

Consultation Response: London Emergency Housing Package

Submitted on behalf of residents and tenants in social housing, represented by the G15 Residents' Group

January 2026

The G15 Residents' Group (G15RG) represents residents across G15 housing associations. This consultation response is based on the views from this diverse group of residents and are representative of the 850,000 who the G15 landlord's house.

Lead G15RG member name: Pamela Newman

Response from: G15 Residents' Group

Contact email: enquiries@G15Residents.co.uk

Introduction

We welcome the Government's intention to unlock stalled developments and recognise the urgency of the housing crisis in London. However, emergency measures must not compromise long-term affordability, safety, infrastructure, or equality of access. Residents are already experiencing the consequences of inconsistent standards, opaque viability processes, and insufficient community facilities. Any reform designed to accelerate delivery must address these risks directly.

Part I – Impact of Time-Limited CIL Relief (Questions 1–16, 32–33)

Potential Positive Impact

Residents recognise the severity of the delivery slowdown. If CIL relief genuinely results in more affordable homes coming forward, this could:

- ease pressure on long waiting lists
- reduce reliance on temporary accommodation
- unlock sites that have been stalled for years

However, residents emphasise that affordable housing must be genuinely affordable to Londoners and include the family-sized homes that are most acutely needed.

Key Risks and Resident Concerns

1. Loss of Community Infrastructure

Reduced CIL will undermine funding for the community assets residents depend on—such as local centres, accessible public spaces, transport links, youth services, and health-supporting infrastructure.

Residents are particularly concerned that this:

- erodes long-term neighbourhood sustainability
- increases social isolation
- puts additional pressure on already stretched local services

Mitigation:

- Require local authorities to demonstrate how lost CIL will be replaced, not simply absorbed.
- Introduce a ringfenced fund for accessibility, inclusion, and community infrastructure.

2. Transparency and Accountability

Residents have repeatedly raised concerns about viability assessments being used to dilute commitments after planning approval. CIL relief heightens this risk.

We ask for:

- statutory declarations from developers
- independent viability checks
- clawback mechanisms if schemes achieve stronger-than-stated returns
- publication of all relief decisions and financial assumptions

Without transparency, confidence in the planning system will continue to decline.

3. Long-Term Affordability

Setting affordability expectations as low as 20% risks embedding lower standards into policy and developer behaviour.

Residents strongly advocate for:

- a higher minimum threshold
- stronger incentives for schemes delivering family-sized homes
- protections to ensure affordable homes remain affordable over the long term

Equality Considerations (Questions 32 & 33)

Residents with protected characteristics are most likely to be harmed by reduced infrastructure funding and accelerated planning processes.

Groups potentially disproportionately affected:

- **Disabled residents** (lost accessibility upgrades)
- **Older people** (reduced step-free routes, health-supporting facilities)
- **Families and minority groups** (fewer community and cultural spaces)

Mitigation Measures:

- Mandatory Equality Impact Assessments (EqIAs) for all schemes receiving relief
- Resident-led equality checks at both design and delivery stages
- Protection of funding for adaptations and inclusive design features

Part II – Proposed Changes to Mayoral Planning Powers (Questions 17–31)

Residents support measures that could speed up genuinely affordable housing delivery, but they strongly oppose any reform that sidelines local voices.

Potential Benefits

- Faster intervention on sites of 50+ homes
- Reduced costly delays
- Greater consistency where boroughs lack capacity

Resident Concerns

1. Risk of Losing Local Voice

Expanding Mayoral powers must not bypass or weaken borough-level engagement. Residents consistently say:

“Residents are experts by experience.”

Any planning process that sidelines local communities risks:

- poor-quality design
- loss of trust
- conflict that delays delivery rather than accelerates it

Mitigation:

- Require a minimum standard for resident consultation even on fast-tracked schemes.
- Publish how resident feedback has influenced decisions.

2. Green Belt and Open Land

Where exceptions are considered, development must:

- be high-quality and sustainable
- deliver tangible community benefits
- meet enhanced energy efficiency and biodiversity standards

Resident Oversight and Monitoring of CIL-Relief Schemes

Residents are concerned that, once planning consent is granted, commitments are quietly diluted or dropped. To address this:

We recommend that all schemes receiving CIL relief must:

- publish quarterly public progress reports
- confirm delivery of affordable housing, tenure mix, and community benefits
- involve residents in monitoring delivery and compliance
- report on any changes made through design or viability reviews

This ensures relief translates into real outcomes rather than reduced obligations.

Quality, Safety and Long-Term Management

Acceleration must not mean poorer-quality homes or higher future costs.

Residents insist on:

- compliance with **building safety, space standards, and energy efficiency** requirements
- no waivers or relaxations for emergency measures
- clear accountability for long-term management and service charges

Too many residents are still living in newly built homes with defects, high service charges, and weak oversight. This must not be repeated at scale.

Fairness, Transparency and Consistency Across Boroughs

Residents are deeply concerned about a “postcode lottery” in how policies are interpreted and applied.

We therefore call for:

- London-wide minimum standards for CIL relief decision-making
- consistent transparency requirements
- a clear pathway for residents to escalate concerns where decisions differ significantly

Without this, reforms risk deepening inequality between boroughs.

Summary of Resident Position

Residents support emergency measures only where they:

- unlock genuinely affordable homes—not just increase overall supply
- do not undermine long-term community infrastructure
- include clear safeguards, transparency, and clawback mechanisms
- embed resident voice and monitoring throughout the process
- maintain or enhance quality, safety, design, and energy standards
- support fairness and consistency across London

Residents must remain central to shaping the future of housing. Without resident involvement, reforms risk repeating past mistakes and undermining public confidence.

¹ [G15 | The G15 Residents Group responds to the London Assembly's Call for Evidence on Social Housing Allocations](#)