

MAYOR OF LONDON



A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS: CONSULTATION REPORT

JULY 2017

COPYRIGHT

**Greater London Authority
July 2017**

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk
enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458
ISBN 978-1-84781-657-3

Contents

Mayor’s Foreword.....	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	7
Research and Consultation Methodology	8
Part 1: Accommodating Growth	10
Part 2: Housing	18
Part 3: Economy	28
Part 4: Environment	38
Part 5: Transport	48
Part 6: Inclusive City.....	56
Bibliography	67
Annex: Statutory strategies and GLA duties	74

Mayor's Foreword

I believe that good engagement is at the heart of good policymaking. Drawing on the experiences, opinions and knowledge of people who live here can help me understand what matters to Londoners. It can also help me ensure that everyone in London is able to access the opportunities they need to fulfil their potential.

In October 2016 I published 'A City for All Londoners' which sets out my ambition for London. I want to create a better city for all who make London their home. As well as consulting on this document for 6 weeks, we ran a series of workshops, focus groups and online discussions. We heard from a range of people, including Londoners, local boroughs, representatives from private and third sector bodies, and community groups.

I wanted to understand what life is like in London for as many people as possible. I am keen to learn how we can improve different life-paths through policy. I also wanted to understand the challenges and opportunities faced by those who help shape this city through their work. I want to know how I can help them turn my vision into a reality.

This consultation looked at the many challenges facing London, from building new homes to protecting our high streets and more. You'll find a summary of the main findings in this document. The information we learned from everyone who took part is already proving useful in producing my upcoming strategies.

So once again, I'd like to thank all who shared their views on my vision for this great city. I look forward to hearing more from you in the coming months and years. Together, we can create a city of which we can all be proud.



Sadiq Khan

Mayor of London

Executive Summary

Context

Part 1: Accommodating Growth

Londoners are generally positive about growth and development, but there was consensus that growth needs to take place in a way that does not harm what makes London an attractive place to live, work and visit. Planning with a long term view and credible meaningful engagement was seen by many third sector stakeholders and community groups to be central to good growth.

Whilst South East London has been recognised as having huge potential for development by boroughs and private and third sector stakeholders, it was felt that this would be more difficult without vast improvement in transport infrastructure in these areas

For the public and community groups, high streets were particularly important spaces for retail as well as for other community uses. Generally people favoured high streets to shopping centres. Many stakeholders noted that high streets face challenges regarding the mix of their offer, and were concerned about the impact of housing developments on high streets. Though there is more support for intensification around stations and high streets, and less in residential areas, brownfield sites for new housing developments were favoured more than existing town centres.

Part 2: Housing

The lack of affordable housing was consistently identified as a significant issue by boroughs, community groups and the public. Many stakeholders felt the breadth of the term in its current use is problematic for communications and local development. Whilst there was generally support for alternative housing tenures such as shared ownership, and hope that these innovations could address some issues of affordability, there was a concern that intermediate options were still exclusive on the basis of both income and age.

Community groups and third sector stakeholders highlighted a preference for infill, maintenance and refurbishment of existing housing estates rather than demolition and rebuilding, suggesting that this approach would be more inclusive and put less pressure on housing delivery targets.

Many stakeholders suggested it was vital that increasing housing supply was done so in tandem with increased capacity for employment space, with affordable business space a key concern of boroughs. They also noted that encouraging more small and medium sized developers would have a positive impact on housing supply.

Homelessness was noted as a significant problem in many boroughs and by Londoners. Third sector stakeholders felt the best way to tackle the homelessness problem was to work more effectively across organisational and sectoral boundaries.

Mixed housing tenures were thought to encourage mixed communities, but it was noted by boroughs and community groups that historically tenures are not mixed but exist beside each other. The rental sector was recognised as a growing sector and one facing both cost and quality issues that need to be addressed.

Accessibility and inclusive design were mentioned as needing greater consideration in housing design and planning, and should be a priority in new developments.

Part 3: Economy

Stakeholders welcomed the Mayor's commitment to retaining London's role as an international business centre, and encouraging greater concentrations beyond the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) was viewed positively. However, for many Londoners, the benefits of the city's success in the global economy are distant, eclipsed by immediate concerns about the cost of living and low wages

Boroughs reported a decline in business space in town centres, and supported the Mayor's commitment to resisting office to residential conversions without proper justification. They would like to see strong policies to protect areas of importance for employment. Business rates and parking charges were perceived to be top of the list of concerns for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in relation to local authorities, along with the viability of opening and sustaining local businesses.

Londoners were generally dissatisfied with opportunities to gain skills for career development. University was felt to inadequately prepare people for employment, and apprenticeships were not thought to be commonplace enough. Many stakeholders stressed the need for more strategic and consistent careers advice service, trying to match people with the right careers and address sectoral employment gaps.

The Mayor's pledge to prioritise culture as a key driver for growth was supported, and in some cases, paralleled by boroughs in their own commitments to grow their cultural offer. All stakeholders highlighted the night-time economy (NTE) as a key part of London's cultural mix, but recognised it was under threat. It was felt that the protection of uses through policy and planning is important, as is a broader definition of the NTE at the local level.

Part 4: Environment

Air quality was commonly referenced by Londoners and community groups as having a negative impact on their health and indeed experience of the city and their local areas. Ambitious policies to improve air quality through a reduction in vehicle emissions were thought vital to many stakeholders. They welcomed the proposal for the Ultra-Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) as a significant step towards this.

London's green spaces were perceived to be diverse and performing a multiplicity of functions by stakeholders in general, but it was noted they could be improved – perhaps through more coordinated management of parks and open spaces.

Stakeholders advocated the GLA taking a lead role in championing the benefits of a low carbon future to businesses. Private, public and third sector stakeholders in general welcomed the priority focus on London mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change. A better strategic overview was seen as a priority to help this work, together with a focus on fuel poverty. Water efficiency was also a priority focus for public and third sector stakeholders, who felt more action was needed to encourage behaviour change on water use and to reduce water demand.

Stakeholders highlighted an opportunity to improve recycling in the capital through better education and public awareness of the types of waste that can be recycled. Some felt that confusion around different colours for different types of waste in different boroughs contributes to lower recycling levels. On a related note, stakeholders expressed their support for the circular economy in London to reduce waste and saw a leadership role for the Mayor to encourage enterprise around the exchange and repair of items.

Part 5: Transport

Plans for increased investment in transport infrastructure were looked upon favourably, though many stakeholders mentioned the need for better orbital links in Outer London, and corridors through the wider South East. Better north-south links and better connections between areas in outer London were thought to have greater potential to stimulate more regeneration and housing development than currently proposed. Making sure public transport infrastructure is integrated with walking and cycling provision was felt to be vital to proper regeneration of areas, as was more considered place-making around stations.

Accessibility and affordability were highlighted as key priorities to make transport more inclusive. There were particular concerns about the cost burden for those living in Outer London and working in low paid jobs in inner London

Stakeholders felt the 'healthy streets' approach could provide an opportunity to have a dedicated budget stream for improvements in active transport. However, many Londoners who cycle had already experienced improvements over recent years including safety, better infrastructure and provision for cyclists by employers. Better digital infrastructure which would allow for improved wayfinding using WiFi was thought to be vital to encouraging people to walk more.

Part 6: Inclusive City

Londoners showed pride and interest in the diverse cultures of their local areas. Their experiences referred to rich interactions with neighbours, support networks, volunteering activities, and local decision-making. They valued local relationships and networks, and were keen to be active in local communities. Indeed, all stakeholders felt active citizenship was a positive way to encourage greater engagement of disenfranchised groups. Boroughs and other stakeholders talked about the need for 'community ownership' and felt citizen involvement should be encouraged in making spaces more inclusive. Similarly, community groups felt that volunteering was an important part of building a successful community and would value more opportunities to volunteer.

Boroughs would like to see a steer from the GLA on what is appropriate for the placement of new schools, and to provide a clearer vision for healthcare infrastructure locally. Some were concerned about the decline of social infrastructure such as community centres, youth centres and public halls, and felt this had impacted negatively on inclusivity and engagement in the community. Libraries and cultural facilities, such as music venues and night clubs, were also seen as under threat.

Public and third sector stakeholders spoke about the safety and inclusiveness of streets and highlighted the need for more consistency so that people, particularly those with visual impairments or physical or mental health problems, know what to expect as they move around London.

Introduction

The Mayor leads the city's strategic response to the deep trends that are shaping London's long-term future. The city's population is already larger than it has ever been, and is projected to grow to 10.5 million by 2041. This growth is a sign of London's success, but with it come complex challenges, with mounting pressure on land, housing, transport and the environment – which could cause costs to rise in an already expensive city.

We live in an increasingly diverse society – London is a city full of people from all walks of life; some of the very richest and poorest people live here with life expectancy differing by up to 15 years between some boroughs.

London's global economy is strong but for some Londoners, the economic prosperity and wealth on their doorsteps seems more remote and inaccessible than ever before – as does an affordable and decent place to call home.

A City for All Londoners was published in October 2016 as the Mayor's statement of intent for London – a direction of travel preceding the publication of his strategies. These strategies will cover land use and growth, transport, housing, economic development, the environment, policing and crime, culture, and health inequalities. They will complement one another and will be put to formal consultation with the public and other stakeholders. The consultation findings outlined in this document are already helping in the creation of the draft strategies.

When the Mayor was elected in May 2016, he made it clear that he wanted to be the most engaged Mayor yet, working with the public, local boroughs and industry to help with decision making at City Hall. The consultation and research findings presented in this report represent a step towards achieving that ambition, through detailed engagement with a range of stakeholders from the individual Londoner to company and borough executives. The information gathered here will be used as part of the evidence base, alongside empirical data, that policy-makers at City Hall will consider in their policy development. There will undoubtedly be tensions between opinions both themselves and with other evidence; where not every issue or view can be addressed policies will seek to find the best fit possible.

The following document begins by outlining the different research and consultation activities included in this document, before outlining some of the key findings and responses that relate to the original A City for All Londoners document.

Research and Consultation Methodology

Findings presented in this document are primarily the product of a series of research and consultation activities carried out in response to the publication of A City for All Londoners – a vision document outlining the Mayor’s priorities for his tenure. Alongside this consultation, recent research undertaken by City Hall’s opinion research team, which gives insights into Londoners’ experiences and opinions, has also been used in the production of this report. Methodological approaches of all consultation and research activities used are discussed below.

As part of the City for All Londoners consultation in October and November, a series of six workshops were held by City Hall policy teams. These workshops debated issues within broad themes of accommodating growth, transport, an inclusive city, environment, housing and economy. Invitations to attend were extended to industry experts and private and public sector stakeholders including local boroughs, developers, think tanks, charities, consultancies, community groups and others. At each workshop, six to ten roundtables were hosted by policy officers, and attendees chose two of these discussions to be part of. Transcribers recorded the content of the discussion, the details of which can be found on

<https://www.london.gov.uk/get-involved/have-your-say/all-consultations/city-all-londoners>

Following the standard process of statutory consultation, after publishing A City for All Londoners on City Hall’s website (London.gov.uk), formal responses and comments were invited by email or post. In order to gain greater insight into how members of specific public communities experience and view different policies City Hall’s opinion research team ran a series of seven focus groups with Londoners. The focus groups lasted approximately 2 hours. Groups were selected based on certain demographic characteristics, including women, LGBT+ Londoners, Deaf and disabled Londoners, refugees and migrants, BAME Londoners, younger Londoners (17-25) and older Londoners (70+). Participants were sampled with support from City Hall’s community relations team or via Talk London. Focus groups were recorded, transcribed and thematically analysed in-house by the opinion research team.

In gain a more general understanding of public views than the focus groups alone could facilitate, a number of discussions were hosted on Talk London, City Hall’s online research community. Talk London is made up of a self-selecting sample of 40,000 Londoners, and hosts regular forum-style discussions on a range of relevant policy issues, as well as running regular online surveys.

As well as this specific consultation on A City for All Londoners, other pieces of recent research undertaken by City Hall's Opinion Research team have been integrated into this document.

The 2015 Annual London Survey was undertaken via Talk London in November 2015. This survey had approximately 4000 self-selecting respondents, and data was weighted by age, gender and ethnicity to reflect London's population. Analysis of this data was done through descriptive statistics and regression analysis.

'Changing Lives of Londoners' – a qualitative research project – was undertaken by the ORS team in 2016. Through careful sampling via Mosaic Public Sector – a geo-demography tool – and Talk London, a series of 18 semi-structured interviews were undertaken in participants' local areas, covering a range of topics which contribute to an overall experience of the city, from personal financial situations to opinions on the built environment. Prior to the interviews, participants undertook photography and written tasks related to the interview content. All data was thematically analysed.

High Streets for All – a second qualitative research project – was undertaken by the ORS team in 2016 and was selectively sampled via Talk London. The aim of the research was to understand the 'value' of high streets beyond their economic contributions. Mixed qualitative methodologies were adopted over 9 high streets chosen by the Regeneration Unit, each interrogated by semi-structured interviews, ethnography and participant-led photography. All data was thematically analysed.

As outlined above, the variety and depth of data sources used to compile this report was extensive. As such not every view or argument can be made in this document. Instead we draw on the points that were deemed most important to respondents and which are most relevant to the Mayoral role and challenges and opportunities ahead. Further detail on each of the reports used can be found on London.gov.uk.

Part 1: Accommodating Growth

Growth and Change: Summary of challenge

London's population is now larger than it has ever been, currently with 8.8 million residents it is set to reach 10.5 million by 2041. That is an average increase of almost 44,000 households each year.

There is opportunity to intensify development across the city, including higher-density development - and significantly in well-connected locations in the city that are well served by existing or planned transport capacity. Transport, housing and other kinds of land use will need to make the best possible use of space. The Mayor is considering a number of growth locations and options to encourage more development in the capital.

It will also be crucial to sustain and promote economic growth by making the right decisions about places of work and balancing these with competing needs for land in the capital. Preserving land-use for offices rather than housing will be essential to creating and sustaining jobs in certain areas, as will be reliable transport links to and from residential areas. At the same time land use will also need to be considered in the context of a housing crisis that threatens the competitiveness of the city. The Mayor plans to explore whether industrial land that is surplus to current needs could be used for housing or creative mixed-use. It may also be possible to relocate industry to other areas of the city without harming the economy.

The Mayor wants to develop the city according to the principles of 'good growth', with a target of 50 per cent of new housing built across the city being affordable. The vision is to create desirable places to live where environmental and social infrastructure, enterprise and leisure space are integrated and where more trains and low-emission buses run in areas with higher density where the most people live.

While most growth will be within London, the Mayor will agree joint infrastructure investment corridors (where infrastructure is planned to open-up housing and other development) with interested local authorities surrounding the city that will stretch out beyond London's borders.

Growth and Change: Stakeholder insights

The majority of Londoners are positive about growth and development, with around 6 in 10 people viewing these as an opportunity to create new homes, jobs and transport. [1] For some groups, however, there remains a degree of uncertainty. Research with community groups and findings from the Annual London Survey showed that middling socio-economic groups and parent-age groups' attitudes to development were less positive those of wealthier and younger

groups. If this is a sign that new development is not delivering for these parent-age Londoners it may lead to a London not conducive to settling and family life. [2] [3]

There was consensus amongst stakeholders from the public and private sectors, and from voluntary and community groups, that growth needs to take place in a way that does not harm what makes London an attractive place to live, work and visit. It is therefore essential that growth is planned properly, considers existing residents and creates desirable places to live and that this is taken forward into the London Plan. [4]

Public and private sector stakeholders recognised that people have different priorities depending on situation and stage of life [4] – a finding reflected in research with Londoners. [1] Life-stage is a key driver of differences and an important consideration in planning growth. Young people (18-24) considered creating jobs a top concern, and prioritised job and business opportunities from new development. People of parental age wanted more schools, but were less likely to think new development would deliver them, whilst older people (55+) considered health services their number one concern. [1]

Third Sector Stakeholders expressed concern that development should be focused on Londoners' needs rather than developers' needs – and that a longer-term view is required to ensure short-termism does not undermine success. [5] This could be achieved by changing the mechanisms for engagement to be more proactive, as was suggested by both public and private sector stakeholders. [4] Research findings showed that perception of change relates strongly to public involvement and ownership of that change. This can only be engendered through genuine, high quality engagement processes; standard planning consultations, reactive in nature often do not deliver this. [1] The Annual London Survey 2015 revealed that satisfaction with planning and regeneration is strongly and positively related to Londoners' overall satisfaction with the capital, highlighting the importance of this. [3]

More prescriptive planning with clear parameters was promoted by participants generally. Third sector stakeholders felt that development proposals should be more explicit about net gain across economic, environmental and social factors, and include culture more strongly. [4] They also prioritised tackling inequalities through development – by strengthening local neighbourhoods and creating access to essential social infrastructure such as primary schools, GP surgeries, and local open spaces. [5] Talk London respondents echoed this and suggested that planning permission should be linked to existing or projected infrastructure capacity for school places and GPs. [2]

Local amenities and opportunities were viewed as important by all community groups, with a general sentiment against too much centralisation of amenities. Young people in particular were concerned with the way centralisation is already negatively affecting their life experiences when based in outer London, which is particularly exacerbated by poor or expensive transport links into the centre of London. [2]

Linked to this, boroughs within South London noted there are areas within their boundaries that have no metropolitan centres, and they stressed the need to plan in a way that supports the changing nature of employment. Concentrating efforts around 'place-making' through transport and housing, it was felt by boroughs, could make areas more attractive to smaller businesses and start-ups similar to the hub of Old Street. [6]

The need for a continued focus on sufficient housing in central London was highlighted by some boroughs and third sector stakeholders, and the emphasis on affordability was considered key to this. There was a concern that if affordable, appropriate family housing is not available centrally, there is a serious risk of creating isolated pockets of relative poverty throughout outer London and beyond. It was therefore considered essential to maintain the broader social mix of housing typologies and as a result, the mix of people, in inner London. [6]

Local authorities throughout the Wider South East (WSE) as well as London boroughs support major opportunities for housing and development within the identified growth corridors associated with the strategic infrastructure schemes. It was felt that development of existing well-connected commuter hubs within the WSE may also be necessary to meet the needs of London [7]. Stakeholders felt there needs to be a consistent approach taken to planning for growth along corridors, especially in terms of land use, encouraging out-commuting, making orbital connections and keeping up with changing technology and travel patterns. The importance of good planning and design of new housing developments was also underlined. [7]

Intensification: Summary of challenge

Encouraging development and good public transport in non-central locations and outer London will be essential for growth. Development will need to make provision for industrial, retail activity and office space, as well as improving transport provision in less-connected areas.

There may be opportunities for more smaller-scale housing development in appropriate suburban locations. Other global cities show that it is possible to increase the density of suburbs without sacrificing their character. Additional housing can also be unlocked by major

infrastructure improvements, such as the Overground extension connecting Barking Riverside, the Bakerloo line extension in South East London and Crossrail 2.

While there is a need to promote economic growth, land should be used intelligently – particularly in the context of the pressing demand for more housing. In some areas, industrial land may be surplus to current needs and could be better used for housing. It may be possible to relocate industry to other areas of the city without disrupting the economy or eroding the critical base of industrial land. And it may be feasible for housing and industrial activity to co-exist in certain locations through the promotion of mixed-use activity.

Intensification: Stakeholder insights

Suburban areas of London are seeing change in population and demographic mix and this is increasing not only the overall demand for housing but also demand for different types and tenures of housing, particularly in outer London areas. This was noted by some boroughs and third sector stakeholders, who also felt boroughs should be encouraged to identify more opportunities for intensification, but not at the detriment of the use mix [8].

Boroughs have generally found that people are more willing to accept intensification around stations and high streets but less so in suburban residential areas due to concerns over loss of character and impact on social infrastructure services. Third sector stakeholders suggested that a neighbourhood plan approach that engages residents early in the process could help to ensure buy-in to suburban change. [8]

Stakeholders and the public alike felt it is essential that any intensification is based on good growth principles and is supported by transport infrastructure, local employment, amenities, investment and by enhancing the local character and sustainability of neighbourhoods. Good growth principles should therefore be tangible and enforceable. [8] This sentiment was echoed by community groups. [2]

As with the challenge of growth, density of development will be a key consideration in the intensification of suburban areas. Respondents in general felt that the focus on the number of units and density often overshadows the quality of living space provided. As well as targeting specific areas, boroughs and third sector stakeholders suggested that London Plan and associated guidance could identify types of housing to be intensified and by how much, providing best practice guidance to facilitate this. [8]

The utilisation of brownfield land for new development was supported by boroughs but they acknowledged the challenges this presents in terms of contaminated sites, accessibility and

economic viability. Some suggested that given these limitations and maximising brownfield within good growth principles may not meet all the housing land needs and so an intelligent review of the multi-functional benefits of Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) within the GLA area may also be necessary. [9] The public tended to favour development of large-scale disused brownfield sites for new housing development rather than existing town centres. There was concern amongst local communities that town centre development can signify an erosion of unique cultures, community cohesion, or social mixing. [1]

Some third sector stakeholders felt it would be possible and appropriate to relocate industry to other areas of the city without harming the economy or eroding the critical base of industrial land – though this should be done carefully to avoid separating businesses from their clients, partners and suppliers, and to limit increases in traffic movement. [5] A more creative use of space in London was supported by private sector stakeholders - they advocated exploring all opportunities to promote mixed-use activity. [10] They believed that, though there may be cases where land could be better used for housing, there are other areas which should be safeguarded as a priority for industry. [11]

It was suggested by private sector stakeholders that Industry and ‘industrial’ requires a better definition, with different industries disaggregating into industrial policy or strategy. [10] It was suggested that the demand for each of those typologies should be looked at to arrive at a view on ‘mixed use’ verses ‘non-mixed-use land’ which tends to be at lower density. Small business should be given a voice in this, it was felt, and policies need to focus on typologies and mix, rather than just land.

Public transport was viewed as key in diversifying outer London and unlocking sites for development. As one borough stakeholder said:

“There are untapped parts of London which, if given better transport could be well used. We could double or treble housing if we had better connectivity in places left behind.” [6]

South East London was recognised by boroughs and third sector stakeholders as having huge potential but again it was felt that any major development would be impossible without more transport infrastructure in areas such as Lewisham, Bexley and Bromley. [8] Talk London respondents also highlighted the importance of public transport considerations in suburban development to provide an alternative to car use. [2]

There was strong evidence that inner London boroughs and private sector stakeholders support the intensification of development around existing transport hubs. [9] [11] It was felt this should strive to maximise the delivery of housing across all tenures and establish mixed communities in the most sustainable and best connected locations. Outer London boroughs also highlighted the need for intensification to provide sustainable infrastructure and much needed family housing. [9]

High Streets and Town Centres: Summary of challenge

In London, the high street acts as a major employer, with more than half of London's jobs spread across the city's 600 high streets. More than the heart of London's businesses, high streets are also the centre of community life, providing sites of activity and places for interaction for Londoners.

The Mayor, through his regeneration programmes, is exploring opportunities to improve high streets and town centres thus supporting their important role. Many town centres across the city have good links into central London, where many people work. As retail methods evolve and housing need increases, it makes sense to focus further residential development in these areas – particularly as they are also popular places to live. In some cases, development could help high streets adapt to the challenges of a changing retail market.

High Streets and Town Centres: Stakeholder insights

High streets were felt to be vitally important to local areas by community groups, with most participants using them several times a week for shopping or socialising. [2] The look and feel of the high street was particularly important to Londoners. [12] A high street that is attractive or visually pleasing was fundamental to participants' use of their local street - with their declining use of the street to some extent being driven by its physical deterioration, which supports the case for continued investment in these spaces.

Retail continues to play a pivotal role in the functioning of high streets. For most participants, chain stores for clothing, homeware, health and beauty, books, etc. were particularly important, with a dual function of making the high street usable and attractive through well maintained shop frontage.

As well as retail playing a pivotal role in the functioning of high streets, the high street was also viewed as an important site of activity and as a centre for the community. Qualitative research showed that on some high streets, independent shops – primarily typical grocery or corner

shops – were perceived as providing spaces for different groups to come together in a process of exchange that was both economic and social. [12] Participants in this research also spoke with great fondness about the markets on their high streets and their role in building community around the locality. Given this, it was felt by private and third sector stakeholders that development should be sensitive to the locality and involve the community in decisions and changes. [13]

BAME groups were most likely to think that high streets had changed in terms of users, as high street businesses provided by their communities had been priced out by high leases. [2] Stakeholders from all sectors also expressed concern that small businesses on high streets are being pushed out due to higher rents which larger multiples can afford. [13]

Community groups participating in GLA research generally agreed that underinvestment in high streets is problematic in terms of the declining aesthetic of the high street, which in turn affects mixed and consistent use. [2] The disappearance of cultural assets from the high street was also a public concern - libraries, music venues and community centres – contributing to the sense of a loss of diversity in the user-base of the high street and reduction in the variety of the high street's offer. [12]

Stakeholders in general noted that some high streets face a challenge regarding the mix of retailers with a high concentration of certain businesses. They felt diversity on the high street was important for growth. Stakeholders also highlighted affordability of retail space as an issue. [13]

Regarding the design and function of retail areas, shopping centres like Westfield are valued but communities were more likely to favour a traditional streetscape in their local shopping areas. The street layout model was considered to be a lot more flexible and more resilient to change [13].

Some high streets are struggling to keep their commercial retail offer because retail space is being replaced by residential or non-retail use. Public and third sector stakeholders felt that where residential housing development takes place in town centres there needs to be a better balance with non-residential space to support businesses, services and employment. Somewhat contrary to this, boroughs reported an increase in the development of high rise homes with two or three retail units on the ground floor - and that these sometimes fail to attract high street retailers or businesses, affecting a high streets' vitality. [13]

Related to this, public opinion research also showed concern over large-scale housing and other developments near or adjacent to high streets – as these could erode the uniqueness of the high street, with high rents and business rates facilitating a process of gentrification. This appeared to conflict with the desire to improve and regenerate local high streets, by improving the offer and reducing the clustering of less-desirable outlets such as pawnbrokers, betting shops, and pound/99p stores. Ultimately, the balance between these two potential futures, and retaining character through a process of positive regeneration, represents a significant challenge to planning and investment for improvement. [12]

In some town centres, boroughs are looking at regeneration and reconfiguring some of their land holdings through land acquisition. Fragmented ownership is a significant issue, and it was thought that some landowners are sometimes reluctant to improve their buildings in town centres if the rate of economic return is low. [13]

Stakeholders in general felt that development of town centres and high streets needs to be flexible rather than a one size fits all approach, particularly in terms of leases and fragmented ownership to try to get the right tenant mix. [13]

“Outer London town centres should be viewed as capable of being home to diverse economies, not just places for housing and retail.” [5]

It was suggested the Mayor could encourage boroughs by channelling resources to where there is a drive for a more nuanced approach to development that balances housing and non-residential, including retail, community space and leisure, to support town centres. Moreover, boroughs also felt the use of space could be more ambitious and creative about mixing live-work spaces, residential and light industrial, technological and digital within and around existing high streets and town centres. [13]

Part 2: Housing

Affordable Housing: Summary of challenge

A City for all Londoners outlines the Mayor's vision for tackling the challenge of housing provision in the capital. Rising numbers of people now live in the private rented sector – where rents have risen by 20 per cent in the last five years, with average incomes only seeing a two per cent rise. As well as pushing some people into poverty and homelessness, these costs also hold back middle-income earners who want to buy a home of their own. The cost of housing also impacts on the city's attractiveness to businesses, as staff from cleaners and porters through to well-paid managers struggle to afford accommodation.

During 2015 only 13 per cent of the homes given planning permission were 'affordable', using the definition given by the current London Plan. The Mayor is working towards a strategic, long-term target for 50 per cent of new homes built London-wide to be affordable. This will be achieved through planning powers, investment and building on public land. The Affordable Housing Programme (2016-21) sets out how the Mayor will provide grant funding to support this. Renting options are also needed to help middle earners, and enable them to save for a deposit. To support this, the Mayor has established the London Living Rent to be based on one-third of median gross household income for the local borough. The Mayor's shared ownership product supports those Londoners who want to buy but who would struggle to on the open market.

Affordable Housing: Stakeholder insights

In the Annual London Survey 2015, Londoners overwhelmingly identified housing as the number one issue facing the capital, with the cost of living and population growth – both linked to housing – close behind. [3] Three-quarters of people said they are dissatisfied with the current housing offer, and a similar percentage reported that they are unhappy with the affordability of homes to buy and rent in London and that homeownership is a pipe dream, particularly for younger people. They stressed the need for more affordable and social housing in London. [2]

Boroughs welcomed the Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG's) aim to increase the amount of affordable housing to be delivered through the planning system. The growing gap between incomes and rising rents / house prices was highlighted as a significant problem by several boroughs. These boroughs were committed to facilitating the delivery of genuinely affordable housing, including the provision of more social rented housing, but noted the challenge of viability. The Mayor's intention to introduce a more consistent,

London-wide approach to viability was therefore supported strongly. [9] It was also felt there could be some flexibility on housing targets in cases where there are substantial requirements for public realm and local facilities. [9]

Boroughs acknowledged that a range of affordable housing provision is required to meet Londoners' needs, including products that meet the needs of people on low-to-average incomes who are of critical importance to the success of local economies. [9] The London Living Rent - pegged to local incomes rather than market rates - was perceived as an important step to achieving this.

"...when you look at delivering 25,000 homes to meet London's needs, and the values, viability, changing tenures - London Living Rent is very useful in this regard because you can deliver more social rented homes." [14]

Boroughs sought flexibility to determine the mix of affordable housing tenures in their area. This was of a particular issue with regards to shared ownership. While there was recognition that shared ownership is appropriate for some parts of London, one borough felt that even 25 percent shared ownership were largely unaffordable for most households in their area.

"Long term renting is now a fact of life for many Londoners and for affordability reasons, it cannot just be seen as a staging post to home ownership." [9]

It was felt by many boroughs that the Mayor has an opportunity, through the London Plan, to set out clear, unambiguous requirements relating to affordable housing, which could, over time, be factored into land transactions and viability appraisals. Some concern was expressed that land costs should not be used as an excuse to negotiate affordable housing levels down (or waive them entirely). [9]

The term 'affordable' was felt by many to be inaccurate. Stakeholders in general felt the breadth of the term at the moment made delivering genuinely affordable housing at a local level difficult. Boroughs agreed that definitions based on income should be used, but that spending a third of income on rent was still a high cost, especially for those with lower incomes. [15]

Third sector stakeholders suggested that types of affordable housing could be better defined with specific delivery targets for each. [5]

"Define affordability with reference to income levels, not market rates, so that there are offers that are genuinely affordable for low-income families, whether they are renting or buying." [5]

Inclusiveness in the provision of more affordable housing needs greater consideration. It was felt, by third sector stakeholders, the eligibility criteria of intermediate options should be age-inclusive and take into account the specific needs of older people in London. They noted that help to save for a deposit to buy a home is implicitly targeting younger people, whereas older people on low incomes are very unlikely to be able to save for a deposit to buy a property, and may be less likely to obtain finance due to mortgage lenders' upper age limits. [5]

Increasing Housing Delivery: Summary of challenge

Annually, London currently builds around half of the homes that it needs. This fundamental lack of supply underpins many of the housing challenges faced by Londoners, including unaffordability of home ownership and private renting and rising levels of homelessness. It also impacts on the city's competitiveness and social mix. The Mayor's aim is to significantly increase levels of house building in London, and he has set a long-term strategic target for 50 per cent of new housing to be genuinely affordable.

The Mayor is identifying opportunities to build the homes Londoners need. This will include focusing development around new transport infrastructure, such as Crossrail 2 and the Bakerloo line, to make the best use of space and connections. The Mayor is also bringing forward the development of public land held by TfL and the Metropolitan Police, and areas of the city where he has more planning control, to deliver thousands of new homes and is focusing on ways of attracting finance into new high-quality 'build-to-rent' development and reviewing how planning policies can recognise the distinct economics of build-to-rent. This will be supported through City Hall investment and using innovative construction methods.

Increasing Housing Delivery: Stakeholder insights

The delivery of 50,000 homes per annum was viewed as an ambitious but a much needed target by boroughs and third sector stakeholders. The challenge of delivering this was seen as huge and dependent largely on how quickly the market can respond – timescales for consent, land availability, funding and trade shortages were cited as factors that can hinder delivery.

There was consensus amongst boroughs that a few large housing developers dominate the sector and that the market needs more small and medium developers that will take on the smaller scale projects, as well as more local authority development. In recent years, local authorities have started development again but they have been inhibited by the Housing Revenue Account borrowing caps. [16]

Land availability was seen as not just a London issue, but a regional one too. It was felt that surrounding districts in Home Counties also struggle to implement the number of planning permissions for residential development to meet the needs of their growing populations too. The intensification of land use in outer London was viewed as a good opportunity to improve affordability in those areas, due to better land values and existing mixed communities with low density. [16]

In terms of London Plan housing targets, boroughs agreed they should be distributed according to each authority's ability to provide viable sites for housing. However, they were keen to work with the GLA to explore and create new models of design and delivery to allow for suburban densification and maximise the plots of land they do have in order to meet London-wide targets. [9]

Some boroughs were positive about the Mayor's support for building more private housing, which, it was felt, would reduce demand-side pressure on existing housing. Boroughs also supported intermediate rent housing, to provide more affordable options for Londoners. [9]

Existing build to rent schemes in London were perceived to be expensive by public sector stakeholders, and it was suggested developers should be incentivised to provide a wider range of prices to enable more income groups to afford rents in the future. [11] Security of tenure was also raised, and it was felt a shift towards longer term tenancies with protections was needed. [17] However, in public opinion research, people were less supportive of these initiatives, suggesting that they represent "shifting of the goal posts" for younger people's housing as rather than now aspire to own their own home, they now have to settle for alternative types of housing and tenure. [2]

The Mayor, through GLA landholdings and as a broker with other public agencies, was seen as having a key role in leading on the strategic and effective use of public sector land to provide more affordable homes. Private sector stakeholders, therefore, welcomed the proposals to use Transport for London land and the potential for this to provide a template for other public bodies such as the NHS. [11] Intensifying housing development on TfL land was especially welcomed, in particular, where the revenue created would be reinvested to upgrade and maintain transport provision. [11]

Promoting development by local authorities and small housebuilders was viewed positively by stakeholders. It was suggested that the Mayor could work with boroughs and the construction industry to look at the skills shortage in the industry and how this could be addressed through employment and training schemes in the capital. [11]

The unique challenges faced by London and the need for tailored policy was raised as a key issue. Boroughs are keen to work with the Mayor to make a case to national government for additional powers and flexibilities to support housing delivery. Equally, as circumstances differ widely between and within London's boroughs, policy must be sufficiently flexible to deliver shared objectives. [9]

Delays to planning permission were highlighted as an obstacle to delivery by private sector stakeholders. It was felt that local authority owned small sites could make a significant contribution to housing delivery but some of these sites get stuck in the planning process due to different views about local character. It was felt that planning approaches that allow some level of flexibility in policy application to support the delivery of new affordable homes was required. [11] Flexibility, while important, was not always the solution - several stakeholders mentioned the need to balance housing delivery with capacity for employment space.

On the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders, boroughs contended that they are currently a poor tool for increasing the volume and speed of housing delivery - being slow, expensive and requiring specific local authority skill sets. [9] Although the CPO process is set in primary legislation, stakeholders felt that better use of CPO's could be facilitated by the London Plan by providing a clear set of conditions for when councils and the GLA can use these powers for empty homes and buildings in order to provide affordable housing.

Private sector stakeholders highlighted that many Londoners live on housing estates built in the mid to latter part of the 20th century. It was felt these are not only in need of refurbishment but also present an opportunity to increase housing numbers through infill development. [11] However, many public sector stakeholders highlighted the need to explore opportunities for maintenance and refurbishment rather than defaulting to demolition and re-building 'affordable housing' at prices unaffordable to the existing residents. [9]

Environmental sustainability was mentioned by private sector stakeholders as necessary if homes are to be more affordable for people on low and middle incomes. It was suggested that the Mayor should work with the construction industry to encourage more sustainable practice and innovation, with modern methods of construction. [11]

Housing Needs and the Private Rented Sector: Summary of challenge

Homelessness is an increasing problem for London exacerbated by scarcity of housing, rising housing costs and welfare reforms, which have made it more difficult for households on modest incomes to access and sustain tenancies. The Mayor has begun working with the London

boroughs to identify ways in which a pan-London approach to procuring accommodation for homeless households may result in better supply and affordability, as well as more suitable accommodation for homeless people. The Mayor's 2016-21 Affordable Homes Programme includes an Innovation Funding and has a budget set aside for accommodation for those ready to move on from hostels and refuges. Both of these are intended to benefit households that face or have experienced homelessness. A new 'No Nights Sleeping Rough' taskforce has been launched, in partnership with boroughs, charities and other key stakeholders, to identify and pursue innovative approaches to tackling rough sleeping.

An increasing number of Londoners – nearly two million – now live in the private rented sector, with families making up a growing proportion of this. More than a third of private rented sector households now have dependent children. Whilst the Mayor recognises the good service that the majority of landlords provide, too many private rented sector tenants experience problems because they struggle to afford their rent and have limited security of tenure or poor housing conditions. Although the Mayor has no formal powers to regulate this sector, he is exploring ways to improve it – such as through taking a greater leadership role in coordinating local authority enforcement activity, including supporting local authorities in London to introduce licensing schemes where they are needed.

Housing Needs and the Private Rented Sector: Stakeholder insights

Boroughs reported they are grappling with increasing homelessness, largely attributable to evictions from assured shorthold tenancies, rent arrears and increasing expenditure on temporary accommodation. [9] The Mayor's commitment to working with boroughs to identify ways in which a pan-London approach could help secure accommodation for homeless households and lead to better outcomes for homeless people was, therefore, received positively.

Boroughs and third sector stakeholders welcomed the Mayor's action to reduce the number of rough sleepers and organisations in general were keen to take an active role in the 'No Nights Sleeping Rough' taskforce. The consultation responses and research revealed the breadth of activities already undertaken by many organisations and individuals to assist and support rough sleepers and homeless people. [5]

Stakeholders from the third sector felt the challenges of rough sleeping could be addressed more effectively by working across organisational and sectoral boundaries and greater partnership working between local authorities, charity and faith-based organisations, and national organisations. It was acknowledged that there is already some highly effective joint

working across London boroughs. Many boroughs said they have put in place strategies to tackle rough sleeping, or are in the process of doing so. [9]

With London property prices double that of the rest of the country, it was felt that low and middle income families are locked out homeownership, while unable to qualify for social housing. Third sector stakeholders noted the increasing number of people living in the private rented sector and the problems of affordability, security of tenure, and housing conditions within this tenure faced by families and people in poverty. [5]

Peoples' negative experiences with the private rented sector were reflected in the Annual London Survey, with 67 per cent of Londoners expressing dissatisfaction with the quality of homes, landlords and letting agents. [3] The proposal for a crackdown on the bad practices of some landlords and steps to tackle inadequate living conditions was received positively by community groups participating in research. Migrants and refugees, in particular, felt the private rental sector makes no allowances for their situation – citing too many conditions involved in getting a property such as needing fixed-hours work contracts and six months of payslips. Many migrants and refugees stated that being re-housed outside London, either temporarily or through relocation schemes, was also a problem, as it takes them away from communities in London in which it is easier for them to integrate. [2]

Boroughs and Third Sector Stakeholders were also supportive of applying additional licensing for private rental landlords. Licensing would, it was hoped, improve Councils' engagement with landlords and provide better recourse for tenants affected by rogue landlords. Private sector stakeholders suggested enforcement of a license should focus on increasing the professionalism of landlords, the quality of the private rented stock and driving out the criminal landlords who blight the sector. Equally, good practice should be recognised and encouraged. [11]

The challenges for children living in inadequate private rental accommodation were highlighted as a particular concern by public sector stakeholders. Living in cold, insecure, overcrowded and unaffordable housing is linked to an increased risk of a range of physical and mental health conditions. The impact on educational attainment and life chances were seen as particularly acute in London, likely because of the higher rates of homelessness and vulnerability. [9]

There was some support from private sector stakeholders for regulating private rents, but it was felt that any such scheme should not result in unnecessary financial burdens being placed on the vast majority of good landlords and by extension their tenants. [11]

Inclusive and Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Summary of challenge

In order to be a city for all Londoners, the capital's housing challenges must be addressed in a sustainable and inclusive way, bringing together people of different ages, ethnicities and socio-economic backgrounds. Effective planning that promotes good design, and places that are attractive and accessible to people from all backgrounds, will be vital to achieving this.

The Mayor's London Plan will need to ensure that the city's considerable demand for housing is met with well-designed, high-quality and environmentally sustainable homes that will stand the test of time. Increasing housing density across London will be necessary, but this needs to be done in a way that is appropriate to the area and does not compromise on space standards or design. The homes delivered in the capital will also need to meet Londoners' diverse needs, and the supply of supported and specialist housing will need to be increased.

Although the supply of new and affordable homes needs to be increased quickly to meet London's growing needs, Londoners should have a stake in and benefit from the city's homes. Communities need to be involved in the planning, design and delivery of homes from the outset, and should be supported to bring forward their own housing projects. Where estate regeneration is necessary, tenants and leaseholders should be treated fairly and existing affordable housing needs to be protected, while open spaces on these estates are safeguarded for the residents too. Use of the city's existing housing stock will also need to be maximised; the number of empty homes in the capital needs to be reduced and a greater proportion of new market homes will need to be made available for Londoners.

Inclusive and Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Stakeholder insights

Having a mix of housing and tenures was thought to encourage mixed and balanced communities, but boroughs and third sector stakeholders noted that historically different tenures are not that mixed within boroughs, but merely exist beside each other. It was felt that to encourage a mixed community, local authorities need to understand who the different communities are and their needs before creating plans for housing type and size. [18]

Public and third sector stakeholders felt that existing residents can feel isolated from new development. Economically, they may not be able to participate in or integrate into what new development brings, or they may fear population impacts of development on their local services. Engaging residents in the planning of development and communicating the benefits for the local community was viewed as a way to improve this. [18]

The issue of inclusivity was viewed as important by the public, who felt this was about access to services and the ability of everyone to feel the city is theirs. Most felt this was not the case at

present and that the decline of social infrastructure such as community centres and youth centres had impacted on inclusivity and engagement. [2]

Stakeholders felt that mixed and balanced communities meant a range of homes and amenities that would allow people to stay in an area throughout their life, and meet the needs of young people, workers, families, and older people. It was felt by industry stakeholders that communities need to provide flexibility and stability to meet the changing needs of people. The scope for people to work locally was considered important. Thus, development needs to be mixed and involve residential and commercial interests. [18]

These sentiments were echoed by the public, who valued diversity in their neighbourhoods, and considered that opportunities to engage with people who live nearby were central to a well-functioning locality. [2]

Many stakeholders felt social behaviour is often shaped by the opportunities around us to interact, and good design policies were thought to be important in facilitating this and contributing to strong communities:

“There are design solutions, things like where you put your entrance, is it publicly accessible, can other people see it, how easy is it to form bonds with your neighbours.” [18]

Moving forward, boroughs and other stakeholders would like to see the principles of mixed and balanced communities developed and articulated in policy, but with consideration that not all places will necessarily have the same mix.

The issue of sustainability was raised throughout discussions. Some stakeholders felt that design should encompass a longer-term plan, thinking many years ahead instead of just two or three years. Related, some felt it should be up to the boroughs to define what their individual needs are within this. [19] There was however a feeling that, with high land costs putting pressure on the size of flats, we need strong minimum space standards to protect against overcrowding in the longer term.

Generally it was agreed that a universal standard for developers does not provide distinctive solutions for local needs. Moreover, a shift in accommodation needs was noted, whereby needs no longer fall into traditional planning classes. Design standards need to be more diverse to meet a broader range of needs, including those of older populations, and multi-generational families. [19]

Boroughs were supportive of a more balanced approach to density and larger buildings and agreed that greater densities can be achieved through a range of designs, including tall and mid-rise buildings. An approach of high-density, mixed-use, mixed-income developments was welcomed in general, provided they are located near well-connected transport nodes and town centres to improve access to jobs and services, and to reduce reliance on private cars. It was felt that higher density communities can sustain schools, local shops and other facilities in a way that a more dispersed community cannot. [9]

Opportunity Areas, in particular, were thought by private sector stakeholders to have the potential to accommodate significant mixed-use, high density development close to new and enhanced infrastructure. [11] However, boroughs felt that a move towards higher density development should not be carte blanche for tall buildings, where it is incongruous in the specific local context. [9] Similarly, within public opinion research, there was general acceptance that tall buildings are needed to provide homes and workspace for London's growing population, but it was felt careful consideration should be given to their design and look. [2]

Part 3: Economy

Global Competitiveness: Summary of challenge

London is a globally competitive city and the businesses based here trade extensively with the world – with exports of almost £120 billion in 2014.

Britain's changing relationship with the EU means London will need to maximise its advantage as a global city in different ways. The Mayor will welcome new investment and forge stronger ties with other global cities, collaborating to develop mutually beneficial trading links and to expand business opportunities. The Mayor will ensure business and global talent continue to see the capital as an attractive base, and that entrepreneurs can successfully start and scale-up new businesses in London.

Through planning, transport and housing policy the Mayor will look to protect and enhance London's global competitiveness. That means retaining London as an international business centre and planning transport around the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) to ensure people can travel to work comfortably and quickly. Projects key to this will be Crossrail 2, the Bakerloo line extension, the integration of High Speed 2, and ensuring London has adequate capacity for air travel.

To ensure that London can compete with other global business hubs such as Singapore and Hong Kong, London's infrastructure will need to be upgraded and extended. A common strategic investment programme for the capital will be established to facilitate this encompassing transport, housing, water, energy, waste, green infrastructure and digital.

Global Competitiveness: Stakeholder insights

Public sector stakeholders welcomed the Mayor's commitment to retaining London's role as an international business centre. They stressed the economic benefits to London and the UK as a whole, which accrue from an agglomeration of commercial activity within the CAZ. Proposals for further investment in transport and utilities provision were viewed as essential to ensuring the CAZ can remain an attractive location for international investment. [20]

Encouraging greater agglomeration in London beyond the CAZ was also viewed positively. It was felt that many sectors – Financial and Creative in particular – see the benefits of being able to interface in clusters such as Canary Wharf, the City, and Old Street, and that hubs such as these could potentially be created elsewhere to spread the benefits of growth to other parts of London. It was felt the GLA could support this by consulting with local authorities to identify underused industrial areas for potential intensification. [21]

Some boroughs have ambitions to be the next technology centre or the next creative place, but recognise that activity in central London cannot easily be replicated in outer London. Boroughs instead suggested the need to work with companies to understand what they are looking for and to try to bridge the benefits that the central core provides. [21]

It was felt that businesses and talented people want to be where things are happening and boroughs talked about the importance of 'having a well-defined story' for hubs in their areas. It was suggested that new infrastructure and development should not diminish the historical character of places. On the contrary, these developments could, for example, build on the industrial heritage of an area. It was felt that putting essential infrastructure in place to create new and continued investment should precede 'branding'. [22]

Connectivity was seen by boroughs as key in convening a wider area. They felt that transport infrastructure – Crossrail 2, HS2, tube upgrades, river crossings, and access to London's airports and their capacity - will be critical to London's economy and global success. It was felt that this should be accompanied by high-density mixed use development, including increased density for housing and other social infrastructure such as schools, health centres and GPs. [22]

Boroughs highlighted how housing tends to take precedence in the local plan and felt there needs to be a more balance in planning regulation to ensure that adequate workspace, essential to economic growth, is provided. But they warned against being overly prescriptive and recognised the importance of the free market in ensuring London can attract high value investments. [21] Boroughs also reported a shift towards residential developments driven by market values, which they are trying to balance with policies for mixed use provision to preserve offices and workspace.

Some areas lack the necessary digital infrastructure and broadband to take full advantage of 5G technology. It was felt that digital networking needs to be strategic, rather than reactive, to improve services and reduce connection costs. Boroughs suggested they could work together to get a better deal on connectivity and that the GLA could support this by acting as a strategic convener to achieve joined-up working.

In addition to digital, stakeholders felt the development of all types of infrastructure in London will be essential to maintaining its competitiveness moving forward. Moreover, London's resources - land, energy, and water – are finite and the management of these was highlighted as key. Stakeholders prioritised the co-ordination of these efforts through joined up working by infrastructure providers. [23]

London's strength is its openness to investment and trade, so consultees felt the idea of being open is particularly important at this time. Businesses with a long-established relationship to London were viewed as less at risk of relocating, but there was concern about newer businesses that might start looking to other cities. The Mayor's role in continuing to promote the message of openness and that London wants these businesses was seen as important. [21]

Industry Stakeholders spoke of the significance of London's economic growth to the wider UK economy. They stressed that strategies should be more than London centric and stressed the need for the Mayor to work with other UK cities to ensure that London's wealth, and schemes such as HS2, benefit other regions. [21]

Londoners are relatively positive about the capital's economic competitiveness, with 39 per cent reporting they are satisfied with this in the Annual London Survey 2015. Roughly half of those surveyed were satisfied with London's ability to attract business and investment (49% satisfied) and its innovation and technological development (49% satisfied). The survey revealed a divide, however, between opinions on the macro economy and personal economic issues. Where respondents referenced the best thing about London in open ended questions, they focused on the city's position as a "global centre for business", whilst reference to economic issues as the worst thing about London most commonly included cost-of-living concerns and low wages, illustrating that not all Londoners are benefitting from the city's success. [24]

Small Business Growth: Summary of challenge

The Mayor wants to support businesses of all shapes and sizes to start up and scale in London. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are particularly important for London's economy. Affordable workspaces provide SMEs with spaces to grow and develop and are critical to their success.

Small Business Growth: Stakeholder insights

The provision of adequate and affordable workspace was seen by boroughs and other industry stakeholders as key to encouraging small business growth. Some boroughs reported a healthy and growing SME base with independent operators establishing start-up spaces for fast-growing tech businesses. [25] Some boroughs, conversely, reported that growth of SMEs has dwindled in recent times due to the lack of adequate, affordable workspace available locally. [20] Several stakeholders mentioned the need to balance housing delivery with capacity for employment space. Affordable business space was a key concern for boroughs, particularly in inner London. It was seen as instrumental in diversifying the employment function of their area and without it they saw a risk that local entrepreneurship would be forced out. They stressed the

need for local planning to protect business floor space in boroughs and supported the Mayor's consideration of affordable workspaces in the London Plan. [9]

Boroughs reported a decline of business space in town centres, partly due to the increasing value of land for housing and retail and the pressure on Councils to create revenue. It was felt that developers are currently focused on housing and should be encouraged to provide more commercial space for SMEs and start-ups, but that better intelligence was needed to know the local demand for space.

Boroughs supported the Mayor's commitment to resisting office to residential conversions without proper justification. They would like to see strong policies included in the new London Plan to protect areas of importance for employment. They felt the Mayor could play a central role - by producing evidence and liaising with Central Government - in ensuring that legislation protects buildings that are 60 per cent occupied by businesses from conversion. [25]

Affordability was a priority issue for both inner and outer London boroughs. [20] It was felt that insufficient affordable space could result in local entrepreneurship being stifled and those looking to start businesses being forced out of inner boroughs and perhaps out of London. Some boroughs have operated an affordable workspace policy in recent years and therefore support a similar approach being adopted in the London Plan. One borough espoused the benefits of this:

"...on-site affordable workspace is key, as it helps to diversify the employment function of areas and allows relationships and information sharing to happen organically between different typologies of workspace, from a start-up operating on a single desk basis to large international companies." [20]

Lack of affordable workspace was thought to impact on SMEs' ability to support skills development because they do not have space, even simple desk space, to offer internships and apprenticeships. Boroughs and private sector stakeholders reported that businesses are downsizing and ending their intern and apprenticeship offers because they are struggling with the cost of commercial space and business rates. It was felt that entry-level jobs with progression and training built into them are at risk and may disappear because of the costs of doing business. [25]

Flexibility was considered a priority for SME growth regarding use of space and function – 'the ability to move walls around if you need lots of small units'. It was suggested that a key intervention could be to align the London Plan with local plans to ensure this type of flexibility.

Boroughs and private sector stakeholders also stressed the need for flexibility in terms of leasing and licenses. They highlighted the risk for SMEs of taking on a long lease and the importance of being able to move on when their needs change. [25]

Co-working space was proposed by private sector stakeholders as a flexible and affordable option. It was viewed as supporting businesses at various stages of their development, from freelancers and start-ups to businesses that are expanding. Closer working and agglomeration of logistics were thought to bring benefits both in terms of increased productivity, and reduced travel and congestion. It was felt the growth in the number of self-employed workers and new start-ups, particularly in tech and creative industries, across the capital justified supporting this model in the next London Plan. [26]

Connectivity was raised as a challenge by some outer London boroughs who are trying to create mixed use development hubs and attract SME start-ups. It was felt that improving accessibility and links to the tube - though buses, cycle paths, good walking routes, and river crossings for relevant boroughs - would improve viable uses of land. It was felt that historically the transport strategy has tended to focus on getting people into central London and that better transport infrastructure in potential opportunity sites should be a priority moving forward. [27]

Business rates and parking charges were perceived to be top of SMEs' concerns in relation to local authorities. The loss of the revenue support grant has consequently lead boroughs to raise funds through business tax. This was viewed as having a particularly adverse impact on boroughs with less business areas compared to those with areas like Canary Wharf. It was suggested that greater help should be given to boroughs that do not have wealthier businesses providing a levy, perhaps through reduced rates for SMEs or pop-ups that could help them to flourish. Private sector stakeholders also suggested there could be business rate relief for not-for-profit affordable workspace providers who accommodate SMEs and entrepreneurs. [26]

In addition to SMEs, it was felt there needs to be greater acknowledgement of the role of social enterprises such as charities and those who make a profit for the public good. Stakeholders felt they should be acknowledged as service providers who are often excluded from plans for business growth, and that their voices need to be heard in the London economy. [27]

Education, skills and opportunity: Summary of challenge

London's success has been driven largely by its appeal and openness to people from around the world. In a changing economy, it is essential for growth that London can draw on all possible sources of talent and that the immigration system enables London to be open.

As well as welcoming talented people from other countries and across the UK, London also needs to develop home-grown skills and ensure that provision more closely matches the needs of businesses across all sectors. Skills development is critical to ensuring all Londoners can contribute fully and benefit from the opportunities that London has to offer.

Not all Londoners, however, get the opportunity to participate in the capital's success. The unemployment rate remains stubbornly high for some groups, particularly people from some ethnic minority backgrounds, disabled people and young people. The Mayor wants to make sure that all Londoners, from primary-school children through to adults who are starting out on their career or looking to 'reskill' and/ or "upskill", get good advice and understand where jobs are being created, such as in the creative industries, tech, digital, life sciences and construction sectors.

The Mayor has pledged to lead a new skills agenda for London to address these issues, and has secured a commitment from government to devolve control over the budget for adult skills (the Adult Education Budget) in London to City Hall from 2019/20.

To ensure that everyone can play an active and dynamic role in London's growth, the Mayor will be exploring the possibility of improving access to English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) courses, through new partnerships.

Education, Skills and Opportunity: Stakeholder insights

Research and consultation revealed a pressing demand for skills and career development amongst London's population. Just 1 in 4 Londoners said they were satisfied with current opportunities to gain skills for career development in the Annual London Survey 2015 (26% satisfied). Satisfaction levels were even lower regarding the fairness of wages (12% satisfied). Indeed, prioritising these to improve life in London were ranked top by survey participants along with the need for infrastructure to support a growing population. [24]

Consultation with community groups revealed some of the issues behind these findings. There was consensus that university fails to adequately prepare people for London's job market, and that more apprenticeships and vocational training should be offered. Migrant groups felt they were disadvantaged in the job market by a lack of language training. They also spoke of extreme under-utilisation of skills, for example, a doctor working as a cleaner, and the reliance on existing networks or friends to find work. Older people felt that over 50s get pushed out of work, and then find it difficult to re-skill to get another job. [2]

Public and third sector stakeholders anticipate that the Government's Post-16 Skills Plan will have a positive impact on vocational and technical skills in parallel to academic routes. They felt that employers should be at the centre of this conversation. Many already participate in higher education provision through their role in course validation, but there were concerns that local colleges and businesses can fail to connect. It was suggested that boroughs could play an advocacy role for local businesses by bringing them together with training providers to identify skills needs, and training and apprenticeships opportunities. Furthermore, through these partnerships it was felt boroughs could work to address the barriers experienced by some community groups, including BAME groups, disabled people and immigrants, in accessing local skills and employment opportunities. [28]

Consultees talked about the skills shortages that exist in specific sectors. The creative industries, in particular, were identified as having long-standing skills shortages. It was felt these stem from inadequate training and provision in schools and are compounded by the increasing demand for talent in a growing sector. [29]

The announcement that the Adult Education Budget will be devolved to City Hall from 2019/20 was welcomed. Industry stakeholders were also keen for London Government to control the Apprenticeship Grant for Employers and to have greater influence in reshaping Further Education provision in London. [26] It was felt that the Apprenticeship Levy paid by London's employers should be ring-fenced to the capital to ensure this leads to sustained employment. [30]

The London Living wage was viewed positively by boroughs and third sector stakeholders. There was support for extending it to cover all types of employment – self-employed, zero hour contracts, teachers and those who work in social care – jobs perceived as essential to sustaining society. [31]

It was thought that reducing business rates for SMEs would encourage small businesses to offer the London Living Wage by helping to offset the costs. Some boroughs are offering discounts for employers who become living wage accredited, but it was stated that not all boroughs can afford to do this. Borough and third sector stakeholders felt a better minimum wage could be offered through apprenticeships which could also better support apprentices who come from lower income families. [31]

The provision of careers advice was seen by boroughs and private sector stakeholders as historically patchy and often the victim of funding cuts. They stressed the need for high quality

careers advice moving forward and that advice should be open-minded about all sectors without prejudice. It should be built on knowledge and understanding of sectoral needs, and provide intelligence on the pathways and 'ecosystems' that support professionals in their career development – where they trained and how they gained experience, where they are employed now or how they set up a business. It was also felt that good apprenticeships should be promoted as a positive choice in careers advice. [28] Community groups also expressed the need for more schemes that encourage entrepreneurialism and start-ups. [2]

The cost and availability of high quality childcare was seen as a barrier to employment for many parents, particularly mothers, who are more likely to consider their childcare responsibilities before taking a new job. The commitment to embed childcare and early education provision within city planning was welcomed by third sector stakeholders. It was felt that this would help to make sure that the number of childcare spaces grows as the population grows, and could help to tackle affordability if low or no rent childcare premises are included within planning requirements. [30] The proximity of training and education to where people live, particularly those with children looking to return to work, was viewed as key to supporting skills development and career prospects. [29]

Culture and the Economy: Summary of challenge

London is renowned for its creativity, arts and culture. The capital's theatres, galleries, museums and nightlife make London an attractive base for businesses and talent. The Creative Industries are a major competitive asset and play a significant role in London's economic growth. The Mayor will look to use the London Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance to protect creative workspace, heritage and the night-time economy.

Increasing London's competitive edge includes supporting a vibrant night-time economy, which also helps attract young workers to the city. To complement the night tube and planning measures for culture, a Night Czar will be appointed to oversee London's night-time economy.

Culture and the Economy: Stakeholder insights

The consultation explored the proposal to provide Creative Enterprise Zones – dedicated zones that could be created in boroughs to offer protection to creative workers from development and high rents. Private sector stakeholders noted the importance of a relationship between different creative spaces to help maximize outputs and facilitate networking, as well as attracting and growing talent in an area. Private sector stakeholders, and boroughs, mentioned the importance of proximity to academic institutions and libraries, or the proximity of artists' workspaces to theatres and galleries. [32]

It was seen as a priority that when creative and cultural businesses emerge and grow in an area they don't have to move on because of a lack of understanding and support for their needs. It was felt that development plans need to be 'bottom up' – shaped by creative communities and residents rather than boroughs or developers and that this will require real commitment from Local Authorities to invest in and retain these creative communities. [32]

It was thought the Mayor and GLA could play a convening role in this – bringing together residents, creative communities, planners and developers to support creative growth. It was also suggested creative spaces could be opened-up to CIL funding.

Private sector stakeholders stressed the distinction between creative and culture and the different attributes and needs of the cultural sector in London's economy. Culture was viewed as less about selling things or making money and more about the pleasure, education and enhanced quality of life it brings – benefits which, it was felt, are sometimes threatened by the focus on creativity and making money. It was considered critical to London's attractiveness to encourage and protect culture through a preservation approach similar to that of the heritage sector. [32]

The co-dependency of creative and culture was also highlighted by boroughs. They expressed the need for a strong and active cultural sector to encourage the growth of creative industries in London which bring high value employment and inward investment. [20] Boroughs and private sector stakeholders felt the London Plan should have a specifically directed approach in the creative sector. [32]

The Mayor's pledge to prioritise culture as a key component for growth was supported, and in some cases, paralleled by boroughs in their own commitments to grow the cultural offer. Boroughs reported they are experiencing a period of unprecedented change and population growth and they see the role of culture as critical to ensuring the success of regeneration. Culture was seen as instrumental in improving people's experience of redeveloped public areas – by creating a balance beyond spaces for retail. It was felt that new development can be complementary to, and even enhance, the existing heritage and culture of an area through creative and innovative planning and design. [20]

Enabling creativity to remain local through the creation of dedicated creative zones could have community benefits by helping to preserve the character of an area. Public participants in the consultation expressed concerns about the impact of development on the built environment:

“...I think that we're losing integral parts of the culture and diversity of London because of certain policies and practices at the moment, which would be incredibly sad. I think Brixton Market is quite a good case study for that... It's quite worrying.” [1]

Boroughs and private sector stakeholders highlighted the nighttime economy (NTE) as a significant part of London's cultural mix that contributes to growth. [33] It was noted, however, that many of London's pubs and clubs are under threat, or have closed in recent years, because of residential development. Stakeholders saw the protection of uses through policy and planning as important, but a more critical issue was to promote a broader definition of the NTE at a local level. They favoured a move towards a '24-hour city' definition that acknowledges round-the-clock activity, including restaurants, entertainment, hotels, logistics, deliveries, as well as services such as health and social care.

It was felt the Night Czar could be instrumental in identifying new growth areas and highlighting the importance of the NTE in the local area. They could facilitate better working between boroughs and licensing partners to achieve more licensing in multi-purpose developments. Developers, who often see nighttime use as not viable, could be encouraged to create more than just retail space in mixed use developments. But there was strong feeling that implementation must reflect local plans. [33] The role of culture in local economies and community integration is explored further in Part 6: Inclusive City.

Part 4: Environment

Towards Zero Carbon: Summary of challenge

The Mayor's ambition is for London to become a zero carbon city by 2050. Reducing carbon emissions will require working towards an affordable, lower carbon and cleaner energy system and more energy-efficient buildings.

Businesses will need to adapt to become lower carbon. Many firms in London are already making it their business to improve the environment in innovative new ways and the low-carbon and green sector employs many thousands of people. Environmental programmes can stimulate growth and market opportunities in this growing low carbon economy, thereby creating the green jobs of the future.

London's poor air quality has serious health implications for residents. Road transport is a significant contributor to this and the Mayor is introducing an emissions surcharge in central London this year for high-polluting older vehicles. This will be replaced by the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) that will cover central London initially and there are plans to then expand this London-wide for heavy vehicles and to the North and South Circular for light vehicles. Other ways to reduce emissions from public transport will be explored – including the phasing-out and conversion of diesel buses, and increasing the number of hybrid and zero emission buses.

The Mayor is calling on the Government to enshrine in law the right to clean air and he is pushing for reform of Vehicle Excise Duty to incentivise the purchase of greener, cleaner vehicles.

Building emissions also affect air quality and the Mayor proposes placing a requirement on new developments to be 'air quality positive' so that they actively contribute to a reduction in emissions.

Towards Zero Carbon: Stakeholder insights

The priority given to zero carbon emissions in A City for All Londoners was welcomed by private and third sector stakeholders, who saw an opportunity for greater synergy between housing and environment policy to tackle carbon emissions. [34] It was felt that the Environment Strategy that will deliver the ambitions of ACfAL presents an opportunity to join up existing policies such as RE:NEW, RE:FIT and the Zero Carbon Homes policy, by forming a comprehensive plan to improve the energy efficiency of the London housing stock. [35]

Regarding new developments, private and third sector stakeholders spoke of the need for clarity on what is being measured with carbon targets – and noted there is often a performance gap between ‘as designed’ and how buildings perform in practice. They suggested the GLA could push for greater transparency of performance data and reporting at a London level to encourage developers to improve carbon reduction. [34]

Stakeholders from the third sector urged the GLA to encourage all boroughs to establish a carbon off-set fund for cash in-lieu contributions from developers - and to support boroughs on how to use the funds effectively to meet the costs of future retrofit of existing housing stock. [36] The need to increase retrofit activity on insulation, heating and lighting was echoed by private and third sector stakeholders who saw an opportunity to tackle emissions in the private rented sector through landlord accreditation schemes in boroughs. It was suggested the Mayor could take the lead on establishing minimum energy performance regulations for this sector in London, recognising this would require central government agreement. [34]

Stakeholders from the third sector and private sector highlighted the need for stronger commitment from boroughs to rolling out decentralised energy, but acknowledged commitment is vulnerable to electoral outcomes: *“Every borough has different priorities... The minute administration changed, everything changed at council level.”* Stakeholders felt the London Energy Plan should have a greater focus on local energy production and they saw a role for the GLA to encourage local councillors to assess local energy opportunities and report back. Solar power was noted, in particular, as an opportunity for London to be more self-reliant in electricity production given the amount of roof space it has. [34]

Talk London respondents also advocated setting up a public energy company to produce clean energy. They felt this would significantly impact on energy use and climate change, as well as help Londoners in fuel poverty. [37]

London’s role in the global push towards keeping global warming within two degrees was explored. Boroughs and third sector stakeholders stressed the need for a systemic approach to achieve this. They noted the current London Plan has firm policy on CO₂ reduction and stressed the importance of supporting this with a clear road map and delivery strategy for the 2030’s and beyond. [34]

Private and third sector stakeholders called for ambitious policies on new builds to be zero carbon rather than carbon neutral, and to include negative emissions technologies , but noted there is resistance to adopt these technologies within the construction industry due to costs.

[34] In addition to reducing carbon emissions from homes, public sector stakeholders felt there should be initiatives to achieve zero carbon commercial buildings and zero carbon transport in the London Plan and the Transport Strategy. [38]

Stakeholders in general advocated the GLA taking a lead role in championing the benefits of a low carbon future to businesses by helping them to understand how to be leaner and more efficient, rather than using regulation alone to change behaviour. They stressed the need to facilitate a change of mind-set about low-carbon: *“Low carbon economy sounds like asking people to make a sacrifice. The solution is designing-in low carbon - recycling etc. [This] would make it become part of the DNA of the economic system.”* [39]

Policy and regulation were, however, seen as critical to encouraging behaviour change and stimulating growth. Stakeholders highlighted a need for local policies, particularly concerning the procurement of localised contract providers on building retrofits and activities, to bring money back into local economies. It was felt the decentralisation and deregulation of energy supply would aid this by enabling energy to be *‘generated locally and managed locally’*. [39]

It was felt the GLA could encourage councils to help local businesses transition to become low carbon businesses. Stakeholders stressed the need for affordable space for community businesses to be incubated in support of this. Lower business rates for greener companies were suggested as another lever for growth and job creation. [39]

The need for collective action and better financial mechanisms were highlighted by Stakeholders. Difficulty in accessing finance experienced by low carbon SMEs was thought to restrict growth. They advocated collective schemes whereby businesses give each other their services on credit and help each other to grow – in this sense creating a ‘community currency’ and reducing SME’s reliance on banks and investors. In terms of larger-scale investment, it was felt the Mayor could take a lead role in asking Banks to create new products and funds for investment that enable London to become zero carbon. [39]

Air quality continues to be a significant environmental and public health problem. Londoners expressed their dissatisfaction with air quality in the Annual London Survey (57%) and ranked it as their top environmental issue. Inner Londoners were significantly more likely to be dissatisfied with the city’s air quality than outer Londoners (63% vs 51%). [40]

The need for ambitious policies to improve air quality through a reduction in vehicle emissions was conveyed strongly by public and third sector participants. They welcomed the proposal for

the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) as a significant step towards this. They noted that emissions and congestion are major health and economic burdens placed on London by road traffic and that the ULEZ will provide an opportunity to factor this into the price of motoring. There was strong support to expand it, to combat air pollution London-wide rather than just expanding it to the inside the North and South Circular Roads. However, it should be noted that the Mayor plans to expand the ULEZ London-wide for all heavy vehicles (lorries, coaches, etc.). [41]

Outer London boroughs raised some concerns, however, about the impact on areas around the proposed boundaries in terms of congestion and air quality. It was felt the zone could have displacement effects and create hotspots at the edges. Inner London boroughs felt that careful consideration should be given to the impact upon residents, council contractors and SMEs in deciding the scheme's implementation. [38]. They were also keen to see funds generated by the zone invested in sustainable transport options. [38]

The Mayor's call to Government for a 21st Century Clean Air Act, diesel scrappage and changes to vehicle excise duty were supported strongly by boroughs. It was felt the Mayor could also lobby the Government to do more to incentivise the take up of electric and hydrogen vehicles by making them cheaper. This was thought to be particularly important in supporting lower-income drivers to switch to cleaner vehicles. [41]

Public and third sector stakeholders prioritised the need to reduce the number of vehicles traveling around London to improve air quality. They noted the challenge, however, of an increasing volume of freight, 'one-hour deliveries' and domestic travel as London experiences population growth. They encouraged the Mayor to consider a variety of solutions, including freight consolidation, river use by the construction industry, car share schemes, and more walking and cycling infrastructure as an alternative to car use. [41]

Stakeholders representing the Transport and Logistics Industry stressed the need to improve congestion and air quality by embracing new technologies: *"The development of automated vehicle movement, next-generation scheduling and electronically generated booking systems by customers... combined with greater use of cleaner combustion systems... there is a huge potential for improved flows of people and goods without undue effect on air quality"*. [42]

Regarding local air quality, public and third sector stakeholders suggested the London Plan could seek to achieve new developments that are 'air quality positive' by encouraging mixed-use developments that provide an option to live and work in the same spaces, and by locating

amenities closer to residential areas to reduce the need to travel. They also favoured easily accessible depots for online shopping collection to reduce the volume of deliveries. [41]

Green Infrastructure: Summary of challenge

Through environmental initiatives, the Mayor wants to improve the health of Londoners and encourage social integration. London's public space - its streets, squares, parks, green spaces and waterways - are vitally important to public life and the character of the city. The Mayor believes that fostering an open and accessible network of well-designed and functional spaces which incorporate green infrastructure including accessible greenspaces, green roofs, walls and trees should be at the heart of planning for a healthy, inclusive and prosperous city. One of the ways he will seek to achieve this is through 'Healthy Streets' initiatives that enhance the local environment. This is explored in more detail in the Transport section.

The London Plan will have an important role to play in keeping standards high in the built environment by ensuring that good architectural and design-quality principles embed green infrastructure in new buildings and neighbourhoods.

Green Infrastructure: Stakeholder insights

London's green spaces were perceived to be diverse and performing a multiplicity of functions by stakeholders in general. High public satisfaction with the city's parks and green spaces was evident in the Annual London Survey 2015 (71%). [40]

However, it was acknowledged by all sectors, that some green spaces could be improved. Many suggested the GLA has a role in providing a cohesive vision for London's spaces to ensure they provide a variety of functions and benefits. [43] Linked to this, boroughs highlighted the need for a more coordinated management of London's parks and open spaces. [38]

Third sector stakeholders highlighted an opportunity for development decisions to look more strategically at green spaces by assessing local needs and existing green space provision, rather than simply looking at the green space proposed within an individual development.

"Within existing and new developments there are extensive areas of spaces with potential for the presence of nature that are simply concrete or hard surface, or uninspiring areas of mown grass." [36]

Boroughs, too, suggested developments should be required to provide accessible green space, experiences of nature on site, and even incorporate biodiverse interventions. [38]

Stakeholders highlighted the challenge of meeting the increasing demand for housing and development in London, and assessing the value of space. Stakeholders stressed the need to build an understanding of value into planning by engaging communities in public space decisions. It was felt that planning policy needs to identify the elements of success in existing developments, such as the Olympic Park, and apply these learnings to ensure quality in the use of space in future developments. [43]

Neighbourhood groups perceived open spaces in some housing estates to be under threat and advocated greater protection of these spaces and steps to ensure that estate intensification is done in such a way that the quantity of open space is maintained or increased. [44]

Stakeholders felt the Mayor's green space objectives should complement policies on health and well-being and ensure equal access to spaces for all. [43] The importance of planning and design of green infrastructure to provide for children's play and the outdoor social integration of families was also highlighted by third sector stakeholders. [36]

Stakeholders discussed the benefits of a National Park City to the capital to ensure all Londoners have free and easy access to high-quality green spaces. There was support for the concept, and stakeholders felt it offered an opportunity to build on the All London Green Grid and saw a strategic role for the GLA to provide leadership and connectivity on this. It was suggested the GLA could increase visibility of the National Park City concept to inspire related local campaigns. [43]

Stakeholders from the private sector, and several boroughs and Wider South East authorities highlighted the need for Green Belt policy to work in tandem with the development of transport links and housing. They acknowledged that the vast majority of Greenbelt land should continue to be protected, but urged the Mayor to undertake a detailed review to identify areas with low amenity and low natural capital value that could host new development. [42] [38] Decisions to develop on open land, it was felt, should give careful consideration to the implications for air quality, flood management, sports and recreation, human health, and biodiversity.

Climate Change Risks: Summary of challenge

London's climate is changing. There is more extreme weather and the city needs to adapt to the new conditions this presents. The Mayor will explore ways to use resources more effectively and efficiently, reduce London's reliance on fossil fuels, and develop the 'circular economy' to reduce waste and keep resources in use for as long as possible. Detailed policies and proposals

will be developed on sustainable water resources, sewerage and flood and drought risk management.

London needs a fundamental rethink of its energy strategy to reduce the emissions created by the way homes are heated – largely through gas boilers which produce carbon dioxide and consume considerable amounts of natural gas. This will require better planning and integration of energy systems, smart technology and meters and building retrofits. Solar and local community energy enterprises will be supported and the establishment of a not-for-profit energy company to supply cleaner energy will be explored.

Climate Change Risks: Stakeholder insights

Private, public and third sector stakeholders in general welcomed the priority focus on London mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change. They highlighted the need to make social housing more climate resilient and felt that interventions to date have tended to be piecemeal. A better strategic overview was viewed as a priority to help up-scale this work, together with a greater focus on tackling poor quality environments and fuel poverty in social housing. It was also suggested that private landlords should be encouraged to provide energy efficient buildings and improve poor living conditions. [45]

Fuel poverty was a particular problem highlighted by migrant and refugee groups, with many reporting that they keep the heating off or down low in the winter due to cost – a problem they felt was exacerbated by prepayment meters in rented properties. [37] The need to reduce heating demand by making homes as efficient as possible was considered a top priority by the third sector stakeholders. They viewed ‘heat mapping’ as an effective way to identify demand for heat by area, to develop district heating schemes that provide affordable and low carbon energy. [36] This suggests there would be support for GLA heat mapping to be enhanced and further improved.

Water efficiency was a priority focus for public and third sector stakeholders. They felt more action was needed to encourage behaviour change on water use and to reduce water demand. They acknowledged that legislation would be needed to make water companies address this, but urged the Mayor to provide leadership in encouraging Water suppliers to initiate change. [45] Third sector stakeholders highlighted the need to reduce wastage and improve recycling through Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) - and suggested these should be mandatory for all developments. [36]

Public and third sector stakeholders saw surface water flooding as a risk to London and felt that better data is needed on 'hotspots' where communities may be at risk. They advocated designing for flooding into hard infrastructure and using green infrastructure - tributary catchments and tree beds - to reduce impacts. [45]

Behaviour change by every citizen was viewed as key to London becoming more resilient to the effects of climate change and that awareness of risks at a local level should be increased. It was felt community groups should be recognised as an important stakeholder to be involved in discussions about resilience. Stakeholders proposed setting up a Resilience Task Force to engage communities and provide information and training. [45]

Stakeholders favoured an integrated approach to policy with interaction between strategies on green infrastructure, energy production and supply, biodiversity and climate resilience, to achieve effective mitigation of risks. [45] Strategies on climate resilience, it was felt, also need to link seamlessly with the Equality Strategy and address issues of air quality and fuel poverty for people most effected by inequality. [45]

Waste, Recycling and the Circular Economy: Summary of challenge

London still produces too much waste which goes to landfill and incineration. These methods are costly and are increasingly not an option. For example, landfill sites taking London's waste are expected to run out of capacity by 2026. London's waste bill is currently in excess of £2bn per year and rising. Local authority run waste services make up around a third of London's total waste costs. In 2015/16 London's local authorities spent £727m on waste services including £270m on disposal (landfill and incineration).

Globally today's linear economy where we "take, make and dispose" is unsustainable. Growing competition for natural resources and volatile commodity markets are increasing uncertainty for markets and therefore the financial risk for business, and can drive inequality. Waste needs to be treated as the valuable resource that it is by clever design of goods and services to significantly reduce waste in the first place, by reusing or recycling our unavoidable waste, and finally, ensuring as much value as possible is captured from waste remaining.

Waste, Recycling and the Circular Economy: Stakeholder insights

Boroughs support the Mayor's aims to reduce waste as part of a holistic approach to improving the environment. Stakeholders highlighted an opportunity to improve recycling in the capital through better education and public awareness of the types of waste that can be recycled. Stakeholders in general noted the variations between boroughs in the types of waste they

handle – foil, glass, food, garden waste, etc – and felt that confusion around this had contributed to lower recycling levels. Blocks of flats were identified as having significantly lower levels of recycling, and Stakeholders expressed the necessity to retrofit facilities for recycling in flats to improve this. [46]

These findings were echoed by community groups. [37] Recycling was thought to be important by all groups, and almost all reported they actively recycle their waste at home. However, all groups highlighted barriers to recycling, such as the different facilities and colour codes in different boroughs. Some groups highlighted a problem for people living in flats – recycling collection there is communal, when other residents contaminate this with non-recyclables it reduces the collective incentive to recycle. It was felt that applying consistent language, colours and images London-wide could help to overcome some of these barriers. [37]

Public, private and third sector stakeholders suggested a role for the Mayor in public education and promoting a culture of recycling through high profile campaigns and use of social media. Stakeholders also saw an opportunity to educate children through schools to help bring the message home to parents. [46]

It was suggested that harmonising recycling waste services between boroughs could provide a more consistent service and improve levels of recycling through clearer messaging to communities. Stakeholders noted, however, that a pan-London collection system would require leadership from the Mayor to encourage boroughs to consolidate their different approaches to waste collection. It was felt that significant investment in logistics from central government would also be needed. Stakeholders suggested the London Plan could take a strategic lead on cross-borough planning for the capital's waste, which Local Plans could then implement at a borough or sub-regional level. [46]

Due to the increasing demand for housing in London, public sector stakeholders felt that waste disposal services are often competing for priority in terms of land space. They suggested the GLA could provide strategic overview on this in planning decisions to ensure there is adequate waste management infrastructure in different areas to cope with London's growth. [46] This was considered necessary if London is to manage its own waste and avoid a reliance on landfill sites outside the capital. [38]

Private sector stakeholders would like to see a renewed strategy on waste consolidation for businesses across the capital that builds on the success of recent retail schemes in the West End. They highlighted how some businesses in Bond Street and Regent Street now use a single

preferred waste supplier, which has reduced the number of waste collection vehicles and made cost savings for businesses. [42]

The business community could do more to reduce waste, particularly take-away food outlets, it was felt by Stakeholders in general. They suggested the Mayor could encourage businesses to significantly reduce the amount of packaging used and to promote the use of recyclable packaging. Talk London respondents felt that supermarkets could also do more to reduce packaging. [37] Stakeholders suggested that social enterprise should be encouraged more. Schemes such as re-using and refilling shampoo bottles in the hotel industry, for example, were viewed positively. [46]

Public, private and third sector stakeholders expressed their support for the circular economy in London to reduce waste. Again, they saw a leadership role for the Mayor to encourage enterprise around the exchange and repair of items such as clothes, tools and electronics. [46]

Community groups had mixed opinions on repairing household goods such as appliances, as repair was perceived as often being more expensive than buying new. This was especially the case for minority ethnic groups – primarily those with South East Asian heritage. However, there was a lot of support for a ‘library of things’ system, where infrequent-use items could be loaned out. This was seen to be good for the environment, to save money, and to save storage space. It was thought these schemes could be run in libraries or community centres. [37] Talk London respondents perceived a successful sharing economy as being part of a community and positive for neighbourly relations. They felt that quality assurance would be required for a library of things to work well, and that a borrowing cost would need to be implemented as an insurance on items. [37]

Part 5: Transport

Connectivity Within and Beyond London: Summary of challenge

The Mayor wants to improve transport within London and ensure that links to and from residential areas that commuters rely on work well. Streets will be improved for walking and cycling, while also maintaining access for low-emission buses and essential freight to service the needs of the economy.

There are plans to develop new transport services in less-connected places, including extending the London Overground to Barking Riverside and potentially across the river to Abbey Wood. The Silvertown Tunnel between the Greenwich Peninsular and Silvertown will boost the economy and connect communities, and the Mayor is also planning a walking and cycling bridge between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf and DLR extension across the river to Thamesmead.

The potential to expand the Tramlink network from Wimbledon to Sutton is being explored, as is the Bakerloo line southern extension to Lewisham and beyond, and working with partners to get the funding in place for Crossrail 2. For many people working in outer London, bus routes will be improved to connect people to town centres, where many of their jobs are.

The Mayor is calling on the Government to devolve suburban rail services to his control to create a substantially bigger London Overground service, with better stations, better service, more staff and more frequent trains.

Making London more connected and inclusive for all is a key priority, and this will be achieved by freezing fares, the recently introduced Hopper ticket on the bus, and protecting existing concessions such as the 60+ bus pass and the Freedom Pass. The Mayor also wants to make transport more accessible by upgrading existing infrastructure with more step free access and by increasing capacity to reduce overcrowding.

Connectivity Within and Beyond London: Stakeholder insights

The Mayor's proposals for increased investment in transport infrastructure, including the commitment to Crossrail 2, the Bakerloo line extension and HS2, were welcomed by public and private sector stakeholders. [47] [48] It was felt these developments will help to increase London-wide public transport capacity and network resilience and enhance London's attractiveness as a place in which to do business.

Private sector stakeholders saw transport into central London as a priority to support growth and employment in sectors concentrated within the Central Activities Zone. [49] To improve links into London, private and public sector stakeholders highlighted the need to identify transport 'hotspots' in outer London and invest to unlock these. [49] Boroughs would welcome directional guidance from TfL and the GLA to overcome funding and delivery issues of larger, more complex transport improvement schemes in outer London. [47]

Private and public sector stakeholders highlighted the need for better orbital links – including by tram – to improve opportunities for people to live and work in outer London areas and reduce the need to travel into the centre for connections. This also has implications for car use, as described by one participant in the consultation:

"You have to take a really long journey, going into the centre and out again, increasing the load on the transport system. That, or people just say, 'Sod it, I'll take the car'." [49]

Connectivity was highlighted as critical to growth in outer London. Some suburban town centres, it was noted, have experienced a loss of jobs when companies have relocated to more accessible places to get the best labour. [49] It was felt, by public and third sector stakeholders, that improved infrastructure and local job creation around transport hubs would improve this and reduce the need for travel to central London. [50]

Public and third sector stakeholders supported proposals for infrastructure investment corridors within the Wider South East. [51] Outer London boroughs and County/District Councils have ambitions for growth that they anticipate will be enabled by cross-boundary investment and joint-working between authorities. [52]

"This is about rebalancing London's economy, not just providing places for people to work in the city. ...making outer London a more rounded, attractive place." [51]

Stakeholders noted the increasing demand on road space by the movement of goods and saw a greater need for freight consolidation and distribution bases in London. This was viewed as particularly important for SMEs who lack the logistics of big companies, and for whom it would be uneconomical to have depots elsewhere. Controlling and staggering freight delivery at different times was suggested as ways of taking pressure off roads at peak times. Reducing HGVs at commuting times would, it was felt, also reduce the road danger to which people who cycle are exposed. [53]

Proposals for more river crossings in the east were welcomed by Stakeholders in general. The absence of river crossings was recognised as a constraint for the communities of east London as well as for the development of well-connected centres beyond the central core. [54] [47] [48]

Access and affordability were highlighted as key priorities to make transport more inclusive. [55] Boroughs stressed the role of transport in supporting people with disabilities to remain independent. They welcomed the proposals to improve the transport system and hoped this would enable people with disabilities to access services previously off limits due to the multiple barriers experienced when trying to navigate London. [47] Stakeholders also saw an opportunity to improve the attitude of other travellers to wheelchair users on buses and to deter the misuse of space for wheelchairs. [55]

The affordability of transport is a key issue for Londoners, with 62% expressing dissatisfaction with costs in the Annual London Survey [40]. Third sector stakeholders noted that, although children and older people enjoyed free travel, there were no concessions for people on low incomes. They highlighted that people living in outer London and working in inner London in low-paid service jobs are particularly vulnerable to high transport costs as they have longer, more expensive commutes. [52] The Freedom Pass was viewed as essential to enabling older people to access shops and services, and to socialise. [55] Older people themselves were also extremely positive about the scope it gave them to take part in cultural activities and access health services. [56]

Improving transport connections in the most deprived areas was viewed as essential in helping people to access the job market. Stakeholders felt links to rail and the underground could be improved, and that there should be regular borough-led reviews of bus routes to ensure they are meeting local needs. [55]

Although Londoners in general are relatively positive about transport services, in terms of frequency and safety, the Annual London Survey revealed greater levels of dissatisfaction with transport service issues amongst those living in outer London compared to those in inner London (38% vs. 29%), suggesting the need for improved services in outer areas. [40]

Participants in qualitative research by the GLA talked very positively about transport in general – the coverage and speed of access it affords to culture, work and friends – but noted the pressure during commuting times and disruption through works as a significant issue. [56] Overcrowding, particularly on the underground, was a concern also raised by some boroughs.

Council's welcomed reference to tackling this in ACfaL and were keen to engage on any planned improvements to alleviate the pressure. [47]

Shaping Places with Transport: Summary of challenge

To support London's growth and make the best use of space and connections, the Mayor wants to concentrate housing development at higher densities around transport hubs. Large investments in the transport infrastructure, such as Crossrail 2 and the Bakerloo line and Crossrail extensions, for example, have the potential to catalyse the development of thousands of new homes.

Transport plays a key role in shaping the places of London and enabling people to have a sense of identity, ownership, and community. Transport should support Londoners' relationships with the places they live, work and play, and contribute positively to their quality of life. Planning development around active lives, where people can walk or cycle to local amenities and use public transport for longer journeys, will be vital in achieving this.

Shaping Places with Transport: Stakeholder insights

The consultation explored transport's role in regenerating London and delivering housing. Improvements in transport infrastructure, such as better north-south links and better connections between areas in outer London, were thought by boroughs to have the potential to stimulate much greater levels of regeneration and housing development than currently proposed in Council programmes by creating more land for development. [47]

Public sector stakeholders highlighted the challenge of delivering housing when there is uncertainty about infrastructure. The current funding model for many developments relies on land value to raise funds for infrastructure, and that when infrastructure is delivered this generates money for housing. Boroughs expressed that they have available land and developers, but not the transport. They felt development of new and existing transport networks in their areas would, therefore, help to 'unlock' the delivery of housing. [57]

Public and private sector stakeholders spoke of the need to regenerate outer London areas with improved orbital connections and the development of light rail to enable people to live and commute across and around London. It was felt this would support a multi-centric model of growth – and encourage more places like Stratford and Old Oak – by providing places to live and work outside of central London. [57] Replicating the success of these areas and attracting big businesses to new regeneration areas, it was felt, would require local investment and

development of major transport connections to achieve the public realm quality seen in central London. [57]

Improving connections to transport hubs and making sure infrastructure is integrated with walking and cycling provision was felt to be an important feature of regenerating areas by public and private sector stakeholders. They advocated providing commuters with transport solutions for the whole journey, like cycle hubs and good walking environments around stations to ensure sustainable trips. [57] Some stakeholders noted an opportunity to utilise technology and information to help people navigate busy streets on foot and by bike, and suggested that better WiFi connections and apps such as Citymapper could support this. [58]

It was felt there is strong appetite for car-free developments in some parts of London as people choose to cycle and use public transport. Inner London boroughs reported that applying a car-free requirement to developments has helped to facilitate housing growth as this has allayed concerns from existing residents about additional pressure on parking from new housing. It was felt vital that the London Plan continues to support this approach. [47]

The elements of what makes good places in a city were discussed by stakeholders, and the role that transport plays in this. Public and third sector stakeholders suggested a definition of place as 'connectivity, character and capacity'. Place was perceived as also relating to identity and distinctiveness - places that people identify with and want to be in - as well as places where people want to get to, to live, work and study:

"Each place has its own story, and transport is key to celebrating that sense of place and making it desirable." [58]

Broadly, the quality of London's spaces was thought to have improved in recent decades, with greater realisation of the value of spaces – both commercially and environmentally. It was suggested that if London is to remain a city for people, greater consideration needs to be given to creating 'place' in plans that focus on improving connectivity in London. [58]

There was also strong feeling amongst public and third sector stakeholders that places function better without traffic, and that more needs to be done to reduce it. [58] This was echoed in public opinion, with nearly three quarters of Londoners (74%) expressing dissatisfaction with road traffic congestion in the Annual London Survey. [40] Pedestrianising more roads and shifting vehicles into other routes was favoured by public and third sector stakeholders. They

also advocated extending the congestion zone to the rest of London and making the charging system easier and more sophisticated with technology. [57]

Place making around stations and interchanges was raised as needing greater consideration in view of the interchanges that will be needed for Crossrail and HS2. King's Cross was highlighted as an example of good place making at a large transport interchange by private and public sector stakeholders. [58]

The need to create a healthier and better city through improvements to residential streets was a key issue. Public and third sector stakeholders highlighted the need to think about the role of our streets in driving health and wellbeing outcomes, and in particular for children. Stakeholders saw a need to redress the dominance of motor vehicles in local streets and to 'liberate' young people to be a part of the streets again. 'Healthy Streets' was viewed as a good way to achieve this. [58]

Air Quality, Active Travel and Public Health: Summary of challenge

Transport is one of the most effective ways to improve the environment and people's health and quality of life. As touched upon in the Environment section, the Mayor wants to create 'Healthy Streets' by reducing traffic, pollution and noise, and by creating more attractive, accessible and people-friendly streets. As part of this approach, a cycling grid will be completed in central London to enable cycling trips around Zone 1, and more Cycle Superhighways will be built.

Plans to transform Oxford Street for pedestrians are also being progressed, as are plans for a new pedestrian and cycle bridge to link Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf. Reducing road danger is a key priority and measures to reduce the speed and dominance of vehicles on London's streets will also be introduced.

Air Quality, Active Transport and Public Health: Stakeholder insights

Air quality was the top environmental priority for Londoners identified by the Annual London Survey 2015. [40] It was most commonly referenced by community groups as a problem that takes away from the health of streets, particularly in central London, and nearly all community groups perceived vehicle pollution to be the main contributor. [37]

In the Environment section, the implications of vehicle emissions for air quality and respiratory health were highlighted. Boroughs, other public sectors, and third sector stakeholders highlighted the need for a 'radical culture shift' in car use, particularly in outer London. [59] They spoke of the need to improve transport provision and make alternative modes more attractive, such as more cycle networks in outer boroughs and reallocating places for walking, in

order to reduce peoples' need to use the car. [50] Improving routes to school with better links, and vehicle speed reduction in local areas, were also mentioned as ways to encourage people not to use care, especially for the school run. [60]

People who cycle who participated in GLA research spoke of the improvements they have seen in cycling in London. They mentioned better street infrastructure, safety in growing numbers and employers making provision for them at work. However, there are still issues, such as poor joined up infrastructure across boroughs. The cycling grid would, therefore, be a welcomed provision. [56]

Boroughs also welcomed the Mayor's proposals for continued investment in cycling infrastructure, and felt this would help to reduce road congestion and overcrowding on public transport. They highlighted the need to overcome falsely negative perceptions about the impact of cycling infrastructure on traffic congestion. [47]

Improving public perception about the benefits for everyone and 'not just cyclists' was considered key to encouraging modal shift and behaviour change. More could be done, it was suggested, to publicise the evidence base on the benefits of 'active travel' for health, and for boroughs to do so collectively. [59]

Community and business engagement was also viewed as important to improving local perceptions about reducing car-use and embracing other modes. The mini-Holland scheme in Waltham Forest was noted as an example of how perceptions had been changed positively through engagement to introduce 'car-free' streets. It was anticipated by public and third sector stakeholders that the introduction of larger-scale initiatives, such as the ULEZ and its expansion to outer areas, would also help to create a change of mindset about vehicle use in communities. [59]

It was suggested that cycling needs to feel safe and convenient for more people to embrace this mode. [59] Continued investment in segregated cycling, quietways and cycle parking, and increasing associated facilities such as showers, lockers and bike maintenance provision – was viewed as a priority by Boroughs. Investment that promotes walking, such as wayfinding information, was also felt to be important. [61]

Technological innovation and information were viewed as providing opportunities to rebalance the use of streets and achieve smarter travel. It was felt these innovations could assist the flow

of people and traffic at different times, use kerb space better, and encourage different types of vehicle use linked to a charging system. [62]

The Mayor's vision for 'healthy streets' was welcomed by boroughs and third sector stakeholders, particularly the cycling and walking ambitions and initiatives to improve air quality and road safety. [38] [36] Talk London respondents felt cyclists' welfare would be improved through provision of more cycle lanes. They also suggested that streets would be enhanced with more trees, pocket parks and places to sit. [37] Street cleanliness should be improved also - this was identified as significant to maintaining London's environment (after air quality) for people in the Annual London Survey. [40]

Public and third sector stakeholders felt the healthy streets approach provided an opportunity to have a dedicated budget stream for improvements that would encourage more active transport. They saw TfL as having a leadership role in supporting the healthy streets approach through all aspects of its activity regarding cycling, walking, public transport, and the management of public space. [59] Moving forward, third sector stakeholders are keen to see TfL, boroughs and delivery partners consulted in design decisions for inclusive walking and cycling infrastructure. They also highlighted the importance of community engagement in developing plans to create healthier streets. [36]

Part 6: Inclusive City

Social Integration and Social Mobility: Summary of challenge

The Mayor wants to build strong communities where Londoners of different backgrounds lead interconnected lives and are able to actively participate in the life of the city and the decisions that affect them. Ensuring social integration and social mobility will be central to this, as will be tackling the economic and social injustice that drives inequality and unfairness for so many Londoners.

The Mayor is determined to tackle the discrimination and disadvantage that prevents many Londoners from reaching their full potential. This means addressing the gender pay gap and low wages that affect women in London, and activities to tackle child poverty.

A new Diversity and Inclusion Vision for the Mayor will be published for consultation that will include priority areas for action. The vision will focus on, but not be limited to, those people protected by the Equality Act 2010^[1]. It will describe how the Mayor and the GLA group will promote equality, tackle discrimination and encourage good relations between communities. In launching the Vision for consultation, the GLA will seek to co-create a final strategy with consultees, which will outline GLA objectives, approach and measures of success.

Social Integration and Social Mobility: Stakeholder insights

Londoners participating in GLA research showed pride and curiosity in the diverse cultures of their local areas. Their experiences revealed a community of Londoners, engaging in rich interactions with neighbours, support networks, volunteering activities, and local decision-making. [63]

Most participants had good relationships with people in their local community. These relationships were borne out of opportunities for local encounter, such as local community clubs, shops or simply walking down the high street. [63] Community groups valued opportunities to engage with people who live near to them and viewed these as central to a well-functioning locality. [64] Similarly, public and third sector stakeholders spoke about social integration as ‘creating contact’ between different groups, and engaging people around a ‘common purpose’. [65]

The importance of ‘identity’ for integration was noted – it was viewed as providing something people can connect to and feel part of. Boroughs and third sector stakeholders highlighted the

^[1] The law protects the 9 characteristics of age, disability, gender, gender identity, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, sexual orientation

importance of having ‘a shared identity that allows for multiple identities’. [65] Sharing in the collective London identity was viewed by people as an important way to establish a relationship to the city that transcends background and origin, but also celebrates these. [66]

Boroughs and third sector stakeholders noted that digital exclusion was becoming an increasing problem for connecting to communities and neighbourhoods. Older people were perceived to be particularly affected by this. They saw a role for the GLA and the new Chief Digital Officer to push for greater digital inclusion in London. Language was also highlighted as a determinant of good integration, and that supporting new Londoners to learn English would enable them to participate more fully in London and community life. [65]

Development and regeneration play a crucial role in integration. Londoners were generally welcoming of change and saw it as an integral part of living in a dynamic city like London. [66] It was noted, however, that the pace of change in some areas may lead some groups, particularly lower income groups, to feel excluded. [65]

GLA research with Londoners [63] revealed that housing costs could be undermining community cohesion, forcing those who live centrally and want to buy property into cheaper, outer London areas. Some felt that increasing transience amongst renters undermines local trust, safety and relationships. The Mayor’s commitment to addressing the tenure imbalance and delivering more affordable rented housing was, therefore, seen as a much needed intervention. [65]

Stakeholders noted, however, that mixed housing does not automatically mean integration. Tensions around the number of new homes that are sold overseas and then left empty were highlighted by third sector stakeholders who felt this hindered integration. [65]

It was felt by public and third sector stakeholders that giving more people access to secure and affordable housing would also help to promote social mobility for London’s most disadvantaged groups. It was anticipated by public and third sector stakeholders that the proposed registration of private landlords will help to address poor living conditions. [67] It was also suggested that Strategic Housing Market Assessments could include a requirement to identify the needs of different groups living in the private rented sector to inform housing strategy. [67]

Employment was perceived to be a key enabler for social contact and good community relations, according to third sector stakeholders and boroughs. They spoke of the importance of employment as a facilitator of integration, and how work should be appropriate and fulfilling. It was felt the Mayor could work to address stigma or preconceptions that are barriers to inclusive employment, particularly for people with disabilities. [65]

It was felt that employment – whether paid or voluntary – offers a real solution for people to integrate, as people from different social groups can meet and work together. This was thought to be particularly important for refugees as employment is usually their main method of integrating. [65] It was seen as a priority by third sector stakeholders and boroughs that jobs are created by new development and that affordable housing nearby enables local communities to stay in the area and access those local jobs. [65]

GLA research with community groups revealed the competitiveness of the job market and the particular barriers faced by some groups. Racism in the job market was referenced by BAME groups and younger people, many of whom talked about using ‘white names’ on application forms to increase the likelihood of getting a job interview. Migrant groups felt that the employment system was skewed against them – preventing them from taking a job until granted full asylum, and through the dearth of available skills and language training. Similarly, BAME groups felt the job market did not make an upwards career trajectory easily achievable. [68] The proposal for a new Equality Framework – which will incorporate key indicators regarding fairness and the reduction of economic inequality – was welcomed by public sector stakeholders. [69]

For many who are in employment but on low wages, this can mean in-work poverty. Third sector stakeholders identified women in part-time employment as representing the biggest group of low paid workers in the capital, many of whom are mothers who struggle to find well paid, flexible work opportunities that fit around their families, and whom encounter a lack of affordable childcare. [70] Low-wages and economic inequality were viewed as a particular blight on families and a determinant of child poverty. [70] The London living wage was viewed by both public and third sector stakeholders as a positive step to addressing this by securing a fairer wage. [67] There was general agreement across community groups that the London Living Wage should be a required rate of pay rather than optional. [68]

Community Engagement and Volunteering: Summary of challenge

As part of the objective of ‘good growth’, proactively building strong communities in London – where Londoners of every background feel connected with each other – is a priority focus for the Mayor. This will require developing new ways of helping new Londoners to feel part of London and enabling them to play active roles as citizens and neighbours.

The Mayor is committed to community engagement and to understanding how, strategically, City Hall and the GLA group can support the activity that happens at a more local level in civil society. The Mayor will support opportunities to bring people together in communities that encourage civic participation and ‘active citizenship’. Local sports activities will be supported

through the community and grassroots sport investment programme, and using crowd-funding and opportunities for Londoners of all ages to volunteer in projects to improve the city, and to play an active part in the democratic governance of the city, will be explored.

Community Engagement and Volunteering: Stakeholder insights

Londoners who participated in GLA research valued highly their local relationships and networks, and were keen to be active in their local community. Participants had been school governors, church volunteers, and youth group leaders. Several people talked about their engagement in local issues and local decision-making. Having a diversity of activities that different groups will engage in, it was felt, can help to bring people together even when other parts of their lives diverge. [63]

This finding was echoed by third sector stakeholders, who felt it was important to create opportunities to bring people together, but also give them a reason to get involved by making it relevant to their lives and something they can identify with. [65]

Boroughs spoke of their desire to have better dialogue with new people – refugees and other groups - whom are settling in their boroughs. But they noted how the same demographic groups tend to engage rather than new groups: *“In terms of what we’re asking communities to invest, in terms of time, because we’re not time rich, it’s left to the people who are privileged.”* [71]

Active citizenship was viewed positively as a way to encourage greater engagement of ‘disenfranchised’ groups. Indeed, third sector stakeholders spoke of their own activities in the community in this way:

“I agree with active citizenship. We do a lot of work with young people and volunteering. We see that as a way of creating contact between different groups.” [65]

Community groups felt that volunteering was an important part of building a successful community and would value more opportunities to volunteer formally. For migrants and refugees, volunteering was particularly important as it gave them a purpose when they are not allowed to work, and helped them to meet and integrate with new people. [64] In addition to engagement initiatives, Stakeholders saw a lead role for the Mayor in developing a stronger narrative to contrast negative media coverage of different groups in London. [71]

Young people, in particular, would like more opportunities to participate in political and civic life, as they felt that political activity was often done to or for them, rather than with them.

They expressed a desire to volunteer but cited time as a constraint due to working, looking for a career, and other aspects of their lives. [64] Supporting activities that engage young people, particularly young people from BAME groups, was viewed as important by public and third sector stakeholder. They mentioned peer leadership programmes and paid volunteering schemes that encourage social enterprise and philanthropy. They proposed the GLA could help to raise the profile of these schemes and value their contribution through an awards ceremony, which may also help to attract commercial funding or sponsorship for schemes. [71]

The extensive activities undertaken by small charities and community groups in a variety of areas such as health and well-being, and planning and regeneration, were noted by public and third sector stakeholders. It was felt, however, that they sometimes lack influence and effectiveness, or suffer from a lack of togetherness. Stakeholders identified an opportunity to strengthen them through better organisation and skills, enabling them to 'speak the language' and 'have the tools' to deal with complicated situations. [71]

Third sector stakeholders spoke of the need to increase community engagement in governance by creating structures where London's communities and citizens can have a real voice and agency in decision making. They suggested that policy levers such as Lifetime Neighbourhoods, Neighbourhood Planning and the Localism Act could be used to empowered communities. [70]

Public and third sector stakeholders noted the power of the GLA to convene different partners, different communities and provide spaces and context to promote conversations where elsewhere they do not happen. It was suggested, for example, the GLA could provide a common platform for the voices of business owners from BAME groups to be heard. It could also 'create a neutral space' to bring together leadership and activity around different sectors to identify what can be done collectively to address issues of local importance. [71]

Social Infrastructure: Summary of challenge

To support good growth, it is important for London to plan for its social infrastructure as well as its physical infrastructure. That means taking a strategic overview of the childcare facilities, community spaces, healthcare facilities and services to support the ageing population that the city needs now and will need in the future – alongside and within housing development. The Mayor wants to ensure there are enough school places in London to meet future demand, and improve community-based healthcare facilities to support the health needs of Londoners and an ageing population.

London's 'cultural infrastructure' needs to be considered alongside this. Culture enriches people's lives, promotes health and brings different communities together. The Mayor wants to ensure that everyone can participate in the city's cultural offer, and that London continues to celebrate its many communities. To support this, the Mayor will ensure that access to London's major cultural festivals remains free, and through new features such as the London Borough of Culture and the Love London campaign.

Social Infrastructure: Stakeholder insights

The consultation sought views on the key priorities for London's social infrastructure – including healthcare, sports, and play facilities. Public and third sector stakeholders felt that a greater focus on children's infrastructure is needed in planning. They expressed concern that play and community spaces do not have the protection afforded to parks and open spaces. They felt strongly that physical infrastructure should include recreation and children's spaces – places that otherwise are seen as informal and get swept away by developers. [72]

Stakeholders spoke of the creative use of space, for example, parkland being used to generate revenue, and allowing communities to manage the vast areas of 'No Ball Games' spaces in London to support other uses like gardening and food growing. Linked to this, it was suggested that schools have valuable land and they could be encouraged to open their grounds outside of hours. [72]

Boroughs and councils felt that the proposed sites for new free schools in strategic locations with high population growth – such as listed buildings and metropolitan open land – are often inappropriate. Concern was also expressed by some Councils that the development of free schools is not underpinned by a growth in housing in those areas. They stressed the importance of Council involvement in deciding free school development so it is considered as part of wider strategic plans about what is needed in an area, now and in the future. Boroughs and councils would like to see robust policy from the GLA on what is appropriate for schools, and to enforce proper social infrastructure in areas for schools. [72]

Public and third sector stakeholders noted obstacles in the development of health facilities – specifically that funding and organisation of these has become fractured – causing delays to projects and developers to back out of projects. Public and third sector stakeholders saw a role for the GLA to discourage this and to provide an alternative vision for health provision locally. They suggested exploring options such as high street drop-in centres, and clustering health services with other social infrastructure – transport, schools and other facilities – to improve access. [72]

Public and Private Stakeholders suggested the provision of sports and leisure facilities should consider the needs of the community and how these facilities complement informal provision such as playgrounds: *“You end up with a swimming pool where three already-healthy people are doing laps, watched by six staff. Down the road, a playground serving thousands of disadvantaged kids is in danger of being shut down.”* It was suggested that formal and informal sports and leisure provision could ‘hybridise’ to help each other, and that opportunities for community-ran facilities could be explored further. [72]

Community groups expressed concern about the decline of social infrastructure such as community centres, youth centres and public halls, and felt this had impacted negatively on inclusivity and engagement in the community. [64] Libraries and other cultural facilities, such as music venues and night clubs, were also seen as under threat. [64]

As London experiences rapid growth, boroughs and third sector stakeholders expressed the importance of preserving the cultural identity and heritage of its places. *“We have to balance future of the city while retaining what we love.”* [73] The wealth, quality and diversity of cultural and arts enjoyed by public participants in the consultation showed this as an outstanding feature of life in London. [66] Indeed, 90% of Londoners stated their satisfaction with the city’s range of cultural attractions in the Annual London Survey 2015. [24]

Cultural venues were seen, by third sector stakeholders, as providing spaces for communities to share ideas. These spaces often act as sanctuaries for communities who have experienced stigmatisation and discrimination, such as LGBT+ members, allowing freer expression of individuality and the sharing of common experience. It was felt that many of London’s cultural and social venues, even commercially successful ones, have been sold for redevelopment. It was suggested that existing planning laws should be applied with specific consideration to the special status of spaces to specific communities. [70]

Libraries were seen as playing a vital role in London’s communities and town centres by offering access to literature and events for under-represented groups including the Black History Month programme and resources for LGBT communities. As one borough described succinctly: *“All in all, libraries are a crucial way of engaging people from all walks of life; providing them with a neutral space to explore culture, relax and learn”.* [69]

Boroughs and third sector stakeholders noted the impact of development on libraries and other cultural spaces, and how these have adapted to survive. They spoke of libraries sharing their space with artists, thereby creating revenue for services. They felt communities could be

encouraged to make better use of existing spaces by exploring collaborative approaches such as this and sharing of facilities. [73]

The need for communities to feel ownership of culture was highlighted. Boroughs and third sector stakeholders perceived a loss of active engagement with communities over last few years and suggested they could be empowered by setting up a fund to develop cultural spaces specifically in London. They welcomed the Mayor's commitment to engage with communities and felt the review of strategies was an opportunity to reinvigorate that approach. [73]

In developing a 'cultural infrastructure' plan, public and third sector stakeholders suggested the London Plan should consider the cultural identity of a community and the spaces within it. It was felt important to first understand where cultural spaces are needed in London. They noted that much of London's cultural offer is centralised, and that a better dispersal could help to regenerate communities more widely. The picture of cultural provision from borough to borough was viewed as patchy and Stakeholders advocated having a more joined-up approach to identify need and opportunity. They supported the creation of a London Neighbourhood Plan to facilitate this: *"London is fragmented, at a borough level. We need to see each other as one larger community. Policy and processes encourage this"*. [73]

Designing Inclusive Places and Spaces: Summary of challenge

The built environment is an important determinant of people's health and quality of life, and of how well a society integrates. Effective planning and good design can help to bring people of different ages, ethnicities and socio-economic backgrounds together, and it can support a wide range of civic activities. Planning for social infrastructure, therefore, should be based on the individual needs and priorities of communities and neighbourhoods across the city.

The Mayor wants to include an Inclusive Neighbourhoods principle in the London Plan which will ensure that places are accessible to all, both young and old and from all backgrounds - something crucial for social integration. This will seek to improve the city for all Londoners, and will be complemented by the environmental and transport measures outlined in earlier sections.

Designing Inclusive Places and Spaces: Stakeholder insights

The physical context of the city – its spaces, buildings and infrastructure – can facilitate or inhibit community activity and a sense of place. Londoners spoke both positively and negatively about the growth of development in their areas. They shared positive experiences of new or upgraded public spaces, particularly natural rather than hard-surfaced space, which they were able to enjoy personally and felt direct beneficiaries of. Conversely, the prevailing perception of

new housing development was of something largely out of reach and exclusive. Perceptions were linked to issues of cost, accessibility and ownership, rather than the physical aspects or quality of development. In terms of design, Londoners were positive about much of the change they have seen, with new buildings often perceived as better than what was there before. However, they emphasised the need to build on the existing historic character of local places. [66]

The consultation explored views on inclusive design policy. The London plan requires a high standard of inclusive design and this is supported by the Supplementary Planning Guidance which outlines how that can be achieved. In terms of the development of accessible homes, private and third sector stakeholders highlighted a lack of consistency in the implementation of these policies across London. They attributed this to a lack of conceptual understanding of access requirements at the borough level caused by a decline in recent years in engagement with disabled people in the planning process. It was suggested the GLA could initiate a reversal of this trend and encourage more engagement with disabled peoples' organisations at both the local and London level. [74]

Private sector stakeholders talked about the pressures on designers and architects to juggle priorities and adhere to guidelines, and the efforts they currently make to consider access when designing new homes. However, they also acknowledged a need for change in the design and construction industry, in terms of improving levels of understanding around disabled peoples' needs and ensuring their views are sought early-on in the design process. They suggested the industry could make improvements by auditing the effectiveness of design changes for access, and by making spatial requirements a more prominent feature of architects' training. [74]

As well as accessible design for disabled people, inclusive design is about access for all Londoners, including parents with buggies, children and older people. Stakeholders highlighted barriers to access and inclusion such as high street cafes having tables and chairs on the street, making it harder to get around. They also spoke of the need for designated seating in street life. A common theme running through these issues was the need for meaningful early engagement with users and communities in planning. The need for more diverse representation in neighbourhood planning and on planning committees was also mentioned, to ensure the view of all community groups are considered on matters such as cycle paths, floating bus stops and wider kerbs. Third sector stakeholders suggested that neighbourhood forums would benefit from more support from the GLA to strengthen their voice in decision making. [74]

The use of shared spaces was a key topic: *“Generally in London, for disabled people the biggest issue is shared space... They are not cohesive, with different rules for different schemes.”*

Another participant highlighted this is an issue for other groups too: *“Cyclists and motor vehicles don’t mix, and that is accepted, but there is an apparent aversion to this concept for cyclists and pedestrians, younger people and the elderly – each need to have a safe space.”* [62]

Public and third sector stakeholders spoke about the safety and inclusiveness of streets and highlighted the need for consistency across boroughs so that people, particularly those with visual impairment or mental health problems, know what to expect as they move around London. It was suggested the GLA could lead on creating a uniformity across the shared spaces of London – by considering the needs of different groups and striving to “create multi-use spaces or a network of spaces that can be connected”. [62]

Young people were identified by public and third sector stakeholders as sometimes feeling ‘designed out’ of public spaces because of others’ anxieties about their antisocial behaviour. The trend for local authorities to remove benches from public areas to discourage them was mentioned in regard to this. Stakeholders stressed the need to create inclusive spaces for people of all ages to socialise, play or sit. Consideration of how space is shared by different users is important within this: *“My son [who is visually impaired] wants to know he won’t be hit by a football... Suppose one area is quieter for people to chat in, and another area is for activities?”* [62] Better engagement with users of spaces was viewed as a priority, as was achieving a balance between safety and enjoyment for all groups.

Stakeholders talked about the need for ‘community ownership’ and felt citizen involvement should be encouraged in making spaces more inclusive. Examples of where communities have worked with charities and Councils to improve an open space were mentioned and viewed as adding value to an area and an opportunity for volunteering. Crowdfunding was supported as a way to fund initiatives. [62]

Talk London respondents mentioned the need for more toilets in public spaces, as well as places to sit and rest. Linked to ‘healthy streets’, it was felt these provisions would make walking more accessible for more people. Public and third sector stakeholders also noted how the absence of toilets impacts on the use of public spaces and highlighted that free to use, good quality, accessible and well located toilets should be considered a part of infrastructure. [62]

It was recognised that there is a small but increasing number of spaces privately owned and managed, particularly in areas of new development areas. Stakeholders felt it was important to ensure those spaces are managed well and viewed as community assets for the public good. Concern was expressed, however, that privatisation of spaces and parks could lead to a 'corporate aesthetic' and diminish the character and diversity of places. Stakeholders also stressed the importance of ensuring these public spaces remain welcoming to all, especially young people. [75]

Bibliography

- [1] GLA Intelligence, "The Changing Lives of London - A Qualitative Research Report," February 2017.
- [2] GLA Intelligence, "ACfaL Findings of the Public Consultation, community focus group meetings," January 2017.
- [3] GLA Intelligence, "Annual London Survey 2015 report," February 2016.
- [4] GLA Intelligence, "What is Good Growth? Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [5] Consultation, "Third Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [6] GLA Intelligence, "Spatial Approach to Good Growth, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [7] GLA Intelligence, "Development Corridors in London and the South East, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [8] GLA Intelligence, "Intensifying some suburban areas, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [9] Consultation, "Public Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [10] GLA Intelligence, "More intelligent use of industrial land, Accommodating Growth workshop notes," November 2016.
- [11] Consultation, "Private Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [12] GLA Intelligence, "High Streets for All: Qualitative Scoping Study," February 2017.
- [13] GLA Intelligence, "Town Centres and High Streets, Accommodating Growth workshops notes," November 2016.
- [14] GLA Intelligence, "Affordable Housing Tenures, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.

- [15] GLA Intelligence, "Affordable housing delivery and viability, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [16] GLA Intelligence, "Increasing and Accelerating Housing Delivery, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [17] GLA Intelligence, "Meeting the range of housing needs, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [18] GLA Intelligence, "Mixed and balanced communities, workshop notes," November 2016.
- [19] GLA Intelligence, "Residential design quality standards, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [20] Consultation, "Public Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [21] GLA Intelligence, "Global Competitiveness, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [22] GLA Intelligence, "Infrastructure, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [23] GLA Intelligence, "Infrastructure stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [24] GLA Intelligence, "Annual London Survey 2015," February 2016.
- [25] GLA Intelligence, "Affordable Workspace Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [26] Consultation, "Private Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [27] GLA Intelligence, "Support for SMEs, Start-ups and Growth Economy, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [28] GLA Intelligence, "Education and Skills stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [29] Consultation, "Unknown Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [30] Consultation, "Third Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [31] GLA Intelligence, "Opportunities for all, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.

- [32] GLA Intelligence, “Cultural and Creative Workspace, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2016.
- [33] GLA Intelligence, “Night-time economy, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2017.
- [34] GLA Intelligence, “Zero Carbon and Keeping within 1.5 degrees, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2016.
- [35] Consultation, “Unknown Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL”.
- [36] Consultation, “Third Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL”.
- [37] GLA Intelligence, “ACfaL Findings of the Public Consultation, community focus group meetings,” January 2017.
- [38] Consultation, “Public Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL”.
- [39] GLA Intelligence, “Transition to the Low Carbon Economy, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2016.
- [40] GLA Intelligence, “Annual London Survey 2015,” February 2016.
- [41] GLA Intelligence, “Air Quality beyond 2020, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2016.
- [42] Consultation, “Private Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL”.
- [43] GLA Intelligence, “Natural Capital, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2016.
- [44] Consultation, “Community Group written response to ACfaL”.
- [45] GLA Intelligence, “Resilience London, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2016.
- [46] GLA Intelligence, “Waste, recycling and the circular economy, Stakeholder workshop notes,” November 2016.
- [47] Consultation, “Public Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL”.
- [48] Consultation, “Private Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL”.

- [49] GLA Intelligence, "Transport and Economy, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2017.
- [50] GLA Intelligence, "Outer Transport, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [51] GLA Intelligence, "Development Corridors in London and the South East, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [52] Consultation, "Third Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [53] GLA Intelligence, "Central Transport, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [54] GLA Intelligence, "Inner Transport, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [55] GLA Intelligence, "Transport and Inclusion, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [56] GLA Intelligence, "The Changing Lives of London - A Qualitative Research Report," February 2017.
- [57] GLA Intelligence, "Transport: Regeneration and Housing, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [58] GLA Intelligence, "Transport and Place, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [59] GLA Intelligence, "Transport and Health, stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [60] GLA Intelligence, "Transport and Environment, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [61] Consultation, "Public Sector Stakeholder, written response to ACfaL".
- [62] GLA Intelligence, "Designating inclusive public spaces, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [63] GLA Intelligence, "The Changing Lives of London - A Qualitative Research Report," February 2017.

- [64] GLA Intelligence, "ACfaL Findings of the Public Consultation, community focus group meetings," January 2017.
- [65] GLA Intelligence, "Social Integration and Inclusion, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [66] GLA Intelligence, "The Changing Lives of London - A Qualitative Research Report," February 2017.
- [67] GLA Intelligence, "Social Mobility, Equality and Fairness, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [68] GLA Intelligence, "ACfaL Findings of the Public Consultation, community focus group meetings," January 2017.
- [69] Consultation, "Public Sector Stakeholder written response to AcfaL".
- [70] Consultation, "Third Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".
- [71] GLA Intelligence, "Community, Active Citizenship and Participation," November 2016.
- [72] GLA Intelligence, "Social Infrastructure Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [73] GLA Intelligence, "Culture, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [74] GLA Intelligence, "Inclusive Design, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [75] GLA Intelligence, "Activating, Managing and Maintaining Public Spaces, Stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [76] GLA Intelligence, "Talk London online discussion," January 2017.
- [77] GLA Intelligence, "Accommodating Good Growth workshop notes," November 2016.
- [78] GLA Intelligence, "The Changing Lives of London - A Qualitative Research Report," February 2017.
- [79] GLA Intelligence, "Development Corridors in London and the South East, Accommodating Growth workshop notes," November 2016.

- [80] GLA Intelligence, "Intensifying some suburban areas, Accommodating Growth workshop notes," November 2016.
- [81] GLA Intelligence, "Opportunity Areas, Intensification Areas and other growth area designations, Accommodating Growth workshop notes," November 2016.
- [82] GLA Intelligence, "Spatial Approach to Good Growth, Accommodating Growth workshop notes," November 2016.
- [83] GLA Intelligence, "What is Good Growth? Accommodating Growth workshop notes," November 2016.
- [84] GLA Intelligence, "Affordable housing delivery and viability, workshop findings," November 2016.
- [85] GLA Intelligence, "Affordable housing tenures, workshop notes," November 2016.
- [86] GLA Intelligence, "Meeting the range of housing needs, workshop notes," November 2016.
- [87] GLA Intelligence, "Residential design quality standards, workshop notes," November 2016.
- [88] GLA Intelligence, "Build to rent, workshop notes," November 2016.
- [89] GLA Intelligence, "Residential design quality standards, workshop notes," November 2016.
- [90] GLA Intelligence, "Transport and Environment workshop notes," November 2016.
- [91] GLA Intelligence, "Transport and Health - stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.
- [92] GLA Intelligence, "Transport - Central - workshop notes," November 2016.
- [93] GLA Intelligence, "Talk London online discussion," January 2017.
- [94] GLA Intelligence, "Intensifying some suburban areas, stakeholder workshop notes," November 2016.

[95] GLA Intelligence, "Spatial approach to good growth, workshop notes," November 2016.

[96] Consultation, "Unknown Sector Stakeholder written response to ACfaL".

[97] GLA Intelligence, "Annual London Survey 2015," February 2016.

[98] Consultation, "Unknown Stakeholder written response".

[99] GLA Intelligence, "Increasing and Accelerating Housing Delivery, workshop notes,"
November 2016.

Annex: Statutory strategies and GLA duties

The GLA is a strategic body, which means it sets the direction for other authorities and organisations in London. It has some direct delivery powers – for example through TfL and in the use of the affordable housing grant. In some cases, local authorities are legally obliged to adhere to the GLA’s policies, most significantly the London Plan. But much of the GLA’s work relies on partnership working and influencing others to work towards my vision.

At City Hall, I have a statutory duty to keep under review seven strategies and a policing and crime plan. These are detailed descriptions of different elements of my vision for the city. Different strategies have different levers to implementation, as set out below.

London Plan

The London Plan is the strategic spatial plan for the city. It is a legal duty for the local plans of local authorities in London to conform to it. Planning law requires that planning applications must be decided in accordance with the development plan, of which the London Plan forms part, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Transport

The transport strategy is directly linked to TfL’s prioritisation of investment and services. The London boroughs have a statutory duty to prepare Local Implementation Plans (LIPs), setting out how they will help deliver the strategy. It also seeks to influence other organisations with a role in transport in London.

Housing

The housing strategy sets out how the Mayor will use the affordable housing grant. The strategy also seeks to influence other organisations with a role in housing in London. All housing strategies and policies of local authorities are required to be in general conformity with the Mayor’s housing strategy.

Environment

The single integrated environment strategy (which has reduced from six strategies) has some powers of direction over local authorities, regarding waste management and air quality. It also seeks to influence other organisations with a role in improving London’s environment.

Economic development

The economic development strategy seeks to influence other organisations with a role in economic development in London.

Health inequalities

The health inequalities strategy seeks to influence other organisations with a role in the health of Londoners.

Culture

The culture strategy seeks to influence other organisations with a role in London’s culture.

Policing and crime plan

The policing and crime plan sets the budget for the MPS, sets out policing and crime priorities for London and holds the Commissioner to account on behalf of Londoners.

Drawing on feedback to *A City for all Londoners*' vision for the city, detailed policies and proposals relating to their individual subject areas will be prepared for each plan or strategy. The public and stakeholders will then be consulted on draft strategies/plans before they are finalised and I formally approve them. In the case of the London Plan an examination in public will be held. The policies and proposals set out in *A City for all Londoners* are therefore subject to public and stakeholder consultation, and the relevant statutory processes and procedures relevant to each particular plan/strategy. When preparing them, we have a general legal duty to consult specific stakeholder groups (Statutory consultees are as follows: the London Assembly (which also has a power to reject the statutory strategies with a two thirds majority); the four GLA functional bodies; the London boroughs; and other stakeholders that the Mayor considers appropriate or which the relevant legislation requires to be consulted, including groups representing business, voluntary groups benefitting London, groups representing racial, ethnic and national stakeholders and groups representing religious communities.) and to take into account their potential likely impacts on specific groups or areas of interest (usually achieved by conducting an Integrated Impact Assessment - IIA). (In addition to specific requirements relating to individual strategies and plans, the following matters need to be taken into account when preparing them: the Equalities Act, health, health inequalities, sustainable development, climate change and its consequences and community safety; and in some cases a Strategic Environmental Assessment, Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment and a Sustainability Assessment may be required.) Where relevant, City Hall's policies must address the cross-cutting themes of health improvement, reduction of health inequalities, contribution to sustainable development, and mitigation or adaptation to climate change, and (so far as possible) be consistent with national and EU policy, and one another.

In addition to these policy-specific strategies, I have a general power to promote economic development, social development and the improvement of the environment, which means I can use my influence to improve life for Londoners in every way I see fit (as long as it does not duplicate the work of other parts of government) – for example by promoting excellence in London's schools, improving public health and encouraging volunteering and civic participation.

As with all public sector bodies, City Hall is subject to the public-sector Equality Duty, which requires us to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities.

