

Draft London Plan 2026: response from PLUSHSE16 and NoPriceOnCulture

Sent via email: londonplan@london.gov.uk

Just Space: office@justspace.org.uk | **Protect Our Places Coalition (POP):** melissa@latinelephant.org

Submitted via email on Wednesday 15th October 2026

Who we are

We are Carmen Gowie Clinkett and Michael Clinkett, founders of PLUSHSE16 and of the NoPriceOnCulture movement. We write as locally displaced community leaders with more than 25 years on the ground in Southwark, 22 of them from PLUSHSE16 at 19–25 Rotherhithe New Road, Surrey Quays, SE16.

PLUSHSE16 was five Black-owned businesses under one roof: a barbershop, a hair studio, a Caribbean takeaway, a youth music studio and a car wash. It opened in 2002. For two decades it was a meeting place, a safety net, a first job, a mentor and a place where Black and working-class Londoners from Southwark, Lewisham and beyond were seen and welcomed. We delivered social value every day, without funding, without a lease that protected us and without a seat at the table.

The developer first made contact about our site in 2018. That is when the seed was planted, and when the pressure and the stress began for our family, our staff and our customers. Six years later, on 16 January 2024, around twenty bailiffs removed us, after a 17-month fight for the relocation that Southwark planning policy said we were owed. We did not displace ourselves. Nearly three years later we are still without a home, and the site is being demolished.

NoPriceOnCulture grew out of that fight. It now supports other community spaces facing the same pattern: grassroots groups that deliver the council's outcomes but own nothing, and are removed when the land becomes valuable.

Who we stand with

- **Just Space** — PLUSH SE16 is a member of the Just Space network. We both sat on the Londoner's Economy topic group that wrote the [Alternative London Plan for a Caring City \(2026\)](#). We support the Just Space submission and its [topic sheets](#).
- **The London Assembly Planning and Regeneration Committee** — our community's evidence fed into its April 2025 report, [Social value in planning and regeneration: knowing the price of everything and the value of nothing](#).

- **PlushSE16 x HUBSE16 CIC** — our community interest company, which carries the work on while we are displaced.
- **Other displaced and threatened spaces** — including The Cotch youth space in Walthamstow, now facing eviction, which NoPriceOnCulture is supporting.

What we are asking for, in one line each

1. **GLE1 Part F** is not effective. Make relocation a condition that must be met *before* displacement, not a hope after it.
2. **There is no social value policy.** Add one, as the London Assembly recommended in 2025.
3. **Equality duties are missing.** Require an Equality Impact Assessment, under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010, wherever a development displaces businesses or spaces that serve people with protected characteristics.
4. **GLE5** must recognise everyday culture — barbershops, Caribbean food, youth music — as culture.
5. **PV1 Part B(5)** must require, not "seek", community voices. Log them and publish them as official evidence, answer them, and fund the work of reaching the people most affected, who rarely take part in plan-making.
6. **"Affordable" must be defined (GLE7 and PV3).** Affordable is no longer affordable. Tie it to what local people and businesses can actually pay, test viability with the community, and stop national chains' rents setting the benchmark for our high streets.

We ask to be invited to the Examination in Public. We say it here, and we say it again at the end.

How the process failed us

We had the strongest local protection in London on our side, and it still did not keep us open. Southwark's Local Plan policies P31 (Affordable workspace), P32 (Small shops) and P33 (Business relocation) read well. P33 says a business relocation strategy "must" be written with affected businesses and set out viable relocation options. In practice nobody enforced it before we were removed.

When	What happened	What it shows
2002	Michael Clinkett leases the units; PLUSHSE16 opens	22+ years of trading and community service begin
2018	Regent Land and Development first makes contact about the site	The seed is planted. Pressure, uncertainty and stress begin here, four years before any

		planning decision and six years before the eviction
2019	The developer's planning proposal for the site comes forward	We keep trading and serving the community with redevelopment hanging over every decision, every lease conversation and every plan for the future
Feb 2022	Southwark planning committee backs a 12-storey, 48-home tower by Regent Land and Development: 12 social rent, 1 intermediate (Southwark News)	13 of 48 homes (27%) affordable, below Southwark's 35% expectation. The "housing for the community" case was thin from the start
Aug 2022	First eviction; we reopen days later. Officers tell the developer P33 applies and full permission will not be granted without relocation (Southwark News)	The policy was recognised, but only after we were already out on the street
2022–23	The developer argues P33 did not apply because it post-dated the application	Transitional gaps let a "must" become a "maybe"
Mar 2023	Southwark refuses full planning permission while no relocation is agreed (PLUSHSE16)	The council's only lever was the planning decision. It could not stop the eviction
2023	Court proceedings for possession (Southwark News)	Landlord and tenant law moves faster than planning policy, and ignores it
16 Jan 2024	Final eviction by around twenty bailiffs after a 17-month fight for relocation (Southwark News)	The council said it was "under no jurisdiction" to act. No relocation was ever delivered

Apr 2025	London Assembly report calls for a social value policy in the next London Plan and protection for long-standing businesses	City Hall was told, in writing, what was needed
Oct 2025	Demolition of the site begins	The asset is cleared. The community is still displaced
Jul 2026	Draft London Plan published with no social value policy and a weaker relocation clause (GLE1 Part F) than Southwark's P33	The lesson has not been learned

Four failures repeat through every row, and we repeat them through this response:

1. **The pressure started years before any decision.** From the developer's first contact in 2018, our future was uncertain. No policy recognises the harm done to a business, and to the people who rely on it, during those years of waiting.
2. **Relocation came after displacement, not before it.** A strategy that is not secured before vacant possession is a promise, not a protection.
3. **No one with power had a duty to act.** The council could refuse planning permission. It could not stop a landlord, a court or a developer. The Mayor had no policy to call on.
4. **Our social value, and who we served, never counted.** No assessment measured what five Black-owned businesses gave this neighbourhood, or who lost out when they went.

P31, P32 and P33 sound right on paper and fail in practice. The draft London Plan copies the weakest version of them. The wording must be reassessed.

Statement 1: Policy GLE1 Part F — displacement of small and independent businesses

Policy GLE1 Part F is not effective and not justified. It is the only clause in the draft Plan that addresses the displacement of existing businesses, and it would not have saved PLUSHSE16.

What the policy says. Developments that displace small and independent businesses "should either re-provide such space... where feasible and appropriate... and/or work with the borough to ensure that appropriate relocation options are available."

Why it fails the tests.

- **Not effective.** "Should", "where feasible", "appropriate" and "and/or" give a developer four ways out. Nothing says *when* relocation must happen. In our case it never happened at all.
- **Not effective.** The clause bites only on a planning application. Displacement happens earlier, through lease expiry, possession proceedings and bailiffs. By the time a decision is made, the business is gone. That is exactly what happened to us between August 2022 and January 2024.
- **Not justified.** The policy is weaker than the local policy that already failed us. Southwark's P33 says a relocation strategy "must" be provided, written with the affected businesses. Even that did not keep us open. The draft offers no evidence that a softer London-wide test will work better. The Plan does not review how the current Plan's business protections have performed.
- **Not positively prepared.** GLE1 Part A plans for "SMEs, larger firms and third sector organisations". It does not plan for the long-standing, culturally rooted businesses that are most at risk.

On the ground. We were a textbook case for Part F. Five small, independent businesses, trading for 22 years, displaced by a residential tower. The council agreed relocation was owed. The developer argued it was not. The landlord went to court. Twenty bailiffs came. No relocation option was ever offered that let us keep trading. Policy sounded right on paper and failed in practice.

Modification sought. Replace Part F with:

F Where development would displace existing small, independent or community-serving businesses, the applicant **must** submit a Business Relocation Strategy with the application, prepared with the affected businesses. Permission **must not** be granted until: (1) a suitable, affordable relocation or on-site re-provision has been agreed in writing with each business, at no greater cost to them; (2) arrangements allow continuous trading, with temporary premises on or near the site where needed; (3) each business is offered a right of first refusal and a right to return to the completed scheme on equivalent terms; and (4) these obligations are secured by planning obligation **before** vacant possession is sought, and monitored by the borough for at least five years after completion.

Insert in the supporting text: "Displacement that takes place before a decision, in anticipation of redevelopment, will weigh heavily against the proposal."

Why this matters. Relocation that comes after eviction is not relocation. It is closure with paperwork.

Statement 2: No social value policy — GLE7 Part B(4) and paragraph 4.67

The draft Plan is **not positively prepared and not justified because it has no social value policy**. The phrase "social value" appears only twice in the economy chapter: in GLE7 Part B(4) and paragraph 4.67, both about who may rent affordable workspace. It is never defined, never measured and never protected.

Why it fails the tests.

- **Not positively prepared.** In April 2025 the London Assembly Planning and Regeneration Committee found that redevelopment is causing "irreversible damage to communities". It recommended that the next London Plan "include a social value policy" setting out how community voices are heard in planning decisions, and new policies to protect long-standing businesses that deliver high social value. The draft does neither. A known need has been left out.
- **Not justified.** The GLA's own evidence was given to the Mayor and not acted on. No reasonable alternative, such as the Just Space Alternative Plan's Policy 20 *Audits of social value*, has been assessed.
- **Not effective.** Without a definition, social value becomes whatever a developer's consultant says it is. That is how a 12-storey tower with 27% affordable homes was presented as "housing for the community" while five Black-owned community businesses were removed.

On the ground. Social value, to us, is not a spreadsheet line. It is the barber who knows every family by name, the Caribbean food that tastes of home, the young person recording their first track for free. It is the safety net, the open debate, the sense of belonging. We said this to the London Assembly in November 2024. It must be defined by what local people value, what they fight to protect and what they would grieve to lose. None of that was counted when we were displaced. None of it is counted in this draft.

Modification sought. Insert a new policy:

Social value. (A) Boroughs must audit the social value of high streets, town centres, markets and community-serving businesses with traders, residents and community groups, using measures that capture non-monetised value. (B) Major applications, and any application that displaces an existing business or community space, must include a Social Value Statement based on early engagement with existing occupiers and users. (C) Long-standing businesses and spaces identified as delivering high social value must be protected from displacement, or re-provided on equivalent terms before any loss. (D) The Mayor will publish guidance on defining and measuring social value, co-produced with community organisations.

Why this matters. What is not measured is not protected. What is not protected is lost. We were lost.

Statement 3: Equality Act 2010 s.149 and protected characteristics — GLE1 Part F and GLE5 paragraph 4.56

GLE1 Part F and GLE5 paragraph 4.56 are not positively prepared and not effective, and the Plan risks failing the Mayor's Public Sector Equality Duty under [section 149 of the Equality Act 2010](#).

Displacement is never treated as an equalities issue, although it falls hardest on people with protected characteristics.

The law. Section 149 requires the Mayor, and every borough, to have *due regard* to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a [protected characteristic](#) and those who do not. Advancing equality includes removing

disadvantage, meeting different needs and encouraging participation in public life. The duty applies when policy is made, not after the harm is done.

Why being a protected characteristic matters. Race and age are protected characteristics. PLUSHSE16 was five Black-owned businesses serving a largely Black and Caribbean-heritage community, and a youth music studio for 12 to 20 year olds. When a space like ours is removed, the loss is not neutral. It falls on one community, in one place, again and again across London. The London Assembly found these consequences "all too often have a disproportionate impact on low-income, marginalised and minority communities". A Plan that does not look for that impact cannot claim to have had due regard to it.

What the draft says.

- **GLE1 Part F** (business displacement) contains no equality test at all.
- **GLE5 paragraph 4.56** says an Equalities Impact Assessment "should be undertaken" where a proposal affects protected groups, but only for cultural facilities, and only in supporting text.
- Across the five policy chapters, the Public Sector Equality Duty is named once, in the housing chapter. Equality is not a Good Growth objective in its own right: the current Plan's GG1 *Building strong and inclusive communities* has been dropped.
- Just Space's review finds the Integrated Impact Assessment's equality appraisal superficial and skewed to the positive, with no assessment of negative or cumulative impacts ([topic sheets](#)).

On the ground. To our knowledge, at no point between 2022 and 2024 did any decision-maker assess what our removal meant for the Black community we served or for the young people who used the studio. We were treated as a property matter. We were a community.

Modification sought.

1. Add to GLE1 Part F: "An Equality Impact Assessment, prepared before determination and published with the application, **must** assess the effect of displacement on people with protected characteristics who own, work in or use the affected businesses, and set out mitigation."
2. In GLE5 paragraph 4.56, replace "should be undertaken" with "**must** be undertaken and published before determination", and move it into the policy text.
3. Reinstate a Good Growth objective on strong and inclusive communities, citing the Mayor's s.149 duty.
4. Require the Integrated Impact Assessment to assess the cumulative equality effects of displacement in Opportunity Areas, and to treat socio-economic disadvantage as a factor alongside protected characteristics.

Why this matters. An equality duty that starts after the bailiffs leave is not due regard. It is regret.

Statement 4: Policy GLE5 Culture and creative industries — everyday culture left out

Policy GLE5 and paragraphs 4.55 and 4.57 are not positively prepared and not effective. The policy protects culture as galleries, venues and Creative Enterprise Zones. It does not see the culture that lives in barbershops, hair studios, Caribbean kitchens and youth studios.

What the draft says. Paragraph 4.57 defines culture as "music and performance venues, visual arts, fashion, film, design, crafts and making, cinemas and museums". Part D asks for re-provision of "existing cultural facilities". Paragraph 4.55 only "encourages" boroughs to "consider" continuity of use and a right of first refusal for the existing operator.

Why it fails the tests.

- **Not positively prepared.** The definition leaves out the places where diverse working-class communities actually make and share culture. Paragraph 6.27 recognises that markets serve "London's diverse ethnic communities". The same logic is missing for the businesses that do this on the high street every day.
- **Not effective.** Continuity of use and a right of first refusal are the two things that would have kept PLUSHSE16 alive. In the draft they sit in supporting text, as things to "consider". They will be ignored, as P33 was ignored.

On the ground. The PLUSHSE16 barbershop was a place of public debate. The music studio gave young people affordable access to production. The takeaway kept Afro-Caribbean food culture on a street where it is often misrepresented. Under GLE5 as drafted, none of this counts as a "cultural facility". So none of it would be re-provided.

Modification sought.

1. In paragraph 4.57, insert after "cinemas and museums": "and everyday and community culture, including culturally specific businesses, food, barbering and hair, faith and community spaces, and youth music and media spaces that serve as cultural anchors for particular communities."
2. Move paragraph 4.55 into the policy as a new Part F: "Where a cultural facility or culturally specific business is affected, development **must** secure continuity of use, a right of first refusal and a right to return for the existing operator, on financially viable terms."
3. In Part A(2), replace "consider requiring" with "require".

Why this matters. If our culture is not written into the definition, it will be written out of the city.

Statement 5: Policy PV1 Part B(5) — community voice in Brownfield First Opportunity Areas

Policy PV1 Part B(5) is not effective and not justified. It says only that "the involvement of community voices, particularly those from underrepresented groups, should be sought." Seeking is not hearing, and hearing is not acting.

Why it fails the tests.

- **Not effective.** "Should be sought" sets no standard, no stage and no consequence. A leaflet drop meets it. The people who used PLUSHSE16 every day were not meaningfully engaged before the Rotherhithe New Road scheme was approved in February 2022.
- **Not justified.** The London Assembly's first 2025 recommendation was a policy setting out *how* community voices are heard in planning decisions. Just Space's topic sheets note that "consultation" appears only 13 times in the draft, mostly about the GLA talking to boroughs and TfL. The alternative, a Mayor's Statement of Community Involvement, has not been assessed.
- **Not positively prepared.** PLUSHSE16 sat minutes from Canada Water, which this draft designates as a Brownfield First Opportunity Area. These are exactly the places where growth pressure will displace the next PLUSH. The communities there need more than "should be sought".

On the ground. We fed our community's voice into the London Assembly, into Just Space and into this response, unpaid and while displaced. We had to fight our way into every room. The people most affected by decisions should not have to break down the door to be heard.

Engagement must leave evidence. Today, "engagement" too often means a leaflet, an online survey or a drop-in that the people most affected never hear about. What residents and traders say is summarised by the applicant, if it is recorded at all. Once a decision is made, there is no trace of it. Community voice has no status, so it can be ignored without consequence.

The people who will feel London's changes most are rarely the people who write, or respond to, plans like this one: shift workers, small traders, carers, young people, older residents, people for whom English is not a first language, and communities who have learned that City Hall does not listen. Reaching them takes time, trust and money. Grassroots groups like ours do that work already, unpaid, on top of running businesses and services.

We ask that community voice is **safeguarded**: collected properly, logged as official input, published, and answered. Without that, engagement is a tick-box exercise. It cannot make plans for London's change effective, because it never tells the decision-maker what the change will really mean on the ground.

This is also a legal point. Section 149(3)(c) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to encourage people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life where their participation is disproportionately low. A plan that waits for those voices to arrive by themselves does not meet that duty.

Modification sought.

1. In PV1 Part B(5), replace "should be sought" with: "**must** be secured from the earliest stage through co-production with existing residents, businesses and community organisations, in line with the Mayor's Statement of Community Involvement, and its effect on the proposal must be shown."
2. Insert a new policy committing the Mayor to a **Statement of Community Involvement** covering the Mayor's planning frameworks, referred applications, Section 106 negotiations, TfL and Places for London, and Mayoral Development Corporations (Just Space Alternative Plan, Policy 1).

3. **Make community voice official evidence.** Require every plan, Opportunity Area framework and major application to submit a **Community Voice Record**: a log of who was reached, how, and what they said in their own words, kept unedited and published with the application. Decision-makers must show how each main issue raised was taken into account, in a "you said, we did" response. A decision taken without one should be treated as not properly informed.
4. **Fund engagement with the people least heard.** Create a ring-fenced **community engagement fund**, paid for through planning obligations on major schemes and by the GLA, so that trusted local organisations are paid to reach residents, traders and young people who do not usually take part. It should cover interpreters, childcare, evening and weekend sessions, and payment for people's time and expertise.
5. Require boroughs to set up **Community Review Panels**, alongside Design Review, that include historically under-represented communities (Just Space Alternative Plan, Policy 4), and report each year on who took part in engagement, measured against the local population.

Why this matters. Every failure in this response — relocation that came too late, social value that was never counted, equality that was never assessed — starts with the same thing. Nobody was required to listen to us.

Statement 6: Policy GLE7 Affordable workspace — "affordable" needs defining

Policy GLE7 and paragraph 4.63 are not effective and not justified, because "affordable" is defined only as a discount on a market that has already priced our communities out. Affordable is no longer affordable.

What the draft says. Paragraph 4.63 defines affordable workspace as space "provided at rents maintained below the market rate". Part A ties provision to "an assessment of viability". Part E protects existing affordable workspace only where it was formally provided as affordable workspace since 1 December 2017.

Why it fails the tests.

- **Not effective.** A discount on an inflated rent is still an inflated rent. If market rents on a parade double, "affordable" doubles with them. Nothing in GLE7 links affordability to what local businesses earn or what local people can pay.
- **Not justified.** Viability assessments are written by and for developers. Communities never see the land value, profit and cost assumptions that decide how much affordable space, or how many affordable homes, a scheme provides. Our scheme offered 27% affordable homes against Southwark's 35% expectation. We were never invited to test the figures.
- **Not positively prepared.** Part E protects only formally designated affordable workspace. PLUSHSE16 kept rents and prices low for 22 years on an ordinary lease. Under GLE7, that space counts for nothing.

Modification sought.

1. Replace paragraph 4.63 with: "Affordable workspace is workspace let at rents that existing local small businesses can sustain, set against a locally evidenced benchmark based on local business turnover and household incomes, not solely as a discount to market rent. Boroughs must review the benchmark with local businesses and community organisations at least every two years."
2. Add to Part A: "Viability assessments that affect affordable workspace, affordable housing or the re-provision of existing businesses must be published in full, independently reviewed, and tested with affected communities through open consultation on the viability metrics used, including benchmark land value, developer return and the cost of displacement."
3. Extend Part E to protect **existing low-cost and long-standing business space**, whether or not it was formally designated as affordable workspace.

Why this matters. If the word "affordable" can mean anything, it protects no one. Communities need a realistic assessment of what is affordable, and a seat at the table when viability is decided.

Statement 7: Policy PV3 Town centres and high streets — national chains and high-street rents

Policy PV3 is not positively prepared and not effective, because it does nothing to stop high-street rents being set by national chains that local and working-class businesses cannot compete with.

What the draft says. PV3 promotes "vibrant, resilient, accessible and inclusive" high streets and a "diverse mix" of uses. It says nothing about rents, who can afford them, or the balance between independent businesses and national chains.

Why it fails the tests.

- **Not positively prepared.** In our experience, large organisations such as Tesco, Sainsbury's, Gail's and Pret A Manger are a catalyst for unaffordable high-street rents. They can pay rents and offer lease covenants that local independents cannot. Their lettings then become the comparable evidence that landlords and valuers use, which sets the rental tone for the whole parade. They effectively dictate and distort market values.
- **Not effective.** Once a street's rents re-base around national chains, affordable rents disappear from lower-income and working-class communities. Every "affordable" discount in GLE7 is then calculated from that distorted figure. Their arrival is often presented as a sign of successful regeneration. For the people already there, it is often the start of the end.
- **Not justified.** The Plan offers no evidence on who is occupying London's high streets, at what rents, or what happens to independent businesses when national chains arrive. Just Space's Alternative Plan proposes audits of social value (Policy 20) and a restructuring of business rates (Policy 25). Neither has been assessed.

On the ground. The barbershop, the hair studio, the Caribbean takeaway, the studio and the car wash were all started by local people with little capital and a lot of graft. That is the entrepreneurial spirit of working-class London. When rents are set by national chains, there is no first rung for the next PLUSH to stand on. The spirit is not lost. It is priced out.

Modification sought. Insert a new Part F in PV3:

F Plan-making authorities must: (1) audit the mix of independent and national multiple occupiers, and rent levels, on their town centres and high streets, with traders and residents; (2) designate high streets and parades where a minimum proportion of units is secured for independent and local businesses at locally assessed affordable rents; (3) protect small units from amalgamation, using the conditions allowed by GLE1 Part E; and (4) benchmark affordable rents against local independent lettings, not lettings to national multiples.

The Mayor should also press Government to restructure business rates so that small businesses can compete on fair terms (Just Space Alternative Plan, Policy 25).

Why this matters. When national chains set the rent, they decide who gets to build a business in our neighbourhoods. Usually it is not us.

Examination in Public

We wish to be invited to the Examination in Public in 2027, and to speak on Policies GLE1, GLE5, GLE7, PV1 and PV3, on the absence of a social value policy, and on the Mayor's duty under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010.

We are among very few participants who can tell the Inspectors, first-hand, what happens when London's displacement policies are tested in real life. We want to explain the changes we are seeking, give up-to-date evidence from our community, and respond to developers and other participants, and to any new evidence or changes in national policy, including the August 2026 NPPF.

Our concerns, one last time:

1. Relocation must be secured **before** displacement, not after. The harm starts at first contact, as ours did in 2018.
2. Social value must be **defined, measured and protected**, as the London Assembly recommended.
3. The Mayor's **s.149 equality duty** must be built into every policy that displaces people with protected characteristics.
4. **Everyday culture** is culture.
5. Community voice must be **required**, not "sought". It must be recorded as evidence and properly funded, so engagement is never a tick-box.
6. **"Affordable" must be defined** against what local people and businesses can pay, and viability must be tested **with** communities.
7. **National chains must not set the rent** for working-class high streets.

We did not displace ourselves. Please do not let this Plan displace the next PLUSH.

Carmen Gowie Clinkett and Michael Clinkett Founders, PLUSHSE16 (PlushSE16 x HUBSE16 CIC) and NoPriceOnCulture Members of the Just Space network

We consent to this response being published with our names and organisation.

Evidence and sources

The draft Plan

- [Draft London Plan, Chapter 4: Growing London's economy](#) — GLE1 Part F, GLE5 and paras 4.55–4.57, GLE7 Part B(4) and para 4.67
- [Draft London Plan, Chapter 6: Place visions](#) — PV1 Part B(5), PV3, para 6.27

Law and local policy

- [Equality Act 2010, section 149: Public Sector Equality Duty](#)
- [Equality Act 2010, section 4: the protected characteristics](#)
- Southwark Plan 2022: [P31 Affordable workspace](#), [P32 Small shops](#), [P33 Business relocation](#)

City Hall and coalition evidence

- London Assembly Planning and Regeneration Committee, [Social value in planning and regeneration](#), April 2025, and [press release](#)
- Just Space, [Alternative London Plan for a Caring City](#), 2026 — Policies 1, 2, 4, 20 and 22
- Just Space, [Draft London Plan topic sheets](#), October 2026

Our own record

- PLUSHSE16 and HUBSE16 CIC, *Social Value + Community Voices*, public statement to the London Assembly, 8 November 2024 (attached)
- [PLUSHSE16 campaign site](#) — timeline, press and the open letter to Southwark Council
- Southwark News: [first eviction and P33 ruling, Aug 2022](#) · [scheme approved, Feb 2022](#) · [possession and relocation dispute](#) · [after the final eviction, Jan 2024](#)
- Our public submission and seven changes are also viewable [here](#) published as evidence of our communities input.