.g. seeking asylum, domestic violence/abuse; young people who are precariously housed; and households who are inadequately housed or neglected in their housing services. Each conversation was hosted by a community project with deep connections into that community and the ability to reach, engage and support people to discuss housing and planning as it affects them. The evidence and insights these in-depth conversations generated helped identify areas for further investigation and consideration. Due to the sensitivity of these conversations, these were not attended by GLA officers but were hosted and summarised by community project/group leads with headline findings reported to the GLA and subsequently published within a findings report.

London Sustainable Development Commission (co-design event)

2.12 Three workshops were held, hosted by consultants. The workshops explored how social value could be embedded into the London Plan. Information about the approach and methodology is available on the P4LP engagement portal LSDC co-design webpage, and the recommendations report is available on the call for evidence webpage.

Key Themes from P4LP Consultation

2.13 The P4LP feedback provided rich and in-depth insights into the range of planning issues that are important to Londoners. This early engagement helped to inform and shape the initial stages of preparing the new London Plan. While many key areas were raised throughout the programme, the following emerged as recurring themes that were the most important to Londoners and stakeholders:

- Climate Change
- Housing need
- Transport
- Health and well-being
- Changed work patterns and the role of town centres

2.14 The themes identified, together with the detailed discussions held on these and other spatial matters, informed the development of the policy framework set out in the Towards a New London Plan consultation. They also guided the commissioning of further evidence base research to support the emerging Plan.

3 Towards a New London Plan

3.1 The Towards a New London Plan (TNLP) consultation ran for six weeks from 9 May to 22 June 2025. The document set out a roadmap to the new London Plan, including some key ideas that the Plan might include. It did not include all the policy matters covered by the current London Plan, instead focusing on a range of more significant potential options and changes.

3.2 This included potential changes to the current London Plan approach to housing, including where future housing could be located, how many homes may have to be delivered and the approach to affordable housing. It also set out potential options and questions around growing London's economy, making changes to industrial land, changes to design policy and tall buildings as well as setting out options for infrastructure, climate change and resilience.

3.3 The TNLP consultation set out some possible policy directions and choices, rather than a clear stance on how the future London Plan would deal with the respective policy areas. The document did not include draft policies and was not a formal stage of statutory consultation. In setting out options for consideration and discussion, the document was clear that not all of them would be taken forward in a replacement Plan. Londoners were invited to give their views, which would be considered in the development of the new London Plan.

3.4 This chapter provides an overview of consultation activities, level of responses, and key themes. It then provides a summary of the topics that attracted the highest volume of responses and/or are considered central to informing the Draft London Plan. It is not a comprehensive summary of all responses received. All responses received have, however, been reviewed and considered in the development of the Draft London Plan.

3.5 A summary of the responses received are organised by the chapters and topic areas in the TNLP document:

- Introduction, which covers Good Growth, viability and delivery
- Increasing London's housing supply
- Growing London's economy
- London's capacity for growth and design quality
- London's infrastructure, climate change and resilience

Consultation Activities

3.6 As part of the TNLP consultation, the GLA provided multiple ways for Londoners and stakeholders to give responses and feedback over the six-week period.

Engagement portal and email submissions

3.7 The document was published on the GLA's online consultation portal. This allowed people to respond to a survey. Participants were not required to respond to every section in the document, so some topics had more responses. Responses could also be submitted via email and, as with the online portal, these either responded to the whole consultation or focused on specific topics. 'Who responded' can be found in Table 1.

Talk London

3.8 The GLA's Talk London platform was used through the TNLP consultation. This allowed Londoners to easily submit views online by responding to 11 structured questions (see Appendix A) focused on housing and the economy, without it being necessary to review the whole TNLP document. The discussion board was also active during this time, and insights from this were also captured. 'Who responded' can be found in Table 1.

Stakeholder meetings and online public sessions

3.9 Focused engagement meetings were held with a range of stakeholders, networks, and groups, including for example the Youth Panel, the London Infrastructure Group, and the London Deaf and Disabled People's Organisation (DDPO) Forum. These meetings enabled topic specific discussions about areas of interest to stakeholders. Online public sessions were also held to provide an overview of the consultation, with recordings of this made available to view on the GLA's engagement portal Towards a New London Plan webpage.

Engagement workshop on housing and the economy

3.10 On Friday, 13 June 2025, a 2 hour in person engagement workshop was held at City Hall, facilitated by We Made That, to inform the development of the new London Plan. The objective of the workshop was to invite participants to share their priorities for an inclusive and accessible housing system and economy including how to make homes and neighbourhoods – as well as town centres and high streets – accessible and inclusive. It brought together 55 Londoners, invited by the GLA, representing a diverse range of backgrounds and organisations advocating for key groups within the city. The majority of workshop participants were attending as individuals, with 15 attending in a professional capacity, from campaign groups, professional bodies, and one local authority member – these included representatives from groups advocating for disabled people, older people, safety, and on behalf of the climate.

Easy Read consultation and engagement workshops

3.11 The six-week consultation on the Easy Read version of Towards a new London Plan took place from 19 September to 2 November 2025. This was an additional consultation targeted to provide an opportunity for Londoners who might prefer an Easy Read version of the materials to respond to the ideas for the next London Plan. The Easy Read version was published later as an additional consultation, and it was made clear that anyone who had previously responded did not need to respond again.

3.12 The Easy Read Information Booklet translated the key elements of the TNLP document into an Easy Read format. Easy Read is designed to be less complex than plain language text and can be useful for people with learning disabilities and other conditions affecting how they process information. It can also be useful for people who find it difficult to read and write or are communicating in a second language. The preparation of the Easy Read Information Booklet & Survey was led by a specialist adaptive communications organisation and followed a co-production approach.

3.13 In addition to publishing the documents online, two half day targeted engagement workshops (one in person at City Hall and one online) were delivered with the support of Publica CIC and Inclusion London. These events were designed to provide people who prefer Easy Read formats with a supportive engagement environment suited to their needs. A total of 24 people attended across the two sessions.

Who Responded

3.14 A total of 3,224 responses were received taking into account submissions through the online engagement portal, email, Talk London Surveys, and Talk London discussion threads. Table 1 shows responses by submission channel and Table 2, responses by respondent type.

Table 1 Number of consultation responses by submission channel

Submission channel	Number of responses
Online engagement portal	500
Email (excluding duplicates from online portal)	491
Talk London survey	1,897
Talk London discussion thread	336
Total	**3,224**

Table 2 Percentage of consultation responses by respondent type

Respondent Type	Percentage of responses
Individual	81%
Individual by petition	3%
Community group	4%
Government	3%
Industry	6%
Business	3%

3.15 Around 1,000 submissions came through the online engagement portal and via email submissions. Many of these were detailed responses either on specific topics or to each section in the consultation document.

3.16 For the purposes of analysing consultation by respondent type, all responses via Talk London have been assumed to be from individuals. Around 2,000 people took part in the Talk London online consultation through survey or discussions. This captured the views of different age ranges, with a mix of those from inner (50%) and outer London boroughs (48%); and slightly more men (53%) than women (45%), with 2% identifying as other.

Comments from Talk London and Engagement Workshops

Talk London

3.17 Three quarters of respondents said that they're unhappy with London's current housing situation, with 55% saying that developers should help fund affordable homes as a top priority. To increase housing availability, there was support for regulating overseas ownership, relaxing planning rules to help speed up development and for building on brownfield sites. Participants also shared the things they most value in London's town centres and high streets which were cafes, restaurants and pubs (75%). Market squares and traffic free spaces followed closely behind (73%), with cultural (69%) and community services (68%) also highlighted.

Housing and economy workshop

3.18 Key topics that arose under housing were the affordability crisis, the need for social housing, accessibility as a fundamental right and enhancing communal features, as well as designing for different needs e.g. soundproofing. Key economy topics were enhancing public spaces for all, a desire for vibrant and inclusive town centres, economic equity as a guiding principle and the strengthening of policies for inclusivity. A summary of the workshop is provided in Appendix B.

Easy Read workshops

3.19 Participants across both sessions expressed a clear and consistent message: London's future growth must be both inclusive and affordable, ensuring that disabled people, people with learning difficulties, and low-income residents can live, work, travel, and thrive independently. The discussions revealed deep systemic issues in accessibility, affordability, and equity across housing, transport, employment, and environmental policy. For example, while there was support for London's net zero ambitions, especially acknowledging that energy costs, poor insulation and overheating buildings disproportionately affect disabled and low-income households, the consultation highlighted that efforts must not deepen inequality. A summary of the workshops is provided in Appendix C, and summaries of the Easy Read survey responses in Appendix D.

Responses to Good Growth, Viability and Delivery

3.20 The Good Growth objectives in the current London Plan are: building strong and inclusive communities, making the best use of land, creating a healthy city, delivery of the homes Londoners need, growing a good economy and increasing efficiency and resilience. Many respondents across all groups supported the Good Growth objectives in principle and would welcome continued commitment to Good Growth in the new London Plan but requested clarity on how the objectives are prioritised and trade-offs are dealt with.

3.21 A strong theme which emerged was the possibility of "growth at any cost" overriding Good Growth. Many individuals and community groups expressed concern that the options in the TNLP document prioritised housing numbers and economic growth over other objectives such as health, environmental protection, community cohesion and liveability. Respondents argued that if development leads to poor outcomes (such as loss of green space, displacement, pressure on services, or declining wellbeing) it cannot credibly be described as "Good Growth". There was strong support among individuals and community groups for reframing viability around public value, for stricter controls on developer profit, and for greater use of public-led and community-led models such as community land trusts and cooperatives.

3.22 Industry and business respondents largely support the Good Growth framework but stressed the need for streamlined deliverable policy, clearer prioritisation of objectives, and recognition of development viability and infrastructure funding constraints. Several emphasised the importance of logistics, retail vitality, innovation in housing typologies, and mixed-use development in supporting a "good economy".

Building the homes needed

3.23 Responses focused on the need for more suitable housing as a fundamental need but also showed concern for the achievability of large housebuilding targets in the capital. Many stated that current approaches have failed to deliver social and genuinely affordable housing, have contributed to displacement and inequality, and produced schemes of poor

quality. Local authorities and government bodies supported streamlining housing policies, but largely opposed lowering affordable housing thresholds, climate commitments or design quality, emphasising that delivery should not come at the cost of wider long-term outcomes. There was widespread support for a brownfield-first and retrofit-first approach, including conversion of offices, reuse of existing buildings and small-scale intensification, before release of green belt land. Many respondents opposed green belt release entirely, citing climate, infrastructure and long-term resilience concerns. Further commentary on these topics is included below under Responses to Increasing London's Housing Supply.

Inclusive growth and community stability

3.24 Respondents repeatedly linked inclusive communities to housing stability, particularly the ability of families, older people and lower income groups to remain in their neighbourhoods over time. Many stated that displacement, unaffordable housing and loss of local services undermined community cohesion. Community-led housing, cooperatives and Community Land Trusts were frequently cited as possible mechanisms for delivering long-term affordability, stewardship and social value aligned with Good Growth.

A healthy city

3.25 Submissions placed a strong emphasis on health, wellbeing and social outcomes and showed widespread support for retaining and strengthening GG3 Creating a Healthy City, with calls to: give greater weight to physical and mental health outcomes, embed Health Impact Assessments more consistently, and recognise built environment design, daylight, access to nature, sport, play and community facilities as essential contributors to long-term health. Several respondents argued that health should be treated as a foundational enabler of economic success, not a secondary consideration. Many respondents highlighted that Good Growth must be underpinned by reliable public transport, freight and servicing systems, active travel networks, and everyday amenities such as shops, schools, GPs and community facilities. Growth without infrastructure was seen as harmful, particularly in outer boroughs with limited transport accessibility.

Protection of green space and natural capital

3.26 Many respondents, particularly community and environmental groups, stressed that green belt, Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), urban green space, waterways and biodiversity are critical to multiple Good Growth objectives: health, resilience, climate adaptation, food security and social wellbeing. There was strong resistance to interpreting "best use of land" as simply higher density or green belt release, and repeated calls to prioritise brownfield development, reuse, retrofit and a "demolition last" approach.

Calls to strengthen climate and resilience objectives

3.27 Many responses propose explicitly strengthening net zero, climate adaptation and biodiversity recovery within the objectives, with some arguing for climate protection to be elevated as a core or overriding principle of Good Growth rather than an implied outcome.

Responses to Increasing London's Housing Supply

Addressing housing need

3.28 The TNLP consultation considered where housing should be located and what kind of housing is needed, including specialist housing and Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Affordable housing was also a key topic in the consultation document.

3.29 Industry and some businesses broadly supported ambitious targets but stressed that current delivery rates were far below required levels due to construction cost inflation, financing constraints, regulatory change and delays in the planning process, and called for streamlining policies, reducing duplication, greater flexibility on viability, and faster planning decisions to restore confidence and accelerate build-out.

3.30 Meanwhile, many individuals and community groups questioned the scale and the reliance on private-led delivery to meet the Government's housing need figure[1], citing uncertainty over population projections, infrastructure funding, labour shortages, and climate constraints. Several argued delivery should focus on meeting local needs, particularly for essential workers, rather than headline numbers. Local authorities and government bodies emphasised that planning alone cannot guarantee delivery, noting a growing gap between permissions granted and homes completed, and calling for coordinated action beyond the planning system.

3.31 Community groups and many individuals argued for prioritising social rent and genuinely affordable homes, ensuring that housing delivery meets needs, while warning against reducing standards or obligations in the name of delivery. Many responses also highlighted the need for accessible and specialist housing, which can provide suitable homes for all. Key policies' responses are summarised further in the sections below.

Locations for delivering homes

3.32 There was strong support for a **brownfield first approach**, however developers commented that these sites would not be sufficient for meeting the entirety of London's housing needs and would need to be used with other sources of land. Some respondents stated that the optimisation of brownfield sites should not be to the detriment of achieving a high-quality and appropriate mix of housing. Concerns were raised about the constraints often associated with brownfield sites, such as the costs involved in bringing them forward for development and the impact that policy requirements can have on their viability.

3.33 There was strong support for retaining **Opportunity Areas (OAs)** as a spatial designation, and for the introduction of new OAs where justified. Views on the removal/de-designation of OAs were more mixed, with some respondents supporting particular propositions and others identifying concerns over de-designating/reviewing OAs in outer London and the implications this could have for growth. Some responses advocated the need to recognise the unique and complex challenges of delivering OAs.

3.34 There was general support for the need for **industrial land**, but respondents acknowledged the great need for housing and the contribution industrial land could make towards this supply, including through land swaps. However, some responses stated due to the nature of industrial land this source would make a limited contribution, especially via co-location and that there was a need to review the affordable housing target and associated plot ratio.

3.35 A number of objections to building on **MOL** were received. Respondents advocated for MOL to continue to be protected, and that the London Plan needed to be clear that MOL differs from the green belt. There was some support for building on MOL land, but it had to be in the 'right' location

[1] 880,000 homes over the next decade at the time of the TNLP consultation and 850,000 at the time of writing this consultation report.

3.36 A significant number of responses were received which objected to building within the **green belt**. The headline reasons for objections to building within the green belt included that:

- The green belt should be protected for sports and recreation, habitat, food growing, rainwater management and flood resilience.
- The green belt should be protected for biodiversity habitat and green infrastructure roles in mitigating flood risk and urban heat island (UHI) effect, given the pressures of climate change and the accelerating loss of UK biodiversity. It was also stated that the releasing of sites would run counter to environmental goals in the London Environment Strategy and the Mayor's own declared climate emergency.
- The green belt provides recreational benefits which would be lost if it is redeveloped.
- Building on the green belt will increase transport, air pollution and carbon emissions, as such will contradict a decrease in carbon emissions.
- The green belt serves as a buffer around London, and urban sprawl will be enabled if green belt is lost.
- Building on the green belt would place unsustainable pressure on transport networks, schools, health care facilities, water and waste infrastructure
- Developments near protected areas such as SSSIs and SACs could impact on the functionality of these assets

3.37 Some comments also raised a concern that should the London Plan allow for development on the green belt, these sites would be used prior to brownfield sites.

3.38 There were also a number of responses from developers which supported development within green belt and grey belt, highlighting the role that such land could play in meeting London's housing needs. A number of comments did however emphasise that development within the green belt and grey belt should be in the 'right' location, and that improved infrastructure, particularly transport, would be needed to support such development coming forward.

3.39 Some responses set out their views as to what should be achieved at green belt and grey belt sites, which includes providing a minimum 50% affordable housing, well-connected to public transport, supporting biodiversity net gain, providing a range of homes and supporting Local Nature Recovery Strategies and other programmes. Several comments from developers were also made about the role that small-scale green belt sites could play in the short-term, noting the complexities associated with delivering large-scale urban extensions.

Affordable housing

3.40 Responses to affordable housing requirements were mixed, with industry professionals favouring a lower threshold under the threshold approach to planning applications, whilst community groups and individuals tended to favour a higher threshold. Boroughs were typically neutral or considered the threshold to be in the right region. Regarding alignment with the London Plan, boroughs favoured being able to retain local control whilst industry professionals favoured a regional approach set by the London Plan.

3.41 There were mixed views around altering affordable housing requirements based on application size, with some application size threshold suggestions focused on supporting SMEs. There was mixed support for a 50% threshold on green belt. Support for a 50% requirement came from boroughs and some industry professionals, however many in the

industry rejected a blanket approach, preferring context to be taken into account due to the risk of undermining sites coming forward.

3.42 In terms of prioritising social rent, broad support came from certain parts of the sector (e.g. RPs) as well as community groups, boroughs and individuals with more tempered support from the industry as a whole. There was a broad consensus that Key Worker Living Rent would be a positive introduction, although some boroughs wanted to maintain control over it in their area. Some industry respondents called for a change to the threshold approach to planning applications via the removal late-stage reviews. Other notable points raised include the request for flexible use of grant and the increasing difficulties of making shared ownership stack up, in a London context.

Specialist and supported housing

3.43 Most stakeholders were in broad agreement that there is a significant need that continues to grow for specialist and supported housing, which is due to an ageing population, rising disability and increasing homelessness. Stakeholders widely agreed that the current provision of this type of housing is inadequate, and the London Plan should play a key role in addressing this need.

3.44 Some community groups, and the majority of industry and business groups supported a London-wide strategic approach, while the majority of boroughs and some individuals objected to a London-wide approach and insisted that the needs for specialist housing must be set locally by the boroughs who know the existing context. There was consensus that delivery should be based on accurate needs assessments, monitoring of completions and many thought that there should be dedicated land and funding for specialist and supported housing. There was strong concern for vulnerable groups for this type of housing need.

Purpose-built student accommodation and other forms of shared housing

3.45 There were mixed views regarding PBSA and other forms of shared accommodation, with many recognising the important role it plays within the housing market yet simultaneously highlighting flaws – particularly in relation to quality and design. Developers largely considered PBSA to provide a crucial role in meeting London's housing needs, calling for a more proactive endorsement in the London Plan, noting that provision has not kept pace with demand. In their view, PBSA provides well-managed accommodation as an alternative to private renting, meets needs, frees up accommodation for others and supports the diversification of the housing market.

3.46 Boroughs were more sceptical, citing concerns about overprovision and overconcentration. While respondents recognised the need to plan for a range of housing types, including student housing, their priority was for conventional and affordable housing. They considered it important that the London Plan provides evidence to demonstrate the need for PBSA/co-living as part of any policy approach. Some respondents considered that policy should deal with PBSA and co-living separately to reflect the nuances of each.

3.47 Nomination arrangements (NAs) and whether or not they work in practice as originally intended, have been a subject of debate over time, including as part of discussions prior to the publication of the PBSA London Plan Guidance (2024). Consultation suggested that NAs may be best applied to affordable student accommodation, rather than the majority of rooms – a sentiment that developers and providers generally agreed with, but boroughs did not. In the boroughs' view the link between a university and

accommodation provides evidence of need so NAs are required to cover both market and affordable rooms.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

3.48 There was broad consensus on the need to plan accommodation provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Views differed on whether the London Plan should set targets for permanent pitches and plots or whether this should be left to boroughs. Some respondents called for targets based on capacity, set in a similar way to housing targets with borough input. Support increased for the London Plan to set pitch targets if they are capacity based. Other matters raised included the London Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment, delivery and concerns over location.

Responses to Growing London's Economy

3.49 The TNLP consultation included ten policy areas in this chapter including: Central Activities Zones, specialist clusters of economic activity, town centres and high streets, industrial land, London's night-time economy, culture and creative industries, visitor economy, digital infrastructure, access to employment and affordable workspace. Overall, responses emphasised the need to protect important local economic infrastructure such as town centres and high streets as well as designated areas which support the economic growth of London and agglomerations like the Central Activities Zone.

Central Activities Zone (CAZ)

3.50 There was strong support for the CAZ to remain, with any changes to the boundary to be undertaken collaboratively with the boroughs. Housing delivery was seen as important in the CAZ, to support resilience. However, several respondents, including industry groups, boroughs, community groups and Historic England suggested that new housing should not undermine the CAZ economy, night-time, culture and heritage uses. Several industry groups supported housing delivery on the outskirts – for example making the Northern Isle of Dogs more mixed use, with a greater proportion of housing. Respondents also made it clear that there should be a priority for vacant, poor quality commercial space that did not meet needs of occupiers or current energy requirements to be retrofitted, repurposed or redeveloped for other business uses and/or housing, whilst ensuring enough lower-cost space suitable for SMEs was retained.

Town centres and high streets

3.51 Many respondents supported a flexible range of businesses in town centres, with community and access groups citing the need for a wide range of uses that are accessible and support cultural and social interaction (including youth clubs, pubs, play spaces and intergenerational community centres, affordable business space, markets and services like libraries, laundrettes and public toilets). There was strong support from Londoners on reactivating vacant town centre properties, including for meanwhile uses. Community and some business groups said this should be affordable business and community space.

3.52 Boroughs supported local management but there was a mixed response on whether the Plan should require them to prepare detailed town centre strategies, in addition to local plan responsibilities, with resource constraints highlighted as the main factor. Among boroughs and community groups there was consensus on the need for restrictions on uses such as gambling outlets, takeaways and pay-day loan shops that can give rise to negative impacts on high streets and the health and wellbeing of Londoners.

Industrial land

3.53 Respondents generally recognised the importance of industrial land and were supportive of strategic targets for industrial capacity so long as boroughs were involved. The need for identifying growth locations for industrial uses was also raised. There was generally support for the review of designations that reflect on changing and emerging industrial requirements. There was some scepticism over light industrial uses in town centres given the dependence on local circumstances and industrial requirements.

3.54 There was general support for the concept of intensification and co-location but concerns over viability, the need for flexibility and measures of intensification. There were mixed responses on land swaps, which allow for the release of land for housing, where homes and industrial uses have come forward together. There was the view that they should not be relied upon, as there will be a need for infrastructure investment and reprovisioning in the same economic market. There were concerns that land swaps could displace jobs, disrupt existing economic clusters, undermine their viability and increase travel. The significant loss of industrial land over the last 20 years was highlighted, suggesting that land swaps could still work if they used land less suitable for homes such as land with high noise levels or close to the road network and less connected to public transport.

3.55 Responses also raised concerns around **data centres**, specifically where they should be located and their potential impacts. There was support for a strategic approach to identifying need and delivery across London, with most respondents stating a preference that data centres be on industrial land. Some also felt that data centres could be located within the green belt, however, there was wide recognition that the competition for land and infrastructure capacity would need to be managed. In terms of impacts, respondents were clear that the potential impacts (such as on air quality) would need to be addressed but potential opportunities should also be harnessed. Respondents also raised the point that data centres should be managed separately to warehouses and should have a clear planning use class.

Night-time economy, culture and creative industries

3.56 Respondents called for the careful management of night-time clusters in appropriate locations, with a particular focus on inclusive facilities for night-time workers and measures that enhanced safety for all users of the night-time economy. Some respondents and boroughs also emphasised the need to continue protecting public houses, recognising them as an important part of London's social fabric and their broader role within the city's network of social and leisure venues, as well as the night-time economy.

3.57 Respondents widely acknowledged the contribution of culture and the creative industries to both local economies and London's wider economy. There was strong support for cultural activity, particularly within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and town centres. Boroughs identified culture and the creative industries as key drivers of economic growth and regeneration. This was supported by boroughs with Creative Enterprise Zones (CEZs), as well as those with established cultural and creative clusters.

Affordable workspace

3.58 There was a strong consensus across public and private sector responses that the London Plan should remain strategic and set out general principles for affordable workspace, with detailed policies and criteria to be defined locally. There was also strong support that local policies should be based on consistent and rigorous evidence of need and impact on

viability. There was consensus among industry groups and some (though not all) boroughs for off-site provision or financial contributions where on-site provision was not practical.

3.59 Several respondents (including most community groups, several boroughs and some business and industry groups) supported the idea of widening the range of affordable workspace uses to include all of planning use class E. Some industry groups and boroughs expressed caution however, citing risks associated with viability and diluting the delivery of affordable workspace for employment-generating uses. Several businesses, industry groups and some boroughs suggested that affordable workspace policy should not apply to general industrial and warehousing uses. Education providers suggested that policy should not apply to research and development uses.

Responses to London's Capacity for Growth and Design Quality

3.60 This chapter explored the spatial planning and design aspects of London's development, largely focusing on housing. The TNLP consultation included 10 policy areas: building height and scale; tall buildings; supporting a denser London linked to transport connectivity; London's heritage; designing the homes we need; heat risk, ventilation and overheating; homes for families; accessible housing; space standards and other requirements and designing for everyone. The most responses were provided on density, height and tall buildings, as well as heat risk and water quality, with individual respondents particularly interested in accessibility and designing for everyone.

Density, building heights and scale

3.61 There was broad support for increasing density across London, particularly in well-connected locations such as town centres and areas with high public transport accessibility, although respondents emphasised that density should not be equated solely with building height. Many highlighted the role of mid-rise development (typically 5–9 storeys) in delivering higher densities in a more efficient, family-friendly and sustainable way, with tall buildings seen as appropriate in limited locations such as established clusters and major centres.

3.62 Views on introducing minimum height benchmarks were mixed. Some industry and business respondents supported a more directive London-wide approach, arguing that clearer parameters would provide certainty, reduce planning risk and support delivery. However, a significant proportion of boroughs, community groups and individuals opposed blanket benchmarks, raising concerns about impacts on local character, heritage and amenity, and emphasising the need for a context-led approach based on local evidence.

3.63 There was general support for the principle of a London-wide small site design code, particularly in relation to improving consistency and supporting SME delivery, although respondents stressed that any such approach should be flexible and not overly prescriptive. Across all groups, there was a consistent emphasis on maintaining design quality and addressing site-specific constraints, including daylight, overshadowing, infrastructure capacity and environmental performance. Responses also highlighted the importance of viability and regulatory factors, including the impact of building safety requirements and increasing construction costs on mid-rise and taller development.

Tall buildings

3.64 It was largely acknowledged that tall buildings will continue to play a role in London's growth, particularly in well-connected locations, Opportunity Areas, and major town centres. However, there was significant divergence on how central they should be and how proactively they should be planned. The development industry, investors and some strategic bodies emphasised that tall buildings are essential to meeting housing and economic targets, optimising brownfield land and supporting growth around transport hubs. Local authorities, heritage bodies and community organisations were generally more cautious, questioning whether tall buildings meaningfully addressed affordability, social housing delivery or sustainable placemaking, and highlighted what they considered to be wider harms (townscape, carbon, social and environmental impacts).

3.65 Most respondents supported a plan-led approach, but with differing views on where responsibility should lie. Many boroughs defended the principle that tall building locations should be identified through local plans, based on detailed local evidence, character studies and community engagement. Several councils also stressed that removing or weakening the requirements for borough-identified tall building zones would undermine certainty and would encourage speculative proposals. Developers, landowners, investors and some strategic consultees argued that borough approaches are inconsistent, cautious and politically constrained, hence these groups supported the London Plan taking a more proactive approach. Some supported fallback or "in principle" policies at London level where boroughs do not identify suitable locations.

3.66 There was near universal agreement that the current 6–7 storey / 21m benchmark is problematic, but strong disagreement on what should replace it. Many respondents stated they would welcome clearer London Plan guidance on how applications outside tall building zones should be assessed. But there was strong consensus that tall buildings must meet exceptional standards, regardless of location, in terms of public benefit, carbon emissions and whole-life environmental impacts, residential amenity, daylight and overshadowing.

Housing design requirements

3.67 There was broad support among boroughs, community groups and many individuals for retaining the current London Plan approach to housing design, including the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) and London-specific requirements. They highlighted their role in ensuring homes are functional, adaptable and support health and wellbeing. Industry and business respondents emphasised the impact of additional requirements on viability, arguing that higher standards can increase costs, reduce density and constrain delivery, and therefore called for greater flexibility, alignment with national standards, or a more design-led, case-by-case approach.

3.68 Many boroughs, community groups and individuals supported retaining the London Plan's higher minimum ceiling height requirement, emphasising its contribution to better daylight, ventilation and thermal comfort, and its role in supporting healthier and more adaptable homes. Some respondents also linked increased ceiling heights to improved resilience to overheating and enhanced overall spatial quality. However, a significant number of industry and business respondents raised concerns about its impact on viability and delivery, noting that additional height requirements can increase construction costs, and building mass, which can be particularly a problem on constrained or height-sensitive sites. Several argued that ceiling heights should align with national standards or be applied more flexibly.

3.69 There was strong support across many respondents for the requirement that all new homes provide a minimum area of private outdoor space, with this seen as essential to health, wellbeing and access to nature, particularly in high-density urban environments. Respondents highlighted the importance of private amenity space during periods such as lockdown in the COVID pandemic, as well as its role in addressing inequalities in access to green space. However, industry respondents more frequently questioned a blanket requirement, arguing that private balconies may be impractical or underused in some contexts, such as tall buildings or noisy locations, and can constrain design efficiency and increase costs.

Heat Risk, ventilation and overheating

3.70 Responses regarding overheating measures were mixed. Some respondents, mostly business and industry, supported leaving overheating to the building regulations and removing these requirements from London Plan. Several respondents promoted the use of air conditioning to replace dual aspect requirements. Others (mainly boroughs and community groups) were concerned that not addressing overheating at planning stage leads to reliance on active cooling at building control stage. A larger number of respondents across boroughs, community groups, and business/industry, supported continuing to prioritise passive design and ventilation measures such as dual aspect and shading and some of them were concerned about the increasing use of air conditioning exacerbating the urban heat island (UHI) effect.

3.71 There was significant concern about the increasing risks of overheating in buildings and the UHI effect and the need to address it in planning. These mainly came from community groups, government respondents, and individuals. Many respondents also highlighted the importance of green infrastructure (particularly trees) in mitigating heat risk. Additionally, there was a high degree of support for passive design measures in developments and concerns about the increasing use of air conditioning, while a smaller number of respondents advocated for a more permissive or supportive approach to air conditioning.

Accessible housing

3.72 Overall, respondents stressed the need for accessible housing. A number of comments were received in relation to the need for a definition of an accessible homes to be broader reaching, taking into account the needs of a wider range of people, including neurodivergent people and people with sensory impairments. Comments highlighted the benefits of quieter environments on health and wellbeing and noted how lack of noise reducing insulation is the most common housing access feature missing for neurodivergent people.

3.73 There was support across groups for continuing the existing requirement of 10% wheelchair user housing, which was considered to be flexible and practical. Community groups, the public and boroughs supported requiring wheelchair accessible housing for different tenures, to ensure housing choice, equal access, and reduce costs. Concerns were raised from industry though about cost and over-provision. Some stakeholders believe the existing requirement works well, in terms of adaptations being provided once an end-user is identified.

3.74 Boroughs, community groups and individuals were broadly supportive of requiring wheelchair uses homes to be marketed to disabled users first. Some respondents, however, were concerned about risks e.g., costs to developers, barriers to occupation, complexity and difficulty monitoring. Some respondents called for more information on

how it would work, whilst others called for flexibility, depending on site specific circumstances. A borough demonstrated their application of this approach.

3.75 Most responses referred to student accommodation. There was broad support for re-visiting accessibility targets for student accommodation. Some respondents expressed concerns about overprovision and impact on overall and affordable units. Those against re-visiting noted past under-provision, potential savings, choice, adaptability benefits, temporary storage, benefits for guide dog users and disabled family members. Some respondents referred to quality issues and a need for support for neurodivergent students, such as the Quiet Hall charter.

Responses to London's Infrastructure, Climate Change and Resilience

3.76 The policy topics in this chapter covered strategic level spatial planning and how assets such as bodies of water and green spaces play an integral role in climate resilience. The TNLP consultation included 19 policy topics in this chapter: energy efficiency standards; heat networks; whole life-cycle carbon and circular economy; waste; green and open spaces; London's open spaces; green infrastructure and biodiversity; water; the strategic importance of London's waterways; flood risk management; water management; transport's role in London's growth; sustainable transport networks to support growth; car parking, cycle parking and deliveries; responding to transport trends and new technologies; fire safety; air quality; heat risk and healthy communities.

3.77 Overall, responses demonstrated how Londoners value the wealth of green and open spaces in the city for their multiple purposes of social connection, health, and combatting climate change. A large number of responses also focused on the role of transport in London's growth, consistently highlighting accessibility and equality of access across London to public transport and active travel routes.

Energy efficiency, whole life-cycle carbon (WLC) & circular Economy (CE)

3.78 Responses broadly supported the importance of strong **energy efficiency** standards to meet net zero targets and reduce energy demand, but views differed on how these should be delivered. Many boroughs, community groups and individuals supported retaining or strengthening London-specific standards, arguing that national policy is unlikely to be sufficiently ambitious, while industry respondents more often favoured alignment with national standards to provide consistency and support viability.

3.79 Overall, responses highlighted a shared ambition for higher energy performance, while referencing a need for balance between policy ambition and practical implementation. There was general support for increasing on-site carbon reductions and prioritising fabric-first approaches, though concerns were raised about deliverability, cost and diminishing returns. Respondents supported a shift towards more robust performance-based metrics, such as energy use intensity, alongside concerns about the performance gap in existing modelling methods. There was some criticism of carbon offsetting, with support for a stronger focus on on-site delivery.

3.80 Responses broadly supported strengthening **whole life-cycle carbon and circular economy** policy, with strong emphasis on reducing embodied carbon. Many respondents, particularly individuals and community groups, supported prioritising the retention and retrofit of existing buildings, while industry and some public sector respondents favoured a more flexible "retrofit-first but not retrofit-only" approach to balance carbon reduction with viability and growth.

3.81 There was widespread support for clearer London-wide frameworks and the introduction of benchmarks or targets, although concerns were raised about data quality, methodological consistency and the risk of added complexity. Responses highlighted strong backing for embedding WLC and CE more firmly in policy, alongside a tension between increasing ambition and ensuring policies remain practical, consistent and deliverable.

Green and Open Spaces

3.82 There was broad support across respondents for the Mayor's ambition to increase access to green and open spaces, tree cover and nature recovery, recognising their critical role in supporting physical and mental health, addressing climate resilience (including overheating, flooding and air quality), and enhancing biodiversity. Many respondents emphasised that green and blue infrastructure should be treated as essential urban infrastructure, not an optional add on, and should be delivered in a coordinated, strategic way across London.

3.83 A strong and recurring theme emerging from responses was the importance of protecting existing green spaces, particularly the green belt and MOL. Government bodies, community organisations and large numbers of individuals expressed concern that housing pressures could erode these assets, especially in already deprived or climate vulnerable areas. Additionally, there was widespread support for a clear distinction between green belt and MOL, with many arguing that MOL should remain robustly protected and not be subject to the green belt review processes.

3.84 Heritage organisations highlighted that many of London's parks, squares and open spaces are historic assets, some at risk due to underinvestment. They called for more explicit recognition of London's open space heritage in the Plan, stronger links between heritage conservation and nature recovery, and targeted investment and management for historic parks in poor condition. It was highlighted that tree planting and greening initiatives, while welcomed, should respect historic landscape design and character.

3.85 There was strong support for the development of a London wide Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and the London Green Infrastructure Framework, with calls for these to be effectively integrated into the London Plan and joined up across borough boundaries. Boroughs also stressed the need for flexibility, locally specific evidence, and clear guidance—particularly on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), which was highlighted as having been difficult to deliver in dense inner London contexts. Several respondents argued for a London wide approach to BNG offsetting to keep benefits within the city.

3.86 Community groups and individuals repeatedly emphasised the health and wellbeing benefits of green space, particularly in high density areas with limited access. Many welcomed proposals to map areas with low green space per person. There were frequent calls to safeguard specific types of green space for sports, recreation, food growing, habitat and water management, including the development of a London wide Playing Pitch and Sports Development Strategy. Industry respondents generally supported green infrastructure and nature recovery in principle, but stressed the need for proportional, flexible and non-duplicative policy requirements, fully costed to avoid undermining development viability and affordable housing delivery.

Green infrastructure and biodiversity

3.87 Many respondents call for higher Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) targets (e.g. 20–30%) and alignment with the "30x30" nature target. There was also a strong emphasis on

biodiversity as a core component of all development, including food growing (e.g. allotments), pesticide-free approaches, and urban habitat creation. The **Urban Greening Factor (UGF)** was widely supported as a simple and effective tool to embed greening in development; however, many argued it needs better integration with BNG, clearer guidance, and should be expanded use to include small developments. UGF was often seen as particularly useful in urban contexts where BNG does not apply, while BNG was supported for driving measurable biodiversity outcomes.

3.88 Respondents strongly emphasised the importance of quality over quantity. Concerns were raised that current metrics can encourage "tick box" or surface-based greening with limited ecological value. There was strong support for prioritising habitat quality, ecological function, connectivity, mature trees, existing habitats, and long-term maintenance, alongside nature positive design features. Stronger alignment with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and delivery of biodiversity gains—particularly off site BNG—within or near London was widely supported.

3.89 Delivery and implementation challenges were a recurring concern highlighted in responses, including policy complexity, cost, viability impacts, limited ecological expertise in boroughs, weak monitoring and enforcement, and inconsistent data. Respondents called for improved ecological evidence, standardised tools and calculators, mandatory data sharing, and clearer long-term stewardship and funding arrangements.

3.90 Strategic and landscape scale planning was strongly supported, including connecting developments into wider green and blue infrastructure networks, supporting green corridors, safeguarding land for nature recovery, and recognising the multifunctional role of waterways. Many responses stressed the need to balance environmental ambition with deliverability and viability, particularly for smaller scale or suburban schemes.

Water management

3.91 Many respondents referenced nature-based solutions, highlighting the benefits that nature can have in improving water quality and other water matters, such as flood risk. The catchment-based approach, integrated water management strategies and retaining flood resilience policies was supported by several Local Authorities, Thames Water and the Environment Agency. Several references were also made to a strategic London-wide approach to improving water quality, with it being recommended that sub-regional Water Integrated Management Strategies should be developed to support improving water quality, and addressing other key water matters, within London. Others commented that the catchment-based approach should be expanded to address surface water flood risk, in line with the London Surface Water Strategy.

3.92 There was a reference to the London Plan setting clear policy and expectations to provide a clear mandate to boroughs to hold developers accountable. References were also made to misconnections, and how stronger enforcement on this is required. Other key themes included the link to biodiversity, improving accessibility, the need for robust water infrastructure (and how this should be appropriately evidenced), and the importance of a coordinated approach.

Transport's role in London's growth

3.93 Respondents expressed strong overall support for the London Plan's emphasis on public transport, active travel and sustainable growth. Many stressed that transport is fundamental to London's economic success, social inclusion and climate objectives, and that housing growth must be directly aligned with improvements to transport

accessibility, capacity and reliability. A dominant theme that emerged was the need to reiterate and embed the Mayor's Transport Strategy, particularly the target to reduce car trips and traffic. Many respondents argued that reducing car dependency is essential for tackling congestion, air quality, carbon emissions and public health, though there was some caution that policy must reflect local realities in outer London where public transport options remain more limited.

3.94 There was widespread support for investment in public transport, including rail modernisation, new and extended lines (such as the Bakerloo Line extension, DLR extensions and West London Orbital), enhanced orbital connectivity, and significantly improved bus services. Respondents repeatedly highlighted the importance of reliable, frequent buses for areas underserved by rail, and called for faster rollout of zero emission fleets, including fully electric buses. Several stressed that affordability is critical to achieving modal shift, with calls to review fares, caps and concessions. Accessibility emerged as a major concern, with strong and consistent calls to prioritise step free access across the network, arguing that inclusive access is essential to social equity, independence and growth. Improved station design, reliable lifts, better staff support and accessible interchanges were also highlighted as urgent priorities.

3.95 Active travel was widely supported, but respondents stressed the need for safe, connected and continuous walking and cycling networks, particularly in outer London and underserved communities. Support was strongest where active travel infrastructure is delivered alongside public realm improvements, like seating and lighting. Some respondents raised concerns for pedestrian priority, safer junctions and better management of e bikes and scooters.

3.96 Many organisations highlighted the importance of freight, logistics and servicing as essential infrastructure underpinning London's economy. There was also support for better planning of logistics space, river and rail freight, consolidation hubs and low emission deliveries, alongside recognition that freight traffic must be managed carefully to avoid undermining safety and congestion targets.

3.97 Developer contributions were supported as a priority for transport and affordable housing, but there was concern about viability, uncertainty over government funding, and the risk of planning growth without confirmed infrastructure. Many called for stronger integration between the London Plan, the Infrastructure Plan and borough local plans, ensuring that growth is phased, equitable and genuinely sustainable across all parts of the capital.

Fire safety

3.98 Many respondents from industry and business suggested that the new London Plan should leave fire safety matters to building regulations at the national level. They highlighted that it is not helpful to have two potentially conflicting requirements (Building Regulations and planning policy) which can change over time and lack consistency. Other industry representatives commented that having fire safety planning policy added complexity and delay to development.

3.99 Some other respondents, mostly boroughs and some community groups, considered it important for fire safety to be considered through the planning process and not only addressed later at the building control stage. Some highlighted that existing national standards do not sufficiently address fire safety and identified the requirement for evacuation lifts was as particularly important to be a planning requirement, although a

similar number of industry responses objected to this requirement. Some respondents, primarily boroughs, supported clarifying that the fire safety policy only applies to major developments where people sleep on premises. Some of these respondents also supported leaving this issue to be addressed at the national level in the future.

3.100 A small number of respondents, mostly industry representatives and a few boroughs, agreed that in the future, when the building regulations improved, fire safety should be left to the national level and not be a policy in the London Plan.

Air quality

3.101 Respondents overwhelmingly supported continued and strengthened action on air quality, recognising it as a major public health issue linked to premature mortality, chronic illness, and worsening health inequalities. Poor air quality was consistently framed as an environmental justice issue, with disproportionate impacts on children, older people, those with existing health conditions, and communities in areas of higher deprivation. A significant volume of respondents explicitly supported embedding the 2021 WHO air quality guidelines into the London Plan, with a clear pathway to compliance by 2030.

3.102 While improvements in NO_2 were acknowledged—particularly following ULEZ, cleaner buses, and vehicle electrification—there was a strong consensus that Londoners are still exposed to unsafe air, especially fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$), both outdoors and indoors. Many responses suggested there has been an over emphasis on pollution from traffic, neglecting other harmful sources like wood burning, diesel generators and construction that remain. Some respondents noted that mortality linked to air pollution is often compounded by heat during hot, still weather, and argued that air quality policy should be more clearly integrated with climate change adaptation and overheating mitigation in the London Plan.

3.103 There was a strong emphasis on indoor air quality within planning and building standards. Respondents consistently highlighted the need to address indoor air quality, recognising that Londoners spend around 90% of their time indoors. Mixed comments were received on air pollution during construction, with some stating that this needs to be minimised, whereas others highlight that reducing NRMM emissions is often complex, costly and could delay developments.

Key Themes from TNLP Consultation

3.104 The TNLP consultation provided valuable feedback that informed the preparation of the draft London Plan. It should be noted that the consultation facilitated discussion on some broad issues and captured a wide range of views and, as such, responses did not always directly relate to matters that can be addressed in a spatial development strategy. Views also inevitably differed on many issues.

3.105 Careful consideration of the comments, alongside relevant evidence, Mayoral priorities, learnings from the current Plan and its implementation, and Government direction, has underpinned a draft London Plan that prioritises a strategy and policies to deliver more homes for Londoners and support sustainable economic growth – while ensuring the city continues to tackle climate change and enhance its environment, health and green spaces.

3.106 The following sections briefly outline how some key policy areas have been influenced by the consultation, with comments and insights received helping to inform a refreshed suite

of Good Growth objectives and update and strengthen policy approaches to ensure London's growth is inclusive, viable, and sustainable over the long term, while also seeking to respond to the challenging viability context.

Good Growth

3.107 The feedback on the importance of **a rounded approach to Good Growth** is reflected in a refreshed, more clearly focused suite of Good Growth objectives in the draft Plan. These recognise key interrelationships between things like health, climate resilience and wider environmental outcomes. In turn, policies go well beyond simply enabling a particular quantum of growth to ensure this broad definition of Good Growth is interwoven in the Plan – actively shaping growth to best effect. The planned quantum of growth (which is less than the government's assessment of need) reflects an understanding of limits to realistically achievable Good Growth, particularly in the initial ten-year period and in the present viability context. It is set at a level that **ensures that a plan-led approach**, securing benefits and mitigating impacts can be maintained, and levels of growth can be sustained to **meet need over the longer term**.

Making best use of land

3.108 Making best use of land (including place-based assets and infrastructure) was a key theme raised that continues to be at the heart of the London Plan approach. There was particular support for **maintaining a brownfield first approach** which is embedded in the spatial strategy, for instance the prioritisation of planning for growth within the existing urban area. The need for enhanced interventions within Opportunity Areas to address complex barriers to delivery, is recognised. The brownfield first approach is also reflected in policy requirements which set **higher expectations for green belt development**.

3.109 Recognising the other aspects of Good Growth that Londoners want to see realised, the spatial strategy has a strong environmental aspect to it, identifying **Environmental Opportunity Areas** alongside other types of opportunity to ensure that environmental improvements such as nature recovery and improved access to nature are embedded in the Plan's approach to growth.

3.110 The strong support from consultation responses for **increasing density** particularly in **well-connected locations and for promoting mid-rise development**, has informed the development of an optimisation framework. This policy embeds the link between density and transport connectivity (through a new metric of Sustainable Access Measure) and focuses on promoting midrise development across London.

3.111 In response to consultation feedback around support for **sustainable growth**, public transport and the Mayor's Transport Strategy, the draft London Plan further strengthens the integration of land use and transport by identifying broad locations for growth in areas that are or can be well-connected. To accommodate the growth needed in London, transport connectivity underpins the identification of targeted limited areas of green belt that can deliver sustainable patterns of growth while enhancing biodiversity and access to green space.

Housing

3.112 There was a clear call to ensure homes are delivered that meet people's needs and a number of policy interventions in the plan have been included that seek to better address this. Concerns over **housing affordability** remains at the heart of many housing

conversations. In the context of high affordable housing needs and poor economic headwinds that are significantly reducing housebuilding across the country, the Threshold Approach to Planning Applications has been amended to better account for viability and costs with the aim to encourage more schemes to fast track, speeding up delivery, particularly of much needed affordable homes. To reflect the emphasis on the importance of social rent, new tenure requirements prioritise this type of affordable housing. The commitment to ensuring that London's important **key workers** are considered in the housing market has been addressed through the requirements for the Mayor's new Key Worker Living Rent homes.

3.113 Policies concerned with different types of accommodation have been developed considering themes raised. **PBSA** and **Gypsy and Traveller accommodation** have set targets for delivery and a policy framework that will help deliver them in the right locations. Considering borough and industry feedback in particular, this means a student housing policy that will help spread delivery more across London to meet need in relation to higher education providers and available and suitable locations. This in turn removes the need for NAs to be secured beyond the affordable elements of the scheme, as targets and their underlying methodology act as the basis for understanding need and where it exists on the ground.

3.114 Recognising the **importance of specialist, supported and older people's accommodation,** the draft Plan provides needs figures to act as a strategic guide in the short-term, and policy concerned with the loss of non-self contained accommodation is also included. In response to consultation feedback, **accessible housing** policy has been enhanced to better support its delivery and retention and to facilitate it reaching those that need it.

Town centres and commercial activity

3.115 There was strong support for London's commercial centres and activities. This includes support for the CAZ to remain London's centre for economic, night-time and cultural uses but some housing delivery is seen as important to provide much needed homes and support resilience. In response, the draft Plan introduces a **new concept of Mixed CAZ** where boroughs can consider greater housing delivery, with Core CAZ being the default designation to support the strategic functions of the CAZ.

3.116 Respondents support a flexible range of businesses in general and specifically in town centres, noting the need for restrictions on certain uses that can have negative impacts on communities. In response the Draft London Plan proposes to **continue to support boroughs to restrict the concentrations of sui generis uses** such as betting shops, adult gaming centres, pawnbrokers, pay day loan shops and hot food takeaways that can have a negative impact on town centre diversity, community safety and/or the health and well-being of Londoners.

3.117 In terms of **affordable workspace**, there was strong consensus that the London Plan remain strategic with detailed policies and criteria defined locally, based on rigorous evidence. The Draft London Plan proposes to retain this approach. Responses to other policy options was varied.

Climate change and environmental sustainability

3.118 Consultation responses supported policy moving to more robust **performance-based metrics for energy efficiency** than the current policy focus on carbon reduction over building regulations. These comments, as well as detailed evidence base work, has led to

the Draft London Plan having a policy with new energy and heat demand metrics for development. Concerns about **flood risk, waste/embodied carbon, water and air quality** are also reflected in **strong, London-specific approaches** to these matters, building on the pioneering approaches developed in the current plan.

Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and green belt

3.119 The **value of MOL** to many was clearly articulated and this has led to a policy that is separate to Green Belt and which continues to apply a **high level of protection**, with release only in exceptional circumstances in a way that enhances functionality (e.g. through improving public access).

3.120 The approaches to (re)development on the **green belt** and industrial land have been shaped by the clear messages about the value of that land for its currently designated purposes, and fears about functions that may be lost in changing that. Development on such land is to be **carefully managed** through the plan to **protect and incorporate as much as possible of what is valued** (such as green spaces, and important infrastructure on industrial land), while recognising the significant need for housing. The approach to density and focusing growth in well-connected locations aims to minimise the need for overall release.

Transport

3.121 Reflecting strong support for **public transport investment** and concerns about deliverability, transport policies have been developed with an aim to promote a **coordinated approach** to planning obligations, protection of transport land and provision of connected networks of public transport and active travel that enhances strategic and local connections. This will enable targeted investment and efficient use of resources to support and unlock sustainable growth. The draft Plan also makes clear the requirement to deliver further transport investment to underpin ongoing growth.

3.122 Responding to strong support for active travel and concerns about safety and street clutter, the draft Plan combines the **Healthy Streets and Public Realm** policies to ensure that all publicly accessible spaces (new, improved, and temporary) are welcoming, accessible and safe during day and night. Dedicated spaces are required for dockless e-scooters and bikes to ensure that footways remain clear of clutter.

Appendix A Talk London Survey Questions

The government has set out new national requirements for the number of homes to be delivered across England. They have said London needs to find space for 880,000 new homes.

1. **Which of the following, if any, do you think affect the possibility of reaching 880,000 new homes (in London)? Tick all that apply.**
   - Changes in interest rates
   - National government funding
   - Building regulation
   - Planning
   - How quickly homes sell
   - UK economic situation (such as inflation)
   - World events and political situation
   - Something else (please tell us)
   - None of the above
   - Don't know

Local councils and authorities can ask for new developments to have certain things. To get planning permission, an applicant will need to either build them or put forward money to help provide them. These support the community in that location. This could include affordable homes, or adding community buildings like a doctors' surgery, or a school. Or it could include parks, squares or other places for people to spend time. It could also be transport related, such as new or improved stations, walking and cycling routes or increasing the number of passengers existing rail or Underground lines can carry. Supporting everything a community needs isn't always possible as it would be too costly and funding will also be needed from other places. We would like to understand what you would prioritise as most important, for the London of the future.

2. **If you had to choose, which of the following do you think should be the priority for developers to help fund to get permission to build? Tick up to two.**
   - Affordable housing
   - Public transport infrastructure (such as train or underground lines, stations or bus stops)
   - Other transport infrastructure like cycle lanes and pedestrianised areas or routes
   - Improving nature and biodiversity (including parks and waterways)
   - Social and community facilities (such as community centres, schools and doctor's surgeries)
   - Affordable workspaces to support businesses
   - Creating employment opportunities
   - Don't know

3. **And if you had to choose, which of the following do you think is least important for developers to fund to get permission to build? Tick up to two.**
   - Affordable housing
   - Public transport infrastructure (such as train or underground lines, stations or bus stops)
   - Other transport infrastructure like cycle lanes and pedestrianised areas or routes
   - Improving nature and biodiversity (including parks and waterways)

- Social and community facilities (such as community centres, schools and doctor's surgeries)
- Affordable workspaces to support businesses
- Creating employment opportunities
- Don't know

4. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with London's current housing situation?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

London needs to find space for 880,000 new homes. The London Plan will identify where these houses could be. This may mean making tough decisions. These decisions could include releasing Green Belt for building. It could mean taller buildings. It could mean filling in spaces between buildings and making existing buildings in our neighbourhoods larger. Or encouraging land to change from business use to homes.

5. Thinking about town centres and high streets, which of these statements comes closest to your thoughts?

- Housing is more important than commercial properties (e.g. shops, food outlets, offices)
- Housing and commercial properties are of equal importance
- Commercial properties are more important than housing
- Don't know

6. Which of the following, if any, would you most value in London's town centres and high streets? Tick all that apply.

- Shops
- Personal services outlets such as hairdressers, opticians, banks, post offices, estate agents, nail bars
- Places to work like offices, studios and laboratories
- Cafés, restaurants and pubs
- Take-away food and drink outlets
- Leisure uses such as cinemas, bowling alleys, gyms and sports facilities, gaming arcades, escape rooms or indoor and soft play facilities
- Cultural uses such as theatres, art galleries, museums
- Evening and night-time uses such as late-night pubs, live music performance venues, night clubs
- Community centres, places of worship, libraries, doctors, dentists, schools, nurseries
- Markets, squares and traffic-free spaces
- Something else (please tell us)
- Don't know

We have to decide where to build new homes. There are different types of land that we could prioritise for this. **Brownfield sites** are land that has a permanent building now or has had one before. **Green belt** is land that is set aside to protect against unlimited sprawl. It also protects

against towns merging into one another. London's Green Belt surrounds the city and extends beyond Greater London into the Home Counties. Green Belt includes both undeveloped land and brownfield land. New national policy means that Green Belt boundaries can be moved more easily if needed to build more homes or other development. **Grey Belt** is a new term introduced by national policy. It means land that is in the Green Belt that has previously been built on or that doesn't strongly meet some of the purposes of the Green Belt.

7. If you had to choose, where would be your first choice of location to build homes for London? Tick one.

- Brownfield land within the built-up areas of London
- Brownfield land in the Green Belt (previously developed Grey Belt land)
- Other Grey Belt land (Green Belt land that doesn't strongly separate towns or prevent urban sprawl)
- Other Green Belt land that has good transport connections

8. Why did you choose that location?

9. And where else, would you choose to build homes for London? Tick all that apply.

- Brownfield land within the built-up areas of London
- Brownfield land in the Green Belt (previously developed Grey Belt land)
- Other Grey Belt land (Green Belt land that doesn't strongly separate towns or prevent urban sprawl)
- Other Green Belt land that has good transport connections
- Nowhere else

10. You said you would choose to build homes for London on: [answer to question 7 if brownfield]. Which of the following types of brownfield sites, if any, were you thinking of in the previous questions? Tick all that apply.

- Extending or adding onto existing buildings or homes to turn into multiple homes
- Sites in London that are empty or underused
- Building homes on retail parks or car parks
- Building new developments in town centres and high streets near stations
- Tall buildings in accessible locations
- Estate regeneration
- Building on industrial land (changing sites from industrial to housing)
- Something else (please tell us)
- Nothing specific

11. You said you would choose to build homes for London on: [answer to question 7 if Green Belt]. Which of the following Green Belt location types, if any, were you thinking of in the previous questions? Tick all that apply.

- Areas at the edge of London's built-up area with good transport connections (e.g. rail or Underground stations)
- Areas at the edge of London's built-up area, but further away from transport connections
- Areas at the edge of existing towns and villages further away from transport connections

- Areas where there are few homes currently but where good transport connections could be put in (e.g. adding a new station on an existing railway line or extending existing lines)
- Areas where there are few homes currently and no transport connections
- Something else (please tell us)
- Nothing specific

Appendix B TNLP Housing and Economy Engagement Workshop Summary

Overview and Key Messages

As part of the Towards a New London Plan consultation, a two hour in person engagement workshop was held at City Hall on 13 June 2025, facilitated by We Made That. The workshop brought together 55 Londoners, invited by the GLA, representing a diverse range of backgrounds and organisations advocating for key groups within the city. The majority of workshop participants were attending as individuals, with 15 attending in a professional capacity, from campaign groups, professional bodies, and one local authority member – these included representatives from groups advocating for disabled people, older people, safety, and on behalf of the climate.

The objective of the workshop was to invite participants to share their priorities for an inclusive and accessible housing system and economy, to inform development of the draft Londo Plan. This objective was explored through the following questions and activities:

Housing:

- 'Quickfire' survey questions to understand general sentiment on housing
- Table discussion question: What types of homes are most needed in London?
- Table discussion question: What is needed to make homes and neighbourhoods accessible and inclusive for all?

Economy:

- 'Quickfire' survey questions to understand general sentiment on the economy
- Table discussion question: What is needed to make town centres and high streets accessible and inclusive for all?
- Table discussion question: What could be done to ensure London's economy offers opportunities for all?

Open questions were selected for the workshop discussion, to allow a participant-led discussion, guiding facilitators as to participants' priorities and key concerns. This means that issues raised did not always directly relate to matters or proposals suggested in Towards a New London Plan, and particularly for the economy section, did not relate to planning matters. While aiming to provide context to participants' views on planning matters, this summary on balance leaves out issues raised that did not relate to planning (for example discussions on skills, or fair pay). This summary prioritises highlighting key topics where a general consensus of concern was observed, rather than a comprehensive analysis of individual participant viewpoints.

Overall, the workshop discussions underscored the urgent need for a **holistic and integrated approach to planning that prioritises affordability, accessibility, community well-being, and equitable economic opportunities for all Londoners**.

Housing Key Messages

- Affordability crisis: Participants resoundingly emphasised the critical need to address affordability across London's housing system. Current "affordable housing" is seen as falling short, with affordability in particular burdening low-income residents, disabled individuals, young people, older people, and families.

- Social housing as imperative: There was strong advocacy for prioritising social housing developments over market-rate housing, with a desire for rents to be linked to income. Many also critiqued the Right to Buy scheme as depleting social housing stock. Additionally, some emphasised the desire to see existing social housing refurbished rather than demolished and rebuilt.

- Accessibility as a fundamental right: The majority of participants emphasised that accessibility must be a central consideration, calling for a substantial increase in the delivery of accessible housing units that cater to the diverse needs of Londoners. This extends beyond simple wheelchair accessibility to encompass a wider spectrum of physical and cognitive requirements and access needs that may evolve over time. It was felt that the current approach lacked central coordination and monitoring.

- Enhancing communal features: Participants highlighted the importance of high quality communal features within housing developments, to increase quality of life and encourage community building and safety through knowing your neighbours. This included access to green space, public seating, youth centres, community centres, and design features that encourage social interaction.

Economy Key Messages

- Enhancing public spaces for all: Participants focused on the need to improve public spaces to promote inclusivity and encourage social interaction. Key priorities included ensuring the availability of free, clean, and accessible public toilets, ample seating areas, and inviting green spaces.

- Desire for vibrant and inclusive town centres: London's town centres and high streets were recognised as vital hubs for community life and economic activity – especially in more residential parts of London, away from central London. Participants underscored the importance of preserving markets, independent businesses, and cultural and community spaces to cultivate inclusive and vibrant communities, expressing concerns about the dominance of large chain stores and financial pressures on small businesses.

- Economic equity as a guiding principle: Economic opportunities were seen as needing to be inclusive. Participants expressed the need to shift the focus away from maximising profits and GDP in favour of prioritising people and their needs within the city. They argued that closing the accessibility gap, with access to employment opportunities, would result in significant financial benefits for the economy.

Strengthening policies for inclusivity: Participants highlighted the necessity of strengthening existing policies, especially related to inclusivity. Improved policy implementation was also seen as crucial for ensuring equitable outcomes.

Housing

The discussion on housing opened with an informal "Quick Fire Question Survey", to understand participants sentiments towards housing in London. This identified high levels of dissatisfaction with the current housing situation, with 3 in 4 (76%) participants saying they are dissatisfied, and over half of these very dissatisfied. No participants indicated they were very satisfied, and only 2 participants (4%) said they were satisfied with the current housing situation with 18% states they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

What types of homes are most needed in London?

When asked via the opening "Quick Fire Question Survey", whether London's housing is currently meeting people's needs, 38 out of 46 (83%) answered 'No'. A follow-up question asking which factors are most important when thinking about new housing, shows that affordability is the top priority, followed by accessibility, types and sizes of homes, and proximity to public transport. The following pages highlight how these priorities were expressed in the discussion.

Affordability is a core concern, affecting most groups of people but particularly those in low-income groups, disabled people, young people, older people, and families. As highlighted in the opening "Quick Fire Question Survey", nearly all participants said affordability was one of their most important concerns when thinking about new housing developments. While affordability was a shared concern, discussions highlighted that **different groups are affected by affordability in different ways**, including:

- Older people in social housing struggle to find an affordable place to downsize to in their local area, staying in properties with additional bedrooms which is felt to add to the pressure on housing supply.
- Students are affected by a lack of affordable housing nearby to universities, and extra costs caused by paying rent outside of term-time.
- Young adults can't afford to move out of their parental home.
- Families discussed living in overcrowded homes.
- People are having to move outside of London – including people working in essential services in London – away from their support networks.
- Disabled people are felt to experience affordability issues particularly acutely, due to the additional costs associated with many disabilities, and with some disabled people not being able to work.
- It was also highlighted that lower priority groups such as single men are less able to access social housing, despite their financial need.
- Private renters including middle-income people are also struggling with affordability and high rents as a proportion of income.

Bringing affordability in line with income was seen as very important, across tenures. 'Affordable' housing is widely seen as unaffordable, due to high service charges, and rents, which are linked to market rents rather than what people can afford.

- Social housing was considered the most affordable tenure, but concern was still raised about affordability of social rents by some participants.

- A small number of participants also pointed to issues with social housing delivered through housing associations.

- Across tenures, it was felt to be important that rent is tied to income rather than market rent, and positivity towards the idea of key worker affordable housing and rent and service charge caps.

There is doubt that developer-led housebuilding can meet the challenges of affordability, including in the **green belt**. Frustration was raised with developers as they are seen to prioritise profit and use viability to evade affordable housing targets.

- Dissatisfaction was also mentioned with the number of empty properties in London, including in recently built properties, which was felt to indicate the challenges of using new-build housing to meet the affordability challenge.

- There was concern that delivering affordable housing on the Green Belt, would add to the cost of living for residents there, due to high travel costs to reach other parts of London.

Protecting and increasing the supply of social housing is seen as critical. Participants who had experienced living in social housing noted the long waiting lists for social housing (e.g. 2 years for a 2-bed, 5 years for a 1-bed), and high use of temporary accommodation, highlighting a need for more social housing. It was suggested social housing should be the focus of affordability targets rather than 'affordable housing'. Many participants critiqued the Right to Buy policy, for reducing stock of social housing., including social rented accessible homes, which become unavailable for people who really need them.

- Refurbishing, rather than demolishing social housing, was mentioned as essential by a few participants, to ensure the right to stay for existing residents and prevent a net loss of social housing tenancies. A need to coordinate between accessibility and affordability housebuilding targets was also highlighted, due to the higher costs associated with being disabled.

Discussions highlighted **a lack of supply of family-size homes, options for downsizers, and provision for disabled people**. Families report living in overcrowded housing, with one of them reporting living with an 8-person family in a 3-bed property. Another mentioned children sharing beds due to overcrowding. Calls were made for more 3+ bed properties.

- Several older participants mentioned the difficulties for older people in downsizing or re-locating to more accessible accommodation, even when they are disincentivised from staying in their current property by paying the bedroom tax. Issues included struggling to find affordable homes locally, and not being able to afford the costs associated with moving home. There were suggestions there should be more options for downsizers, with ground floor level access.

- For disabled people, issues included being housed in homes which don't meet their access needs, including in the home and wider housing development, or being housed above the ground floor in a high rise and a lack of Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans (PEEPs). This included a participant mentioning homes which were designated as 'accessible' but fell

short of the required standard to be genuinely accessible due to challenges with door widths and spatial allowances.

Adaptability was felt to be key, alongside the ability to move to more suitable accommodation. The majority of social renters felt strongly that it should be easier to move to more suitable accommodation, with the right to stay in the local area guaranteed. The option to adapt existing homes was also felt to be critical, due to the challenges of moving within the existing social housing system, individual preferences to stay in their existing home, and the recognition that people's needs and circumstances change over their lifetime.

- For example, an older person's advocate discussed a need to factor in future adaptations into design – enabling adaptations like grab rails, level access bathrooms, or downstairs bedrooms to be retrofitted, while maintaining design quality.

- Nonetheless it was noted that adaptability affected people differently according to their tenure and circumstances, for example disabled private renters are disincentivised from seeking adaptations for fear of rent rises or eviction, while social renters or people on low incomes may not be able to afford adaptations at all.

Increasing the delivery of accessible housing for a range of needs was seen as a particular priority. A few participants who were either disabled, or who represented disabled groups highlighted how the current housing stock fails to meet the existing 10% accessible housing delivery targets, and suggested this target should be higher, to adjust for previous under-delivery and to meet the needs of disabled people, an ageing population, and people with temporary or future impairments. A few participants even suggested all new homes should be wheelchair accessible, to make them fit for existing and changing needs, and to retrofit older buildings to meet new accessibility standards.

- It was also highlighted that developers prefer to deliver wheel-chair adaptable homes (M43A) rather than accessible (M43B) homes, pushing the costs of adapting onto local authorities or tenants, which contributes to the lack of truly accessible homes.

- There was a critique of a lack of evidence gathering at a London-wide and borough-level about the accessibility requirements of local residents to set appropriate targets, and lack of central coordination and monitoring of these targets.

There was also positivity towards other forms of **specialist housing**. While recognising that most people will continue to live in general needs housing, there was positivity towards more specialist housing, in particular for:

- Older people who can benefit from a sense of independence and community by living in specialist housing.

- Homeless people, who need appropriate hostel accommodation – including private rooms and ensuite bathrooms.

- Truly affordable student accommodation that is within easy reach of the university.

- Co-living was also mentioned by one participant a scheme which is currently poorly supported in London, while there are thriving examples in mainland Europe.

What is needed to make homes and neighbourhoods accessible and includes for all?

Delivering accessible homes will require clarity on accessibility needs, and to think broadly about access. Participants highlighted **accessibility needs are not limited to wheelchair accessibility**, and the range of disabilities including physical or hidden disabilities require different adaptations, for example, extra warmth, different lighting, soundproofing, or access to energy to power equipment. It was also highlighted that accessible homes should not be assumed to be for single people, as many disabled people have families.

- There was a suggestion for there to be a clear definition of 'accessibility' in the London Plan, relating to housing design, to avoid conflating defined access needs for disabled people, with a more general meaning of accessibility, and to ensure the requirements of developers are clear.

New build developments were generally seen as poor quality, termed 'cardboard houses' constructed cheaply with lack of soundproofing, poor insulation, and potentially unsafe cladding. Flats being too hot was also mentioned, along with a lack of basic features like baths, or features like windows in bathrooms, which help to prevent mould.

- Maintenance issues are a concern across many tenures and lifts breaking is a key issue for high-rise tenants.

- Fire safety was a key concern, with participants noting features like sprinklers and adequate fire doors have not been implemented, despite awareness. Concerns around fire safety particularly affect disabled residents who live above ground floor.

- Small room sizes were also a concern. For families, housing design could be improved through larger bedroom sizes for children sharing, and larger living rooms.

- It was also important that housing design didn't single out or distinguish social housing, or accessible housing.

Feelings about **building heights** link strongly to maintenance issues, and access to outdoor space.

- Generally, participants did not report issues in living in flats, but access to safe, high quality outdoor and green space was important for making flats acceptable places to live. This included private outdoor space like balconies, communal green space, and accessible routes to nearby parks and green spaces.

- Participants considered there to be significant safety and accessibility issues relating to higher-rise buildings, due to widespread disrepair, maintenance, and lifts breaking. And generally it was only considered suitable for older people or disabled people to live in flats if they were located on the ground floor.

- Therefore, participants tended to prefer lower to mid-rise blocks to higher-rise blocks, perceiving them to be safer, and better connected to green or outdoor space.

Communal features and access to outdoor space is important for a sense of belonging, safety and comfort. A sense of community and 'knowing your neighbour' was said to be important for a sense of safety and belonging. Participants widely highlighted a frequent lack of communal features including green space, community hubs, youth spaces and design

features which would encourage interaction (e.g. front doors facing each other). Mixed communities were also felt to be important, with Londoners of different backgrounds.

The design of the wider housing development, and neighbourhood is seen as critical to deliver accessible and inclusive housing.

- To make accessible homes truly accessible, the entranceways of developments and other communal features need to be accessible. Accessible carparking spaces should be located next to accessible homes, including charging points for accessible EVs. This includes lifts which are accessible for wheelchairs, bikes, and parents with prams.

- Not all public transport stations are accessible, which should be improved. In the meantime, participants felt accessible housing should only be built in areas which are close to accessible transport.

- Car free developments and building over car-parks can discriminate against disabled people, sometimes termed 'eco-ableism'. For other groups like families, it's also deemed unrealistic to not have a car, and discriminatory for people who draw their income from their cars, like driving instructors.

Summary

1. **Affordability:** Affordability is a core concern, affecting most groups of people but particularly those in low-income groups, disabled people, young people, older people, and families. Bringing affordability in line with income was seen as very important, across tenures. There is doubt that developer-led housebuilding can meet the challenges of affordability, including in the Green Belt.
2. **Social Housing:** Protecting and increasing the supply of social housing is seen as critical.
3. **Types of homes, adaptability, and accessibility:** Discussions highlighted a lack of supply of family-size homes, options for downsizers, and provision for disabled people. Adaptability was felt to be key, alongside the ability to move to more suitable accommodation. Increasing the delivery of accessible housing for a range of needs was seen as a particular priority. There was also positivity towards other forms of specialist housing.
4. **Safety, design, accessibility, and maintenance:** Delivering accessible homes will require clarity on accessibility needs, and to think broadly about access. Quality, insulation, design, fire safety and maintenance are all key issues.
5. **Building heights:** Feelings about building heights link strongly to maintenance issues, and access to outdoor space.
6. **Communities and neighbourhoods:** Communal features and access to outdoor space is important for a sense of belonging, safety and comfort. The design of the wider housing development, and neighbourhood is seen as critical to deliver accessible and inclusive housing.

Economy

The opening "Quick Fire Question Survey" asked which participants what they most value about town centres and high streets, highlighting that community, leisure and cultural uses are highly valued, as were personal services (e.g. banks, post offices).

What is needed to make town centres and high streets accessible and inclusive for all?

There was support for greater **cultural, educational and social uses in town centres**, representing the diversity of local communities. There was widespread positivity toward high streets and town centres supporting cultural expression and community: libraries, museums, community theatres, art spaces, and faith spaces. It was noted that spaces like these are often multi-use so offer a wide range of benefits, and as such are cost-effective spaces.

- It was felt high streets should be places for connection, skill-building, and informal work—not just consumption.

- Local access to GPs, health centres and pharmacies was felt to be essential, alongside post offices, banks and other services.

- Community centres with leisure activities, play areas, and affordable gyms valued for all age groups.

- Free space to relax, study, and meet is needed - libraries often close early, cafés have cost/access barriers.

A variety of **affordable shops and local independent businesses make town centres accessible** and create a sense of local identity.

- 'Useful' local shops including affordable food shops, other local independent shops, and charity shops were commonly valued.

- Independent shops and businesses were felt to help represent the diversity of the local community, creating inclusive spaces with a sense of place. For example, having visibility of areas particular communities e.g. Vietnamese restaurants focused on one road.

- However, concern was raised about high rents pushing out small businesses, and encouraging uniform high streets dominated by big chains.

- A small number of participants mentioned that financial incentives, business rates relief and affordable units for start-ups could help. In addition, empty shops could be used creatively.

Markets are valued for their role in creating inclusive spaces but are felt to be in decline. By offering a range of affordable products, including food, clothing, and cultural items, markets are felt to be inclusive to wide section of the community.

- They are valued for helping to create a sense of place and a unique identity. which encourages community belonging.

- It was mentioned they are in decline, and some participants felt measures to increase participation could include traffic-free squares, with seating for people to rest.

Being able to **use public space for free is important**, but often the spaces and amenities are lacking. Lack of free, clean, accessible public toilets was a key issue.

- There was some recognition of the challenges of delivering free public toilets in the current economic climate but was a suggestion shops should be part of the community toilet scheme. Need for changing places facilities, particularly for disabled people and families

- Public seating areas are important for parents, older people and disabled people, but are often removed due to anti-social behaviour concerns

- There was felt to be a need for free space to go indoors and outdoors, for example more public squares, free co-working spaces, and seating.

- London was felt to have excellent green and blue space – canals – but this is not uniform, and there is a need for more green space in some areas and cleaning up the canals so it's more accessible as a public resource e.g. for water activities.

Suggestions were made for **improvement of the public realm** to enhance physical accessibility, and inclusivity for everyone:

- Participants highlighted the need for seating, bike racks, signage, and Blue Badge parking or drop-off spaces to consider accessibility in their location and be designed inclusively. For example, important any public or outdoor seating, or location of bike parking does not block wheelchair access.

- Quieter and calm spaces were also important, especially for older people and neurodivergent individuals.

Transport connectivity was felt to be important to maximise access to town centres. Participants shared mixed views on pedestrianisation, highlighting the need to ensure access for people needing cab drop-offs, or for Blue Badge holders. Accessibility on transport (step-free stations, underground staff) is vital for disabled and older people. It was highlighted that currently only 1/3 underground stations are accessible. The need to improve travel connections between different local town centres was also highlighted.

Safety and security is also a key concern impacting inclusivity. The importance of safety in public spaces and at night was highlighted. Fears mentioned included phone and bike theft.

- Having places open at night including cafes and support hubs was suggested to improve feelings of safety.

What could be done to ensure London's economy offers opportunities for all?

The discussion on economy opened with "Quickfire Survey Questions", to understand background sentiments to London's economy. Half (50%) disagreed that London's economy offers accessible opportunities for all Londoners, with 1 in 10 (12%) agreeing, and 1 in 5 (22%) neutral on the question.

Participants felt there is a need to re-think the economic narrative, with a focus on people, not profit. There were discussions of a need to re-think the economic narrative on economic growth with a **focus on supporting communities**. For example, less focus on GDP and 'growth' and more about the wellbeing of a city's residents. The doughnut economy was mentioned - where we should live within our planetary means.

- As highlighted in the previous section, participants valued 'useful' and independent, local shops, and markets, above uniform chains, including charity shops. Suggestions were made for affordable community-owned cafes, co-op shops, and recycling hubs that foster belonging.

- Asking more of developers and multi-national companies was also raised as a suggestion, connecting to local skills development and social value.

Community and social infrastructure were also mentioned as having an economic role. Libraries, leisure centres, and community centres provide space, warmth, internet access, and free learning—important for wellbeing, accessing opportunity, informal skills exchange and intergenerational learning, which ultimately supports more equitable access to economic opportunities.

- It was felt town halls and hubs which offer support should be centrally located and accessible, in visible locations (e.g. Tower Hamlets' new town hall was seen as a positive example).

In relation to **locations of jobs and supporting Londoners to work**, closing the 'accessibility gap' should be prioritised as a benefit, but is currently seen as a cost.

- There was felt to be a misperception that disabled people can't work, and a lack of accessibility provision in place as a result. It was highlighted that closing this 'accessibility gap' would enable disabled people to work, with economic as well as social benefits.

- Lifts, disabled parking, and integrating accessible workplaces with accessible public transport were all highlighted as necessary features for accessibility. And a suggestion was made for the GLA to promote accessible office hubs across London.

- Participants also highlighted that disabled people that can work may be in need of flexible or part time work to support them in managing their condition, meaning access to work nearer to home may be preferred.

It was discussed that many groups want to work, but struggle to access it, and **access to local jobs and volunteering infrastructure** could help address this.

- Participants discussed issues accessing work for other groups including mothers, people with caring responsibilities, older people, young people entering the job market and migrants, and inequities in the current system, including higher proportions of racialised communities in low-paying jobs.

- While many of the solutions suggested fall outside of the remit of the London Plan, access to local work was seen as important for those with caring responsibilities.

- And access to volunteering opportunities was important for people who don't yet have the right to work, or as a way to build up confidence and skills to enter the job market. Free-to-access community, social and outdoor infrastructure was seen as essential to this.

Participants highlighted importance of **travel-times and affordability of public transport** are important for accessing work.

- An hour or less was considered a reasonable length commute in general, where people did not have needs or responsibilities that required them to work closer to home.

Affordability was also a concern, with participants highlighting increased transport costs for people living further out in potential Green Belt developments.

There was felt to be a need for **improved equality policies** and governance in the London Plan. It was highlighted the current London Plan's inclusivity policies (GG1, D5) are vague and unenforceable—and recommended they should refer explicitly to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). PSED could give policies "teeth" if applied from start to finish in planning and decision-making. Current policies were said to vary too much by borough, recommending that the Mayor should provide unified strategies (e.g. disabled parking rules).

- Inclusive design standards were also suggested, to roll out accessible and inclusive housing design.

Summary

1. **Community, leisure and cultural uses:** There was support for greater cultural, educational and social uses in town centres, representing the diversity of local communities. Access to health, leisure, and everyday services was also important.
2. **Affordable and independent businesses:** A variety of affordable shops and local independent businesses make town centres accessible and create a sense of local identity. Markets are valued for their role in creating inclusive spaces but are felt to be in decline.
3. **Inclusion and participation in public space:** Being able to use public space for free is important, but often the spaces and amenities are lacking. Suggestions were made for improvement of the public realm to enhance physical accessibility, and inclusivity for everyone. Transport connectivity was felt to be important to maximise access to town centres. Safety and security is also a key concern impacting inclusivity.
4. **Economic activity that serves London's diverse communities:** Participants felt there's a need to re-think the economic narrative, with a focus on people, not profit. Community and social infrastructure were also mentioned as having an economic role.
5. **Locations of jobs and supporting Londoners to work:** Closing the 'accessibility gap' should be prioritised as a benefit but is currently seen as a cost. It was discussed that many groups want to work, but struggle to access it, and access to local jobs and volunteering infrastructure could help address this. Participants highlighted importance of travel-times and affordability of public transport are important for accessing work. There was felt to be a need for improved equality policies and governance in the London Plan

Appendix C TNLP Easy Read Engagement Workshops Summary

Overview and Key Messages

Publica CIC and Inclusion London supported the GLA London Plan team to deliver two engagement sessions aimed specifically at Londoners who would benefit from having an Easy Read version of the London Plan consultation materials. The first engagement session was held in-person at City Hall and attracted 14 participants. The second engagement session was held online and attracted 10 participants.

The participants at these engagement sessions were primarily disabled people, with a significant number of people identifying as neurodiverse: of the 24 people that attended across two sessions, 20 are disabled people and 4 are either support workers or family members providing support.

Across both sessions, facilitated by Publica CIC and Inclusion London, a range of topics drawn from the Easy Read version of the London Plan were discussed. The feedback from disabled Londoners has been grouped into topic categories in this summary.

Engagement participants across all sessions expressed a clear and consistent message: **London's future growth must be both inclusive and affordable**, ensuring that disabled people, people with learning difficulties, and low-income residents can live, work, travel, and thrive independently. The discussions revealed deep systemic issues in accessibility, affordability, and equity across housing, transport, employment, and environmental policy.

Housing

Participants highlighted a severe shortage of accessible and affordable homes. Many disabled Londoners face long waiting lists, poorly designed properties, and a lack of independent living options. Affordability pressures, complex tenancy processes, and inaccessible information compound these challenges. Participants called for easy-read tenancy agreements, better financial guidance, and stronger enforcement of accessibility standards. The London Plan should embed inclusive design across all housing tenures and ensure meaningful co-production with Disabled People's Organisations (DDPOs).

Transport

Transport was seen as fundamental to independence but remains fragmented and unsafe for many. Barriers include inaccessible stations, unsafe cycle and pedestrian layouts, inconsistent driver behaviour, and limited door-to-door transport options. Participants called for a London-wide accessibility audit, expansion of step-free access, better staff training, and protection of taxi and drop-off points in new schemes. Integrated planning between housing, transport, and the public realm was considered essential.

Jobs and Businesses

Disabled people continue to face structural barriers in employment - from inaccessible recruitment practices and workplaces to low pay and lack of local job opportunities. Participants stressed the need for inclusive hiring, reasonable adjustments, and fair pay aligned with the London Living Wage. Whilst many of the participants' concerns about jobs and employment fall

outside of the scope of the London Plan, there is a call for the GLA to use its influence to promote inclusive employers.

Sustainability and Climate Change

While participants supported London's net-zero ambitions, they warned that sustainability efforts must not deepen inequality. Rising energy costs, poor insulation, and unsafe or overheated buildings disproportionately affect disabled and low-income households. Environmental measures must prioritise accessibility, ensure safe mobility, and include disabled people in decision-making. Inclusive retrofit schemes, accessible recycling systems, and equitable access to green spaces were key priorities.

Overall Message

Across all themes, participants called for joined-up, co-produced planning that brings housing, transport, employment, and sustainability together under one inclusive framework. The London Plan should commit to measurable accessibility targets, stronger accountability for developers and service providers, and a citywide culture of inclusion where every Londoner - regardless of ability or income - can participate fully in civic life.

Housing Affordability and Accessibility

Participants raised significant concerns about the affordability and accessibility of housing in London. They highlighted that current housing provision fails to meet the diverse needs of disabled people, those with learning difficulties, and residents on low or part-time incomes. The discussions emphasised the urgent need for more genuinely affordable, accessible, and well-designed homes; stronger accountability for developers and boroughs; and better coordination between housing, social care, and financial support systems. Participants called for a co-produced, inclusive approach to housing policy that enables independent living and equal access to safe, sustainable homes across all communities.

Affordability and Financial Barriers

- Rising costs and limited income: Many participants described being unable to meet rent, energy, and food costs simultaneously, forcing choices between essential needs.

- Part-time and low-income workers face disproportionate rent levels and limited consideration of variable earnings by landlords or housing providers.

- Complex tenancy processes create additional barriers. Standard contracts are often inaccessible, with unclear information about total costs (e.g. utilities, service charges). Participants recommended that all tenancy documents be provided in easy-read and accessible formats.

- Lack of targeted financial support: Adults with learning disabilities living with family members are frequently excluded from housing benefit or Universal Credit support.

- Support and advice gaps: Participants identified the need for financial guidance and tenancy-readiness support to help residents understand rent payments, contracts, and budgeting.

Accessibility, Quality, and Design

- Severe shortage of accessible homes: Waiting times for suitable housing can extend beyond ten years.

- Existing housing stock is often unsuitable, with narrow layouts, poor maintenance, inadequate heating and ventilation, and unsafe materials.

- Loss of adaptations when properties become vacant was repeatedly cited, wasting resources and delaying re-use by other disabled residents.

- Inclusive design must extend beyond wheelchair access to include visual, sensory, cognitive, and neurodiverse accessibility needs.

- New developments should guarantee adequate internal space, step-free access, outdoor space, and compliance with accessibility standards (e.g. BS8300).

- Surrounding infrastructure (entrances, pavements, lifts, and green spaces) must also be fully accessible to ensure residents can safely navigate their environments.

Independence, Choice, and Supported Living

- Participants emphasised the right to independent living and the importance of choice in where and how people live.

- Supported housing should enable autonomy, not institutionalisation. Current provision is limited, fragmented, and inconsistently managed.

- Hybrid professional roles (combining housing and social work expertise) were cited as good practice in some boroughs to better coordinate assessments and ongoing support.

- The London Plan should encourage a wider range of housing options – including ground-floor units, bungalows, modular housing, and mixed-tenure developments – that reflect residents' physical and social needs.

- Local planning could adopt a "15-minute city" approach, ensuring housing is connected to essential services such as transport, shops, health care, and community facilities.

Governance, Accountability, and Monitoring

- Compliance with accessibility targets (e.g. the 10% wheelchair-accessible homes requirement) is inconsistent.

- Developers and housing associations lack clear incentives to deliver or maintain accessible and affordable homes. Participants suggested:

    - Developer levies or planning reliefs linked to affordable and accessible housing provision.
    - Regular monitoring and public reporting on accessible housing delivery by type and tenure.
    - Inclusion of accessibility metrics within borough-level housing performance frameworks.

- Co-production and engagement with Disabled People's Organisations (DDPOs) and lived-experience groups must be embedded in policy design and review.

- Participants also called for trained and accredited accessibility officers in every borough to oversee compliance and liaise between planning, housing, and transport functions.

Communication and Information Access

- Housing information and processes remain overly complex and inaccessible. A London-wide Access Management Plan was proposed to coordinate accessible communication methods and engagement standards across boroughs.

- Information formats (e.g. Easy Read, large print, audio, and digital) should be mandatory for all key housing documents and consultations.

- Inter-agency coordination must improve to prevent residents "falling through the gaps" between housing management, building control, and social care systems.

Summary of Key Housing Affordability and Accessibility Recommendations

1. Mandate accessible and easy-read tenancy agreements for all housing providers.
2. Strengthen compliance and data collection on accessible and affordable housing delivery.
3. Expand supported housing options that enable independent living.
4. Embed co-production with DDPOs and disabled residents in all housing policy and planning stages.
5. Incentivise developers to exceed accessibility and affordability thresholds.
6. Integrate accessibility officers within borough planning and housing teams.
7. Ensure joined-up communication and support systems across housing, care, and financial services.
8. Promote the 15-minute city model linking accessible homes with transport, services, and community networks.

Transport

Participants highlighted that London's transport system remains inconsistent and often unsafe for disabled and visually impaired people. Key concerns focused on physical access barriers, poor communication, lack of staff support, and the need for a joined-up approach across modes of travel. Accessibility in transport was viewed as inseparable from housing and public-realm planning.

Physical Accessibility and Infrastructure

- Step-free access remains limited: many Tube stations and older rail sites are still inaccessible due to heritage constraints or lack of lift provision.

- Bus accessibility varies widely; wheelchair bays are frequently occupied by buggies, and drivers often refuse or fail to deploy ramps.

- Floating bus stops and cycle lanes routed across pedestrian areas were repeatedly cited as unsafe and disorientating, particularly for blind and partially sighted users.

- Pavement obstacles, bollards, scaffolding, and e-bikes parked on footways create daily hazards for people with mobility or sensory impairments.

- Participants called for a comprehensive audit of accessibility officers across the Greater London Authority (GLA) and boroughs, and for British Standard BS8300-1:2018 to be fully embedded in London Plan policy.

Communication, Information, and Safety

- Inaccessible information systems - including digital-only complaints processes requiring time-stamped uploads exclude many visually impaired users.

- Auditory and visual announcements at bus stops and on vehicles are inconsistent, often missing or incorrect.

- Perceptions of safety on public transport are declining: participants reported incidents of verbal abuse, collisions with cyclists, and lack of enforcement of shared-space rules.

- Greater emphasis is needed on clear, consistent signage and driver awareness training to ensure safety and dignity for all passengers.

- Taxis and drop-off zones are increasingly restricted by pedestrianisation schemes, reducing essential door-to-door access for people with mobility or vision impairments.

Integration with Housing and Public Realm

- Participants stressed that transport accessibility cannot be planned in isolation from housing, public spaces, and community infrastructure.

- New developments should be directly linked to accessible public transport routes and designed around inclusive access principles from the outset.

- Cycle infrastructure should not compromise pedestrian safety or restrict mobility-aid users; cycling, walking, and public transport must be balanced through inclusive design review.

- The London Plan should promote safe, accessible pedestrian networks, with adequate seating, lighting, and wayfinding for people with sensory or cognitive impairments.

Affordability and Connectivity

- Transport affordability remains a barrier, particularly for those on low incomes or disability benefits.

- Dial-a-Ride and TaxiCard schemes are valued but under-resourced, with inconsistent eligibility and coverage.

- Participants suggested the need for integrated fare concessions and better promotion of existing entitlements (e.g. Freedom Pass, 60+ Oyster).

- Connectivity between boroughs is limited for step-free travel, restricting employment, education, and social participation opportunities.

Governance, Standards, and Co-Production

- Participants recommended that each borough appoint trained accessibility and transport officers to oversee compliance with inclusive design standards.
- The GLA should undertake a London-wide accessibility audit covering bus stops, crossings, and active-travel routes.
- Ongoing co-production with Disabled People's Organisations (DDPOs) and local user groups was seen as essential to ensure continuous improvement.
- Lived-experience evidence, including films or case studies, should be used to hold transport authorities and operators accountable.

Summary of Key Transport Recommendations

1. Remove floating bus stops and redesign unsafe cycle/pedestrian interfaces.
2. Expand step-free access across the Tube and rail network, prioritising interchange stations.
3. Protect taxi and drop-off access in new pedestrianisation or road-calming schemes.
4. Undertake a London-wide accessibility audit aligned with BS8300-1:2018.
5. Embed co-production with DDPOs and lived-experience representatives in all transport policy and infrastructure projects.
6. Integrate transport, housing, and public-realm planning to deliver seamless accessibility across everyday journeys.

Jobs and Businesses

Participants expressed concern that disabled people, people with learning difficulties, and those on low incomes face major barriers to entering and sustaining employment in London. While the London Plan aims to support inclusive economic growth, engagement feedback shows that workplace accessibility, discriminatory recruitment practices, and low pay remain systemic challenges.

Barriers to Employment

- Recruitment bias and lack of training: Employers and HR teams often lack awareness or skills to recruit and support disabled applicants. Hiring processes are rarely adapted to accommodate diverse needs.
- Limited access to local jobs: Many disabled people struggle to reach central London workplaces due to poor transport accessibility or long commute times. Participants called for more local, accessible employment opportunities closer to home.
- Workplace accessibility: Many offices, shops, and workspaces remain physically or digitally inaccessible, limiting participation and career progression.
- Voluntary work exploitation: Participants noted that unpaid or underpaid roles are common for disabled people, particularly within public and voluntary sectors.
- Inconsistent support schemes: National programmes such as Access to Work are valuable but under-promoted and often complex to navigate.

Pay, Affordability, and Financial Security

- Low and inconsistent wages were identified as a key barrier to living and working in London. Participants emphasised that London weighting and fair pay should be mandatory for all employees in the capital.

- Disabled workers frequently face higher living costs (transport, care, accessibility adjustments) without corresponding income support.

- Part-time employment and zero-hour contracts leave many workers without stability or access to housing and financial services.

- Participants urged the Mayor to use influence over public procurement and business support schemes to promote the London Living Wage and disability-inclusive employment practices.

Workplace Inclusion and Support

- Reasonable adjustments are not consistently implemented across workplaces. Many employees are unaware of their rights, or employers are reluctant to fund adaptations.

- Participants called for clearer accountability mechanisms to ensure compliance with the Equality Act and workplace accessibility standards.

- Neurodivergent employees often experience sensory overload or lack of adjustments in open-plan or noisy environments. Employers should be encouraged to adopt flexible working patterns, quiet spaces, and inclusive communication methods.

- Training and development opportunities must be equitable and accessible, with adjustments built into professional pathways rather than offered reactively.

Inclusive Business and Economic Growth

- Participants called for stronger connections between employment, housing, and transport planning so that disabled people can live and work independently within their local areas.

Safety, Culture, and Representation

- Participants reported ongoing disability-related hate crime and harassment, including in workplaces and on the way to work. A more inclusive culture is needed across London's public spaces and business environments.

- Representation of disabled people in leadership and policymaking roles remains low. The group supported the creation of Disability Champions or Advisory Panels within City Hall and local authorities to ensure that lived experience informs economic strategy.

- Recognition and value of disabled workers' contributions were described as essential to shifting public attitudes and employer practices.

Summary of Key Jobs and Businesses Recommendations

1. Encourage local employment opportunities through borough-level economic planning.
2. Ensure all workplaces meet accessibility standards, including sensory and digital access.

3. Introduce monitoring and accountability for reasonable adjustments and equality compliance.
4. Integrate employment planning with housing and transport accessibility.
5. Champion representation and leadership of disabled people in public and private sector governance.
6. Tackle disability-related harassment through joint campaigns with employers and boroughs.

Sustainability and Climate Change

Participants expressed concern that current sustainability and climate strategies do not sufficiently consider the needs of disabled and vulnerable Londoners. While there was strong support for the London Plan's environmental goals, many participants emphasised that climate resilience, energy efficiency, and net-zero policies must be inclusive by design and address affordability, accessibility, and health impacts equally.

Inclusive Climate Adaptation and Building Design

- Extreme temperatures are a growing concern. Many participants reported flats reaching over 40°C in summer, particularly in high-rise buildings with poor ventilation or inadequate shading.
- Heating costs were cited as a major burden for disabled people and those living in poorly insulated homes, especially where higher ceilings or inefficient systems increase bills.
- Building retrofits and energy-efficiency schemes are seen as essential, but participants raised issues around misuse of retrofit grants, lack of inspection, and inaccessible application processes.
- The London Plan should ensure that climate resilience measures (cooling, ventilation, shading, flood protection) are built into both new developments and existing housing stock.
- Participants called for stronger building standards and enforcement to prevent the recurrence of unsafe materials, such as those implicated in the Grenfell tragedy.

Affordability and Energy Poverty

- Energy costs are disproportionately high for disabled and low-income households, leading to "heat or eat" decisions in winter.
- Participants requested subsidies or targeted grants for energy-efficient retrofits that do not penalise tenants in social or supported housing.
- Transparent billing and easy-read communication from energy providers were recommended to help residents understand their usage and entitlements.
- Energy and sustainability strategies must not widen the affordability gap - green policies must also be socially equitable.

Accessibility and Public Space

- Environmental initiatives, such as road-calming schemes and low-traffic neighbourhoods, have sometimes had unintended negative impacts on disabled people - restricting access for taxis, Dial-a-Ride, or care services.

- Participants called for inclusive design assessments to be mandatory in all climate and environmental projects, ensuring accessibility for people with mobility, sensory, and cognitive impairments.

- Fly-tipping and waste management were highlighted as ongoing accessibility issues: dumped furniture and waste can block pavements, create hazards for blind or wheelchair users, and damage local wildlife.

- Accessible recycling systems and clearer communication around waste categories were suggested to encourage participation in London's sustainability goals.

Green Infrastructure, Health, and Wellbeing

- Access to green space is vital for mental and physical wellbeing. Participants emphasised that guide dog users, wheelchair users, and people with sensory impairments often face physical or logistical barriers to parks and open spaces.

- The London Plan should prioritise accessible, safe, and well-connected green infrastructure - including benches, rest points, clear routes, and lighting - to ensure equitable participation in outdoor environments.

- Urban greening initiatives should be designed with input from disabled communities to ensure that planting schemes, paths, and community gardens are genuinely usable for all residents.

Governance, Oversight, and Co-Production

- Participants highlighted the need for greater oversight of retrofit and green grant programmes to prevent misuse and ensure benefits reach those in need.

- Co-production with Disabled People's Organisations (DDPOs) should be embedded in climate and sustainability policy to ensure disabled voices shape environmental planning.

- The GLA should publish inclusive climate performance data, monitoring not only emissions and energy efficiency but also social outcomes, such as reduced fuel poverty and improved access to green space.

- Inclusive sustainability must be recognised as part of social justice and equality policy, not a separate technical agenda.

Summary of Key Sustainability and Climate Change Recommendations

1. Integrate inclusive design into all sustainability and climate policies.
2. Mandate energy-efficient retrofits and climate-resilient design in all housing, ensuring affordability for tenants.
3. Strengthen oversight of retrofit grants and ensure accessibility of funding processes.
4. Address energy poverty through targeted support for low-income and disabled residents.

5. Ensure environmental schemes (e.g. low-traffic zones) are assessed for accessibility and do not limit mobility or care access.
6. Improve waste and recycling systems with accessible communication and enforcement against fly-tipping.
7. Expand accessible green infrastructure, including safe paths, benches, lighting, and rest points.
8. Embed co-production with DDPOs in all climate and sustainability planning.
9. Report climate progress inclusively, tracking social and accessibility outcomes alongside environmental targets.

Appendix D TNLP Easy Read Survey Summary

The Easy Read version of Towards a new London Plan (TNLP) included a survey with ten questions, and Londoners could also submit their responses via email. The responses are summarised below by survey question.

What do you think about our ideas for affordable housing?

Generally, the survey responses indicated a strong level of support for delivering affordable homes, with a clear preference for social rented homes. However, respondents were concerned with the actual affordability of "affordable homes", believing them to be out of reach for many. Many respondents voiced concerns that there is not enough affordable housing delivery at present, and any reduction in affordable housing requirements would not be supported. Respondents also showed a clear preference to ensure that there were affordable accessible homes.

Where would you choose to build more homes?

All respondents were in favour of building homes close to public transport, whilst the majority of respondents were in favour of building on brownfield land on high street and town centres as well as in local neighbourhoods. The results were split on opportunity areas, central London, industrial land and on parts of the Green Belt.

Do you think we are planning to build the right types of homes in London?

The majority of respondents did not agree with this, with only four respondents answering yes to this question.

What do you think about the type of homes we are planning to build?

The topic of affordable homes was prevalent amongst the responses, with some voicing concerns that the AH requirements are too prescriptive. Other key themes included the need for accessible homes (including for neurodiverse individuals), larger family sized homes and increased space standards. The need to design homes for all was raised in a number of responses especially in regard to the elderly, families and those with complex needs.

The design and architectural design of new homes was another core theme emerging from responses with many raising concerns regarding high rise buildings, particularly in suburban areas. Others were concerned about the visual impacts and environmental impacts (e.g. wind tunnels) caused by tall buildings. The lack of gardens came up, with a number of respondents citing outside space as a priority for new buildings. Sustainability was also raised, with a number of respondents noting that new homes should adhere to strict environmental regulations. Some respondents raised concern with the amount of PBSA being built.

Do you think we are giving enough support to London's businesses?

Many respondents felt that there was not enough being done to support London's businesses.

What do you think are the most important for London's high streets and town centres?

The key themes emerging from the responses included ensuring that high streets contain a mix of uses including retail, civic functions, play spaces and community facilities. Many respondents also felt that housing could be integrated into town centres to increase vitality and safety.

Concerns were raised around certain uses being too prevalent on high streets (such as betting shops) believing that more could be done to restrict such uses.

Individuals felt that public realm improvements were key to bettering high streets as was improving accessibility and public transport. Certain individuals felt that issues such as waste, advertising and cluttering actively blight high streets across London. There were mixed views on transport within town centres and high streets with some respondents feeling that improved public transport is key to bettering high streets whilst others felt that restrictions on cars and parking reduced footfall. Other themes arising from responses included concern that high rents limited uses on the high street and negatively impacted vibrancy.

Do you have any ideas about how we can make sure new buildings and places make everyone feel welcome?

Accessibility was one of the core themes emerging from responses, with individuals suggesting that ensuring buildings are accessible to people with disabilities and neurodiverse individuals was one of the most important aspects. This included making sure features such as ramps and lifts were integrated into new buildings. Many also felt that reducing density and/ or height would help make buildings seem more welcoming. Other matters raised include ensuring that safety features were included (e.g. lighting), including publicly accessible toilets and integrating green space into new developments. Individuals also noted that community facilities such shared workspaces or allotments could be beneficial.

Do you think London should carry on having higher standards for new buildings to manage climate change?

Nearly all respondents agreed that London should maintain the higher standards for new buildings to manage climate change.

Would you like to tell us more about climate change or the environment?

The key themes emerging from responses focused on food risks, urban heating, ventilation and green space. Many respondents felt that new building should be designed with climate change in mind (this included the materials used, building standards, green infrastructure). Retrofitting was raised a number of times, with respondents indicating that retrofit first should be the norm. Many respondents also raised concerns around the health impacts of climate change and pollution. Conversely, some respondents did indicate that standards were too high and were changing at a pace that was too rapid.

What would make it easier or get more people to walk or cycle in London?

Respondents felt that improving cycling infrastructure and using traffic calming measures were integral to encouraging cycling. Concerns were raised around shared pedestrian and cycle space, particularly next to bus stops, with respondents feeling that those cycling for commuting purpose often travelling at speed. Some respondents also had worries in regard to e-bikes and motorised scooters, considering that these could impact individuals perception of safety as a pedestrian/ bike user.

Some respondents did feel that traffic calming measures were not the answer, although many did feel that a reduction in car use was crucial to helping people walk or cycle more. Protected cycle lanes were raised as another core issue affecting the ability of individuals to cycle. Accessibility was also a key theme with some respondent's worrying that these transport methods were not feasible for all Londoners.

Adapted Easy Read Survey by Southwark Travellers Action Group

Southwark Travellers Action Group (STAG) adapted the Easy Read TNLP survey to reflect the issues most affecting the communities they work with (Gypsies, Roma and Travellers with a connection to Southwark) and provided both the adapted survey and the 21 responses they received. These responses include the view compiled from two focus groups held by STAG (13 individuals) as well as responses completed by those who requested the forms separately.

Key themes emerging from this were the affordability of accommodation (to rent and buy) which indicates a concern around the ability of individuals to do either. There was also a clear preference for individuals to be able to reside on a traveller site over bricks and mortar accommodation (largely due to cultural reasons). The preference to be able to rent a Council owned Traveller site, although many respondents did state that they would reside on a privately rented pitch. The majority of respondents felt that the London Plan should concentrate on building social rented homes and most felt that intermediate homes are not a good idea.

In terms of where Traveller sites should be located, there were a mix of responses, but many agreed that being close to public transport was key. Central London, brownfield land and parts of the Green Belt were also popular responses. Being close to family and shops were key concerns of respondents. All respondents felt that there should be pitch targets but disagreed on whether the Mayor or local councils should set them.

Respondents were also asked if sites were suitable for different groups and there were a mix of responses indicating that not everyone felt that they catered to families, older people, people with disabilities and cared for people. Key concerns for pitches included making them accessible, ensuring services (such as broadband), loss of greenspace, pollution and climate change. Individuals also had mixed feelings on transport, feeling that car use should be easier for those with disabilities. There were varied opinions on public transport and cycling.