



Citizens' Jury – future of London's Green Belt

August 2019



Bringing the voices of communities into the heart of organisations

Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
1.1 Background	4
1.1.1 London First's Views on The Green Belt.....	4
1.2 Methodology	5
1.3 Overview of findings	5
1.3.1 The final verdict.....	5
1.3.2 Pre-existing views.....	6
1.3.3 The debate.....	6
2. Background, Objectives and Methodology	9
2.1 Background and objectives.....	9
2.1.1 Background	9
2.1.2 London First's Views on The Green Belt.....	9
2.1.3 Context.....	10
2.2 Methodology	10
2.2.1 Overview.....	10
2.2.2 Rationale and limitations	11
2.2.3 Recruitment	12
2.2.4 Content and analysis process.....	13
3. Pre-existing and Initial Views	15
3.1 Pre-existing understanding of the Green Belt.....	15
3.2 Spontaneous understanding of the Green Belt debate	16
3.3 Participants' initial alternative ideas for addressing housing need	17
3.4 Summary of views at the start of the Jury	18
4. The Jurors' Journey	21
4.1 Reactions to initial learning.....	21
4.2 Perceptions of the housing crisis.....	23
4.3 Views after hearing the Panel of Speakers.....	24
4.3.1 Jurors' questions to the Panel.....	24
4.3.2 Jurors' views immediately following the Panel session.....	25
4.3.3 Jurors' questions and thinking following the Panel discussion	26
5. The Verdict	30
5.1 The overall verdict.....	30
5.2 Associated conditions.....	31

6. Conclusions.....	34
Appendix A: Jury Profile	35
Appendix B: Agenda and Stimulus Materials	36
Jury agenda	36
Stimulus material used during Session One	36
Stimulus material used during Session Two	36
Appendix C: Jurors' Evaluation of the Process.....	37

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Background

The Mayor's London Plan – the spatial development strategy for the city – states that London needs to build c.65,000 new homes every year to keep pace with the need for homes. London has consistently failed to meet previous housebuilding targets and, without radical change, seems unlikely to meet the new target. This is likely to mean that in the long run, house prices will continue to rise faster than wages, making housing unaffordable for many Londoners.

While a range of actions could be taken to increase housebuilding in the capital, London First who commissioned this research, is focussing its efforts on three key areas:

- more money, from central government which will leverage in more from the private sector;
- more land, both privately and publicly owned sites coming forward for development; and
- better ways of building, including:
 - at higher densities;
 - through modern methods of construction; and
 - supporting new tenures such as build to rent.

1.1.2 London First's Views on The Green Belt

As part of London First's focus on 'more land', it has long called for a review of London's Green Belt. In 2014, with partners they produced [a report on London's Green Belt](#), which explains the history of the Green Belt and outlines the different land uses that currently exist within it.

London First does not question the need for the Green Belt to exist, nor for there to continue to be strong protection for valued green spaces and sites that have special environmental designations. However, it has argued that local planning authorities should be encouraged to review their Green Belt and consider how the land within it that is of poor environmental quality, of little or no public benefit and has good connectivity could be re-designated for high-quality, well-designed residential development that incorporates truly accessible public green space.

When thinking about public opinion, London First's hypothesis was that where the facts and the arguments on both sides are clearly set out, Londoners may be willing to review land currently designated as Green Belt to help tackle London's housing crisis. Community Research Ltd was commissioned by London First to test this hypothesis.

1.2 Methodology

Community Research was commissioned to conduct a Citizens' Jury exploring London residents' views about undertaking a review of London's Green Belt. In summary, 12 Jurors were recruited (all London residents at different life-stages and with different backgrounds to be broadly representative of the demography of London) to participate in the sessions held in July 2019.

The Jurors attended an initial evening session during which their pre-existing views about the Green Belt and housing issues in general were explored and they were given an overview of the current context. At the second session, Jurors heard balanced evidence from both sides of the debate in the form of presentations from expert witnesses and a panel discussion. They were then asked to deliberate the issues and deliver their 'verdict'.

The question that the Jury were asked to consider was:

Should current Green Belt restrictions be reviewed to help tackle London's housing crisis?

1.3 Overview of findings

1.3.1 The final verdict

At the end of the second session, the 12 Jurors were asked to consider their verdict on whether there should be a review of London's Green Belt restrictions to help tackle London's housing crisis. The final voting was as follows:

- 11 'strongly agreed' or 'tended to agree' there should be a review¹.
- 1 'strongly' disagreed with a proposed review.

There was broad consensus that a review should ensure that brownfield sites within the Green Belt could be considered for development and that planning restrictions should potentially be lifted for these areas.

The 11 Jurors who were comfortable reviewing restrictions on the Green Belt, also highlighted a number of **conditions that they would like to see associated with such a review:**

- There was a strong call for any development of Green Belt land to provide **affordable or social housing** (and for the social housing, not to provide a 'right to buy' option because of the perceived adverse impact that this policy would have on future supply).

¹ 5 strongly agreed and 6 tended to agree.

- Jurors made it clear that any housing built on Green Belt land **should be for those in need** i.e. they wanted reassurance that any new developments would, in reality, be tackling the housing crisis.
- **Farmland** in the Green Belt should be preserved.
- There will be appropriate **design standards** (both practical and aesthetic) in relation to any new development, with **necessary infrastructure** provided alongside new housing.
- Jurors also called for **frequent reviews, transparency** and for **communities to have a say** in terms of developments in their area.

1.3.2 Pre-existing views

Prior to the process of deliberation, most of the Jurors had a limited understanding of what the Green Belt is and any associated planning restrictions. They tended to assume that all Green Belt land is 'green' and they were surprised that some Green Belt land has actually been built upon and / or is not green in appearance.

Jurors spontaneously identified reasons why Green Belt restrictions might need to be reviewed. The needs to preserve green space and protect wildlife were 'top of mind' for many. However, several Jurors also immediately recognised that the Green Belt could play a role in addressing London's housing needs. They tended to be those Jurors who had had direct experience of housing need. Such participants were keen to highlight the lack of affordable homes in London and the need to find solutions for this.

The majority of Jurors were open to reviewing Green Belt restrictions from the outset. However, they also suggested other solutions to the housing crisis including repurposing of derelict buildings, building new towns outside of Greater London and focusing on developing other cities in the UK.

1.3.3 The debate

Jurors heard from several speakers during the course of the two sessions, aimed at informing them of the issues and stimulating the debate.

Session One
<p>Ellie Evans, partner at Volterra, an organisation which specialises in the economic impact of developments and proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ellie focused on future housing need in London.
<p>Roger Madelin CBE, Head of the Canada Water development at British Land, who previously led on the King's Cross development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roger gave detail of the planning process to take a project from concept to completion, and explained why brownfield land can be a challenge to develop.
Session Two
<p>Outlining why Green Belt policy in London should be reviewed:</p>

- Barney Stringer, Director at Quod, a company that advises on a wide range of planning issues.
- Siobhain McDonagh, a Labour Party politician, MP for Mitcham and Morden

Outlining why Green Belt policy in London should not be reviewed

- Paul Miner, Strategic Planning & Devolution Lead at the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE).
- Steve O'Connell, a Conservative member of the London Assembly, representing Croydon and Sutton.

A '**Jurors' Friend**' was also in attendance throughout session two to answer technical questions or points of clarification in a neutral and independent way.

- Dr Alan Mace, Associate Professor of Urban Planning Studies at the London School of Economics

Throughout the sessions there was much debate, with the Jury asking many questions to aid their deliberations including:

- How long the current Green Belt restrictions have been in existence.
- What, if any, impact building on Green Belt land might have on the climate.
- Questions seeking to clarify the amount of land in London covered by the Green Belt.
- Whether London's growth / potential to sprawl is necessarily a negative.
- If, under the terms of a review, it would be possible to re-designate land that isn't currently Green Belt to become Green Belt.
- Why, when looking at current national planning policy, the housing crisis isn't considered to be an 'exceptional circumstance' which would potentially allow Green Belt restrictions to be relaxed.
- Discussions relating to the relative merits of building higher-rise buildings vs. building on Green Belt land. Jurors asked questions about the relative environmental impacts of these two options.
- Whether building more houses might stimulate even more housing demand.
- Questions related to planning processes and how development is controlled now and might be controlled in future, if a review of the Green Belt were to happen.
- Questions about whether, if Green Belt restrictions were relaxed, affordable houses would actually be built.



2. Background, Objectives and Methodology

2.1 Background and objectives

2.1.1 Background

The Mayor's London Plan – the spatial development strategy for the city – states that London needs to build c.65,000 new homes every year to keep pace with demand. London has consistently failed to meet previous housebuilding targets and, without radical change, seems unlikely to meet the new target. This is likely to mean that in the long run, house prices will continue to rise faster than wages.

While a range of actions must be taken to increase housebuilding in the capital, London First who commissioned this research, is focussing its efforts on three key areas:

- more money, from central government which will leverage in more from the private sector;
- more land, both privately and publicly owned sites coming forward for development; and
- better ways of building, including:
 - at higher densities;
 - through modern methods of construction; and
 - supporting new tenures such as build to rent.

2.1.2 London First's Views on The Green Belt

As part of London First's focus on 'more land', it has long called for a review of London's Green Belt. In 2014, with partners they produced [a report on London's Green Belt](#), which explains the history of the Green Belt and outlines the different land uses that currently exist within it.

London First does not question the need for the Green Belt to exist nor for there to continue to be strong protection for valued green spaces and sites that have special environmental designations. However, it has argued that local planning authorities should be encouraged to review their Green Belt and consider how the land within it that is of poor environmental quality, of little or no public benefit and has good connectivity could be re-designated for high-quality, well-designed residential development that incorporates truly accessible public green space.

2.1.3 Context

There are several effective campaigns and organisations² that want to maintain the status quo over Green Belt policy. Conversely, a number of academics and organisations focused on increasing housebuilding feel that current Green Belt policy is not fit for purpose (although views differ on what policy should be in place).

As far as the public is concerned, Ipsos Mori's 2015 opinion poll research for CPRE³ suggested that a majority of the English public supports the protection of the Green Belt. However, it is worth noting that a much lower proportion of Londoners agreed that "*existing Green Belt land in England should be retained and not built on*" within the CPRE survey. A 2018 ComRes poll⁴ for The Centre for Policy Studies found that nearly half of British adults (48%) say that they would support more homes being built in their local area, with a similar proportion agreeing that while most of the countryside around England's towns and cities should be protected, some ought to be used for new housing and other development (47%). Polls of this kind, however, can only ever be based on a relatively limited level of understanding.

The rationale for conducting a Citizens' Jury was, therefore, to explore what a more informed group of members of the London public thought about the issue.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Overview

London First's hypothesis was that where the facts and the arguments on both sides of the Green Belt debate are clearly set out, Londoners may be willing to consider a review of land currently designated as Green Belt to help tackle London's housing crisis.

Such debates lend themselves well to a Jury approach because Jurors can be exposed, not only to agreed facts and information, but also to the various views of different 'witnesses'. Jurors hear arguments from all sides and can interrogate the viewpoints that they hear, in order to come to their final view.

Community Research Ltd was commissioned by London First to conduct a Citizens' Jury exploring London residents' views about undertaking a review of London's Green Belt. In summary, 12 Jurors were recruited (all London residents) to attend two deliberative jury sessions:

² [For example, CPRE and The London Green Belt Council – which cites that it brings together "over 100 organisations including councils, residents & environmental groups with a shared concern for London's Green Belt."](#)

³ <https://www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/attitudes-towards-green-belt-land>

⁴ <https://www.comresglobal.com/polls/centre-for-policy-studies-housing-poll-september-2018/>

- an initial 3-hour evening session to introduce the topic, on 22nd July 2019; and
- a full day session, to fully deliberate the question held on the 31st July 2019.

The question that Jurors were asked to consider was:

Should current Green Belt restrictions be reviewed to help tackle London's housing crisis?

2.2.2 Rationale and limitations

A Citizens' Jury was conducted because the research aims were best served by intensive discussion, with the input of facts, information and opposing witness views over an extended period. Deliberative approaches involve a broad cross-section of participants working together, ensuring that a range of different perspectives are heard. Information is provided throughout, to enable Jurors to attain a deep understanding of the issue under consideration.

The deliberative process enables participants to move beyond their own personal perspective and consider the issues they are presented with, in a much wider and more holistic context. In this way participants may move gradually from an initial position as an individual, to a new perspective as a citizen. Rather than considering only their own immediate priorities, they can take on board additional information; hear the views of others from different backgrounds and experiences; and thereby come to a more fully considered conclusion than might otherwise have been the case. Information provided is carefully sourced and checked to ensure that it is balanced and to ensure that Jurors are not unduly influenced or led to a particular conclusion.

It is important to note that this methodology is not intended to be statistically representative and, as such, does not permit conclusions to be drawn about the extent to which the Jury's views would reflect those of the wider London population.

It should also be noted that the findings in this report are based on the views of people who have considered the issues in greater depth, for more time, and with more information than members of the public would be likely to consider in the course of their day-to-day lives.

Whilst a broad cross section of the public was represented, there is an inherent risk as with all research that individuals who actively choose to participate in an exercise of this kind are somehow different to overall the population.

Throughout the report, quotes have been included to illustrate viewpoints. It is important to remember that the views expressed do not always represent the views of all the Jurors. In general, however, quotes have been included to illustrate where there was a particular strength of feeling about a topic.

2.2.3 Recruitment

In total, 12 participants attended the Jury. Participants were recruited to be broadly representative of the population of London, with reference to the following:

- individual characteristics (gender, age, ethnicity, working status);
- household characteristics (social grade, housing tenure); and
- geographical location (representing 12 different London boroughs, 5 inner and 7 outer).

A specialist research recruitment agency, Saros Research UK, recruited participants via an established and growing database of thousands of people who have actively signed up to take part in research exercises. Targeting a wide pool of people using this database enabled us to cover the broadest possible geography of London and avoided having to send recruiters into particular areas. This method of recruitment gave us greater representation across London than other methods might have.

Saros sent out anonymised details of the Jury requirement to a large number of potential participants, asking them to complete a recruitment questionnaire to ascertain whether people matched the broad recruitment criteria. Saros then screened every participant thoroughly by telephone, to check the accuracy of their responses to the qualifying questionnaire, and to ensure that they understood what would be expected of them.

Jurors were told in advance that the Jury would concern how to meet the increasing need for housing in London, but they were not given any specific detail about what the Jury would cover. Once selected, they were, however, asked to bring to the Jury a photo of what they think of when they imagine some Green Belt land.

Jurors were screened to make sure they were not working in a role in Local Authority Planning or for a housing developer or builder. Those who were active members of a political party or who had previously campaigned about national environmental issues or about land use at a local level, were screened out of the process because the intention was to hear from those who do not usually participate in the Green Belt debate.

Jurors were paid a monetary incentive, to thank them for their time and to cover any incidental expenses. The payment of incentives for exercises of this kind is important to encourage attendance of those who would not otherwise participate in research. It is also a way of acknowledging the importance of people's contribution and input.

A participant profile for the Jury can be found in Appendix A.

2.2.4 Content and analysis process

Facilitation at the Jury was conducted by Community Research. Some discussions involved all Jurors, and others were conducted in smaller groups.

At the first session, Jurors were provided with information using the following stimuli:

- A “pub quiz” presentation of facts and figures relating to London’s current and future population; projected housing demand; the Green Belt and current planning policy.
- A photo sort exercise with Jurors asked to sort photos into those which are Green Belt and those which are not.
- A presentation by Ellie Evans, partner at Volterra, an organisation which specialises in the economic impact of developments and proposals. Ellie focused on future housing need in London.
- A short video of Roger Madelin CBE, Head of the Canada Water development at British Land, who previously led on the King’s Cross development. Roger spoke about his experiences of being a developer in London, provided an insight into what’s needed to navigate the planning process to take a project from concept to completion, and explained why brownfield land can be a challenge to develop.

At the full day session, Jurors heard from two speakers on each side of the debate:

- outlining why Green Belt policy in London should be reviewed
 - Barney Stringer, Director at Quod, a company that advises on a wide range of planning issues.
 - Siobhain McDonagh, a Labour Party politician, MP for Mitcham and Morden.
- outlining why Green Belt policy in London should not be reviewed
 - Paul Miner, Strategic Planning & Devolution Lead at the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE).
 - Steve O’Connell, a Conservative member of the London Assembly, representing Croydon and Sutton.

Jurors were given an opportunity to ask questions of each speaker and to also debate the issues amongst themselves.

Dr Alan Mace, Associate Professor of Urban Planning Studies at the London School of Economics, attended the Jury in the capacity of ‘Jurors’ friend’. He was briefed to answer any technical questions or points of clarification in a neutral and independent way.

Jury discussions were audio recorded and Jurors' individual feedback was further gathered in a series of short questionnaires based on the Jury question. The questionnaire was administered at various points within the session to allow us to track the deliberative journey:

- Questionnaire 1: Immediately after introductions at the first evening session. This ensured that their immediate, personal views were captured before any group discussion.
- Questionnaire 2: Having heard from all the witnesses at the second session to monitor if, and how, views changed having heard the opposing views.
- Questionnaire 3: At the very end of the second session to uncover if, and how, the Jurors private deliberations had impacted on individual views.

The final agenda for the Jury sessions and hand-outs are provided in Appendix B.

By its nature, qualitative and deliberative research generates a large volume of data. In this case, the discussions were audio-recorded (with the participants' knowledge and permission) and then transcribed. Several researchers then undertook analysis independently and simultaneously and compared results to ensure consistent interpretation. Prior to writing this report the entire team of researchers met to develop the themes and structure for reporting.

The second day of the Jury was also filmed to allow for a short summary video to be produced.

All Jurors were asked to complete an evaluation questionnaire at the end of the two sessions; the results of which are outlined in the Appendix C.

3. Pre-existing and Initial Views

3.1 Pre-existing understanding of the Green Belt

Initial discussions⁵ revealed several common themes relating to Jurors' pre-existing understanding of the Green Belt, as outlined below:

- Limited understanding of the Green Belt.

Most Jurors felt that they had only a rudimentary knowledge of the Green Belt.

"I think people might have heard about it but, unless it actually affects them, to an extent they don't really... they just kind of get on with their everyday lives. They don't really look at it or look into it or about it."

The youngest of the Jurors explained that they had gained a basic understanding from their school geography lessons. However, several other Jurors explained that they knew little about the Green Belt debate because they did not tend to follow current affairs or arguments of this nature very closely.

"I am completely like that, I avoid the news, it's negative."

- Green Belt land is perceived as exclusively green.

Based on their mostly limited knowledge, all Jurors tended to imagine Green Belt land comprising solely of grassland, whether open fields or more narrow strips of green land. This was strongly reflected in the visual images that Jurors brought with them to the first session.

"That's what I think of, when I think of Green Belt, I think of green, grass, trees."

"Just green open spaces."

- Green Belt land surrounds suburbs/cities.

Some Jurors highlighted, early in discussions, their understanding that the Green Belt was land which surrounds suburban areas and/or cities and could not be built on.

"So you think of a suburban town and just beyond London that's the Green Belt."

"Mine was a green space as well but it was more like a green area around London, like where you can't build on these areas."

⁵ All quotations within this section of the report are taken from the first evening Jury session discussions.

- Limited awareness of planning restrictions on Green Belt land.

Several Jurors were aware that Green Belt land was associated with planning restrictions and was not open for development. However, this was not something that was understood or known by the majority. One Juror brought an image⁶ of the Green Belt encompassing houses.

"It's a designated area of land not allowed to be built on."

- Uncertainty about whether the Green Belt encompasses all green space.

It was clear, even amongst those who displayed greatest understanding of the Green Belt, that there was confusion about what kind of land is classified as Green Belt and what is not. The more Jurors thought about the green spaces near where they lived, the more uncertain they appeared to become about whether it is classified as Green Belt.

"I live near Blackheath and I don't think of that heath land as Green Belt at all. But I suppose it is, I just think it's protected land and not because it's Green Belt. But I suppose it is Green Belt."

3.2 Spontaneous understanding of the Green Belt debate

When Jurors were asked which organisations or groups may have an interest in whether a review of Green Belt restrictions is conducted, the need to preserve green space and protect wildlife was top of mind for many.

"People that don't want anything built on there; they want to preserve the wildlife."

"I would have thought someone like the National Trust or one of these Wildlife organisations. I think the National Trust own woodlands, don't they? So I would have thought they'd have a say on it."

However, Jurors also identified several other reasons why Green Belt restrictions might need to be reviewed. Some felt that expanding businesses and large infrastructure projects (High Speed 2, Heathrow expansion) would be interested in a review of Green Belt land.

There were several Jurors who immediately recognised that the Green Belt could play a role in addressing London's housing crisis. They tended to be those who had had direct experience of difficulties finding appropriate accommodation. They were keen to highlight the lack of affordable homes in London and strongly advocated the need for a compromise.

⁶ https://omghcontent.affino.com/AcuCustom/Sitename/DAM/065/green_belt_1200.jpg

"And it's almost like somebody has decided, I don't know who, how, why, where, that this is almost sacrosanct, and I think living in London we can't afford to have that view anymore. Or I feel that we can't afford to have that view anymore."

"The two hot topics right now are about climate change and housing, and those two actually go hand in hand in this topic that we're discussing because those are the two main factors now. You've got to look at a balance between green areas and housing."

There was some strength of feeling from a minority of Jurors about the perceived inequity of the current system i.e. that all the dense development seems to be in poorer areas either because those living in more affluent areas are more likely to protest about new development or because the local councils in more deprived areas are more likely to want to relax planning rules to obtain revenue. Linked to this, they felt it is not fair if all the Green Belt land is 'sacrosanct' if this means heavy development in other places.

"So you go into one part of the Borough and you look at houses that are pretty much compact, which are very dense, and then you go to another part of the Borough, probably about five minutes' walk away, and then it's much more open. I think a lot of it was down to planning and Councils just saying, "do you know what, we can generate a bit more money if we build another 50 odd flats here, or maybe a 100 odd flats here, and we'll keep the Muswell Hills and the Crouch Ends looking nice."

There was also a feeling that the media might be reinforcing a negative narrative about development. A small number of Jurors indicated that they feel that the media has a role to play in perpetuating the current situation. One participant brought an image from Private Eye magazine⁷. This was not because they agreed with the sentiment of the cartoon but because it was an interesting reflection of media opinion and the messages that they hear.

"No, a lot in the media says it's [housing development] greedy, it's wrong, it's this and that and the other but not looking from the other side."

"Yes, so I see it as an 'us and them' kind of thing, London versus everybody else. Everybody else feels as though we are greedy because we want to expand when they're not really looking at it from the other side..."

3.3 Participants' initial alternative ideas for addressing housing need

It became clear towards the end of the first session that Jurors were keen to see that all avenues were explored in order to address London's Housing crisis and that reviewing Green Belt restrictions was not regarded as the only

⁷ <https://www.private-eye.co.uk/covers/cover-1297>

solution. Jurors put forward the following as either alternative or complementary solutions to a review of Green Belt restrictions:

- Renovating or repurposing derelict buildings.

"There are buildings that are derelict, okay, there's been thugs that have broken windows, for example, but rather than leave them empty why can't we put people in them?"

- New towns/building beyond the Greater London boundary.

"Probably about 30 odd years ago, I went with my wife, to Milton Keynes. A lot of Londoners went from London, Welwyn Garden City, to Milton Keynes. We had free transport and we went round various sites where housing is much, much cheaper than London."

"Yes, so I don't actually know what the answer is, but my thought was what about new towns?"

- Focussing on developing other cities in the UK.

"Maybe it's a little bit controversial but I think other cities/areas in the country have to be developed because you've sort of got everything revolves around London, in terms of business anyway."

3.4 Summary of views at the start of the Jury

Jurors were asked at the very beginning of the Jury, before any discussions took place, to share their views on how far they agreed or disagreed with the main Jury question. As Figure 1 highlights, most Jurors were open to reviewing Green Belt restrictions to help tackle London's housing crisis from the outset. However, the initial discussion highlighted that many Jurors only had a superficial understanding of what the Green Belt was at this stage.

Figure 1: Views on the Jury question - At this stage, how far do you agree or disagree with the main Jury question: London's Green Belt restrictions should be reviewed to help tackle London's housing crisis.

Juror ID	Beginning of Session One
1	Tend to disagree
2	Neither agree nor disagree
3	Don't know
4	Tend to agree
5	Tend to agree
6	Tend to agree
7	Tend to agree
8	Strongly agree
9	Strongly agree
10	Tend to agree
11	Tend to agree
12	Strongly agree

The concept of a review was inextricably linked to a desired increase in social housing in the minds of many Jurors and, whilst accepting of a review in principle, they were keen that any such review would not simply benefit private investors, rather it must provide affordable or social housing.

"It should be for social housing. If it's not then I would basically be one of those picketing against building on it, if I'm being honest."

"The thing is though, if you're going to build a block of flats, okay, it's normally the rich investors who normally buy them and then they rent them out."

"If there's a crisis they should treat it like a crisis and give to the people who need it and not let the private investors buy."

Some agreed with the question, whilst not necessarily wanting to see an increase in development on Green Belt land. They held the opinion that a review is simply a review and that it won't necessarily lead to any particular outcome.

"I don't think there's anything wrong with a review, as long as you're transparent."

"I think the outer London Boroughs like Havering... more the big boroughs like Bromley, Havering and Hillingdon that have most of the Green Belt land within the Boroughs, should have the remit to allow planning permission to build on. The policy, in short, needs to be reviewed. Whether we act on it or not, that's a different matter, at least have the ability to be able to act on it."

The concerns of the minority of Jurors who were opposed to a review at this early stage in the process, focussed on two main points:

- That a review of Green Belt policy will not lead to an increase in social or affordable housing and, therefore, should be opposed.

"But they're going to release Green Belt land and they're going to build properties people can't afford anyway."

"They say they're going to do social housing in these developments and they do a handful for social housing and the rest are four hundred grand for a three-bedroom apartment. It's just unbelievably overpriced, no wonder nobody can afford it. So, I don't think releasing Green Belt land is going to solve the affordability of living in London."

- That a review would be the 'thin end of the wedge'.

"Okay, a green field that you can walk around. Let's say like next year they review it and they say, "we'll get rid of 50% of this one", 10 years later "well, let's get rid of another 50%" and then another 10 years. It's slowly shrinking and shrinking until there is no land."

4. The Jurors' Journey

4.1 Reactions to initial learning

Jurors were given the following information at the first evening session in order to inform subsequent deliberations (see Appendix B for full content):

- A photo sort exercise with Jurors asked to sort photos into those which show Green Belt land and those which do not.
- A "pub quiz" followed by presentation of facts and figures relating to London's current and future population; projected housing demand; the Green Belt and current planning policy.
- A presentation by Ellie Evans, partner at Volterra, an organisation which specialises in the economic impact of developments and proposals. Ellie focused on future housing need in London.
- A short video of Roger Madelin CBE, Head of the Canada Water development at British Land, who previously led on the King's Cross development. Roger spoke about his experiences of developing in London.

It was clear from the photo sort exercise that Jurors were surprised to discover that not all Green Belt was green countryside. In particular, the image of a scrapyard on land defined as Green Belt jarred with Jurors' existing perceptions.



The images of land by the side of a railway and of houses on what looked like green, open space also caused confusion as to what might currently constitute Green Belt land.



Aside from the visual information, Jurors also had to process facts and figures throughout the course of the evening's presentations. Information that Jurors particularly picked up on during subsequent discussions on the presentations were:

- The age of Green Belt planning policy.

"It's 1955 so obviously it should be reviewed."

- The length of time from the concept to completion of developments.

"So, again, it's hard... for me it was interesting but hard to watch that gentleman talking, and I totally believe him, I don't think he was lying in any shape or form, that he had so much aggravation when he only wanted to do something that was, in my eyes, decent and good. But overnight in the area that we're coming from, and I can't talk about any other part of London, we're just talking about East, it almost seems like they shove them up."

"Totally agree with everything he said but, when we found out that we was getting the Olympics, it didn't take them half that amount of time that it took for Kings Cross to build a whole Olympic City. So, I just... is it one rule for one but because we was getting the Olympics?"

- The extent to which there is a housing crisis in London.

Most Jurors needed little convincing about the existence of a housing crisis in London. The facts and figures presented, for many, confirmed their own or their families' experiences of difficulty with finding and affording accommodation.

However, two Jurors remained less convinced – both about the current situation and about future housing need projections.

"I'm a bit sceptical about the whole housing crisis. It's not that evident to me, there just seems to be loads and loads of buildings all the time in the Borough of Greenwich, there's so many flats in the village itself. So they keep saying we need more and more housing and I know the population's going up, but where are these people living now? Because we do see homeless people but there's not families on the street, so I don't know where we get this."

"If the crisis was that bad then surely something would be done really quickly."

- The amount of government money that was being spent on benefits as opposed to investment in housing.

"There was a slide that said the demand side and the supply side, and I think obviously everyone would rather they put more money into the supply side than the demand side because they're using a lot of money for benefits. And it could possibly lead to having to spend less on benefits

with more supply but it's like jobs and all that, you just don't know how it's going to go, that's the problem."

4.2 Perceptions of the housing crisis

Some of the Jurors were more acutely aware of London's housing crisis than others, often due to personal experience of living in inappropriate housing themselves and/or knowing others that were affected. It was this subsection of Jurors that were quickest to identify and accept that reviewing the Green Belt could lead to provision of more homes. They gave examples of their own situation and that of their children (and mentioned the social and financial impact of families not being able to live near each other).

"If it doesn't really affect you then you don't really see it as much. Because me, personally, I just moved house yesterday, but I was waiting for four years in a one bed, with my daughter - who's now four, for four years until this social housing had been made affordable for us. So it's definitely there and you don't see it because nobody really complains, it's like as long as there's a roof over your head you're grateful, but we definitely need more houses because living in a one bedroom, two people for a really long time, it does impact."

"For example, my own son's 38 and it did take him up until last year to get the money together for a mortgage, and that wasn't in London, so he's had to move further out. So, it does seem that we're losing our younger people because either the properties are too expensive, or they aren't there."

"It's a shame because families are being split all over England because of that. ... I've got one lives in Kent and one lives in Milton Keynes because they couldn't afford to rent in London."

"Everyone assumes homeless is somebody who's sleeping on the street but homeless is also people who are sofa surfing, people like myself who live with their family member. I don't have my own bedroom, I sleep in the living room....I consider myself medium income, I earn enough to pay a mortgage, I just don't earn enough to shell out £70/80,000 as a deposit."

Whilst not all Jurors were personally affected, the majority accepted that there is a housing crisis and that they or their families could be affected in future.

"So I think crisis covers a very, very wide range, and it isn't necessarily... people tend to think crisis may or normally mean on the poorer scale, it doesn't at all. It's anybody at any time, circumstances happen to people and one minute you're okay and you've got a stable roof over your head and the next minute you haven't, and that's a housing crisis."

One Juror was not convinced by the fact that there is a housing crisis and asked questions in relation to the current situation and future housing need projections. This Juror felt that there is great uncertainty about future need,

particularly given that the implications of Brexit are unknown, and that demand could be overstated. Another Juror felt that housing associations are working hard to supply affordable accommodation and that there is more supply than people think.

4.3 Views after hearing the Panel of Speakers

In Session two, Jurors heard from two speakers on each side of the debate:

- Barney Stringer, Director at Quod, a planning consultancy and Siobhain McDonagh, Labour Party MP for Mitcham and Morden, who both outlined why they believe Green Belt restrictions in London should be reviewed.
- Paul Miner, Strategic Planning & Devolution Lead at CPRE and Steve O'Connell, Conservative London Assembly member for Croydon and Sutton, who both outlined why they believe Green Belt restrictions in London should not be reviewed.

Two sessions following the speakers (one with the Panel in attendance and one after the Panel of speakers had left the room) gave Jurors an opportunity to discuss the issues and clarify any questions that they had.

4.3.1 Jurors' questions to the Panel

The key questions from Jurors directly to the Panel were as follows:

Themes	Verbatim questions
Will a review work?	<i>"I appreciate that you [Siobhain McDonagh] are seeing a lot of people who are having housing difficulties, but do you think that, by reviewing the Green Belt, that the people with the issues are going to get housed? Because isn't it more likely that there'll be private homes built and the people haven't got the affordability to afford those schemes?"</i>
For those against a review – what is the alternative?	<i>"So I didn't quite understand, for those who are against it, for fixing the housing crisis. I don't quite understand what are your suggestions in how we can fix this?"</i>
Points of clarification	<i>"So a lot of figures have been floating around in terms of how much space we have that is Green Belt. Whilst I understand 22% of the land within London is Green Belt, how much is that in comparison to that extra Green Belt itself? So how much of the Green Belt is actually within London?"</i> <i>"My question is all the Green Belt sites that have tips and rubbish and car pounds, where exactly would all that rubbish then go? We already have an issue with all our rubbish and things being sent to other countries that are now being sent back to us. So, yes, we want to make the housing for people but what are we going to do with all this rubbish, all these broken vehicles and everything like that?"</i>
Planning/development related questions	<i>"[If a review were to happen] would the statutory planning laws still not be in place that 'right, fair enough, we're going</i>

	<p><i>to review Green Belt land but so and so's come forward, they want to build a thousand homes on this bit of land'. They're still going to go through the usual regular planning process to see the pros and cons of that development?"</i></p> <p><i>"If you're going to relax the planning laws, then the Green Belt that you specifically don't want built on, you're saying, they'll ask these questions and then we stop there, stop there, but how are you going to ensure that it will stop there? Because, if you get a developer, in my mind, their interest would be the profit and they might start on that site that you've identified but then 'oh, but we're just going to build on that field beyond it'. How can you ensure that that won't happen?"</i></p> <p><i>"So, do you think that private landowners should be prosecuted for actually doing nothing with the land that they have? Because you're not helping the economy and you're not helping the houses being built, you're just doing nothing with the land."</i></p>
<p>Is London's growth a negative?</p>	<p><i>"You were talking about urban sprawl, like Los Angeles and everything else. I've never been to Los Angeles, so I don't know what that means when you say that we don't want London to become like Los Angeles. From what I see on the TV, it looks a pretty nice."</i></p> <p><i>"Yes, what's the problem with London growing because eventually it's going to pop? So what is the problem with that?"</i></p>
<p>Alternative solutions</p>	<p><i>"My son is 36 now, was born in London and he's had to move out because there's no way he could afford it, and he's in Milton Keynes...has to work in London for his job but he has to pay astronomic... it's about £5,000 a year his train. He's only within half an hour so it is workable, but I think, if they tried to save the money on the train fares or make some deduction to working, that would help more people move out. That might be the answer rather than spending all the money on the housing, maybe try to reduce the train fares, work something out. And put more trains on as well because there's not enough"</i></p>

4.3.2 Jurors' views immediately following the Panel session

Following the speakers and a Panel Q&A session, Jurors were asked to complete an individual questionnaire indicating if, and how, their views had changed in relation to the overall Jury question. Some Jurors' opinions had solidified:

"Even more strongly agree. I feel that housing crisis was given more of an important highlight, in particular, the comments around space near train stations. I believe not relaxing [Green Belt restrictions] will cause London to become more dense than eventually becoming a city that discriminates against disabled, mentally ill, elderly etc."

"I still feel that reviewing the Green Belt restrictions will likely lead to a release of land that will only benefit a small number of people i.e. the developers and those that are wealthy enough to buy their homes."

Whilst there was still a majority in favour of a review, Figure 2 below illustrates some increased uncertainty amongst Jurors about the question, which reflects the complexity of the question and the fact that Jurors were trying to assimilate the new information that they had heard. As one Juror commented:

"I think the more I heard the more questions that I have."

This quote illustrates the some of the reasons for the indecision:

"I'm undecided. When I heard Siobhain [McDonagh] speak about certain sites, not all of them, there are some brownfield sites in the Green Belt, I think there should make provisions to use those exceptions. If they find that once they relaxed it that it would start wanting to get the 100% Green Belt as well."

Figure 2: Views on the Jury question - At this stage, how far do you agree or disagree with the main Jury question: London's Green Belt restrictions should be reviewed to help tackle London's housing crisis.

Participant ID	Beginning of Session One	After hearing from witnesses in Session Two
1	Tend to disagree	Tend to disagree
2	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
3	Don't know	Tend to agree
4	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree
5	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree
6	Tend to agree	Tend to agree
7	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
8	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
9	Strongly agree	Neither agree not disagree
10	Tend to agree	Tend to agree
11	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
12	Strongly agree	Tend to agree

4.3.3 Jurors' questions and thinking following the Panel discussion

Once the Panel had left the session, Jurors were given an opportunity to ask questions to the Jurors' friend – Alan Mace from the LSE – and to start to discuss the issues amongst themselves. The following issues and questions were raised:

- How long the current Green Belt restrictions have been in existence.

This was felt to be a key fact as many Jurors felt that the length of time since the legislation came into being (1955), was an argument for the review i.e. times and needs have changed in the meantime. However, one

Juror was of the opposite view, feeling that it hadn't taken much time for calls for the policy to be reviewed.

"It's only taken 70 odd years for it to then be up for review again, and that's in our lifetime."

- What, if any, impact building on Green Belt land might have on the climate.

"I'm against the review because I'm very het up on climate and I just feel like there wouldn't be a line drawn."

Jurors wanted more explanation of the potential impact of building on the Green Belt on wildlife, flooding and, particularly, clarification of whether London is kept cooler by having the Green Belt. The latter point [the heat island effect] was mentioned by one of the speakers opposed to the review as a key argument for retaining the Green Belt in its current form.

- Questions seeking to clarify the amount of land in London covered by the Green Belt.

One of the Jurors wanted clarification about the percentage of London covered by the Green Belt. Their point was that the Jury has only been asked to consider reviewing the 7% of the Metropolitan Green Belt that is within London's boundary.

"I think that it's quite a minimum amount of space in comparison to the whole metropolitan Green Belt area, so I am in favour of reviewing it."

- Whether London's growth / potential to sprawl is necessarily a negative.
- If, under the terms of a review, it would be possible to re-designate land that isn't currently classified as Green Belt, so that it becomes Green Belt.

The possibility of land being newly designated as Green Belt was a key factor for some, who felt that a review could be an opportunity for more appropriate land designation in future rather than simply a reduction in Green Belt land.

"Could [a review] also possibly lead to us making other decisions of other places that should be Green Belt that are currently not Green Belt and then just switching things about? That actually might make things easier and make things better."

- Why the current housing crisis isn't considered to be an 'exceptional circumstance' which would mean that Green Belt restrictions could potentially be relaxed.

"Some of the members of the Panel mentioned that Green Belt areas can allow planning in exceptional circumstances. If the housing crisis is not an exceptional circumstance, what is?"

- Discussions relating to the relative merits of building higher rise buildings vs. building on Green Belt land. Jurors asked questions about the relative environmental impacts of these two options. Some also indicated that they had negative feelings about higher-rise developments.

"I don't know who said something about it becoming quite dense in London, which I agree, and building up more. I don't understand why that isn't more environmentally unhealthy than going on the Green Belt, if we're building more houses upwards is that not going to be even worse?"

- Whether building more houses might stimulate even more housing demand. There was some concern that there would be unintended or unanticipated consequences of providing more housing supply.

"Do you think there'd then be another boom because people would then start to have families and then there'd be a whole another crisis, its 'gosh, we've built all these'... when you think about it, 'we've built all these smaller places and now people are having families because we've relaxed some reviews'. Even though I'm for it but it's just a question as well."

- There was wide, albeit not universal, agreement that brownfield sites within the Green Belt should be considered for development and that planning restrictions should be lifted in these cases:

"The review is helping us tackle those pockets of areas which are being used for dumps, that are being used for car washes, that because of a technicality we can't look to review, and we can't look to build on those. And that's what we're looking at, not an approach to then bulldoze the whole of the metropolitan green space area and build on it."

"I was opposed to it. When I saw pictures of rubbish dumps on the Green Belt, providing the new housing is built on these rubbish dumps, I'd be quite happy to go ahead with that...and also if it doesn't affect any wildlife."

However, there was concern from Jurors opposed to the review about the possible precedent that this may set. They felt that once development on the Green Belt was allowed in one area, then it would open the way for more and more development.

- Linked to this, some of the other Jurors' questions related to planning processes and how development would be controlled in future.

"So, the housing crisis is always going to be there unless something is drastically done, so what's to say that they are going to take a chunk of it on brownfields and then think, 'actually we need the Green bit now to build hospitals, supermarkets'?"

"But how are you going to ensure that it will stop there? Because, if you get a developer, in my mind, their interest would be the profit and they might start on that site that you've identified but then 'oh, but we're just

going to build on that field beyond it'. How can you ensure that that won't happen?"

One Juror queried if Councils could retain some control by working in partnership with developers:

"So what about Councils, instead of just selling the land to a developer, they invest with the developer in that housing and then they'll get some income from that? Because they need income, don't they, Councils are so short on income?"

A related point was the call for transparency and public accountability – a number of Jurors' questions throughout the sessions related to community engagement in the planning process and how the public would have a say about developments in their local area.

"So public decision making for public land really."

- Jurors' views (whether in favour or opposed to a review) frequently hinged on the question of whether new developments would genuinely provide affordable housing. Jurors asked questions relating to the percentage of affordable homes currently being built in London.

Those in favour of a review wanted reassurance that, if restrictions were relaxed, then the land would be used for affordable homes.

"I've always been for a review, I think it's long overdue and I think it should only be for affordable/council social housing, whatever the terminology is. It should not be for private landlords to buy and sell at a huge great big profit, it should be for the people that actually need it and those are the people that can least afford it."

Those opposed to a review cited their belief that the land wouldn't be used for affordable development, as one of the key reasons for their opposition.

"I'm all for making better use of the brownfield sites on the Green Belt but I feel quite strongly that it wouldn't get used for what we'd all like it to. I think for affordable housing it's excellent, but I just think developers would get their hands on it and it wouldn't help the crisis."

5. The Verdict

5.1 The overall verdict

At the end of the second day, the 12 Jurors were asked to consider their verdict on whether there should be a review of London's Green Belt restrictions to help tackle the London's housing crisis.

11 of the 12 jurors agreed⁸ that current Green Belt restrictions should be reviewed to help tackle London's housing crisis. The remaining juror strongly disagreed. The final voting is shown in Figure 3:

Should current Green Belt restrictions be reviewed to help tackle London's housing crisis?				
✓✓ Strongly agree	✓ Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	X Tend to disagree	XX Strongly disagree
5 Jurors	6 Jurors	0 jurors	0 jurors	1 Juror

Figure 3- The Final Verdict

The quote below exemplifies the views of those Jurors who had been personally affected by the housing crisis and were strongly in favour of a review. However, it wasn't only those who were personally affected, who were in favour of reviewing the policy.

"I'm somebody who is waiting for Council housing, I've been on the list for God knows how long and the likelihood is I probably never will get a Council property. I can't afford to wait until all of that's sorted out, to be honest, and I'm looking at a solution for the shortest amount of time. So, if that does mean taking a piece of that Green Belt, what is wrong with that? While we're still waiting for this decision about housing developers taking bits of land here and whatever, if this is something that can help loosen the strangle hold on people who are on the lists, like myself, then what's wrong with that?...I feel it stops me from growing, I can't think about having a family or anything like that and that kind of thing."

⁸ 5 strongly agreed and 6 tended to agree.

At the final vote, some Jurors who were undecided at certain points of the Jury had moved to agreeing with the jury question and one Juror who had been opposed at the midpoint, also supported the review.

"Before I didn't know what the Green Belt was. Being presented with both arguments, facts and figures, as well as personally being part of the crisis made me agree more strongly."

The views of the one Juror who remained against the review, throughout the Jury, hardened to strongly opposing it.

"Having been given the evidence today and discussed with the group, I don't feel a review is necessary to alleviate London's housing crisis and I am still not clear what part of the population the 'crisis' affects."

Individual views, and how they moved throughout discussions, are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Views on the Jury question - At this stage, how far do you agree or disagree with the main Jury question: London's Green Belt restrictions should be reviewed to help tackle London's housing crisis.

Participant ID	Beginning of Session One	After hearing from witnesses in Session Two	After delivering the final verdict Session Two
1	Tend to disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
2	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree
3	Don't know	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
4	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to agree
5	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Tend to agree
6	Tend to agree	Tend to agree	Tend to agree
7	Tend to agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
8	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
9	Strongly agree	Neither agree not disagree	Tend to agree
10	Tend to agree	Tend to agree	Tend to agree
11	Tend to agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
12	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to agree

5.2 Associated conditions

Whilst the majority of Jurors were in favour of a review of Green Belt restrictions to tackle the housing crisis, there were a number of conditions related to their verdict that they wanted to be taken into account.

They felt strongly that feasible, **alternative sites should be developed where possible in the first instance**, for example, developing brownfield sites and repurposing empty buildings/sites that have been identified by

developers i.e. that have options on them but have not been developed as yet because of the property market. One Juror who was opposed to the review felt that restrictions on developing listed buildings should be reviewed in preference to developing on Green Belt land.

Once the above alternatives have been exhausted, then 11 of the 12 Jurors indicated that they would be comfortable reviewing restrictions on development on Green Belt land, with a number of considerations. There was a strong call for any development of Green Belt land to provide **affordable or social housing** (and for the social housing, not to provide a 'right to buy' option because of the perceived adverse impact that this policy had on available supply in the longer term).

Some Jurors felt that there should be an opportunity to review whether developers have provided sufficient affordable housing on brownfield sites before they are trusted to develop on sites on the Green Belt.

"It depends on how successful the affordability was on those [brownfield] sites already, because then you draw the line and say 'actually, no, only 10% of those houses are being built [are affordable] on the brownfield sites, then why would you then go onto the green part?"

When Jurors were asked what percentage of affordable/social housing would be acceptable, there were mixed views. Around half indicated that they would be comfortable if the Mayor of London's 'fast-track approach' of at least 35% of homes built being affordable, with the others feeling that the percentage should be 50% or higher.

"It (35% of new housing development being affordable) would be better than what we have right now if that was the case. So, beggars can't be choosers, I guess."

For those agreeing with a review, conditions to their agreement also included: the need to ensure that the **necessary infrastructure** is provided alongside housing; that there is still **plenty of farmland** given the rising importance of sustainable agriculture; and that there will be appropriate **design standards** (both practical and aesthetic) in relation to any new development.

"I think we do need local farms to be providing stuff to go in the shops, like Farmers Markets and things. We need those little farmers around the Green Belt, I wouldn't want to see those go."

"And also for the design to be nice. Like mentioned earlier, something decent looking, not like a ghetto. Something in keeping that's affordable. ...Make it look decent."

Jurors made it clear that any housing built on Green Belt land **should be for those in need** i.e. they wanted reassurance that any new development would in reality be tackling the housing crisis.

"[Houses should be for those] that fit the criteria, they're working in London, they've got family in London, they need to be in London. They should go through that means of testing before they're able to buy them."

Jurors also called for **frequent reviews, transparency** and for **communities to have more of a say** in terms of development in their area:

"If it is to be reviewed, it should be reviewed frequently, somewhere between 10 to 25 years, possibly around there. All reviews should be made available to the public for everyone to see, and that communities should have more say in the reviews and what happens."

6. Conclusions

All but one member of The Jury was in favour of reviewing current Green Belt restrictions to help tackle London's housing crisis. In the final verdict, following the presentation of evidence and the day and a half of deliberations, 11 of the 12 Jurors indicated that they either agreed strongly or tended to agree with the statement.

All of the Jurors, apart from one, needed little convincing about London's housing crisis. Many had experienced the repercussions of the crisis at first hand – having had to rent inappropriate accommodation from private landlords (often too small for their needs), having to 'sofa-surf' at friends or having to move away from the places where they grew up. Some older Jurors mentioned that their adult children had been forced to move out of London to buy cheaper accommodation outside of the capital describing the social impact on family relationships, as well as the financial impacts on households.

Whilst there was not complete consensus on the overall verdict, there was consensus on the importance of providing affordable housing. Those Jurors in favour of the review felt strongly that restrictions should be reviewed **only if** a high proportion of any development is ringfenced for affordable homes. They wanted to be reassured that 'ordinary' London residents would benefit from a review rather than property developers or more affluent members of the population. This was also one of the key reasons why the one Juror opposed to the review remained so – they were sceptical that relaxing the restrictions would not, in reality, equate to an increased provision of affordable homes.

Jurors felt strongly that any development on the Green Belt should prioritise brownfield or low-quality sites near good transport links. They also called for reassurance about checks and balances within the process. They wanted to be sure that development on greener parts of the Green Belt would be controlled given the beneficial impacts of green spaces on health and wellbeing, as well as the potential impact on the environment of more development. There was some evident concern about the development of brownfield sites in the Green Belt being the 'thin end of the wedge'. Jurors wanted an evaluation of the success of building on brownfield land within the Green Belt i.e. to understand whether it delivers the affordable housing that they want. They also felt strongly that development decisions need careful scrutiny and that local communities need to have a say in the process.

Appendix A: Jury Profile

Total	12
Gender	
Male	6
Female	6
Age group	
18 – 29	3
30 – 44	4
45 – 64	3
65+	2
Ethnic background	
White	7
BAME	5
Working status	
Economically active Employed or self-employed Part-time or full-time	8 (4-5 in full-time work)
Economically inactive Unemployed, retired, sick or disabled, full time student, looking after home or family	4
Social grade	
AB	3
C1C2	6
DE	3
Attitudinal questions	
Environmental attitudes	Record attitudes to environment and development/housebuilding
Affiliations	
Political parties	Screen out
Campaign groups	Screen out
Lifestyle	
No dependent children	8
Dependent children	4
Housing tenure	
Owner occupier	6
Private rented	3
Social rented	3
London area	
Inner London borough	5 different Inner London Boroughs
Outer London borough	7 different outer London Boroughs

Appendix B: Agenda and Stimulus Materials

Jury agenda



Citizens' Jury
Outline Sessions Ag

Stimulus material used during Session One



Quiz questions and
answers FINAL.pptx



Ellie Evans
slides.pptx



Picture sort
exercise.pdf

Stimulus material used during Session Two



Slides for second
session FINAL.pptx



Paul Miner
slides.pptx



Barney Stringer
slides.pptx



Siobhain
McDonagh slides.pptx

Appendix C: Jurors' Evaluation of the Process

An evaluation questionnaire was distributed to all Jurors at the end of Jury. The Jurors were asked to give their views on a series of statements, using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There was a high level of satisfaction with the process, with no Jurors indicating that they disagreed with the statements.

The results in summary are as follows:

	Session 1	Session 2
<i>I enjoyed taking part in the event</i>		
Strongly agree	9	8
Agree	3	4
Neither agree nor disagree	-	-
Disagree	-	-
Strongly disagree	-	-
<i>Everyone was given a fair chance to have their say</i>		
Strongly agree	9	7
Agree	3	5
Neither agree nor disagree	-	-
Disagree	-	-
Strongly disagree	-	-
<i>The event was well organised and structured</i>		
Strongly agree	10	9
Agree	2	3
Neither agree nor disagree	-	-
Disagree	-	-
Strongly disagree	-	-
<i>The information was easy to understand</i>		
Strongly agree	5	5
Agree	6	6
Neither agree nor disagree	1	1
Disagree	-	-
Strongly disagree	-	-