Refreshing the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth

The appendixes

January 2019






Appendix A: The value of the Quality Charter Process
Appendix B: What cohesion means
Appendix C: Principles for designing cohesive communities
Appendix D: Better neighbourhood management
Appendix E: Auditing housing performance

The URBED Trust

Contents

Appendix A

The Value of the Quality Charter Process

Dr Stephen Platt

This report assesses the Cambridge Quality Charter and it implementation through the Camrbridgeshire Quality Panel. It is based on telephone interviews using a list of prompts with planners, developers, designers and panel members. The main findings and conclusions are summarized in the body of the report *Refreshing the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth.*

People interviewed

Local authority planning officers
Jonathan Brookes, Principal Urban Designer, Cambridge City Council
Jane Green, Development Delivery Manager, South Cambs DC
Juliet Richardson, Head Service, Growth & Economy, Cambridgeshire CC
Applicants
Heather Topel, Project Director, University NW Cambridge
Emma Fletcher, Managing Director, Smithson Hill, Ex Marshall
Duncan Jenkins, Project Director, Endurance Estates
Design team
Robert Rummey, Managing Director, Rummey Design
Teresa Borsuk, Partner, Pollard Thomas Edwards (PTE)
Panel Members
Robin Nicholson, Member, Cullinan Studio
David Birkbeck, Chief Executive, Design for Homes
Simon Carne, Architect Planner Urban Designer, CQP member
David Prichard, Co-Founder and Consultant, Metropolitan Workshop LLP
Others
Nigel Howlett, CEO, Cambridge Housing Society
Kathy MacEwen, Hounslow LB, Ex CABE design review
Peter Studdert, former Director of Planning at Cambridge City Council (pending)

What are your impressions of new development in Cambridge and the region?

Planners

The overall quality is very good compared to elsewhere. We were pushing at an open door with Countryside and others stepped up to produce better quality than normal, for example Barratts at Trumpington Meadows used Allies and Morrison to fine tune the layout because the scheme had to work hard to deliver the numbers and it needed good designers. [Jonathan Brookes]

It's variable – excellent in some place and average and depressing in others. [Juliet Richardson]

Applicants

We have tried to respond to issues as they arise. I can't comment on other new developments, but we looked around the county at what works or doesn't. The issues are transport, accessibility and how much Eddington should be part of the city or separate, access to open spaces, the balance of informal and formal, drainage etc. The planning process can protect quality to an extent but is always subject to pressures of what the developer believes the market will bear. [Heather Topel]

The quality of new development is hit or miss: some schemes will stand the test of time and there are others they will be pulling down in 30 years. This is to do with the quality of materials and detailing and a lack of quality of open spaces because open space tends to be used as a buffer rather than a big amenity space. [Emma Fletcher]

Three examples come to mind – NW Cambridge, the Southern fringe and Trumpington Meadows. I particularly like Trumpington Meadows; it has more of a village feel and a family scale. Some developers had to be dragged kicking and screaming to deliver better quality. Countryside produced good roadway planting and the development looks really smart and the variety works well. I'm less convinced with the development around the Addenbrookes access road, maybe it will look better when the planting is more mature. I like the pitched roofs and the housing around the Trumpington Church and how the old village has been respected; it works well. I struggle with NW Cambridge; it looks like Eastern Europe – it's too cold. But I like the Hill housing around the Bell Language School. CB1 has a good buzz and I like the narrow streets. There is activity and its busy, smart, new and fresh, there are shops, it's coming together. I did the planning at Orchard Park. It's of its era and it looks okay. There were a few teething problems, but is not too bad. It's not got the quality of the Southern Fringe and it's a product its setting and where it is in the city. In the round, development in Cambridge is pretty good. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

Attitude generally positive. With larger developments land can get subdivided into parcels, with each being carried out by a different developer/ architect - and so, unless there are sensible guidelines, can end up as an architectural wonderland. Landscape is key in tying a place together. For example, in NW Cambridge the landscape is consistent over the whole site. Developments need time to settle and let landscape take over. [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

Generally the quality is very good in Cambridge from what I've seen on site and the ones we reviewed. Obviously it's not 100%. And my impression is that it's getting better. How much that is due to the influence of the panel and the quality charter I don't know. Maybe just the threat is helpful to get developers to raise their game. [Simon Carne]

Cambridge is good relative to other places and there is more energy to try to make things better. But it could be better and although there are some highs, there are also some lows. It all started with Northstowe, which is ironic since in Northstowe there are some of the poorest schemes we've seen. [David Prichard]

Frankly most of the country's best housing that has been built in the last 10 years is in Cambridge. But what intrigues me is why several schemes, notably those you can see approaching the station from the south, such as Kaleidoscope, and those overlooking Cambridge Leisure, miss. That's perverse: usually developments around a transport hub (especially when connected to London jobs) are better than those far out on the city edge. In Cambridge the best housing is mostly in the new urban extensions and the worst is mostly in the city centre. [David Birkbeck]

Others

There is a wide variety of quality in Cambridge. Some is very good, especially where Colleges/the University have been involved. Some is very short-term focused commercial and high density and leaves a lot to be desired. Some schemes go ahead that are undesirable and we have started to see one or two developers offering affordable housing schemes that are unacceptable to us in quality. [Nigel Howlett]

Does the Quality Charter and Panel make a difference to particular schemes or to the general quality of new development in Cambridge?

Planners

All the major sites have been to the panel for review and have had to respond to the quality charter. A lot is dealt with at pre-app, so much that the panel picks up on is on our radar but it helps that an independent panel of experts that is not constrained by policy or politics says it. The 4Cs Quality Charter works because it's simple, and yet is much more than just aesthetic judgment. When the panel review schemes using the 4 Cs you get a much more rounded view than that taken by most design review. [Jonathan Brookes]

I genuinely believe that the charter and panel make a difference. Applicants with high quality schemes recognise and appreciate the panel's input and the review helps raise the bar for weaker applicants with poorer schemes. The panel's report has a huge influence with council members and planning committees. Councillors appreciate the integrity of the panel members and place huge faith in their opinions. When the County took over responsibility for the panel from Horizons and the panel became self-financing there were those who thought it wouldn't survive more than 12 months. I'm proud of helping make it work so successfully. It's down to the various chairs and panel members. [Juliet Richardson]

Applicants

We used the 4Cs throughout the planning process. I like to think we might have come up with the same idea or thought as broadly. It was valuable bringing schemes to the panel; it challenged our design team and was a reassurance before going to committee. [Heather Topel]

The CQC can make a huge difference if there is consistency in the quality panel. We saw a different panel each time, which set us back and caused confusion because we were covering old ground. (This is slightly misleading as a great deal of effort goes into trying to ensure the same scheme is seen by the same panel members.) Seeing the panel earlier we would have developed a greater collective understanding but due to timing we weren't allowed to go earlier to the panel on Wing and Cherry Hinton. Planning should be an iterative process. I would rather meet five times and be happy to pay for five panel reviews during the course of a scheme to establish a back and forth dialogue. [Emma Fletcher]

I like the approach. The idea of 4Cs is something we were involved in. It's easy to understand and a simple benchmark. It's better to think about the 4C's early and shape your presentation to suit. Retrofitting them depends on the brief you give the master planners. I have had mixed experience with a panel. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

The Charter and the 4Cs are extremely beneficial. They provide a simple shorthand way of people understanding the design led approach the panel would like to see. Whether they produce a result is harder to prove. Everything changes in the long course of a project. On our big scheme in Bourn the case officer and all the developer's personnel changed and that only left me providing continuity. [Robert Rummey]

The intention (to use the 4Cs to raise quality) is laudable but when you are preparing a presentation the 4Cs should be integral to every aspect of the scheme. Having to organise the material and telegraph the message in the 4Cs sometimes feels like another layer of structure you could do without. We present what we've done rather than structure along the 4Cs. [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

The 4Cs makes sense, it is always a struggle to separate the Cs. People do think about the 4Cs and have gone beyond lip service to them in the way they structure their presentation and the way they think about their schemes. We all struggle with *Character* and people tend to be rather superficial. It is the historic nature of highways that determines character as much as anything. We are faced with the large turning circles and refuse lorry provision and, in response to complaints from the disabled community, we are being asked to reassess shared space and apply a blanket ban. On *Climate* building regulations have gone a long way but greening and water management and how well the place will be maintained in the future are also part of climate. The whole landscape thing is crucial that's the area where climate and connectivity come together. The simple description of a process and then the assessment of design quality by reference to the 4 C's were what impressed me. [Simon Carne]

The quality charter is a good document primarily because it's short, intelligent and succinct and not drowning in complicated language. We need to emphasise that the Charter is what we are investing in and applicants need reminding. The Cambridge Quality Panel is the best I sit on, partly because it has an agenda, the 4Cs, which covers a spectrum of issues. The 4Cs are what a good architect would be trying to do anyway but they have the virtue of nursing weaker applicants and being more demanding of them. Our role is to push them up to be better designers. Developers don't appreciate what good design can do for them. Many are old fashion house builders employing mediocre designers. [David Prichard]

The 4Cs predate the London SPD, which provides clearer, more rigorous guidance - for example, you must have 6 m of outdoor amenity space. The problem with the 4Cs is that it avoids detail. We need more focus on exactly what supports good development. Developers often use the 4Cs to highlight the better features of their scheme, using any positives they can describe in 4C language to mask other potential weaknesses. The guidance needs more detail. For example, I'd recommend minimum floor to ceiling heights and proof of a ventilation strategy. Climate, as addressed in the 4Cs, will impact in the first instance as overheating so we need to guarantee properties have a workable ventilation strategy. I feel we've done well, but at least one scheme that got good feedback at the panel ending up with serious overheating issues. That points to the need for more precise questioning. [David Birkbeck]

Others

In theory I think that the 4Cs are a good idea and that the concept is really important. [Nigel Howlett]

I believe design review does make a difference, but the effect is more complex than making improvements to individual schemes. It creates a climate of expectation, raises the bar and signposts what the authority is trying to achieve. [Kathy MacEwen]

How important is the quality of new development to you and your organisation?

Planners

Members have high expectations about the quality of new development and that's why we have such an experienced urban design team in Cambridge. We achieve most at pre-app and a lot of that improvement is unnoticed. The things that make a scheme work well and long lasting are not the architectural wow factors but detailed issues. For example all the parking bays on our schemes can accommodate larger cars. [Jonathan Brookes]

Quality is very important to my team. The County is a strategic authority; so achieving quality on individual schemes is less of a priority than it is for the Districts, rightly so.

Applicants

It is very important for organisations I've chosen to work for; they all have a vested interest in Cambridge. [Emma Fletcher]

Quality varies from landowner to landowner and I have to bring landowners with me. What we want and what works from a planning point of view is flexibility and lifting the bar on quality as you go along. For me quality is what looks good on the ground and what works on the ground. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

There is a dawning realisation in the industry that quality does make a difference and that poor quality has made a whole generation resistant to change and has undermined the acceptability of development. [Robert Rummey]

Quality is fundamental; it is not about winning awards but about delivering excellent places and eg homes. Developers need for their schemes to be a success and for their homes to sell to be able to move onto their next development. [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

Quality is crucial after all were creating a legacy. At the tail end of my life I'm trying to operate at a higher level of effectiveness and I'm pleased and honoured to be involved in the panel and to take part in Cambridge development. [David Prichard]

Others

We usually don't have a direct input on quality as the majority of the housing we get is section 106 from developers and we have to take it or leave it. One of the main issues is inadequate space standards. We expect affordable rented property to be fully occupied, so if it is a five-person house we expect the single bedrooms to have enough room for a bed, storage and desk, etc; some don't. The main consideration is that our housing needs to allow people to live their lives properly. We are keen to see two separate living spaces on the ground floor so that different activities can go on simultaneously or at the very least to avoid small kitchens that are cut off from the rest of the living space. Then there are management issues. If the nature of the scheme means a high service charge then the cost to the occupier could be prohibitive. We are also wary of some builders because of their willingness or otherwise to deal with defects. We know from experience that some people are easier to work with and are more responsive than others. [Nigel Howlett]

There are big differences between different local authorities. In some places there is a feeling that good design is less important whereas in others, like Cambridge, developers and applicants know they have to up their game to get approval. [Kathy MacEwen]

What things contribute to the success or otherwise of new housing? What makes some housing more desirable?

Planners

The really big thing that contributes to success of a scheme is developer legacy. In general developers who have a long-term involvement build better quality housing. [Juliet Richardson]

Applicants

The occupiers are key for example initially Accordia was hard to sell and then key people moved in. The quality of the landscape and an understanding of the setting are important – Accordia for example should not have been replicated willy-nilly across Cambridge because settings are all different and need to respond to their environment. Proximity to good schools is also critical. [Emma Fletcher]

The big problem is to get the County Council highways to play ball. It's a big issue – frustrating. They unpick good work and it takes an age to the time to get permission. On Ely North e had a good onsite session with County Council members. We took on highways on four principal points – the width of the road, tree adoption, on-street access and footpaths and parking. The Church Commissioners had rolled over but that's not my approach. We had a round-table and came away agreeing. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

Some developments, by the very act of development destroy the very thing that made the site special in the first place. Working with an already established landscape can be key. These are tricky times I was in a meeting today where the developer was worried about how to sell the homes; he said there is no point in building if we can't sell. Of course quality is more fundamental than spending money. Today, we have to be more nimble and smart about how and where the money is spent. [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

The Quad scheme, which is value engineered to pieces. The scale of the public realm is too large and the centre of the scheme it is very disappointing and hey haven't put in half the stuff they promised in the public square. The streets are too wide and give a suburban feel to what should be a bit of the town. Some other parts of Great Kneighton work very well and are quite tight and give a good urban feel, but we're fighting house builders. The original people involved in the scheme may have moved on and are no longer there to fight their corner and wrong decisions about what is worth preserving get made. [Simon Carne]

First impressions are important and it's the soft and hard landscaping that makes the place look finished. So investing in good landscaping and semi-mature material is good value and high-quality fences and walls and paving are important. We should also anticipate how people might change and personalise their homes. We need adaptability. Some of the most popular homes we designed were 4 person 2-bed homes where the twin room could be divided because there was a wide landing and two windows or a wide mullion [David Prichard]

In Cambridge agents are advising developers that people are looking for 150m2 apartments. At first sight they seem oversized when most of the country is getting

less than 70m2. It's such a different market. Hill and Countryside have taken this on and are competing with each other. You can see it at Eddington – apartment terraces big enough to land helicopters on. Never in my wildest dreams did I think this kind of thing would be built on edge of town sites in the UK. They defy the development economics of the rest of the country, apart from places like Oxford, Cheltenham and Bristol. But potentially this new development is far more robust and gives the city enviable housing stock that can only further enhance its appeal – even to Europeans who are known to mock our new-builds. If you were a Dane thinking about moving to Britain, you'd pick Cambridge for apartments 50% bigger than you'd find in Copenhagen. [David Birkbeck]

Others

There is tremendous pressure on affordable housing so people who come to us from the top of the housing needs register often have major life problems or difficult personal circumstances. People can't necessarily get a home where they'd like or near their support networks so their satisfaction with the new housing may be lower than one might expect. One of the things that crops up regularly with our residents is inadequate parking. For a while it was planning policy to restrict parking. Most of our residents work and as you go further away from the town centres there is a greater need for car ownership due to weaknesses in public transport. The second major issue is antisocial behaviour which relates both to the design/density of the property and the letting policy of the association. We have learnt that the higher the density, the greater the potential for social conflict and if you house a number of people in difficult circumstances together. So one can increase social cohesion with the right density and design. Finally, shared space is an issue and sharing with people whose lifestyle doesn't match yours or who exhibit erratic behaviour can cause social conflict. Good design can minimise these risks and ensure we build fully inclusive communities [Nigel Howlett]

What do you think people mean when they talk about the quality of new housing?

Planners

What quality means varies with different people and between schemes. People buying into a new scheme will have a different perception to those already living on the edge of the new development. The new residents might like the sense of community or the modern design, while people in neighbouring housing may hate the flat roofs and high density. [Jonathan Brookes]

Well thought through schemes with an underpinning evidence base where one can understand the thought process behind the design. Alconbury School is a classic example. Some schools get a harder time than they deserve from the panel bearing in mind the pressures on them. Distinctive places with an identity. Good use of materials that wear well. There is a care home scheme at Mitchums Corner where the white render looked good at first and is now badly stained. [Juliet Richardson]

Applicants

People don't often know what they mean by quality. I think a scheme should be assessed after five to seven years of use – we can be too quick to make judgments. The choice of materials and how they weather and how easily people can look after the property is also important. The quality of the kerbstones makes a huge difference to your reading of the street, and lighting is important but it doesn't have to be over engineered. [Emma Fletcher]

It's the roads and the landscaping that creates the look. Place making and creating a sense of place is crucial, as are activities and facilities and whether you'd like to live there yourself. Quality is about place and space that adds value rather than cost. Quality of the materials is seen as adding cost and we have discussions about whether the landowner wants to go there. At the end of the day it's a commercial decision. I keep reflecting on what Meredith said about creating "Elyness" i.e. identity and distinctiveness. Trumpington Meadows has a strong identity but I get lost in the rest of the Southern fringe. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

Quality is responding to context and optimising the opportunity for every home e.g. in capturing a view, considering aspect etc. Much about quality is about place making, taking account of setting and offering each home something special. It can be as simple as ensuring to capture a view or enjoying the aspect. [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

I struggle with it, but I think we can provide exemplars and references of what is good design. The long-term for oversight of the scheme as it comes into use is important. Berkeley homes put a lot of effort into setting up a management company to manage the development and ensure it doesn't go downhill. [Simon Carne]

A sense of place is important. Usually a new development looks like a building site. [David Prichard]

I focus on just a few elements of what works when I look at new housing – size (especially ceiling heights and storage), dual aspect/cross ventilation, outdoor amenity space and decent parking and bin stores. Get these right and most other weaknesses will be manageable. [David Birkbeck]

What factors are crucial in determining the quality of particular schemes? Can we predict which schemes will stand the test of time?

Planners

Ultimately the scheme has to be policy compliant, so having a robust design policy is critical. The ultimate test is whether we can sustain an appeal. Given that, then the appetite of the developer and the calibre of the design team are crucial in achieving a smooth run through the quality panel and committee. Members pay a lot of attention to the panel report and a scheme with a poor review would have a difficult time at committee. A switched on developer employing a good design team having a fruitful pre-app discussion, part of which involves coming to the panel at an early stage, usually results in a positive outcome. [Jonathan Brookes]

It is important that the original architect be retained during the build out. On the Bovis Paragon Scheme (Lots 15-18) in Great Kneighton the original architects, Levitt Bernstein, were sacked the minute they got approval. Contrast that with Abode, were Proctor Mathews were involved in all stages of the scheme. But this is something that planning permission can't control. [Jonathan Brookes]

On paper NW Cambridge looks good, but I find it claustrophobic and high density. Maybe with time it come together. CB1 is a big disappointment. There are mixed views about Alconbury. I find it too samey at the moment, with not enough identity. I like the Skanska housing at Great Kneighton. [Juliet Richardson]

Applicants

A shared understood vision is most important in delivering quality. It's also the clarity of the planning policy and calibre and robustness of the planning officers, but it's also the ambition of the developer to try and deliver quality. The biggest things that signals quality is the public realm, it provides the most enduring impression. Creating a real place has next to nothing to do with the buildings and is all about public spaces and civic buildings. The true meaning of a successful scheme is how well it works in terms of people's daily lives. The buildings themselves help if they are well designed and built of good materials, but they are less important and our design guidelines say very little about architecture. [Heather Topel]

There are increasingly too many rules and regulations – how to you get real inspiration? We spend the first few months looking at constraints when we should be thinking of opportunities. Everyone comes to the project with a tired heavy heart. We get so negative and it's impossible to maintain that inspirational excitement. But ironically, also with more regulation it sometimes appears we are delivering less what people want. (The CQC and panel are advisory, not regulatory.) The perceived benefit to existing residents is also important. On some schemes, existing residents are not getting anything from the new development except more traffic. We need to think about benefit for all. [Emma Fletcher]

House builders need to feel comfortable when they come on site. But for them it all depends on the market and the rate of sale. Much depends on the aspiration of the landowners and if they are interested in leaving a legacy. Most aren't. Most of the housing we have built will ultimately stand the test of time; the cheaper stuff won't. Higher density doesn't scare me and we are encouraged to make the best use of land. We had lots of debate on Cherry Hinton about the front spine and when a development becomes overpowering and when it looks right. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

I would rank client aspiration first, followed by a demanding LA and finally the talent of the design team. I don't believe it's the market. But we don't give 30+ purchasers, who have watched Grand Designs a real choice. [Robert Rummey]

It's all those things. Above all is the ambition of the client; they're paying the design team that has to be good to optimise opportunity. If the applicant doesn't want to go there it is not possible. And the local authority makes a difference. [Teresa Borsuk]

The strength of the planning authority is very important. From the start house builders realised that the Cambridge planners had a firm grip on quality under Peter Studdert and Glenn Richardson. The panel was asked to take this role in supporting the officers and we have to keep pushing for quality. Hills are a good example of developers suffering from success and getting diverted as they get bigger and no longer retain the vision and tight control. Some even get to the point where they go downhill as people retire things change. [Simon Carne]

It is to do with identity and distinctiveness, being well connected and nurturing a sense of community and being able to cope with change. Can the owner maintain and change their home. [David Prichard]

Others

The Government has recently indicated a move away from the policy of residualisation of affordable housing and the idea that social housing would only provide short-term accommodation for people in greatest need. In a place like Cambridge if you compare the income distribution to the housing market you find that the majority of the population need affordable housing or a heavy subsidy in the private sector, and are unable to afford to buy. They therefore need permanent long-term housing tenancies and a secure long-term home. [Nigel Howlett]

At CABE we could be tougher, for example, in telling applicants they needed to change their design team and start again. Some design teams are so poor they are baffled and don't get what the panel are saying. Inexperienced architects can be defensive and can find it hard to hear criticism. The only thing then is refusal. [Kathy MacEwen]

Did the quality charter or the review by the panel make any difference to a particular scheme.

Applicants

The panel has made a big difference but could have made a bigger difference if we had come sooner because it was difficult to get across what we done in the time. The panel could also have been more consistent. The panel produced a report but was not there to back it up with the County Council when we were arguing our idea for greening Newmarket Road and the highway engineers were opposed to the to the proposals. You get the vision beaten out of you at meetings with when they say agree or delay getting planning. [Emma Fletcher]

The Ely North briefing was pretty awful. The panel's questions went back to basic principles that had already been set. It would have been better if we'd received a better briefing earlier on. On Cherry Hinton it was probably helpful. Whether any points raised made a difference I don't know. We had a good team and we were all there or thereabouts and I felt we were going through the motions. I can't put my finger on whether the review makes a difference or not. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

I believe that the demands of the LA and Quality Panel will force radical change in housing design. Knowing we were coming to the Quality Panel and that it was using

the 4Cs, made us structure our presentation differently and helped us persuade the client to raise the bar. It also made us consider some elements that we hadn't been giving enough thought to. [Robert Rummey]

Quality schemes don't always sail through planning however. Planning policy can be a tick box exercise and sometimes a better solution can take longer. This is where the quality panel comes into its own, for example in saying that although the scheme is not compliant it's great. I think that if the designer comes up with a better idea then the code should be flexible. (But this challenges the planning authority's to insist on compliance.) [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

In Northstowe, on Gallaher's phase 1, the road bell-mouths were all wrong and set up constraints that are inconsistent with the parameters approved in the master plan. The panel tried to correct the problem, but Gallaghers were not interested, they just wanted to sell the plots. Until we get to a position where 70% of the land is owned by the city things will be difficult. [Simon Carne]

The planning system is depleted and planners are under more pressure, with fewer resources and many good ones have turned poacher. Our job is to empower them and broaden their interrogation of the drawings. Councillors need to see what were doing and applicants should be encouraged by examples of how the panel's intervention has made schemes better or avoided problems. The issue now is that developers are afraid of not selling or making money. And there is pressure from councillors to get on with it. People make the process the villain and an inanimate process is easy to blame. But we need regulations and builders need to follow them. [David Prichard]

A sense of confidence applies across the whole city of Cambridge, then suddenly stops at Cambourne and Northstowe. The challenge to the Quality Charter is why quality seems to delivered regularly on one side of the line and such a battle on the other. That's why we need to follow up by codifying what's worth having for the future. [David Birkbeck]

Others

It is obvious that a lot of new housing built at the cheaper end of the market won't stand the test of time. As a housing association providing affordable housing provider we have a long-term view, which includes the services and repairs we provide. The quality of construction and the quality of the detailing on components is therefore important. Factory built housing may provide part of the answer but getting good contractors who can do the repair and maintenance work is also going to be an issue, particularly with Brexit. Many of the people we house are self-employed and increasingly we need to think about the ability to work from home. We also need to consider cooling not just heating. [Nigel Howlett]

Is there anything you think needs to be added or dropped from the quality charter or changed in the review process?

Planners

The 4C headings are fine, Community is important. We can't create communities but we can create a structure that can foster the formation of community. I'm not suggested adding a new C, but the wording could be more nuanced and refined with respect to community. [Jonathan Brookes]

The buildings are less important than the public realm and key routes. We need a more critical review of the strategic elements of place. [Jonathan Brookes]

New settlements bring a whole load of complexities that would benefit from a health check so when it comes in at reserved matters we don't lose sight of the whole. Robin often asks who is overseeing all this, who's in charge of the master plan and there may be a role on some schemes for the panel to appoint a champion to see the scheme through. [Jonathan Brookes]

We could do more with more resources in terms of 'look back' sessions for example. The panel members need to be well prepared before the meeting and to have done their homework. They may need more support in the run-up to the meeting. We might also investigate different formats for the report since it is such a crucial document. [Juliet Richardson]

Applicants

If one takes schemes to review at different design stages it is important that there is continuity in panel membership. There is a great benefit in having a panel with local understanding and schemes like NW Cambridge need a champion who can follow the project through. [Heather Topel]

Feel that the report needs greater rigour because members hold us to these reports. Maybe something to be investigated is how this report can be improved. One of the issues we found was that a scheme is seen at a particular point in time and may change before it goes to committee, and some points in a review report can be confusing or misleading for members. Sometimes I felt that the write-up didn't reflect the conversation we'd had. Obviously we are not n the room the whole time and the panel is briefed by officers before we present and then have a private discussion after. But I felt that sometimes things I had anticipated being in the report weren't there and new things we hadn't discussed had appeared. The summary that Robin provides is fundamental and allows us to hear the main points first hand. It is these things and only these that should be in the report. [Heather Topel]

The quality of space we are asked to present in is terrible. The room is too small for so many people. A room where you can present properly would improve interaction. It would also be nice to have the right to reply to the report. We take the report seriously and try to adapt our ideas to meet the panel's comments, but there can be things in the panel's report that weren't discussed. It would be nice to relate the quality charter to policy because it's not always clear how the Charter feeds through. I don't think the planners place as much weight on the charter as they do on their own policy. [Emma Fletcher]

The next stage of Cherry Hinton is coding and there is a big question about how we do that. There are two landowners with different ideas and we knit the whole together. The code needs to concentrate on high-level factors, a materials palette and provide flexibility in character areas. I would like it to concentrate on place

making issues, getting the glue right and providing flexibility on how the parcels work. But typically the planners will want to get into the detail and that takes an age to negotiate. Unless the developer is on board it pointless. I fear us getting too detailed to early in the process. Good design adds value. The question is how to achieve that without getting into too much detail, reducing flexibility and slowing delivery. [Duncan jenkins]

Designers

Came out of the quality panel review feeling good. The panel helped to fix the location of the centre with the client and helped the LA who had been terribly unsure. After the panel the uncertainty and the discussions went away. Only one thing I'd change. There was no follow up after the review. I would like to see the panel at least once a year. The panel is comprised of eminent people and it would be good to continue the dialogue. The panel and the LA could be more demanding. [Robert Rummey]

It's what's implied or behind it that is important. I don't know what I think about the outcomes. One of the big problems is that there isn't any post-occupancy evaluation. [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

What I like about the Charter is that it is succinct. The real difficulty is that we are visual people and we respond to diagrams and pictures. If we could reduce things to half a dozen drawings rather than 30 pages of text that would be a great improvement. One thing we've highlighted as missing in the 4Cs is long-term maintenance and management. So much of the built environment depends on continuing the master developer being involved. It's difficult to get this message across because it's not something developers are interested in. The Charter doesn't want to be too prescriptive but we could tie the 4Cs more closely to policy. [Simon Carne]

David Birkbeck's work is brilliant as a house builder checklist; it is not about aesthetics, it deals with objective issues. A good combination would be the Birkbeck list and a panel review. Schemes should come earlier. And surgeries with planning officers are an incredibly useful support, allowing officers to talk about problems. There should be plans with the panel's report; after all we live in a visual world. We should also insist applicants show the options they considered in developing their ideas. [David Prichard]

I would love to see an SPD for Cambridge. Details that specified how apartment corridors had to have natural daylight and natural ventilation, sprinklers for apartment buildings to get rid of those stupidly tight ‘fire lobby’ hallways so you get views from the front door through the windows and beyond (which several developers have adopted as a driver for sales), minimum storage space. Good places set up their own SPDs. Dublin and Manchester have one and city-states in Europe often have. [David Birkbeck]

Others

Affordability and security of tenure are crucial issues. This is really important in terms of creating a long-term healthy society. Ignoring the bottom 50% of the income distribution is not an option. So affordability should be on the agenda of the 4Cs. [Nigel Howlett]

How you evaluate the work of the panel is critical. There is anecdotal evidence that it is effective in improving quality but hard facts are more difficult. The process for selecting panel members is important and the majority should be experienced designers and planners. One of the things CABE tried to do was to define the key issues in good design and to pull out messages about what had been learnt in design review. Panels need to develop better relationships with regular developers and create a dialogue. This could be at an annual meeting with an invited audience of interested parties. (A good idea that would need resourcing.) The questionnaires that applicants have to fill in could be much better in recording what the applicant found helpful in the design review and what made a difference. [Kathy MacEwen]

Do you think Cambridge is an exemplar for planning elsewhere in Britain? Are you proud of your contribution to what has been achieved in Cambridge?

Planners

Yes we should be proud of what we have achieved in Cambridge and people have been coming from abroad to see what we've been doing. There have been good schemes that have won awards – NW Cambridge, Trumpington Meadows, Gt Kneighton. I recently spoke about how to achieve design quality at a RIBA / RTPI conference. People were genuinely interested. One said, but you've got the luxury of a buoyant economy. I said actually the components of quality are simple and you have got to get them right. They include adaptability and sustainability and this can be achieved on a budget. [Jonathan Brookes]

Cambridge has to be an exemplar for lots of reasons. We are an internationally recognised city without a city offer in terms of facilities. And connectivity is poor. The University has too greater influence in the development of the city and could contribute more positively to social and community cohesion in the city. [Juliet Richardson]

Applicants

We can hold up Cambridge as an exemplar. From my own experience the level of rigour and resource in the planning process and the breadth of the 4Cs approach doesn't exist in most other places. It has been an exciting and challenging place to be. [Heather Topel]

I think we can be proud of what we have achieved in Cambridge. We have delivered more housing for more people. Problem is we haven't delivered benefits for existing residents and I'm expecting a massive push back from people in the future. There will be a conflict between those who manage to buy into Cambridge when prices were lower and young people who are forced to live further afield. But the genie is out of the bottle of and we have to concentrate on the quality of the open and urban spaces. Public art is my biggest disappointment – they seem to have got it right in London especially around Kings Cross. [Emma Fletcher]

It takes ages to get consent and we need to focus on delivery. There is a housing crisis. Cambridge City planning takes an age and the rate of delivery is painfully slow. With so many hurdles, do you get any better quality? It's a pain to get planning and Cambridge City is one of the most challenging authorities: it's really really hard, and it shouldn't be. [Duncan Jenkins]

Designers

Cambridge is an exemplar that can provide a model for elsewhere. Large schemes can have a big influence on a local area, both positive and negative. Poor schemes can cement low quality of the local offer while good schemes can improve the image of a wider area and can trigger a sense of place. [Robert Rummey]

I enjoy working in Cambridge. There is a level of interest and understanding and a desire and intention to achieve the best. Sometimes I'm surprised by the outcomes. The quality panel is good and a lot of the planners and urban design team a good. Cambridge should be proud of itself it takes pride in place and is proud of the contribution is making. [Teresa Borsuk]

Panel members

I think we can be proud of what we have achieved. It would be nice to know who else is doing well and if there is high-quality elsewhere. There's nothing in Wales Scotland or the South West on the panels I sit on. We need to compare Cambridge with other medium-sized towns, which have a similar pressure on the surrounding countryside. [Simon Carne]

Yes we can hold Cambridge as an exemplar. Development is a long game, but some developers treat it as if it were a hit and run exercise. Few schemes can be like Accordia, but at least developers should show some aspiration. The key issue is affordability. We need to see new forms of tenure or we will sink to the lowest form of ghastly housing where the excuse of increasing density is to provide no baloneys or outdoor space, no parking, poor aspect, low space standards and poor ventilation. The stock we'll be left with will be terrible. We need to make rental more desirable and proud to rent should be the new clarion call. [David Prichard]

Others

We can be proud of what we've achieved in Cambridge. We're lucky. Most parts of the country don't have these advantages. If I talk to my colleagues in other parts of the country they tell me how lucky we are. [Nigel Howlett]

Appendix B

What cohesion means

History of the term

The term cohesion first entered the UK policy debate after the 2001 'race riots' in Bradford, Oldham and Burnley. The term was developed by Professor Ted Cantle who produced a report on the issue commissioned by the Home Secretary that described the segregation of communities as leading to 'parallel lives'. The report distinguished between **social** cohesion, relevant to increasingly divided communities where individuals are integrated into their local ethnic or religious based communities, and **community** cohesion, relating to participation across communities that knit them together into a wider whole. It additionally recognised that 'the impact of housing policies on community cohesion seems to have escaped serious consideration'.[1]

Since that time, a number of developed and updated working definitions have been published.[2] Recurring principles of community cohesion were:

- People from different backgrounds having similar opportunities
- An awareness of people's rights and responsibilities
- People trusting one another and trusting local institutions to act fairly
- A shared future and sense of belonging
- Valuing what communities have in common, alongside a recognition of the value of diversity
- Strong relationships between people from different backgrounds.[3]

Public debate on cohesion in this period primarily focused on ethnic diversity and immigration, but prevailing research usually points towards issues of deprivation, disadvantage, and long-term marginalisation as being the leading factors aside from immigration. As research into equality and social inclusion has shown, England as a whole performs poorly compared with most other countries other than the USA, and social mobility has been declining. The consequences or costs include, according to an influential book on the subject *The Spirit Level:*[4]

- Poor health, especially mental health and feelings of self-esteem
- Poverty, especially associated with what is termed 'chaotic lifestyles'
- Low educational achievement and aspirations
- Aggressive behaviour and some forms of crime
- Potentially the stigmatisation of whole neighbourhoods as, those who can, move elsewhere.

[1] Cantle Report 2001, and Independent Review Team 2001
[2] The main source is the Social Exclusion Unit in the Labour government between 2001-2010
[3] DCLG guidance 2008
[4] Richard G. Wilkinson and Kate Pickett, The Spirit Level, 2009

Policies for social cohesion

The current political debate on community cohesion has centred on the high-profile Casey Review published in December 2016. While there is a broad acceptance that the report is well-researched and in-depth, the conclusions have brought substantial contention. The author, Dame Louise Casey, described her aim as outlining; *'not just about how well we get on with each other but how well we all do compared to each other… what divides communities and gives rise to anxiety, prejudice, alienation and a sense of grievance*' and how to *'build more cohesive communities*[5]*.'* A large focus again was on immigration, described as being due to higher birth rates in new communities coupled with faith schools leading to ethnic isolation. Other key areas were ethnic minorities as well as the traditional English working class facing economic exclusion, and also gender inequality issues amongst South-Asian communities.

The recommendations made were:

- Providing additional funding for area-based plans and projects, including the promotion of English language skills, empowering marginalised women, promoting more social mixing, particularly among young people, and tackling barriers to employment for the most socially isolated groups.
- Developing a set of local indicators of integration and requiring regular collection of the data supporting these indicators, and promote successful approaches.
- Promoting British values.
- Exploring the route to British citizenship and considering an 'integration oath'.
- Working with local areas to promote integrated schools and a greater mix of students.
- Tackling cultural barriers to employment.
- Reducing segregation through improved housing and regeneration policies.
- Introducing greater safeguards for children not in mainstream education

Ultimately the idea of 'cohesion' can be seen as people sticking together in a united whole as well as benefitting equally from economic development. This is what the RSA Inclusive Growth Commission under economist Stephanie Flanders defined as: '*enabling as many people as possible to contribute to and benefit from growth'*. [6] In other words the spread of wealth matters as much as or more than the absolute levels. In a fragmented and fast changing world this can be difficult, with people having many more identities than just where they live. Indeed for many of those who rent, and who may stay in the same home for less than a couple of years, the concept may have much less value than for an old-established family who has lived in the same street for many years. Cohesion is not simply about communities

Attempts have been made through the European Union, and under the last Labour Government, to direct resources at disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and more recently at so-called 'problem families'. The topic is of particular importance in new

[5] Casey Review, 2016

[6] RSA, Inclusive Growth Commission: Making our economy work for everyone, 2016

communities where a proportion of housing may be reserved and allocated to those in most need. Furthermore opportunities often exist for rebalancing or improving the existing neighbourhoods at the same time, for example through improved public transport or shared shops and community facilities. Schools have often been targeted as the focal point for achieving effective cohesion[7].

There is substantial research supporting the principles that greater social mobility and economic equality are the solution. However beyond academia and reports from social organisations such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and Shelter, there has been little public debate into factors such as the design, management, and allocation of housing in new settlements. Nor are planners learning from examples of where social cohesion is being achieved. While there is a general consensus within the literature on the importance of government, businesses, public institutions and society working together if cohesion is to be achieved, with ever tighter budgets, this may be dismissed as impractical.

The higher property values and housing demand in Cambridge, along with the Quality Charter process should enable innovations to be tried and tested. So in conclusion, we need to ask ourselves "What role does the Quality Charter have in preventing divided communities and a rise in anxiety, ill health, prejudice, alienation or sense of grievance, and how could it help create successful mixed communities in areas of lower demand"?

Policies for mixed communities

This section reviews the literature dealing with mixed communities that is where attempts are made to accommodate people from different social and economic backgrounds. A private review by Professor Michael Carley of the literature in relation to proposals for new communities in Cambridge East stated that *'Despite high expectations there is no evidence that tenure mix delivers social benefits to residents. Providing a clean, safe environment and reducing tensions arising from 'neighbourhood nuisance' by provision for high quality management and maintenance is more important to quality of life for residents of all tenures.'* [8]

'Neighbourhood nuisance', as Carley called it, can easily get blamed on individuals, when the roots of the problem lie in design or management. While some people can create exceptional problems, especially if they are relocated to a new development that lacks normal community facilities, the most common problems involve a mixture of both design and management:

- Noise from adjoining flats, which is particularly acute when neighbours play loud music late at night or quarrel frequently (see research by David Birkbeck at Design for Homes)
- Lifts and lobbies (necessary in developments above four stories)
- Rubbish removal (a problem when people with different lifestyles and standards co-exist)

[7] The Camden Commission, 2017

[8] Discussion with author and not public

- Parking arrangements (a potential benefit of mixed income communities in locations with good public transport)
- Children's play facilities and access to open space (a problem not only where there are too many children in the same development, but also when fights break out over 'territory').

However apart from the experienced tangible drawbacks of a contrasting social mix, a large obstacle for mixed communities as addressed in numerous literature is the public negative perceptions of mixed communities. A report for JRF on developer and purchaser attitudes, based on seven case studies, found that despite slight developer resistance, there was no overriding problem in developing mixed tenure estates, and that concerns about property values and attitudes of private developers was not the central issue in the debate[9].

Yet despite the potential benefits, and the evidence that mixed communities can be made to work, the idea of mixed communities is not yet fully accepted in the development world. Mixing communities in the UK still creates fears among some house-builders, who believe that it will put off house buyers, despite evidence to the contrary. Influential research, such as by Demos, questioned whether the idealistic objectives can be achieved as people simply do not want to mix with their neighbours today.[10] Paul Cheshire goes further in considering the aims misguided, as they do not address the root problem of poverty[11] – a factor addressed in the previous section of this report. Of course many people prefer to live next to people like themselves. But this should not stop people from different backgrounds living together harmoniously. It is often pointed out, for example by the Urban Task Force in *Towards an Urban Renaissance* that some of the most successful places like Notting Hill in London, are both very high density and very mixed.[12]

A large proportion of this research however has been conducted between 2000-2010, and today, achieving community cohesion and the promotion of mixed-communities is more challenging than ever. Anne Power in her latest publication this year on the regional politics of a 21st Century urban age, outlined how across European cities are struggling to cope with the loss of industrial jobs, the decay of urban infrastructure, in-migration (most often from poorer regions), outward sprawl pressures, and traffic congestion and transport bottlenecks.[13] Growing anti-immigrant sentiments, she writes, *'provoked by sluggish growth and intense inequality lead to a level of dissatisfaction and marginalisation that threaten social cohesion, with highly devisive consequences.'*

[9] Rowlands R, Muries A and Tice A, More than tenure mix: Developer and purchaser attitudes to new housing estates, Chartered Institute of Housing in association with the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2006

[10] Jupp, Living together: community life on mixed tenure estates, 1999

[11] Paul Cheshire, JRF, Segregated neighbourhoods and mixed communities: A critical analysis, 2007

[12] Urban Task Force, Towards and urban renaissance, 1999

[13] Anne Power, Regional politics of an urban age: can Europe's former industrial cities create a new industrial economy to combat climate change and social unravelling?**, 2018**

The National Conversation on Immigration[14] last year conducted the biggest-ever public consultation on the issue – and regions such as Cambridgeshire flagged immigration as being their greatest issue – a potential result of the rapid migration of Eastern European workers to The Fens for farm and food processing work. Such sentiments have been seen as being a driving cause for Brexit which has further divided the country and stimulated anti-immigrant sentiments. The RSA's Inclusive Growth Commission responded to the issue, by concluding;

'If we are really going to build a nation that "works for everyone, not just the privileged few", we need to do a better job of measuring what counts. We need to understand that modern capitalism is messy and does not produce predictable winners and losers - and that drawing a strict line between economic and social policy is increasingly counterproductive. Above all, we need a national strategy for inclusive growth, agreed and supported by the centre but devised and implemented by local actors with a keen sense of place[15].'

Professor Anne Power also notes the changing tide towards city leadership, with growing collaboration between the core and periphery of cities, central government moves to devolve powers and reduce dependence on central funds, and regional devolution and metropolitan level programmes. These are bringing new funding, and most importantly new enthusiasm for achieving more cohesive communities across the nation.

In drawing up the *Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth*, inspiration came from study tours to a number of innovative schemes in the UK. But for many people, it was the study tour to the Netherlands that convinced participants that it is possible to develop new suburbs that are even more attractive than existing settlements. This section therefore concludes by referring to the Dutch VINEX housing policy, where some 30% of the new housing is affordable, and where housing associations have accounted for almost half the new housing that has been built. [16]

Dutch VINEX housing policy

The successful and inclusive VINEX housing programme built some 95 new suburbs through a national housing policy that increased the housing stock over the period of 1995-2005 by 455,000 or 7.5% in ten years,. 285,000 were on greenfield sites on the edge of cities. A good example visited by a number of groups from Cambridge is Vathorst, a new settlement of 10,000 homes on the edge of the prosperous market town of Amersfoort to the North of Utrecht.

The VINEX policy had very similar aims to the Labour Government's Sustainable Communities Plan and proposals for Ecotowns, which were far less influential. The conditions for receiving government money were written into contracts with local authorities, who assembled the land. Key principles were:

[14] National Conversation on Immigration, 2017

[15] RSA, Inclusive Growth Commission: Making our economy work for everyone, 2016

[16] Nicholas Falk and Jonah Rudlin, International examples of affordable housing, Shelter and URBED Trust, 2018 (to be published)

- Near towns or cities with populations of over 100,000 and as close as possible
- Minimum densities of 30 units to the hectare
- 30% or so to be affordable with a preponderance of homes for sale

In practice there were a wide variety of layouts and designs. According to a major research report, their popularity and success was due to:[17]

- Starting with simple government guidelines, with cities and regions making their own plans
- Dividing the new suburbs into smaller parts; thus in one development at Ypenberg on a former airport near the Hague, 75 architectural teams competed in groups of five to prepare 15 neighbourhood plans.
- Branding many of the neighbourhoods so they looked distinctive
- Providing small scale solutions to open space, such as Home Zones and courtyards.

Conclusion

The idea of a Quality Charter came from research for CABE coordinated by Nicholas Falk into how to design higher density schemes that could accommodate a mix of people.[18] To overcome the disagreements that typically held back progress the report recommended using some form of charter that the different stakeholders could agree on before plans were approved. The opportunity to test this out came when Cambridgeshire Horizons provided the funding for a series of study tours and workshops to draw lessons from best practice in both the UK and in Europe. The results were written up as the Quality Charter and drew on inputs from a hundred different people.

Many research studies have identified the problems that arise from inequality, and these can be aggravated, not solved, when people from very different backgrounds move into new communities, especially if these lack basic community facilities such as shops, schools and buses. When the problems erupted into riots in some cities, government was compelled to support action to 'build more cohesive communities'. Most recently a high level Inclusive Growth Commission at the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) reported on 'enabling as many people as possible to contribute to and benefit from growth'' Despite some consideration at the time of 'spatial inequalities', the final report largely dismissed what the Commission saw as 'property based solutions.'

However there is a large body of evidence, much of it funded from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, to show that the conflicts that can arise, sometimes called 'neighbourhood nuisance' can be avoided, and that mixed communities can be made to work. However with higher densities (over 30 dwellings per hectare), extra care is needed over design, especially the common parts, to deal with potential issues such as competition for parking spaces, problems with waste disposal, and places for

[17] Han Lorzing, Reinventing Suburbia in the Netherlands, Built Environment edition Towards Sustainable Suburbs, volume 32, number 3

[18] Better Neighbourhoods : making higher densities work, CABE 2005

young people, not just small children but also teenagers. There is also a need to organize and fund neighbourhood management, which raises issues over how this is to be paid for.

In searching for good models, British experience is summarized in previous reports on how the new community at Northstowe should be managed. Particular inspiration should also be sought from the Netherlands, and the new settlements that inspired the original Quality Charter, such as Vathorst in Amersfoort and other schemes undertaken through the Dutch ViNEX housing policy.

Appendix C

Principles for designing cohesive communities

This section considers what is known about the way design affects cohesion. Some of the literature is summarised, and examples are given of innovative approaches under the themes of transport and accessibility, participation processes and consultation, public space and co-location, healthy living, and environmental sustainability.

A general criticism people have of new housing estates is the way public or communal space is laid out. Thus a report from the Foundation for Integrated Transport examined some 20 new housing schemes in England, plus their Dutch counterparts, and concluded that most were *'isolated neighbourhoods'…'dominated by the needs of the car*', creating '*American lifestyles'* [19] Evaluations of new housing estates for CABE and others have been particularly critical of the public realm, which often looks hard and unwelcoming. In particular it is important for children to play together outside in safety and comfort if they are to develop their potential. It is also essential for residents not to depend on their cars for short trips if they to stay healthy.

CABE's *Inclusion by Design* guide outlined how the built environment can contribute to a more equal, inclusive and cohesive, and is particularly relevant to the design of new settlements.[20] Streets designed to foster traffic flow or stop crime through cul de sacs reduce the pleasure of walking, and help explain why too few people in the UK walk or cycle to local amenities. This in turn encourages unhealthy lifestyles, with obesity and diabetes as consequences. Public open spaces, including children's play areas, often look arid and uncared for, with little of the greenery found in traditional villages.

CABE viewed inclusive and cohesive design as ultimately being about:

- **Access with dignity** – getting to, and into places, and using them. It is about physical access to places and services, including access to appropriate technology
- **Treatment with respect** – how people are dealt with, talked to and looked after; whether their needs are considered and whether they are respected and welcomed
- **Relevant services** – do places meet people's particular needs? Are they designed with users in mind? Do they give people a sense that they have a right to be there?[21]

The full report of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhoods network in collaboration with URBED and the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust drew lessons from ten new settlements committed to innovation, including Orchard Park in Cambridge, as well as relevant research. A summary report aimed at local authorities highlighted the key

[19] Jenny Raggett and Joey Talbot, Transport for New Homes, Foundation for Integrated Transport, July 2018
[20] CABE, Inclusion by design, 2008
[21] ibid

planning issues for new communities as being the quality of public space, the encouragement of sustainable transport modes, dealing with car parking, and assessing how and to what extent local shopping can be viable.[22] Even where design codes had been drawn up, the public realm often lets the place down, partly because highway or utility engineers are not so interested in the way things look compared with concerns such as safety and cost, and partly because of poor urban design due to lack of skills and experience.

RIBA's latest report '*Ten characteristics of Places where People want to Live*'[23] outlined what they saw as the necessary conditions for, and characteristics of, high quality places where people want to live – and to do so in harmony. The report emphasised the need for high quality masterplans that clearly describe the design principles for a site and that set out clear standards whilst still allowing for the right level of flexibility to achieve controlled variety, and accommodate change over time. In addition these masterplans should be evaluated and monitored by professional teams composed of a range of professions working directly alongside Local Authorities that are empowered to take the lead on projects. Additional innovations in post-occupancy evaluation, mechanisms to increase access to smaller house-builders, and greater utilisation of new technologies in construction, design, and community interaction were also listed as essential in order to consistently achieve high-quality and inclusive design across the UK. The recent Eddington development in Cambridge North West was listed as one of the ten examples of successful models.

Transport and accessibility

Getting around is about much more than accessible buses and trains. It is as important to have well-designed and well-managed streets that don't act as a barrier to movement. Inclusive design means designing for transport that is dignified, accessible, affordable, safe and easy to use. The CABE report called for:

- Chill-proof shelters
- Shelters with secure seating
- Shelters with a talking countdown system
- Shelters with an emergency phone
- Safe and comfortable places to wait
- Buses with ramps
- Buses that are safe from crime at night
- Neighbourhoods that works for people regardless of their age.[24]

Research into ways of reducing car dependence, and raising the use of public transport in the suburbs suggests that transport can be used as a means of building communities, for example through car clubs, or through better provision for cyclists[25]. Car parking and usage can be a major cause of conflict, but can also be a way of building sustainable communities, for example by locating key public services

[22] SUNN, How can local government build sustainable urban neighbourhoods, JRF 2012
[23] RIBA, Ten Characteristics of Places where people want to Live, 2018
[24] CABE, Inclusion by design, 2008
[25] URBED, Tomorrow's Suburbs, GLA 2000, www.urbed.coop

together. Jan Gehl has demonstrated how urban design that encourages active transportation modes and people-friendly spaces perform better in most ways than car-centric conurbations[26].

> For example, in Vauban, Freiburg, the development aimed to minimise car usage by locating car parking on the edge of the neighbourhood and providing discounts for residents who do not own a car. Cycling is encouraged and there is a viable alternative in the form of a frequent tram service into town.

The location and design of places have a profound effect on how people benefit from them. The issues here are about technical, geographical and physical access, as well as usability. The location and design of a place, its facilities, and equipment inside may fail to take into account minority cultural or religious requirements such as space for prayer and washing facilities or number of rooms. The impact of bad design is more likely to be felt by disabled people and older people, people from minority cultures and faiths, and carers with young children, and has a disproportionate effect on women.

There is a considerable amount of research and good practice advice about designing environments that are inclusive. For instance work by Dr Gemma Burgess illustrates how 'trip chains', the multiple journeys such as those between work, childcare and the shops, affect women disproportionately and are not catered for by traditional planning policy[27].

Cambridgeshire County Council has begun efforts to incorporate these ideas, with co-location and innovation being one of the four guiding principles in its *Strategy for Supporting New Communities.*[28] The aims are defined as encouraging community cohesion and providing more convenient and efficient service delivery to the community.

> An example of this in action is the Ramsey Community Hub, which has 40,000 visits per annum, and co-locates a library, a children's centre, Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) customer service centre, the HDC management team, and Ramsey Neighbourhoods Trust, amongst a number of other partners. There also meeting spaces which can be booked by additional community groups. CCC has also recently produced a Community Hub Policy, and will be utilising the strategy in Cambridge Southern Fringe to deliver the Clay Farm Community Hub which aims to have shared community space, a library, health centre, café, and 20 affordable flats.

Participatory processes and capacity building

Consultation is key to inclusive design. Right from the outset of any project, particular attention should be paid to those likely to be overlooked or whose views

[26] Jan Gehl, Cities for people, 2010a

[27] Gemma Burgess, Planning, Regeneration and the Gender Equality Duty – why does gender matter? 2008

[28] Cambridgeshire County Council, Strategy for supporting new communities 2015-2020, 2015

are less likely to be accommodated. This includes women and transgender people, elderly and younger people and children, religious minorities, poorer and socially excluded communities, lesbians and gay men, black and minority ethnic people. This does not happen enough; for instance, people who are victims of racist and homophobic hate crime are unlikely to be consulted about the design of public spaces.

Resident Empowerment Strategies involves a plan to set out how residents will make a contribution to the decision-making process, enabling them to make informed choices regarding the future management and improvements of their homes.

> Study tours for residents in Hulme is an example of this in action, where the community was invited to help those involved with the association, Homes for Change, to pick the right architect, and to agree on what they really wanted. A host of training programmes help tenants take on responsibilities and influence the design and management of renewal schemes, such as those run by the National Tenants Resource Centre in Chester. Some of the most effective involve taking groups on study tours to learn from other relevant schemes. This requires a budget for community development and a dedicated officer from the start if it is to work successfully.
>
> A community planning weekend at Caterham Village attracted over 1000 people. The event led to the setting up of a Local Group with seven working groups, which included young people and the community management organisation. Recommendations from the groups were then negotiated and incorporated into the Section 106 Agreement between the local authority and the developer.

Capacity building is also effective at building skills and self-confidence in a new or existing community.

> Glasgow New Gorbals Arts Project is a locally based scheme that is committed to producing local artwork in the field of arts-led community-led regeneration. It provides tuition and a workshop for local people and works with other local agencies to produce artwork that gives a sense of pride and ownership in their local area. A range of techniques are available for involving potential residents and the surrounding community in considering options for a site, and this can developing a sense of community.

As well as the statutory provision of multi-use spaces, social activities can play a crucial role in community development. However turning schools into community hubs requires more than a readily accessible building, and a curriculum is needed that can motivate bored children, and compensate for parental disadvantage.

> In Barking, where results had been poor, they looked to Holland before changing the curriculum, and almost a third of secondary students have signed up for vocational courses. In the Netherlands some 60% of children are in some form of vocational pathway, and half the weekly lessons are in vocational classes doing something practical. Also up to 15% of primary

pupils and 30% of secondary children repeat a year. Funding is linked to parental situation or needs. Use is made of outings and drama to bring together students from different pathways. The results can be not only happier children, but a more equal society. Barking is now making great progress, with children *'moving forward on pathways which may be different but which have parity of esteem and which produce qualifications of equal value'* according to the Council's technology inspector.

Public space and co-location

The co-location of services work to maximise capacity by providing multiple services in the same building, such as education, health, or leisure facilities. These can be planned ahead of development and can ensure community spaces are well-used, inter-sectional, and catalysts for social interaction across the community, especially in new-towns. Deprived neighbourhoods usually have fewer local amenities and the public and open space they do have is more likely to be poorly managed and maintained.[29] [30] In turn, neglected public spaces can contribute to the onset of vandalism, anti-social behaviour, graffiti and littering.[31] Countering such problems requires adequate management frameworks – an area covered in the next section of this report – however design and location of strategic community services can provide a number of solutions for existing and new settlements.

A notable example of cohesion in action is 'The Hub' in Regents Park created as a community centre with the goal of being a place to meet, watch and play sport. Built for the Royal Parks, the Hub includes changing facilities for people with disabilities, and was developed in collaboration with the London Sports Forum for Disabled People, which promotes an 'inclusive and active' initiative with Sport England and the Greater London Authority. This mixture of social organisations ensured no accessibility features were neglected in the design and delivery of the community space.

Facilitating mixed communities is achieved most successfully in new settlements when schools serve as **'community hubs'**, as the Department for Children, Schools and Families is promoting through co-location of health, education and community services. An example of this is at Greenwich Millennium Village, where a primary school has been integrated with a health-centre and information point, clustered at the north-western entrance to the town acting as a focal point or 'hub' for the community. Another option is the idea of 'Extended Schools' that are open outside normal school hours which help provide an additional and valuable community resource, and raise the attraction of areas that suffer from low demand, as has been happening in Barking in East London.

[29] Environmental problems and service provision in deprived and more affluent neighbourhoods, Joseph Rowntree Foundation report (2005)

[30] Cleaning up neighbourhoods: Environmental problems and service provision in deprived areas Hastings, A et al (2005)

[31] Decent Parks? Decent Behaviour? The link between the quality of parks and user behaviour CABE Space (2005)

A good example from the SUNN network is the development at Lightmoor in Telford by the Bournville Village Trust, where the heart of the community is a new primary school next to facilities such as playing fields, changing rooms, and an IT suite. These are owned and managed by the BFT for the benefit of the school and neighbourhood. The school buildings are rented to the local authority during the school day so they revert to the community out of school hours.

Centres for learning are important particularly for people who need a space in which to study in comfort, especially in deprived areas. Inclusive design can mean a library that is accessible, helpful, stimulating and reflective of the diversity of its community. In Barking, a learning centre hosting a library, café and art gallery lie at the heart of the town-centre development. The library features informal reading areas, circular shelving and brightly coloured rubber furniture. This accessible and inviting approach to a library is clearly working, as the number of users has risen by around 50 per cent.

Some of the best examples are to be found in Continental Europe, where development is led by proactive local authorities, and where it has been much more normal for a mix of people and a mix of tenures to be included in a new settlement.

Sozialbau Housing management company, Vienna

Sozialbau housing management company in Vienna currently has 23,250 cohabitants in 69 housing estates built since 2000. 38.1% are foreign nationals or Austrian citizens born abroad (36.8% for Vienna as a whole). The housing management company specifically aimed to foster social cohesion and integration, to avoid *'A xenophobic attitude is based on a subjectively perceived collision of interests,*[32] *it is not an inborn characteristic but is socially conditioned and thus also a shapeable construct. Alienation and familiarity are relationships and as such are determined by interaction: they can be influenced and changed. Social solidarity can be learned*[33] *and it is apparent that social contact with neighbours*[34] *can be a remedy for xenophobia that is just as simple as it is effective.*[35]*'*

Responding to this principle and seeking to maximize communal contact points in the complexes, they have incorporated into their residences; 161 community laundry rooms; 96 multifunctional communal and bad-weather rooms to be used for neighbourhood meetings, birthday parties and other activities; 96 playgrounds; 6 outdoor swimming pools; 16 gyms; and 21 sauna and wellness centres.

[32] Lebhart / Münz, 2003, p. 351.
[33] Ludl, 2001, p. 23
[34] Kohlbacher / Reeger, 2000, p. 124
[35] Kallmeyer, 2002, p. 155

Healthy living

It is well documented that the poorest people in the UK tend to live in the least healthy environments, with the greatest likelihood of environmental hazards such as flooding and pollution. They are, consequently, less safe and less healthy, as recognized by reports such as by The Joseph Rowntree Foundation[36], that sought to analyse the link between poverty and a poor environment. As such, 'healthy placemaking' has emerged around the world as a priority for cities, defined by the World Health Organisation as: *'The place or social context in which people engage in daily activities in which environmental, organisational and personal factors interact to affect health and wellbeing'*.[37]

In many parts of the UK cars are either essential or more convenient for travelling between home, school or work, and to shops, services and entertainment, contributing to sedentary lifestyles and air pollution.[38] Low density living and a lack of good community facilities are also associated with increased social isolation, and a lack of appealing green space reduces levels of physical activity,[39] mental well-being, and community interaction. Higher densities of physical activity facilities are associated with lower levels of adult obesity[40]. As is now well known, the design and layout of towns are inextricably linked to the health of its population.

Quantitative spatial analysis by Melbourne University on designing healthy cities argued that evidence-based metrics were needed to inform urban policy if the intention is to create healthy walkable communities. Most active-living research has developed metrics on the environment in residential areas, ignoring other important walking locations and the general walkability of an area which they argue must be taken into account[41]. Ultimately inclusive design must take into account people with:

- Specific mobility issues
- Reduced dexterity
- Sensory and communication impairments
- Learning disabilities
- Continence needs

[36] Joseph Rowntree, Monitoring poverty and social exclusion in the UK, 2005
[37] World Health Organisation, Health Promotion Glossary, 1998
[38] Public Health England, Spatial planning for health: an evidence resource for planning and designing healthier places, 2017
[39] Hamano, Association between childhood obesity and neighbourhood accessibility to fast food outlets: A Nationwide 6-Year follow-up study, 2017
[40] Mason, et al, Associations between fast food and physical activity environments and adiposity in midlife: cross-sectional, observational evidence from UK Biobank, 2017
[41] Lucy Dubrelle Gunn, Suzanne Mavoa, Claire Boulangé, Paula Hooper, Anne Kavanagh and Billie Giles-Corti, Designing healthy communities: creating evidence on metrics for built environment features associated with walkable neighbourhood activity centres, 2017

The Town and Country Planning Association, in a report with Public Health England, identified three main areas for change:[42]

Collaboration

- Creating a healthy-weight environment is an excellent focus for collaborative, joined-up working within a local authority. Masterplanning and design
- Healthy-weight elements such as sustainable transport and access to healthy foods need to be considered early in the planning and design process.
- Rural and urban areas face different challenges.
- Landowners have an important role in enabling the creation of connected walking and cycling networks.

Development management

- Minor design details have a cumulative impact for creating healthy-weight environments.
- In some places section 106 planning obligations are rarely delivering elements of a healthy-weight environment.

Behaviour change

- People are most likely to be influenced by their environment when moving to a new home, but often the design elements to help them maintain or achieve a healthy weight are missing when they move into new developments.
- Living environments need flexibility built in to accommodate lifestyle changes.
- Currently, the local healthy-weight impacts of planning policy and development schemes are not being systematically evaluated.

However despite national interest, progress has still been slow. The Design Council conducted a survey in 2018 on 398 built environment professionals in order to understand the greatest barriers to creating healthy places, with 83% reporting insufficient funding as being the main obstacle. The top five barriers were:

1. Insufficient funding;
2. requirements or expectations of developers;
3. other priorities coming first;
4. requirements or expectations of politicians;
5. insufficient time.

Sometimes innovation can be encouraged through participation in national programmes that provide additional resources. The NHS has carried out substantial work on healthy cities in relation to their *Healthy New Towns* programme that aims to explore how new housing developments can achieve better health outcomes. The programme is planned to run until March 2019 and has three key aims:

1. To shape new towns, neighbourhoods and communities to promote health and wellbeing, prevent illness and keep people independent
2. To radically rethink the delivery of health and care services in areas free from legacy constraints, and to support learning about new models of deeply integrated care
3. To spread learning and good practice to future developments and regeneration areas

[42] Town and Country Planning, Public Health England, Planning for healthy weight environments, 2014

Northstowe in Cambridgeshire has led a joint bid for the Health New Tonws programme in collaboration with Cambridge University Hospitals, South Cambridgeshire District Council, and the Homes and Communities agency. Based upon a brownfield development (a former RAF base and surrounding farmland), 10,000 homes, a town centre, eight schools and a number of community facilities will be built over 20 years with the aims of:

- Coping with an aging population by treating people locally within the community.
- Addressing obesity through inclusive neighbourhoods with good cycling/walking connections and access to facilities and open space.

A *Health Living Youth and Play strategy* has been developed that is still waiting confirmation, and a Citizens Advice Bureau has been co-located within an existing medical practice. The future goals entail high-resolution demographic modelling of the needs and health of residents, further co-location of health and community facilities, and the design of a health campus/community hub. The effectiveness of this initiative are yet to be seen.

In 2018 the government held the first Design Quality and Housing Conference in a decade. The over-riding message was that design quality was vital for the promotion of health and wellbeing of present and future generations. However, it was noted by Annalise V Johns of Urban Design Mental Health group who reported on the conference that there was clear lack of cooperation across the sector. Poor communication over the last decade has led to a significant lack of appreciation of the importance of the built environment in the UK.[43] Publications describing policies and initiatives appeared to be stronger in the NHS than in the built environment industry, and what has been published may not be used as much as it should.[44]. The absence of attending health professionals indicated how far behind the UK in implementing the World Health Organisation's *Healthy Cities* programme.

Environmental sustainability

Housing costs are a major factor in enabling those on lower incomes to participate in community life. Sustainability appraisals should ensure that running costs on new homes will be affordable to those on average incomes. The standards or code sought need to match local market conditions. The focus should ideally be on energy savings for an entire planned neighbourhood rather than the individual home, taking into account the emissions from transport. Evaluation should embrace water use and waste generation as well as energy use.

Upton, Northants, has generated interest because the Homes and Communities Agency has sought to apply the principles set out in its Urban Design Compendium not just to the homes but also to the landscape. Green 'swales' hold water from sudden showers before it is released gradually in a

[43] Annalise V Johns, Urban Design Mental Health, 2018

[44] Hugh Barton ed. The Routledge Handbook of Planning for Health and Wellbeing, Routledge 2015

> ‘sustainable urban drainage system’ (SUDS). This reduces pressure on the sewers, and creates a ‘living landscape’ that makes Upton look distinctive.

Sustainability policies should offer a menu of options to house builders, with Energy Performance Certificates used to market the benefits of new homes. The support of estate agents and housing associations is also needed to ensure new residents know how both the neighbourhood and their home are supposed to work. Builders should be offered a range of proven options, as Urban Splash is doing in Manchester.

> New Islington, Manchester’s designated ‘Millennium Village’, has sought higher environmental standards. The Sustainability Plan sets targets with options on how they could be achieved, through, for example:
>
> - combined heat and power (CHP);
> - higher fabric insulation standards;
> - better solar orientation with buildings arranged in fingers around the sun’s path;
> - borehole sources of water and rainwater draining into the canal;
> - waste management through pre-sorted waste collection for recycling, with ‘separation facilities’ in every dwelling;
> - fewer defects through modular construction and prefabrication where appropriate.

One way of making sustainability affordable and attractive is to tap low cost sources of finance. **‘Green loans’**, as part of the Government’s Mortgage Indemnity Scheme, should support installations that cut running costs (rather as the Green Deal for existing homes). Financial institutions that are supporting the Growing Places Fund should be able to help. Some of the cost should be factored off the land value to ensure homes remain affordable. Green features can boost community support and sales.

> Graylingwell, Chichester, is one of the UK’s first zero energy schemes with some homes built to Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The development as a whole meets Code 4, so it is far in advance of general practice. This has been achieved not only through high levels of insulation in houses that are timber framed, and partly timber clad, but also through the use of a gas-fired CHP system. This supplies all the homes with heat through insulated pipes. All south facing homes have photovoltaic (PV) panels built into their roofs, and these generate electricity, with the surplus being sold to the national grid. The energy generated from the PV panels offsets the carbon emissions from the gas used in the CHP system.

Freiburg: environmental innovation

In 1992 the municipality agreed that all development on municipal land should be low energy and new residential buildings are now required to consume a third less than required by German law. An Environmental Protection Authority within the municipality employs sixty staff working on nature, water, waste management and energy. The Authority secures the involvement of all the stakeholders in getting the message across, from the regional energy company to the city's soccer club and local schools.

The circumstances in this historic university town are very similar to those in Cambridge, with the difference that the centre of Freiburg had to be completely rebuilt after Allied bombing, and is now car-free. By providing quality public transport from the start, and making it more expensive and difficult to park a private car, Freiburg has succeeded in shifting people away from their car towards public transport and cycling. In Germany as a whole, while car ownership levels are higher than in the UK, car usage is less, and people seem to take pleasure in well-run public systems that support communal life.

The two new settlements of Vauban and Rieselfeld provide sustainable suburbs on the edge of the city, housing a wide mix of people, including many who have commissioned their own homes through Baugruppen. The results have influenced practitioners from all over Europe, including study tours from the local authorities and development industry through Cambridgeshire Horizons and from the University.

Appendix D

Better neighbourhood management

The subject of creating mixed communities, and breaking up mono-tenure housing estates is vast and often controversial, as can be seen from our review of the extensive literature. The overall conclusion from all the research is that while management is as important as design, there is no simple answer that avoids the need for continuing effort and resources. Hence those planning mixed communities need to get the basics right and to work towards 'rebalancing communities' so that they offer choice or 'pathways' that provide everyone with prospects, and encourage people to act as good neighbours.

Duncan Maclennan at the University of Glasgow has suggested replacing the Right to Buy, with the Route to Buy. Guides such as *Successful Neighbourhoods* show how housing associations could move from managing stock to managing places, and build the capacity of communities to play a more positive role. The difficulty is often where to start, as the problems can seem daunting.

Challenges

Better management is needed to avoid the mistakes of the past, create places that will stand the test of time, and meet much higher expectations from stakeholders. The challenges are formidable and include both changing the image of former council estates, and also building new settlements in areas with high levels of deprivation.

- **Breaking down 'walls'**, so that people no longer feel trapped or excluded within social housing. Lynsey Hanley in her account of living on estates, graphically describes some of the roots of social exclusion: '*Council estates have the effect of making people feel worse about themselves, and in turn, physically worse than other members of society, because they know that they are in many ways cut off from the mass affluence – the mass middle classes, if you like – that the rest of the nation enjoys'.* The challenge is to avoid the vicious circle of low expectations and low aspirations that exist in many mono-tenure and low-income environments.

- **Shaping better places**, as many reports have highlighted, means addressing the problems associated with polarisation and residualisation of social housing, unruly children and anti-social behaviour, and poor connectivity. In addition problems of absent and negligent management need to be addressed; for example two-thirds of new homes in London have been acquired by Buy to Let Investors. New settlements in Cambridge have also ended up with very different occupants to what was originally planned or expected.

URBED were commissioned by the Housing Corporation and English Partnerships, with the University of Westminster, to advise on how to develop mixed communities. The resulting good practice guide broke down the fifteen core tasks of management into the three spatial levels of; domestic, communal, and neighbourhood[45]:

Domestic:

- Ensuring harmonious 'living together' despite different lifestyles e.g. those with and without children
- Enabling a mix of residents with different income levels
- Supporting vulnerable households with particular needs
- Maintaining the standards of private space which impact on the wider look of the area e.g. front gardens, rubbish removal

Communal:

- Providing recreational places for all ages with scope for informal interaction
- Maintaining and monitoring common spaces to a high quality e.g. lifts and entrances
- Managing waste and rubbish sorting and removal to high and consistent standards
- Providing appropriate parking for both visitors and residents
- Providing cycling routes and pedestrian pathways

Neighbourhood:

- Identifying and providing support systems for those with personal and social needs e.g. mental health issues
- Having in place appropriate and sufficient social infrastructure e.g. schools, health care, shops and services, to create a sense of community
- Improving transport links, cutting travel times and costs, and helping residents get to work and accessing services as easily as possible
- Minimising opportunities for anti-social behaviour and crime through good design and support services
- Providing realistic marketing material that describes accurately how a development will grow and fit in to the surrounding neighbourhood, and what can be expected at each stage
- Assisting in improving economic activity within the neighbourhood and providing training and local employment schemes

a. Visible management:

The premier expert on the subject Professor Anne Power at the London School of Economics provides a useful four stage framework based on work in renewing housing estates, which starts and ends with resident involvement, and emphasises visible improvements to the community. She draws on research conducted by Emmit Bergin[46] to propose four key principles for successful renewal of housing estates:

[45] URBED, Mixed Communities: Good Practice Guidance for Management and Service Provision, 2008

[46] Emmit Bergin, Neighbourhood Management and the Future of Urban Areas, 1999

- **Sorting out the basics:** Visible services such as street cleaning generate confidence among residents and local professionals, and therefore need to be tackled first

- **Hands-on management and someone in charge:** A visible management presence and a dedicated budget are key to raising standards. Based on a number of case studies, the costs of neighbourhood management worked out around £200 per household a year, which was on top of major investment programmes. While this is only a quarter of what would typically be paid in Council tax, it has a much larger impact on those on lower incomes

- **Strategic management:** The transfer of control to a highly localised initiative, such as an RSL or a Private Finance Initiative backed scheme, can produce a catalytic shift by giving residents a direct stake in conditions, while local authorities act as enablers and brokers

- **Resident involvement:** Neighbourhood management with resident involvement is seen as key to responding to local needs, and protecting the investment in regeneration, provided it is adequately funded. The costs can be quite low, thus in Broadwater Farm the cost of the neighbourhood officer is about £35 per property or 3% of the cost of local housing management and maintenance. The Area Manager's salary in Waltham Forest Housing Action Trust and in the Bloomsbury Tenant Management Organisation were both about £50 per property a year.

b. Super caretakers:

In areas with higher levels of deprivation, such as the renewal of a large housing estate, on the spot neighbourhood management as used in Hulme, Manchester, pays for itself by bringing together social services, education, and environmental services. It can help in developing a sense of community, and provide quicker responses to issues such as those created when people from different backgrounds come to live together.

> In the redevelopment of the infamous Gorbals, now known as Crown Street, Glasgow, maintenance and repair services are carried out by the New Gorbals Housing Association. There are consistent standards across the development and work is carried out in both rented and owner-occupied properties under the same contract, generating what are described as 'massive economies of scale'. The housing association is able to employ staff five days a week, rather than one or two days as with most private sector organisations.

A report for the Policy Action Team on Housing Management concluded that '*Managing housing effectively in the most deprived areas requires solutions that go beyond housing management'.* For example*,* in Danish housing management for every 80-100 homes people are employed to deal with tenant changeovers, building and landscape management and supporting vulnerable people. There are also

incentives for good behaviour such as three-month deposits which are returned when tenants return properties in good condition or take over some of the work themselves.[47] Each caretaker walks their own patch to get to know the residents such as in Muziekwijk, Utrecht.

c. Pre-emptive management

It is important to act before problems arise, and this calls for community development from the start of a major project. People from different backgrounds may not mix naturally and communities take time to grow and settle. They require plenty of space for informal interaction, such as schools, sitting areas, playgrounds, or even well-placed bus stops. An effective social mix also requires effective institutional arrangements, but the management approach must be tailored to the context, and thought through from the start.

> The development director of the new Bournville Village in Telford, believes their success in Lightmoor came from putting the management agency in place before anything was built, so that adequate powers and responsibilities were built into all the legal documentation.[48] Investment in appropriate management arrangements will ensure positive outcomes for both public and private developers, and both new and existing communities.

d. Neighbourhood compacts or covenants:

A framework can be set for new communities that specifies the basic principles that shape both the eventual masterplan and also the value of the land before public funding is made available. This should cover uses and densities, and also the proportion of affordable or social housing. Covenants can be linked to the granting of leases to secure appropriate standards of behaviour.

> The agreement used in Park Central Birmingham was set up by the Optima Housing Association, which took over from the local authority, in a joint venture with house builders Crest Nicholson. The agreement applies to all residents including freehold and leasehold owner occupiers. It covers issues such as neighbour nuisance, the appearance of the property and parking. [49]

e. Tenure mix

The policy of mixed communities was originally promoted to avoid concentrations of poverty which were seen as self-perpetuating and breeding grounds for social exclusion. The *Sustainable Communities Plan* in 2006[50] called for '*A well-integrated*

[47] Bringing Britain Together, Social Exclusion Task Force, 1999

[48] Michael Carley and Nicholas Falk, Sustainable Urban Neighbourhoods: building communities that last, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2012

[49] Barry Munday and Nicholas Falk, The ABC of Housing Growth and infrastructure, The Housing Forum, 2014

[50] DCLG 2006

mix of decent homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes.' They also called for local planning authorities to *'ensure that new housing developments help to secure a better social mix by avoiding the creation of large areas of housing with similar characteristics.'*

The DCLG under the coalition government of 2010 reversed the policy, stating in their evidence on mixed communities that: '*if there had to be a crude choice between traditional urban and neighbourhood renewal and mixed communities policies to address the top quarter most deprived local authorities (as Neighbourhood Renewal Fund did) or even the most deprived 10 per cent or 5 per cent of wards, the evidence suggests the former offer more limited but better-evidenced benefits at lower costs, and are also more achievable during a recession.'*[51]

A review of mixed income, mixed tenure, and mixed communities by Rebecca Tunstall and Alex Fenton provides a balanced and critical view between these two stances:[52]

- Mix can mean many things, and that the most successful examples have evolved over time. Simply mixing the population will not by itself change behaviour or overcome barriers to social inclusion.
- The nature of the location is critical, and though higher income residents may encourage improved environmental management, this is unlikely to take place in locations with weak demand.
- Similarly school performance will only improve if the higher income residents have children, and choose to send them to local schools. Thus changing the social mix is not the most direct way of raising educational standards. The benefit of having better role models will only work if people interact, and this depends on sites for 'casual interaction' such as shops and communal areas, as well as what happens at nursery and primary schools.
- Hence estate management forums and community organisations are vital. So are policies aimed at equalising choices, for example through 'choice-based lettings' schemes rather than allocation simply in terms of levels of need.
- Letting higher income housing tenants buy or improve their position without having to leave the area, or when a family breaks down, enable parents to live within range of their children. It may also enable households to trade down, for example as their children leave home. So though few people may value social mix by itself, an area with a greater choice of housing should fare better over time.
- However it is far from clear what level of mix is needed to achieve the necessary threshold, and some needs are better met by similar types of people clustering together. This leads to the idea that there should be local letting plans, and agreements covering maintenance standards.
- There is also a need to learn from places that have matured, and not just from new schemes, as there is very little longitudinal evidence of why some places work better than others, or of whom replaces the original occupiers when they move out.

Vathorst, Netherlands: A sustainable urban extension

[51] DCLG 2010

[52] Rebecca Tunstall and Alex Fenton, A review of mixed income, mixed tenure, and mixed communities, 2006

30% of the housing in Vathorst was allocated as affordable either through subsidised renting or housing for sale, and was provided through housing associations. Eight different builders and some 50 different architects were involved with no one architect designing more than 80 units to ensure choice and variety, and the social units were designed to the same high standards as housing for sale to ensure cohesion.

The focus was very much on social sustainability by ensuring a balance of housing at a neighbourhood level in order to create cohesive communities. The mix Vathorst pioneered which was to provide a range of price categories for different income-groups not only promoted social integration but also provided a way of cross subsidising the cost of the social housing. The principle of rebalancing the social mix is a model that has since been adopted nationally.

One problem facing areas with a lot of former Council housing, such as Peterborough, is attracting those on higher incomes to live in new housing estates, and therefore provide the foundation for a mixed or balanced community. Important research for JRF and the Chartered Institute of Housing by a team led by Ruth Lupton concluded that major changes were needed in both design and management to attract higher income families to stay in new mixed communities (Silverman et al, 2005). Their report *A Good Place for Children: attracting and retaining families in inner urban mixed income new communities* (MINCs 2006) distinguished between 'local' and 'newcomer' families, and between whether newcomers had similar occupations to local people, or were in managerial and professional occupations with greater housing choice. The research showed that '*market rate families can be attracted and retained in MINCs, especially when their children are young… The way MINCs are designed and managed can make a difference… Safe, clean and friendly environments matter to families. They can be enhanced by a unified appearance, local staffing, strategic management and community building activities, including community development, cross-tenure resident associations, and the provision and management of public space where people can mix informally.'*

The researchers concluded that retaining higher income families depended above all on providing larger homes and good secondary schools. There is a danger of producing too many small flats because they have been easiest to sell (and fund), resulting in places that may not be sustainable over time. Greenwich Millennium Village was one of the more successful case studies, and shows the value of providing schools that act as community hubs, alongside urban design that generates social interaction, and that creates areas that look clean, safe and friendly. However it also shows the importance of coming up with a clear vision or ethos, and then sticking to it. It is all too easy for the original 'pioneers' to move on, and to be replaced by settlers with very different objectives, particularly if there are no checks on who gets to move into the social housing.

f. Development Trusts

Management matters, and needs to be funded on an ongoing basis. Development trusts can be defined as not for profit community based organisations with property assets which are used to meet community needs. A report on the management of Northstowe New Town evaluated a range of new communities before concluding that a development trust would be better than a Parish Council or commercial management organisation as the aims were to create somewhere innovative, at that

time an Ecotown.[53] The report was based on lessons from a series of case studies of new communities.

> An asset endowed development trust was used in Caterham Village in Surrey, which provided a good management mechanism for the new communities whilst they were growing. For example a trust can provide shops or services at the early stages of a development when they might not otherwise be viable. It can also act as the champion for measures to promote environmental sustainability, such as community transport or measures to engage young people. It can also take on projects, such as the refurbishment of a historic building, that might otherwise not be viable.

g. Residents associations

Resident associations can play a key role in engendering community empowerment by allowing a formal role in the decision-making process. Options include housing management boards (e.g. Waltham Forest Housing Action Trust), resident representation on management committees, (e.g. Hulme), and tenant management organisations (TMO's) (such as Kensington and Chelsea).

> A Development Manager was funded by the developer of Greenwich Millennium Village for two years 'with a remit to act as a catalyst for community activity', to build social capital across the tenures and to establish links to the wider Greenwich community. The manager was instrumental in starting up the residents' association, as well as organising a number of community events and developing the community website.

Tenant management organisations have recently faced public scrutiny due to their role in the recent Grenfell Tower tragedy, however as Anne Power writes the Kensington and Chelsea borough-wide TMO formed in the 1990's is viewed locally as a "fake TMO": '*among the 200 TMOs nationally, that particular organisation is a total anomaly – not community-based, not cooperatively run, not representative. It was set up to cover the whole borough and simply took on the existing council housing department and stock*[54]*.'*

The benefits of a properly functioning TMO give Tenants a voice in the safety, maintenance, and general condition of their blocks. They often know more than staff about who lives in blocks and about earlier works as they have often been around longer than housing staff. They know what changes have been made. They are valuable conduits for vital information, and can thus help their landlords and their community.

Rotterdam: social cohesion through the Opzoomeren policy

[53] Nicholas Falk and Marilyn Taylr, Who Runs This Place? Northstowe Local Management Study, URBED and MTA for Cambridge City Council and Gallaghers, 2016

[54] Anne Power, How Tenant Management Organisations have wrongly been associated with Grenfell, 2017

The name Opzoomeren refers to a street in Rotterdam where citizens had self-organised in tangible way to improve their living environment, and which inspired the birth of the city wide Opzoomeren policy. The process is aimed at changing attitudes, and starts with getting some 'live wires' to organise a street party, which leads on to drawing up rules for how the area is to be run to minimise conflicts. The core aim of the policy was to replicate the success of the original Opzoomer Street to improve the quality of social relations in disadvantaged neighbourhoods across Rotterdam and to promote citizen's initiatives in the voluntary sector.

This usually took the form of community street clean-ups, sports activities and festivals, however initiatives can often be more specialised such as community Dutch language lessons for new migrants. The initiatives are first started by the community, and if successful the Rotterdam Municipality will provide additional funding and support, as well as bringing the framework for the project to elsewhere in the city. This proved a highly effective strategy in bridging the cultural gaps between different ethnic communities, socio-economic classes and age groups, and the initiative now operates on over 1,600 streets in Rotterdam today. Initially being supported by the local authority, the policy has now spread beyond Rotterdam and is subsidised across the Netherlands through national policy.

h. Structured lettings

With more people on low incomes renting from private landlords, many of whom own few properties, it is increasingly important to find ways of regulating renting without hurting the supply. The concept of structured lettings is to arrive at a balanced social mix rather than ending up with too many of any one category, such as single parents with young children. The process is a variant of choice-based letting, which is a system of allocating social housing, where vacancies are openly advertised. It is based on Dutch practice, and enables applicants for social housing to exercise preferences when units become vacant (as opposed to a points systems based solely on need).

Priority could be given to those from local communities, and one example is Ealing's Golden Transfer Scheme. Schools can draw on the wider community, and a good example being Orchard Park's Community Wing, to enable them to open in the first year.[55] In Hulme, Manchester, The Hulme Housing Association 'People First' ran a choice based letting system on their allocations. 35% were selected from people with local community or economic connections on the main housing register, and housing need is not always the determining criteria. This means there is more of a socio-economic mix in their properties, which helps to avoid ghettoisation.

Another possible model is Ireland's Rental Accommodation Scheme (RAS), which has been praised in the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's report on Innovative Financing of Affordable Housing. Due to rising rents in the private rental market the RAS was piloted in 2005/6, which allowed local authorities to negotiate agreements with private landlords for up to ten years in return for a discounted rent which is 8% lower than the market rent. In return the local authority takes responsibility for letting

[5555] Nicholas Falk and Michael Carley, Solutions: how can local government build sustainable urban neighbourhoods JRF 2012

the property and collecting the rents. Instead of low-income tenants receiving a housing allowance they instead pay a contribution to the rent that varies inversely according to their income so that it is not a disincentive to employment. The scheme is financed by central government, and any savings are used to finance social housing. A report for JRF concluded in 2013 on the basis of several studies that *'In summary the scheme has facilitated better value for money for the government, while generally providing a better deal for private tenants.'*

i. Integration of ethnic minorities and migrants

As noted in section two of this report, the largest perceived problem by many regions across the UK including Cambridgeshire is immigration and integration[56]. However the evidence based on integration is poor, which the 2013 report by the IPPR blamed on a lack of clarity about what integration comprises. [57] The inherent complexity of integration presents challenges when analysing and presenting policy-relevant data. For example, as the IPPR outlined; *'male, India-born migrants in the UK have good labour market outcomes, but are much less likely to marry outside their religious and caste affiliation. Are they more or less integrated than someone who 'marries out' but is unemployed?'*

Another facet of the poor evidence base is the lack of longitudinal data – a crucial gap given that integration is inherently a long-term process. An internal Home Office longitudinal study was begun in 2004, but then abandoned. A three-year survey about migrant integration was placed out to tender in 2008, but it was never progressed. The absence of longitudinal data in the UK is in contrast to most other developed countries, for example, Canada which has undertaken four longitudinal surveys of immigrants, starting in 1969[58].

Looking to the future, 'Understanding Society', the *UK Household Longitudinal Study*, begun in 2009, has great potential to provide useful data. Comprising 100,000 individuals in 40,000 households, it is the largest longitudinal study to date. Its large sample size means that it yields a large enough sample of migrants to enable a meaningful analysis of diverse migrant groups. But most of these datasets have so far been under exploited, from a migration perspective.

There have been a number of recent studies that have examined how migrants themselves understand integration. These qualitative studies show that migrants largely see integration in local or everyday terms rather than in terms of integration into a national culture or way of life[59] [60]. The main consensus in the literature is that the process of integration takes place in 'everyday' sites such as schools, shops and workplaces and in the realities of everyday life. Those concerned with integration

[56] National Conversation on Immigration, 2017

[57] IPPR, Back to basics: Towards a successful and cost-effective integration policy, 2013

[58] Black R, Fielding T, King R, Skeldon R and T iemoko R, Longitudinal Studies: An insight into current studies and the social and economic outcomes for migrants, 2003

[59] Cherti M and McNeil C, Rethinking Integration, 2012

[60] Korac M, Integration and how we facilitate it: A comparative study of the settlement experiences of refugees in Italy and the Netherlands, 2003

need to account for the everyday concerns of migrants and the communities in which they live[61].

The IPPR report recommend a number of approaches that can be taken to aid the integration of migrants in the UK:

- **Housing and the built environment –** The majority of newly-arrived migrants end up living in privately rented accommodation, often in deprived neighbourhoods experiencing high levels of population churn[62]. While residential mobility linked to employment is desirable – we need people to be able to move for work – residential mobility caused by insecure housing tenure is usually undesirable. Moving accommodation on a frequent basis impacts on the ability of people to form local attachments and to integrate effectively.

  Residential mobility also impacts on levels of social cohesion in neighbourhoods. Most tenancy agreements in the private rental sector are six-month shorthold tenancies and the de jure minimum has become the de facto maximum for many households. Many of those who work with low income groups in private rental accommodation are calling for an additional 'family' tenancy, giving a longer period of tenure and longer notice period – this could also help to promote integration and community cohesion[63]. A better legal framework to regulate the private rental sector and homes of multiple occupancy and tied accommodation, alongside the commitment by local authorities to implement regulations, would also help to remove barriers to integration.

- **Integration hubs –** The Commission on Integration and Cohesion put some emphasis on the role of 'integration hubs' within neighbourhoods – places and spaces where different groups of people both meet and where support services can be provided for them. Such integration hubs can include schools, colleges, children's centres, community centres, libraries, allotments, parks and playgrounds. Such spaces might be considered to be the 'soft' infrastructure of settlements. But national and local government usually gives little thought about how the built environment and public space can support the mixing of people. Local authority planning departments have usually been absent from debates about social cohesion.

  Planning regulations and land use strategies need to be used to ensure that there is a soft infrastructure where different groups of people can meet and interact. For example, schools and children's centres are institutions that are used by both migrants and those from the broader community. The government may wish to consider the role that 'extended' schools might play in helping integration. A good example of a social organisation pursuing this

[61] Wessendorf S,Common-place Diversity and the Ethos of Mixing: Perceptions of difference in a London neighbourhood, 2011
[62] Rutter J and Latorre M, Social Housing Allocation and Immigrant Communities, 2009
[63] Hull A and Cooke G, Together at Home: A new strategy for housing, 2012

strategy is South London Refugee Association which provides refugee and migration services through the co-location of services such as medical care, advocacy, and ESOL courses in Wimbledon and Balham.

- **Language training** - English language fluency is central to integration. It empowers migrants and enables them to deal with day-to-day life. It also facilitates communication with those who live around them and helps them find work. The last Labour government responded to this challenge by tripling the budget for adult ESOL. New ESOL for work qualifications were introduced in 2007 to meet the needs of migrants already in employment. Despite these developments, there remain long-term problems in the delivery of adult ESOL that have not really improved in the last 15 years. However, the government has recently announced a new round of funding for ESOL which may be drawn upon by local government.

Conclusion

The subject of managing mixed use housing estates is complex, as it can involve action at the domestic, communal and neighbourhood levels. The subject is often ignored, as it raises questions such as the level of service charge that developers prefer to avoid until the housing is occupied. Yet as soon as people with different backgrounds and resources are expected to share facilities they have had no hand in choosing or designing, the potential for conflicts is huge. As there can be huge delays between planning and implementing a project, as the example of Northstowe highlights, with some fifteen years of delay, local authorities need to have policies prepared for different situations and stages of development. [64]

Successful housing estates are ones with visible management, and the benefits far outweigh any additional costs. In very high-density schemes or where vulnerable people are to be housed 'super caretakers' may be employed. Good practice is to provide the management before problems erupt. Neighourhocood compacts or covenants can be used to tackle issues of nuisance. The tenure mix has major impact, and again lessons can be drawn from good practice in Dutch new settlements. In areas of low demand the challenge can be to retain higher income families, for example through larger homes and good secondary schools.

The management mechanisms at the least involve resident's associations, and priority in letting can be given to those with local connections to help grow the sense of community. Integration is a complex subject, as some of the disputes over Brexit illustrate. A recent IPPR report recommends actions on housing and the built environment, integration hubs, and language training. In an area of potentially low demand, setting up a development trust with an asset base can prove beneficial, as examples such as Coin Street in London or the Milton Keynes Park Trust illustrate.

[64] Nicholas Falk and Marillyn Taylor, Who Runs This Place? Northstowe Local Management Study for South Cams, Gallaghers and Cambridge Horizons, 2005
Falk and Marilyn Taylor, Growing Sustainable Communities: Northstowe Local Management Study, for South Cams, Gallaghers and Cambridge Horizons, 2006

Appendix E

Auditing housing performance

This paper considers how performance is best evaluated, based on a review of systems that have been used elsewhere. The worth of the Quality Charter seems clear from the responses to Steve Platt's interviews with users of the Charter, both architects and their clients. Both welcomed the guidance and the chance to discuss proposals with an expert panel. In turn the local authorities rely on the Panel for their assessments in negotiating with developers. However there is an important gap in the process, which is feedback on how well the new developments have performed in practice. Now that a number of schemes have been occupied for over five years, and with the prospect of developments in areas with lower property values, such as Wisbech, it is all the more important to visit completed schemes to assess not just the housing but the neighbourhoods that have been created.

There is a basic issue of what success looks like, as it involves far more than securing coverage in the architectural press. Success can be measured in many ways, for example by how easy it is to attract people to buy homes, turnover or churn, and participation in community life. This can be counted and valued as 'social capital' and will have an impact on property values. For example the East Thames housing association developed a toolkit or 'Density Wheel', which they used to evaluate schemes before they were built[65]. The eight elements or spokes were:

Design

- Neighbourhood amenity and location
- Mixed communities
- Design standards
- Private and communal external space

Management

- Parking provision and management
- Allocation and lettings
- Management, maintenance and community engagement
- Service charges

While some evaluations have been done in Cambridge, including a number by students at the Department of Land Economy, a more systematic and thorough process of monitoring is required if developers and investors are to be convinced of the value of spending time and money on improving the standard product. Not only should this encourage the next crop of developers to aim for high standards, but it should also help show what works, and what does not. There are a range of possible approaches to be considered, such as visual assessments, questionnaires, focus groups, and comprehensive surveys, and a number of commercial approaches that have been used elsewhere and national surveys that touch on relevant indicators.

[65] Helen Cope, draft toolkit for higher density housing

Visual assessments

- The easiest and cheapest method is to commission an expert group, such as from the Academy of Urbanism, to visit a number of schemes and report back. They could use the principles in the Quality Charter to review how far they seem to have been applied. The visits could be combined with a workshop with Quality Panel members and local authority officers to discuss their conclusions.
- While this method is impressionistic, it should help focus efforts on key areas of concern, particularly for the next phases. There are eight possible schemes to assess, and comparisons could be made of schemes undertaken with and without the benefit of the involvement of the Quality Panel. The costs of this process, which might be one-off, could be funded by the Combined Authority, as an extension of this study, as was originally proposed. However the drawback is that it will not provide a method that could be used to raise standards more generally or to address the issues involved in developing mixed and cohesive communities.

Questionnaires

- A common method is to ask a sample of residents to complete simple questionnaires that provide information on their housing needs and resources, and also their satisfaction with different aspects. Importantly these need to go beyond comments on the house itself, which are sometimes picked up by major house-builders, to the design and management of the neighbourhood. Important questions might include how people travel, and how well their needs are catered for, as well as questions regarding provision for children, for example how safe is it for children to go to school or shops on their own.
- To be of any use, the sample needs to be large enough and representative, which can be a problem when little is known about who occupies the units; for example a number of houses intended for owner occupation have been bought by landlords who let them to students, who will have very different requirements. There is also a problem in delivering and securing feedback from residents to avoid bias, for example leaving out the most vulnerable groups. One solution would be to work with resident associations or any community development workers that may be employed. Another is to link monitoring to a project with schools, especially if this could be part of required school work, for example for a geography assignment. Such a project might form part of the work of the public health officers, as it could include questions on loneliness, and active travel.

Focus groups

- The best results generally come from discussions with groups, as probing into what does and does not work can be complex. The simplest approach would be professionally led focus groups with stakeholders, and especially those involved in providing services to the communities such as doctors and teachers. This method was used very successfully in Steve Platt's assessment of Cambourne, which revealed some important problems that had not previously surfaced, leading to corrective action.
- Better still is to involve residents themselves in discussing where they live, and what changes, if any, might be made to future developments, and perhaps communicated in a revised version of the Quality Charter. The discussion groups could follow on from the first stage of questionnaires, which could establish interest, and also help

ensure balanced groups were selected (though there may be advantages in drawing groups from different social and age backgrounds).

- Whatever method were chosen, the results could be used to draw up guidance for the next phases of development, and the extension of the Quality Charter process to Fenland and Peterborough, as well as its applications to major new developments such as at Cambridge North, where innovation might be expected. It would therefore be useful to include discussions of options that could be achieved at less cost, and of different approaches to estate management, such as the use of community land trusts or various forms of cooperative.

Comprehensive surveys

- A further approach would be to combine a number of methods in a process that could be rolled out to other parts of the UK. Cambridgeshire is already acting as a pace setter because of the high rate of house building, and also because of the involvement of many prominent architects and developers. What has been achieved, if the elements can be identified, could therefore help in raising quality standards more widely, and thus reducing the opposition to new housing. It might for example be linked to the work of the new Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence, or CaCHE, which involves some 14 different research bodies and a budget of £8 million. The theme of design quality and design guidance is led by Professor Flora Samuel at Reading and Tom Kenny.
- A full evaluation would include examining the economics of new development to establish whether new housing was offering value for money, with for example lower operating costs compensating for higher initial prices. It would look at factors such as absorbtion rates or the level of demand compared with existing homes, and would use the responses to influence design guidance more widely. One of the drawbacks of past research is that without standardising the questions it is very hard to compare projects, and also it is essential to go back after a few years to overcome the limitations of initial reactions.
- Though the cost of a comprehensive approach might at first seem daunting, once the methodology has been tested out, it could be linked to other national surveys, such as on Wellbeing or Housing Quality, to enable smaller samples to be used. Indeed given the scale of investment required, the cost of doing a proper job should surely be seen as an essential part of Research and Development. In a highly fragmented industry, this is a job that cannot be left to the market, and one where concerned local authorities and private investors, such as in Cambridgeshire, might well take a lead.
- In deciding what should be done, it will be worth examining methods that are being used by some of the house builders, such as the Berkeley Group, as well as periodic surveys undertaken by bodies concerned with investment. There may be opportunities for linking in with academic research, including that undertaken for the Joseph Rowntree Trust, and currently for the Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence (CaCHE).[66]

National quantifiable surveys

There are a number of varying large-scale nationwide surveys in the UK that provide a range of indicators that can be used in part to assess community and cohesion. An example of a comprehensive survey utilizing these datasets can be seen by the Berkley Group below.

[66] Becky Tunstall, Discovering the CaCHE, Town and Country Planning, September 2018

The **British Household Panel Survey**/Understanding Social Society is a longitudinal study operational since 1996 run by the Institute for Social and Economic Research. Interviews (with each participant) and anonymous questionnaires (for more sensitive questions) are undertaken on a nationally representative sample size averaging around 5,000 households (~10,000 adults). Along with demographic data it includes questions on neighbourhood, residential mobility, health and caring, employment changes, values and opinions, and perceptions on vulnerability.

The **Taking Part** survey run by the Department of Culture Media and Sport has been running annually since 2005 incorporating 14,000 participants selected randomly from English postcodes. Similar to the British Household Panel Survey it uses a combination of questionnaires and interviews. It contains questions related to engagement and non-engagement in culture, leisure and sport, frequency of participation, reasons for participating, and barriers to participation. The survey also gathers information on demographics (e.g. age, education), and related areas including: social capital; activities while growing up; volunteering; charitable giving; and TV and internet use.

The **Crime Survey for England and Wales** has been run by the Home Office since 1986 and has a nationally representative sample size of 51,000. It produces a number of quantifiable indicators related to identifying high risk groups, attitudes to crime and the Criminal Justice System as well as the police and the courts, and experiences of anti-social behaviour and how this has affected quality of life.

In 2008 the **English Housing Survey** was created by merging the English house condition survey with the survey of English housing. Run by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, it aims to inform the development and monitoring of MHCLG's housing policies. The survey has 2 main components; face to face interviews and questionnaires carried out on a sample of 13,000 households, and physical surveys of properties conducted by a qualified surveyor along with 6,000 of the surveyed households. The survey looks at factors such as housing history and aspirations, satisfaction with landlords, attitudes to neighborhood income, and satisfaction with neighborhood.

The **Citizenship Survey** run by the Department for Communtiies and Local Government was operational biannually between 2001-2011 and interviewed a sample size of 11,000 randomly sampled households across wards. The questions covered areas such as race, equality, feelings about their community, volunteering and participation, cohesion, and community empowerment.

Creating Strong Communities: how to measure the social sustainability of new developments

This research was undertaken by Social Life and the University of Reading for Berkeley Homes, and has been tested out on at least four housing developments. It uses a range of methods and significantly problems were encountered with getting enough responses from social housing tenants, which required employing an interviewer. The research was developed due to there being a range of methods to design and review good quality homes and assess environmental performance, but not to assess social dimensions such as cohesion or resilience in the same quantifiable manner.

The framework consists of three dimensions: “infrastructure and social amenities”, “voice and influence” and “social and cultural life”, which are underpinned by 13 indicators. Data from 45 questions in total created the results for each indicator. Primary data was collected through a face-to-face residents’ survey and a site survey. The results of the site surveys were benchmarked against industry standards, while the results of the face-to-face interviews were benchmarked against large-scale national datasets for comparable places in the UK. The Office of National Statistics Output Area Classification (OAC) was used for questions taken from Understanding Society and Taking Part surveys, and the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for the Crime Survey for England and Wales and the Citizenship survey.
http://www.social-life.co/media/files/Creating_Strong_Communities.pdf

URBED Sustainability Matrix

In 2013 URBED produced a Sustainability Matrix for a Grosvenor development in Barton, Cambridge, which built upon 15 years of assessment reports covering four stages of design processes (including 2 years post-occupancy) for the sustainable developer Igloo through the Igloo Footprint method. The aim was to attempt to quantify the quality of the design process for the Grosvenor masterplan by analysing and fact-checking proposals using a specialist for each element. The method used categories inspired by the original Cambridge Quality Charter’s 5 C’s; community, connectivity, character, collaboration, and climate change, and each category along with its subcategories was ranked as either; bad practice, market practice, good practice, best practice UK, and best practice EU. The method was developed due to the difficulties found in assessing whether a scheme had lived up to its proposed criteria, and therefore it aimed to a) make criteria measurable, and b) set quantifiable targets. The strength of the method is to provide a clear visual understanding on which elements of a scheme are falling short of national and regional standards.

Opportunities for innovation

If the Quality Panel starts to assess proposals schemes in a wider geographical areas and where issues of cohesion become more important, it could be worth investing more in research and analysis. Here are three options:

- Utilisation of comprehensive surveys with questions drawn from national datasets and supported by local assessments, for example the methodology used by the Berkeley Group. The strengths would be the ability to produce nationally comparative results on a wide range of criteria. The drawbacks will be a high cost and time element.
- A scoring system used to rank varying criteria of a development at multiple stages of the design, construction, and post-occupancy periods, similar to URBED’s work with Igloo and Barratts. The strengths would allow a quantification of quality across a range of criteria, allowing for easy understanding and comparison, as well as clearly highlighting weaknesses and strengths in a development. The drawback will be a high cost and time element (the URBED matrix developed for Igloo costs roughly £4,000 per assessment).
- An independent assessment of the scheme prior to panel discussions with developers, or alternatively requiring the developers to undertake a quantified self-

assessment prior to the panel, or making a contribution to a research fund as part of their S106 commitments.