

How the Warm Homes Plan Can Turn Promises into Progress

Published on 21st January, 2026, the [Warm Homes Plan \(WHP\)](#) was rightfully welcomed by the clean heat and retrofit industry. It pledges £15bn towards upgrading homes, while promising to lift one million households out of fuel poverty by increasing the uptake of low carbon technologies (LCTs) and energy efficiency measures. Yet the WHP will not be judged by the size of its budget, or by the pledges it has made, but instead by how many households it reaches and the impact it delivers.

With the Energy Security and Net Zero Select Committee now consulting on how the delivery of the Warm Homes Plan should be prioritised, and the Government reviewing responses to its Warm Homes Fund call for evidence, policymakers have a critical opportunity to address the risks of delayed mobilisation and an increasingly compressed delivery window.

The WHP: A Catalyst for Change

Beyond its role as a mechanism for funding home upgrades, the WHP was designed to act as a catalyst for growth in the wider domestic decarbonisation and retrofit sectors. Its investment should stimulate demand for LCTs, strengthen supply chains, give industry the confidence to invest, and accelerate the rollout of measures that permanently reduce household energy bills.

So far, this catalytic effect has yet to materialise. While significant funding has been announced, mobilisation of much of the WHP remains at an early stage. The principal programmes currently translating funding into household delivery are Warm Homes: Local Grant (WH:LG), Warm Homes: Social Housing Fund (WH:SHF) and the Boiler Upgrade Scheme (BUS), all of which predate the publication of the WHP.

Commitment versus Delivery

The Warm Homes Plan has allocated substantial funding over a fixed four-year period. However, delivery to date centres on schemes that were already operational or committed before the publication of the Plan – namely, WH:LG, WH:SHF and Boiler Upgrade Scheme (BUS). The table below is based on the funding allocations published within the [Government's Warm Homes Plan](#), with AgilityEco's assessment of the current delivery and mobilisation status of each programme added to illustrate the extent to which the Plan has translated into delivery to date.

Warm Homes Plan						
	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	Total
Low-income homes grants	462	960	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,422
of which Warm Homes: Local Grant	88	206	206	–	–	500
of which Warm Homes: Social Housing Fund Wave 3	374	854*	459	–	–	1,687
New combined scheme	–	–	335	1,000	1,000	–
Boiler Upgrade Scheme (BUS)	295	400	600	683	709	2,687
Heat Networks	215	212	212	212	212	1,063
Warm Homes Fund (WHF)	–	–	–	–	–	5,300
Of which: Consumer loan	–	–	–	–	–	2,000
Of which: Low income	–	–	–	–	–	600
Other programmes	–	–	–	–	–	428
Total funding, inc. Barnett Consequentials	–	–	–	–	–	15,000

Existing programme

Future funding committed but delivery arrangements are yet to be confirmed

Current or imminent delivery period but not yet consulted on or mobilised

*WH:SHF Wave 3 2026/27 comprises the original £459m allocation, the additional £295m announced alongside the WHP, and a subsequent additional £100m commitment for solar PV and battery deployment

Plans for deploying new WHF funding are yet to be confirmed, and annual budgets are also to be published. This suggests that funding for these schemes will be back-ended to the second half of the period. The resulting compressed delivery window presents a significant risk. Large-scale programmes require time to design, consult upon and mobilise, while delivery organisations and supply chains require sufficient certainty to invest in the capacity needed to deliver them. Further delays therefore increase the risk that the full allocation cannot be effectively deployed within the Plan period.

The Cost of Delays

The greatest cost of delayed delivery is borne by households requiring support. Every year of delay means fewer households benefit from warmer, more energy-efficient homes, and more continue to face unnecessarily high energy bills and poor-quality housing.

This is particularly significant for low-income households. Programmes such as WH:LG and WH:SHF are providing substantial support to these households, but both programmes are due to conclude in 2027/28, at the same time as Government intends to transition to a new combined low-income scheme. Any delay in mobilising the successor arrangements therefore risks creating a cliff edge in support, just as existing delivery mechanisms have become established.

Such a disruption would compound the wider delivery challenge. Government's ambition to lift up to one million households out of fuel poverty by 2030 relies on a combination of public investment and strengthened Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards (MEES) across the private and social rented sectors. Yet, the underpinning legislation required to give effect to these strengthened requirements is not in force. A gap in publicly funded support, alongside a regulatory framework that is still being implemented, would further compress the period available to improve low-income homes before 2030.

The issue is therefore not simply whether Government ultimately spends the £15bn committed through the Warm Homes Plan, but whether there is continuous and timely support reaching households throughout the Plan period. Avoiding a break between existing and successor programmes should be a priority if Government is to maintain delivery momentum and achieve the outcomes it has set.

Priorities for Delivery

The programmes currently delivering most effectively for households are predominantly existing schemes. Thus, the Government's priority should be to maximise delivery through established mechanisms, bolster them with increased funding now, to be spent within the existing delivery window, enabling them to reach more households at greater speed, while ensuring that new programmes are properly designed and mobilised.

This should not mean delaying longer-term reforms envisaged through the WHP, but sequencing them in a way that protects household support and delivery in the meantime. This pragmatism will provide government with the time needed to properly plan out the new scheme funding regimes, with realistic targets, and maximise total funding to households that need it most.

This is particularly important for low-income households. Programmes such as WH:LG and WH:SHF have taken time to mobilise to achieve a very strong run rate now, with local authorities and social landlords developing pipelines, procuring delivery partners and establishing supply chains in its early phases. The additional funding committed to WH:SHF during 26/27 is most welcome. However,

progress on WH:LG suggests that it has achieved a run rate where many schemes will have deployed allocated budgets for 26/27 within the first half of the year.

Government should avoid allowing this delivery infrastructure to fall away while the new combined low-income scheme is being developed. It should also consider that, if successor arrangements are not designed, consulted upon and mobilised with sufficient lead time, Government should be prepared to maintain and, where appropriate, provide further support through existing WH:LG and WH:SHF delivery mechanisms to ensure continuity into 2028/29.

More broadly, Government should provide greater certainty over the timing and annual funding profiles of the new programmes announced through the Plan, particularly the £5.3bn Warm Homes Fund. Earlier visibility of arrangements and design will allow the sector to invest in capacity, develop propositions and supply chains, and prepare for the significant increase in delivery required during the latter years of the Plan.

Of course there is a place for new infrastructure, including the planned Warm Homes Agency, but developing new systems must not come at the expense of getting support to households. Tackling the affordability agenda now means prioritising delivery over redesign, and the fastest way to reduce energy bills is to strengthen the mechanisms that are already working.

Conclusion

The Warm Homes Plan is one of the most ambitious commitments to tackling fuel poverty and decarbonising homes in recent years. However, ambition alone is not enough, and the plan's success will be determined by the speed and effectiveness of delivery.

The Government now has a clear opportunity to accelerate funding through the programmes that are already working, avoiding a cliff edge in support for low-income households, and providing sufficient certainty and lead time for new programmes to mobilise effectively. If not, and delivery continues to lag, the Warm Homes Plan will fail to achieve the outcomes it was created to deliver.