

# Report summarising the responses to the 2025 Consultation on Changes to Proposals for Market Redevelopment

Date: 3 October 2025

## Introduction

### Purpose of the document

The purpose of this document is to summarise the responses received to the consultation, identify any key themes and set out the next steps.

### Background

The purpose of the consultation was to update tenants and stakeholders on the final plans for Building C and the Flower Market, and to seek views on specific proposals relating to the design of these new buildings.

The proposals were informed by discussions between CGMA and the Covent Garden Tenants' Association (**CGTA**), Market Management Committees (often referred to as the '**Statutory Committees**') and the wider tenant community.

Specifically, the proposals consulted on were:

1. Building C – subject to funding being available, a proposal to increase insulation in the external walls.
2. Flower Market – subject to funding, proposals to:
  - a. install doors in the external walls of each qualifying unit;
  - b. increase the size and load rating of the goods lifts;
  - c. install enhanced cooling systems to enable zoned cooling;
  - d. repurpose the internal waste compound area as a trolley park; and
  - e. move the location of the vehicle ramp to allow for easier loading.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the priority of proposals a to e above.

### How the consultation was run

The consultation ran for six weeks from 29 May to 11 July 2025.

A consultation document setting out the proposed changes was sent to key stakeholders including:

- all existing market tenants
- market customers
- members of the four Statutory Committees, comprising the two Market Management Committees, the Traffic Committee and the Workers' Advisory Committee
- The CGTA

- Defra

Posters were placed around the market with a QR code linking to the consultation, and the consultation was also prominently advertised on the CGMA website.

Consultees were able to respond by using an online survey, by email and by post/delivery. Opportunities were made available for consultees to ask questions about the proposals by email, through Statutory Committee meetings, and via two drop-in sessions held on 18 and 24 June.

In addition, and at the request of both of the Market Management Committees, a joint meeting of the Market Management Committees was held on 24 June for the specific purpose of discussing and responding to the consultation.

### Questions asked

The online survey comprised of one set of questions on Building C, and seven sets of questions on the Flower Market.

For Building C, consultees were asked for views on the proposal to increase insulation in the external walls. Question 1A allowed participants to choose from fixed responses (*strongly approve, approve, neither approve nor disapprove, disapprove, strongly disapprove*). Question 1B asked respondents whether any other design change should be given the next highest priority and enabled responses via a free text box. Finally, Question 1C provided a free text box for general comments and alternative suggestions (including not implementing any proposals at all).

The remaining questions focused on the Flower Market. Questions 2 to 6 asked consultees for their views on each of the five proposed design changes to the Flower Market and asked participants to choose from fixed responses (*strongly approve, approve, neither approve nor disapprove, disapprove, strongly disapprove*) to indicate whether they approved of each of the proposals. Each of the multi-choice questions was followed by a free text box offering consultees the opportunity to comment on the proposals and asking whether they had any alternative suggestions (including not implementing the proposal at all).

Question 7 asked consultees to rate the five proposed design changes in order of priority, and also provided a free text box for consultees to comment on those priorities.

Question 8 consisted of a free text box for consultees to provide any general comments on the design of the Flower Market.

## Summary of Responses to the Consultation

### Key themes arising from Statutory Committee Meetings

Feedback from the Statutory Committees was as follows.

- Feedback from the Workers Advisory Committee Meeting (held over two sessions) included:
  - Fruit and Vegetable Market traders dealing with dairy and highly perishable goods might benefit from increased insulation;
  - some Fruit and Vegetable Market businesses may benefit more from an extended canopy so that loading and unloading could be completed more easily in adverse weather conditions;

- the importance of facilities to accommodate Dutch trollies in the Flower Market was emphasised;
  - grouping smaller Flower Market businesses together with zoned cooling might be helpful; and
  - further suggestions were made regarding electric vehicle charging, improved bike storage and designated motorcycle parking.
- No specific feedback arose out of the Traffic Management Advisory Committee Meeting.
- Feedback from the joint meeting between the Market Management Advisory Committee (Flowers) and the Market Management Advisory Committee (Fruit and Vegetables) included:
  - it was firmly emphasised that all the walls in Building C should be the same as those within building B2 and B3, with tenants noting that insulation on the front walls should always have been the same as for the other walls, as part of the base build design;
  - it was firmly emphasised that more dividing walls/smaller units are required in Building C;
  - it was stated that the lifts currently proposed for the Flower Markets are not fit for purpose and have resulted in some tenants losing customers; and
  - the proposal to relocate the vehicle ramp was thought to be no longer required.
- Tenants who were also present at the joint Market Management Advisory Committee meeting confirmed that they wished this feedback to stand as their response to the consultation, and that they would not respond to the online survey on that basis.
- CGTA members who were also present at the joint Market Management Advisory Committee meeting confirmed that they wished this feedback to stand as their response to the consultation, and that they would not respond to the online survey on that basis.

#### Key findings from the online survey responses

A total of four responses were received to the online survey. One response was from a Fruit and Vegetable Market Trader, two responses were received from Flower Market Traders and one response was received from a Flower Market Customer.

#### Question 1 – Building C

##### Part A: multi-choice

Only one respondent strongly approved of the proposal to increase insulation in the external walls of Building C. The other three respondents (including the only Fruit and Vegetable Market Trader) responded 'neither approve nor disapprove'.

##### Part B: other design change suggestions

Two responses to this question were received. Both responses were made by Flower Market Traders who appeared to be commenting on the Flower Market design rather than Building C. One response suggested 'one buyers walk in the flower market'. The second response stated there are 'too many' other potential design changes. This respondent also expressed the view that the provision for loading docks and lorry access cannot be proved to work.

#### Part C: respondents' comments

A single response to Part C was received from a Flower Market Trader. Again, this comment appeared to be directed at the Flower Market rather than Building C specifically. The comment expressed the view that the market layout was designed without the developer understanding the true needs of tenants.

#### *Question 2 – Flower Market – external doors*

##### Part A: multi-choice

Two respondents (both Flower Market Traders) strongly approved of this proposal. The Fruit and Vegetable Market Trader did not respond to this question and the Flower Market Customer expressed approval.

##### Part B: respondents' comments

The two responses to this question came from Flower Market Traders who both described the change as 'essential' for loading and unloading produce.

#### *Question 3 – Flower Market – goods lifts*

##### Part A: multi-choice

All respondents strongly approved of this proposal.

##### Part B: respondents' comments

One response was received by a Flower Market Trader. This response described the inclusion of appropriate lifts as essential, noting the existing lifts are not tall enough to carry full height trolleys. Further, the existing lifts in the Interim Flower Market were described as not suitable for commercial use, leading to frequent breakdowns and a loss of customers.

#### *Question 4 – Flower Market – cooling systems*

##### Part A: multi-choice

Two respondents (one Flower Market Trader and one Flower Market Customer) strongly approved of this proposal. One respondent (a Flower Market Trader) approved of the proposal. The fourth respondent neither approved nor disapproved.

##### Part B: respondents' comments

One response was received by a Flower Market Trader. The response noted that different tenants handle different products ranging in temperature from 4 degrees to 16 degrees, with some only requiring ambient temperature. The ability to set unit temperature and humidity was described as essential to ensuring products remain in the best condition possible.

#### *Question 5 – Flower Market – waste compound area*

##### Part A: multi-choice

One Flower Market Trader strongly approved of this proposal and the other Flower Market Trader approved of this proposal. The other two respondents neither approved nor disapproved of the proposal.

##### Part B: respondents' comments

One respondent who neither approved nor disapproved of the proposal asked where the waste will go. The other response was from a Flower Market Trader who expressed the view that prioritising space for the loading dock is essential.

### *Question 6 – Flower Market – location of vehicle ramp*

#### Part A: multi-choice

One respondent strongly disapproved of this proposal and one disapproved. The other two respondents neither approved nor disapproved.

#### Part B: respondents' comments

One response was received by a Flower Market Trader. The respondent noted that a better solution to this issue had since been proposed.

### *Question 7 – Flower Market – priority of changes*

#### Part A: prioritisation

Three respondents answered this question. The order of priorities provided by each respondent is summarised in the table below.

	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3
<b>External doors</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Goods lifts</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Cooling systems</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Waste compound area</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Location of vehicle ramp</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

#### Part B: respondents' comments

One response was received by a Flower Market Trader. The respondent expressed the view that none of the design changes should be compromised, stating that tenants should be excited about the new market, not concerned about whether it will be workable. The response further noted that, with tenant input, the design is improving and moving forward.

### *Question 8 – Flower Market – general comments*

Two responses were received to this question. The first noted that the design for the Flower Market is 'getting closer to being workable' and noted that tenant and customer input is essential to achieve this. The second response asked whether more compost bins were possible.

### Key themes from the online survey responses

- The response rate to the online survey was low. This may be in part because tenants had the opportunity to feed into the consultation through the CGTA and Statutory Committees. Tenants who were also members of the CGTA and Statutory Committees made it clear that their views as expressed in Statutory Committee meetings were to be treated as their response to the consultation.
- Some tenants expressed greater interest in the proposed configuration of the new market, including unit allocation (which was not the subject of this consultation).
- Only one online survey respondent expressed support for the proposal to increase the insulation in the external walls of Building C. This respondent was not a Fruit and Vegetable Market Trader.

- There was general support for all proposed design changes to the Flower Market apart from the proposal to move the location of the vehicle loading ramp which was not supported by any of the respondents.
- The proposal to install doors in the external walls of each qualifying unit in the Flower Market was ranked as the first priority by all consultees who responded to question 7, though only two out of those three strongly approved of the proposal (with the third expressing approval).
- The proposal to change the cooling systems in the Flower Market was rated the second priority by two respondents and third priority by another. Two of these respondents strongly approved the proposal and one approved it.
- All respondents strongly approved of the proposal to change the goods lifts. Of the three respondents who ranked the proposals, this change was rated as the second priority by one respondent, third priority by another and fourth priority by the last respondent.
- Repurposing of the waste compound area for use as a trolley park was ranked as the fourth priority for two respondents and the third priority by the other respondent. It was strongly supported by one Flower Market Tenant and supported by the other, while the remaining respondent who ranked the proposals had neither approved nor disapproved of this proposal.

#### Other feedback received

- An email was received from a Flower Market Trader asking whether thought had been given to the installation of solar panels or any other energy saving measures.
- Feedback received (from Flower Market Traders) during drop-in sessions included:
  - external door access for perimeter units was expressed to be important, particularly for tenants with delivery/distribution businesses;
  - tenants expressed that they would benefit from allocated parking (noting there is currently no plan for this); and
  - it was noted that the old Flower Market building was climate cooled and it was considered important to replicate this.
- Defra providing a letter in response to the consultation. In summary:
  - in respect of the proposal to increase insulation to external walls of building C, Defra recommend that CGMA carefully consider if this is a necessary use of funds (even in the event that additional funding is made available);
  - Defra have no view on which changes to the Flower Market design, if any, should be a priority, but recommend that CGMA ensure any changes agreed are operationally necessary and can be fully funded; and
  - as a general comment, essential changes required by law should be prioritised, followed by any changes necessary for the effective operation of the market, subject to these being affordable within current budgets.

### Next steps

This report was considered by the CGMA Board on 31 July, and on 25 September and the CGMA resolved to pursue the following as strategic objectives for Building C:

- that the internal insulation of the front walls of the units (excluding the roller shutter doors) should be upgraded to the same specification as other internal walls in the units – namely 100mm Kingspan insulation (or equivalent); and
- that CGMA should prioritise installing additional internal dividing walls in Building C, so that more smaller premises can be made available.

Discussions are in progress with CGMA's development partners, VSM, about how best to bring these changes forward. Whilst at this stage CGMA cannot confirm exactly how many additional internal walls will be provided, it has reassured tenants that the base build specification already includes enough walls to ensure that every relocating tenant can be offered a new unit of the nearest practical equivalent size to their current one. As with earlier phases, CGMA will work closely with relocating tenants and the CGTA to agree the optimal layout.

The elements of the consultation relating to the Flower Market will be considered in line with the redevelopment programme, and a further update will be provided on this in due course.