Refreshing the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth

January 2019

Dr. Nicholas Falk

The URBED Trust

Refreshing the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth

This research was commissioned by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority**.** The brief was '*to undertake interviews, use published materials and URBED research to make recommendations on updating the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter to reflect changes since its inception.'.* We were asked to advise on how greater *Cohesion* or social inclusion could be achieved in future developments, by considering the current principles in the light of published research and international best practice, and this took the form of a separate report on *Creating Cohesive Communities*. We also were asked to make recommendations on assessing performance, and have considered the options for evaluating the quality of what has been built. This report summarises the conclusions and the evidence is set out in five appendices.

Contents

Introduction

The idea for 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. [1] To overcome the disagreements that typically held back progress the report recommended using some form of charter so that the different stakeholders could agree on the basic principles 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 through a series of workshops and events. The draft went through several stages, and the ultimate Charter was shortlisted for an RTPI Award.

It is ten years since the Charter was published, and adopted by local authorities and housing developers. Since then Cambridge and the surrounding areas have experienced rapid growth. Our brief followed up the concern of Councillor Lewis Herbert that future developments need to pay more attention to 'cohesion', which may require another C in the Quality Charter, which currently covers Community, Connectivity, Climate and Character. More recently the Independent Economic Review led by Dame Kate Barker in its sixth key recommendation specifically on housing calls for:

> 'i) revisiting the Quality Charter to audit how well developments and regeneration projects since its publication have met the criteria, ii) renewing and updating the Quality Charter.'

This report represents a first step in the process. The work has been undertaken by Dr Nicholas Falk, Executive Director of The URBED Trust, who conceived and largely drafted the original Quality Charter. He has been supported by Jonah Rudlin, with significant inputs from Steve Platt, a member of the Quality Panel, who interviewed fifteen users of the Quality Charter and panel members. We also took advice from Dr Nicky Morrison on relevant sources of information. The report is directed at both the members of the Combined Authority, and the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter Panel, and we would like to express our admiration and support for the work Robin Nicholson has been doing as Chair of the Quality Panel.

The report builds on a previous review of the extensive literature and a good practice guide developed for the Homes and Communities Agency by URBED working with the University of Westminster. [2] The report concluded, based on a number of case studies;

The successful management *of* mixed communities *depends on getting partners to work together and contribute resources, engaging* communities *positively, providing*

---

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

[2] Nicholas Falk and Nick Bailey, Mixed Communities: Good practice guidance for management and service provision, URBED 2008 www.urbed.coop

quality housing management*, and in situations where they are significant numbers of vulnerable people, establishing effective neighbourhood* management *as well*.

Social cohesion, or inclusive growth, is essentially people getting on with each other. It can become a problem when people from very different backgrounds, typically in terms of age, income, class and race, or with different values, end up living close to each other at relatively high densities. It is therefore an important issue for the successful design, building and management of new settlements. If it is not planned for, it can have an adverse effect on a development's image, sales, and ultimately stability and long-term value. On the positive side investment in measures to improve cohesion can pay off in commercial as well as social terms.

Our review of the quantitative and qualitative research highlighted the importance of the quality of design of transport and accessibility, participatory processes and capacity building; public space and co-location; healthy living measures, and environmental sustainability. Cohesion depends on the early provision of appropriate community facilities, and above all good long-term management or stewardship.

This summary report is structured around three questions.

1. How well has the Quality Review process worked in raising standards
2. What is needed to take account of cohesion, and is a separate theme required?
3. How could performance be best assessed?

The supporting evidence and references are presented in a series of five appendices

A. The value of the Quality Charter process
B. What cohesion means
C. Principles for good design
D. Better neighbourhood management
E. Options for evaluating performance.

1. Assessing the Quality Review process

The first task was to assess the Cambridge Quality Charter and it implementation through the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel. The conclusions are based on telephone interviews by Steve Platt, using a list of prompts with fifteen planners, developers, designers and panel members involved in a range of schemes. Appendix A presents the findings of the interviews.

The benefits of the Quality Charter

The results of the interviews clearly established the value of the Quality Charter and the Design Review process, confirming that it encouraged developers to employ good architectural teams and to adhere to their advice:

1. There has been a great deal of new housing in Cambridge and the overall quality is high but there are some glaring exceptions both in the centre and on the periphery.
2. The main factor affecting quality in Cambridge is the attitude of the developer and the ability of the design team they employ rather than the market.
3. The Cambridge Quality Charter (CQC) has been important is raising the bar on quality. People appreciate its simplicity and brevity. The 4Cs provide a comprehensive framework for both applicants and the Quality Panel.
4. Nobody wants more words in the CQC. However, illustrations might be useful. The possibility of tying the 4Cs into planning policy might also be considered.
5. The CQP is effective in supporting officers, acting as a critical friend to applicants and giving assurance to members. It is important that the same panel members review schemes coming back to the panel more than once.
6. The Chairman's report is key since members place great confidence in this document at committee. It is most important, therefore, that this accurately reflects the open discussion and summary at which the applicant was present. There should be a drawing with each report.
7. Most people interviewed thought schemes should come to the panel earlier and more often.
8. On large schemes that take many years and are divided into various plots there is a case for retaining a master planner and for appointing a panel member to champion the scheme.
9. Good quality schemes can encourage community development. Neither developers nor planners can create communities that guarantee cohesion and social inclusion, but well designed and built schemes can reduce social conflict, while poorly thought through schemes can foster social tension and aggravate conflict.

The impact of the Quality Charter process

The interviews confirmed the general value of the Quality Charter with its four main elements or themes of Community, Connectivity, Character and Climate-Proofing (widely known as the Four C's). The key ingredients for good design and quality housing were largely bound up with the public realm. The main messages were:

a. clarity of the planning policy and caliber of the planning officers
b. responding to the context: sense of place, identity and distinctiveness
c. optimising the opportunities for every home: space standards, especially ceiling heights, aspect and cross ventilation, outdoor amenity space and decent parking and bin stores
d. adaptability, so the owner can easily maintain and change their home
e. soft and hard landscaping and quality of the open space and civic buildings.
f. long-term maintenance and management of the public realm.

The interviews suggested three areas for possible improvement

- There may be a case for a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Cambridge embodying clear rigorous guidance for large housing developments.
- The big issue is that despite building lots of good new homes they are still unaffordable to half the residents of Cambridge and the surrounding area. This could be even more problematic in areas with relatively low known levels of demand and property values, such as Wisbech. Hence action may be needed to integrate new developments with improvements to the existing stock, both public and private
- Post occupancy evaluation (POE) is a missing piece in the process. How a place develops and performs over time and how the open spaces and building wear and are maintained are crucial to the quality standards to which Cambridge aspires.

In conclusion local authorities and developers can be proud of what has been achieved in Cambridge and there are lessons from Cambridge that need documenting and disseminating. However before that can be done effectively a system is needed for assessing performance of the new homes and neighbourhoods that is cost-effective and capable of replication. Conclusions on evaluation options form the final section of this report. But first a review was needed of how far the theme of Community addressed the complex task of achieving social cohesion, and whether this required the addition of another theme to the Charter.

2. Achieving social cohesion

Social cohesion, or inclusive growth, is essentially people getting on with each other, and it can become a problem when people from very different backgrounds end up living close to each other, and at relatively high densities. It is therefore an important issue for the design, building and management of new settlements. At its worst 'nuisance' can have an adverse effect on a development's image, sales, and ultimately stability, and require expensive remedial work. It can also harm people's lives.

Cohesion is a contentious subject: some view the problem as being caused by poor social-funding and slow, unequal economic growth, whereas others see social cohesion as being largely an immigration and integration issue, solvable perhaps through the promotion of British values. Either way the issues of 'new town blues' and mental health can easily arise on new settlements, such as Cambourne, even when care has been taken in planning community facilities. There are particular problems when people move in who have no long-term commitment, which can be exacerbated by the short-term perspective of some developers. Below are some common problems which can be averted through good design.

- 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)
- 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').

There is ample quantitative and qualitative research, for example from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, which suggests that social cohesion can be achieved in mixed-communities through the provision of appropriate community facilities, and above all by good long-term management or stewardship.. As these both form elements in the current Charter there is no need for a separate theme, but both the wording and examples would benefit from changes, which are covered later. (see Appendix B for summary of relevant research).

What cohesion means

Cohesion is an intangible concept, and one that can really only be attained indirectly through the general improvement, management, and design of the public realm alongside progressive public policy. Therefore a lot of literature and case studies explored in this report look at issues such as healthy environments, connectivity, or

management structures that may not seem directly related. Such a multi-dimensional approach however is in line with the UN's *2030 Sustainable Development Goals,* particularly in regard to reducing inequalities and promoting sustainable cities and communities as a whole. If the new communities in and around Cambridge and Peterborough are truly cohesive, they can serve as models for the rest of the UK or other countries who may equally be looking for inspiration. This should also help in securing good value from Section 106 contributions.

Hence it is important the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth – and the related Design Review process – take full account of what has been learned both through national research and through local experience, for example by the Clinical Commissioning Group.[3] Thus since the Charter was produced there has been more interest in public health, and '*ensuring that the design and delivery of all programmes (spanning infrastructure, skills, health & wellbeing, innovation and business growth) reflect the standards expected to deliver inclusive, place-based growth….and improves peoples' health and wellbeing, and reduces health inequalities*'.

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. 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 young people, not just small children but also teenagers. There is also a need to organize and fund neighbourhood management, which raises the issue 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.[4] One important conclusion was that an asset endowed neighbourhood trust, possibly funded through a charge on utilities or parking, could play an important role in building a sense of community and promoting behaviour change Particular inspiration can also be drawn from the Netherlands, and the new settlements that inspired the original

---

[3] New Housing Developments and the Built Environment, JSNA and Cambridgeshire County Council, 2015/6

[4] 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

Quality Charter, such as Vathorst in Amersfoort and other schemes undertaken through the Dutch ViNEX housing policy. A clear message from Dutch experience is that 30% is about the right level for providing affordable homes that are allocated to those in housing need, of which two-thirds might best be allocated to 'key workers', including an element for owner occupation, such as equity sharing. In poorer areas where values will be lower a lower proportion may be advisable to avoid skimping on common parts.

Designing for cohesive communities

Good design, especially of the public realm, that is the space between buildings, plays a key role in how well a community functions. This is particularly relevant to achieving goals such as Healthy Neighbourhouds and achieving targets for active travel, for example, but also has a major impact on customer satisfaction and the rate of sales. At its worst poor design can lead to a new estate being stigmatized, vandalized, and ultimately requiring expensive remedial works. Good design is not just about making space for community facilities such as shops on a plan; it is about creating the conditions that will make them viable.

Transport and accessibility are critical .and the Quality Charter already makes a number of proposals based on what has worked elsewhere. Yet schemes are still being put forward for developments in locations that would depend on owning cars, while opportunities to benefit from existing or proposed public transport are missed. Co-location is one of the County Council core principles in its *Strategy for Supporting New Communities*. Transport is a necessary nut not a sufficient condition for growth and wellbeing; so investment needs to be combined with other measures if it is to pay off, such as support for car clubs and car sharing.

The difficult process of changing behaviour can be helped through participatory design and capacity building through schools so that children put pressure on their parents. This is particularly important where many of the new residents are expected to have low incomes or speak English as a second language. The provision of multiple uses in the same building, or community hubs, can save the expense of running separate schools and community centres, as in Orchard Park for example. For example community laundries are often found in buildings run as coops in large schemes in Vienna, Zurich or Danish cities.

Healthy living has become the new priority to overcome the limits on health and social services, especially with a growing elderly population. Guidance is readily available on actions such as collaboration, development and management, and behaviour change. Major projects are being proposed for new communities such as Northstowe, from which lessons could be learned and shared. Many of the actions required are equally relevant to the goals of environmental sustainability, Indeed the savings in energy or health bills could more than compensate for any additional costs upfront, as well as attracting people to live in areas they might not have previously considered.

Suggestions for refreshing the Community section of the Quality Charter

- Developers should be asked about the kinds of people expected to occupy the housing at different stages of development, such as where they are likely to come from.
- The introduction should refer to density levels and tenure proportions where extra care is needed in both design and management to avoid potential conflicts.
-Examples should be illustrated of exemplary schools and community centres, including co-location, from which lessons could be drawn, including activities that draw different groups together and encourage sharing resources (e.g. shared battery's like in Trent Basin).
-Illustrations should be provided of acceptable ways of providing for parking and waste storage that minimize the land take, reducing private parking and adding electric charging points and secure bike parking.
-Developers should be encouraged to make space for innovation and diversity, for example through making 10% of units available to self-builders and cooperative groups (The Town scheme in Orchard Park may provide a good model), or allocating an energy awareness centre.
-Examples of creative Section 106 Agreements might be illustrated that support community development and neighbourhood management company/organisation that involves residents.

Better neighbourhood management

The subject of managing mixed use housing estates is complex, as it can involve action at the domestic, communal and neighbourhood levels. This is a topic that goes beyond the remit of the Quality Panel, yet it should concern local authorities in negotiating Section 106 Agreements. 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.

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, and police or community development workers have to be deployed. Neighourhocood compacts or covenants can be used to tackle issues of nuisance as natural extensions of the Quality Charter. 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 rather than too many 'small boxes'.

The management mechanisms at the very least involve residents associations Priority in letting affordable housing may 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. However solutions are available, and, for example, 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., and there are now many others, including community land trusts.

Possible innovations

In considering how best to secure cohesion in future developments, and how this might affect the workings of the Quality Panel, we have identified a range of innovations that are used to bring people together around common interests. These could be illustrated in a revised version of the Quality Charter, which emphasises the development of 'social capital', including highlighting achievements that have been made, such as community centres., No doubt others will emerge from discussions with those concerned with community health and poverty.

a. Festivals of all kinds

b. Family centres and school based programmes

c. Apprenticeships and mentoring

d. Credit unions and community banks

e. ASOL and community hubs for refugees, migrants, and short-term migrants

f. Community Land Trusts

g. Self-build and cohousing

h. Private renting and rent to buy schemes

i. Parking charges with incentives for car sharing

j. Lifetime neighbourhoods with scope to move home locally as people's needs and resources change.

k. Arts and sports initiatives

l. Allotments and food growing.

3. Auditing housing performance

Despite large levels of investment in new housing, there is no agreed way of assessing or auditing performance, which is crucial if better results are to be achieved from limited resources. One of the main findings from interviewing users of the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter and the Quality Panel was the need to follow up Design Reviews to find out how well the housing and neighbourhood performed in practice. This is in vivid contrast to buying a car, for example, where relevant factors are systematically assessed and reported on. As a result car design is continentally improved, whereas housing in the UK has stagnated.

Furthermore the use of design reviews or audits has fallen dramatically over recent years, as the Raynsford Review of Planning has publicised. In 2013 81 local authorities used housing quality indicators, which had fallen to two in 2016.[5] Reasons for not commissioning audits may include uncertain objectives, the lack of an agreed method, cost to the authority, and who should be responsible. There has been less pressure to take account of environmental impacts since CABE (the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) was wound up, and there regular Housing Audits are no longer carried out.

While there are reputable organisations offering solutions, such as the Building Research Establishment or Design for Life, there are no agreed yardsticks against which performance can be assessed (compared with say fuel efficiency or handling for cars). The differing questions asked in surveys make it difficult to reach reliable conclusions, other than that quality needs to be improved. Appendix E considers a range of different methods, ranging from expert visual assessments and questionnaires or customer surveys to focus groups and comprehensive post occupancy evaluation, with very different costs. But how are cash-strapped local authorities to act, when planning has been cut back so much, and when there is little collaboration between Councils or between the public and private sectors?

We suggest the answer is to treat performance review as a standard part of the development process, and to use it as a means of promoting sales and further investment through some form of certificate. The Combined Authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is under pressure to undertake a proper audit, following up the recommendations of the Economic Commission chaired by Dame Kate Barker.[6] Recommendation 6 proposed that '*The Combined Authority should embed placemaking in their forward planning, by i) revisiting the Quality Charter to audit how well developments and regeneration projects since its publication have met the criteria, ii) renewing and updating the Quality Charter, and iii) demonstrating how other plans (particularly the Non-Statutory Spatial Plan) can serve to create better places. This should include a concern for the quality of place in existing communities, and an area-wide environmental strategy.*'

Our review of alternative methods for this project has unearthed a range of well-tested systems. The problem is that there are largely private funded, and the results

---

[5] Raynsford Review of Planning, TCPA, November 2018 page 50
[6]Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (www.cpeir.org.uk)

are nor readily available or comparable. As the main value from audits would be from comparing different approaches in different places, our proposal is to develop a Cambridge Housing Audit System (CHAS) for housing using a variety of methods depending on the degree of innovation. Organisations undertaking such audits such as Design for Homes or the Building Research Establishment could be asked to tender alongside academic institutions such as the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning. The results could be compared and decisions made on the most cost-effective approach, drawing on the views of different stakeholders:

- **Visual inspection** The easiest and cheapest method is to commission a group of experts 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. For example expert reviews by teams from the Academy of Urbanism could undertake an assessment with a short report and feedback session for around £5-8,000.

- **Ranking** through a scoring system could used to rank varying criteria of a development at multiple stages of the design, construction, and post-occupancy periods, similar to the Igloo Footprint system which uses 'traffic lights'. 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 would be the cost and time element. The Footprint matrix developed for Igloo costs roughly £4,000 per assessment., and is undertaken at different stages, one of which could be the review by the Quality Panel.

- **Questionaire** A common method for evaluation 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. 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.

- **Comprehensive surveys** with questions drawn from national datasets and supported by local assessments, have been used by the Berkeley Group with useful results. 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. The experience of Cambridge Architectural Research is that at least 32 completed surveys are needed to permit some analysis, and these can include not just residents but those who have regular contacts such as doctors or housing officers. The well-received survey and report Steve Platt did on Cambourne cost £30, 000???? which revealed some important problems that had not previously surfaced, leading to corrective action.

- **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. 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. The whole process could be funded as part of the reporting required for the City Deal with government, and might be welcomed by professionals advising house builders on what adds value.

- **Housing audit system** Success can also be measured by factors such as sales and turnover rates, modal split in getting to work, or energy consumption. 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.

It would seem reasonable that with an average investment in a new house of say £250,000, if one percent was allocated to research and development, it would yield a budget of say £75,000 for a scheme of 500 homes. If the government were to provide an incentive, for example through supporting the costs of organisation and dissemination of results, the system could be very cost-effective. Furthermore once some standards had been set for housing generally considered as exemplary, it should be easier to raise standards elsewhere.

If the Quality Panel starts to assess proposals schemes in a wider geographical areas and where choices have to be made over where investment should be made, investing in research and analysis should pay off, and give Cambridgeshire and Pererborough a distict edge as a great place in which to invest.

If the Combined Authority wants to promote schemes in the wider geographical areas where demand is currently lower and issues of cohesion will become more important, it should be worth investing more in research and analysis of 'what works'.. Here are three options

- An independent assessment of the scheme against the principles in the Charter prior to panel discussions with developers, and subsequently after say five years, or alternatively requiring the developers to make a contribution to a research fund as part of their S106 commitments.
- A scoring system used to rank key elements of a development at multiple stages of the design, construction, and post-occupancy periods against some key questions. 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.

- Utilization of comprehensive surveys backed up by focus groups with questions drawn from national datasets and supported by local assessments using one of the proven systems. The strengths would be the ability to produce nationally comparative results on a wide range of criteria. The drawbacks will be a cost and time element.

Conclusions

1. The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter and review process has worked well so far in influencing house builders to try harder, and should take some of the credit for producing schemes such as in the Southern Fringe that look very different from the standard product.
2. However as Cambridge grows, and developments cater for people on lower incomes, the challenges of creating cohesive or inclusive communities will become harder. This requires particular attention to elements in the Charter under Community, and modifications are suggested along with illustration from local experience. Investment will also be needed in neighbourhood management.
3. There are proven ways of assessing performance in use, ranging from surveys and focus groups to expert appraisals, but all impose a cost and need to be replicated widely for best effects. The results will be important to future growth, and so should be seen as a necessary investment, like an MOT test for a car.

Text of Community Section in the Draft Quality Charter (REPLACE WITH FINAL VERSION)

1. Community involvement throughout the process is crucial, which means consulting with people who are going to move in, or are similar to the groups that are expected to move in, and getting their views as the settlement grows, as well as engaging positively and creatively with neighbouring communities.

2. The housing in all tenures should allow for changes in needs and lifestyles so that as people's circumstances and ages change they do not have to leave the neighbourhood, and new forms of intermediate tenure, such as co-housing should be actively promoted, with careful design to avoid areas becoming stigmatised.

3. People should be encouraged to take active roles in the development and continuing management of their communities and engage in local democratic processes. The establishment of appropriate forms of governance should be built into the planning of new communities from the early stages.

4. The 'social infrastructure', such as health, education, and leisure/play is just as important as the physical infrastructure of roads and utilities, and 'community hubs' should be provided in a phased, predictable and flexible way in line with population growth and demographic change. Leisure and play facilities should be affordable to residents.

5. Opportunities should be provided for people to set up their own services, including cooperative and affordable forms of housing to be commissioned by local groups, as well as some self-build, and also where people can live and work.

6. Initial and on-going community development support should be provided for pioneers to 'build your own community', including interim spaces to meet such as cafes, market stalls, as well as their 'e' equivalents.

7. Public spaces should encourage social interaction and support healthy lifestyles, with a clear allocation of responsibilities for managing communal spaces and the public realm.

8. Community (and other key) buildings should be designed to be flexible, and make use of the latest technology e.g. wired up communities, and should support wider community use.

9. Space should be made available for local shops and services to set up, both to build a sense of community and to minimise car dependence. This may include providing interim facilities or giving short-term rent subsidies.

10. Developers should be asked in their planning submissions to provide a clear statement of how their development will build a thriving and sustainable community, including its relationship with other existing facilities, such as health and education, how different tenures will be phased, and how community facilities will be managed. An agreed version should be used in marketing the new neighbourhoods to avoid false expectations.