Creating space for beauty

The Interim Report of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission

Appendices

Contents

A1 - Bibliography and references

Bibliography

Bartholomew, K, Ewing, R (2011) 'Hedonic Price Effects Pedestrian- and Transit-Oriented Development', Journal of Planning Literature 26:1: 18-34.

Berkeley Group, (2012) *Creating Strong Communities: how to measure the social sustainability of new housing developments.* Available at: http://www.social-life.co/media/files/Creating_Strong_Communities.pdf

Boys Smith, N. (2016), *Heart in the Right Street*.

Boys Smith, N. (2018), *More Good Homes.*

Boys Smith, N. and Toms, K. (2018), *From NIMBY to YIMBY.*

Boys Smith, N. Venerandi, A., & Toms, K. (2017), *Beyond Location*

Buitelaar, E., Schilder, F. (2016) 'The Economics of Style: Measuring the Price Effect of Neo-Traditional Architecture in Housing', *Real Estate Economics*

Cadywould, C., O'Leary, D. (2015), *Community Builders,* p. 36.

Cebula, R. (2009) 'The Hedonic Pricing Model Applied to the Housing Market of the City of Savannah and its Savannah Historic Landmark District', *Review of Regional Studies* 39:1, 9.

Cervero, R. (2004) *Transit-Oriented Development in the United States: Experiences, Challenges, and Prospects*, Transportation Research Board, Vol. 102.

Cheshire, P. and Dericks, G. (2014) 'Iconic design' as deadweight loss: rent acquisition by design in the constrained London office market, *Spatial Economics Research Centre (SERC) Discussion Paper, No. 154*

Dolan, P., Peasgood, T., & White, M. (2008). 'Do we really know what makes us happy? A review of the economic literature on the factors associated with subjective wellbeing'. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 29, 94-122.

Ewing, R. and Kreutzer, R. (2006) *Understanding the Relationship Between Public Health and the Built Environment: A Report Prepared for the LEED-ND Core Committee,* OECD

Florida R *et al*, (2011), 'Beautiful places: the role of perceived aesthetic satisfaction in community satisfaction', Regional Studies, pp. 33-48. Florida R., (2008), *Who's your city,* p. 163-5, pp. 314-5.

Frey, B. (2010), *Happiness, a revolution in economics*.

Gehl, J. (1986) 'Soft Edges in Residential Street, *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research* 3: 89-102.

Gifford, R. (2007), 'The Consequences of Living in High-Rise Buildings', *Australian Architectural Review* 50:1.

Halpern, D. (1995) *Mental Health and the Built Environment: More than Bricks and Mortar?*

Halpern, D. (2008) 'An Evidence-Based Approach to Building Happiness' in Wernick, J. (ed.) *Building Happiness: Architecture to Make You Smile,* RIBA Building Futures (London: Black Dog, 2008).

Hillier, B. and Sabhaz, O. (2008) 'An Evidence-Based Approach to Crime and Urban Design; or, Can We have Vitality, Sustainability and Security All at Once?', *Bartlett School of Graduate Studies*, University College London.

Kahneman, D. (2009), *Well-Being: the foundations of hedonic psychology.*

Kuo, F., and Sullivan, W. (2001) 'Environment and Crime in the Inner City: Does Vegetation Reduce Crime?', *Environment and Behaviour* 33:3 343-367.

Leinberger, C. and Alfonzo, M. (2012) 'Walk this Way: The Economic Promise of Walkable Places in Metropolitan Washington DC', *The Brookings Institution*.

Leyden, K. et al (2011), 'Understanding the Pursuit of Happiness in Ten Major Cities', *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 47, pp.861-888.

Lönnqvist, H. (2015). *On the Effects of Urban Natural Amenities, Architectural Quality and Accessibility to Workplaces on Housing Prices– an Empirical Study on the Helsinki Metropolitan Area*, pp. 43-4.

Montgomery, C. (2013), *Happy City*

Myers, J. (2017), *Yes in my back yard: How To End The Housing Crisis, Boost The Economy And Win More Votes.*

National Housing Federation (2017) *Demise of the NIMBY: Changing Attitudes to New Building New Homes.*

NHS England, (2018) *Putting Health Back Into Place.*

Prince's Foundation (2014), *Housing Communities: What People Want.*

RIBA, (2012) *The Way We Live Now*.

Robinson, S, and Pallasmaa, J. (2015), *The Mind in Architecture*

Rodger, R (2001) '*The Transformation of Edinburgh – Land, Property & Trust in the Nineteenth Century*'

Seresinhe, C. I. *et al.* (2015) 'Quantifying the Impact of Scenic Environments on Health'. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 16899; doi: 10.1038/srep16899.

Seresinhe, C. I. *et al.* (2017) 'Using deep learning to quantify the beauty of outdoor places' *Royal Society Open Science.* doi: 10.1098/rsos.170170

Song. Y. and Knapp, G. (2003) 'New Urbanism and Housing Value: A Disaggregate Assessment', *Journal of Urban Economics* 54:2 (200): 218-238.

Soul of the Community Project, (2010), *Soul of the Community 2010 Overall Findings*, p.9. Available at www.knightfoundation.org/sotc/overall-findings/

Spiers, S (2018) *How to build houses and save the countryside*

Tu, C. and Eppli, M. (2001) 'An Empirical Examination of Traditional Neighbourhood Development', *Real Estate Economics* 29:3: 485-501.

Walker, R., Skowronsiki, J., Thompson, C. (2003), 'Life is Pleasant - and Memory helps to keep it that way!', *Review of General Psychology*, 7, No2, pp.203-10.

References

Books

Brett-James, N. (1935). *The Growth of Stuart London.*

Cruickshank, D. (1990). *Life in the Georgian City.*

Cruickshank, D. and Wyld, P (1975), *London: the art of Georgian building*

Cullingworth, J. (1972). *Town and Country Planning in Britain.*

Dittmar,H, and Ohland,G (2004) *The New Transit Town.*

Harvey, A. & Julian, C. (2015). *A Community Right to Beauty.*

HBF (2017).*Reversing the decline of small housebuilders: Reinvigorating entrepreneurialism and building more homes.*

Jenkins, S. (1975). *Landlords to London.*

Kostof, S. (1991). *The City Shaped.*

Leinberger, C. (2009), *The option of urbanism: Investing in a New American Dream*

Muthesius, S. (1982). *The English Terraced House.*

Reynolds, F. (2016). *The Fight for Beauty.*

Robinson, S., Pallasmaa, J. (2015) *Mind in Architecture*

Scruton, R. (2014) *Green Philosophy: How to think seriously about the planet.*

Waine, P. and Hilliam, O. (2016). *22 Ideas that saved the English countryside.*

Wates, N. (2014) *The Community Planning Handbook: How People Can Shape Their Cities, Towns and Villages in Any Part of the World.*

The Urban Taskforce (1999). *Towards an Urban Renaissance: Final Report of the Urban Task Force.*

Policies

Better Regulation Taskforce (1997). Principles of Good Regulation. Available at: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100407173247/http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/brc/upload/assets/www.brc.gov.uk/principlesleaflet.pdf

Brokenshire, J. (2019). Written Ministerial Statement. [Online]. (Last updated 13th March 2019). Available at https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2019-03-13/HCWS1408/

Conservative Manifesto (2017)

Gummer, J. and Goldsmith, Z. (2007). Blueprint for a Green Economy. Submission to the Shadow Cabinet. Report from Quality of Life Commission. Available at: http://www.gci.org.uk/Documents/blueprintforagreeneconomy_.pdf

Labour Manifesto. (2017).

Law Commission (2018). Leasehold home ownership: buying your freehold or extending your lease. Consultation paper. Available at: http://www.lawcom.gov.uk/project/leasehold-enfranchisement/

Letwin, O. (2018). Independent Review of Build Our Rate, [Online].(Last updated 29th October 2018). Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-build-out-final-report

Localism Act (2011) Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted

Reports

Ahlfeldt, Gabriel M., Holman, Nancy and Wendland, Nicolai (2012) An assessment of the effects of conservation areas on value.

Adair, A et al, Institutional investment in regeneration: necessary conditions for effective funding, Investment Property Forum (2006)

HM Treasury (2004), Barker Review of the Supply of Housing.

Barton, H, Grant, M & Guise T Shaping Neighbourhoods – A Guide for Health, Sustainability & Vitality, (2003)

Birkbeck, D. and Kruczkowski, S. (2018). Building for Life 12. 2018 Edition. [online] Available at: http://www.builtforlifehomes.org/downloads/BfL12_2018.pdf

Boleat, M.,(2017), The Housing Problem in London. Available at: http://thehfi.com/downloads/housingprobleminlondon.pdf

Boys Smith, N, Venerandi A. and Toms, K (2017), *Beyond Location.* Available at: http://dev.createstreets.com/front-page-2/campaigns-copy/beyond/

Bullard, R.D., Growing Smarter – Achieving Liveable Communities, Environmental Justice and Regional Equity, MIT Press (2007)

Cadywould, C. and O'Leary D. (2015) Community Builders. Available at: https://www.demos.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Community-Builders.pdf

The Calcutt Review of Housing Delivery, DCLG (2007)

Clear C, Fisher J & Mayhew G, Smart Growth – a sustainable strategy for urban development and regeneration, (2012) available from BRE Trust

DCLG, (2017), *Attitudinal research on financial payments to reduce opposition to new homes*, pp.23-25

Eco-Towns: Financial viability study of the Ecotowns programme, DCLG (2009)

Ewing, R.H, Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Growth and Climate Change, ULI (2008)

Farrell, T. (2019). The Farrell Review [Online] (Last update 15 June 2019). Available at: http://farrellreview.co.uk/

HBF (2017), *Reversing the decline of small housebuilders: Reinvigorating entrepreneurialism and building more homes.* Available at: https://www.hbf.co.uk/documents/6879/HBF_SME_Report_2017_Web.pdf

Hill,S, Submission to the All Party Urban Development Group Inquiry: New approaches to investment in housing delivery, (May 2009)

MHCLG, (2018), *Public attitudes to house building. Findings from the 2017 British Social Attitudes surve*y. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/714160/Public_attitudes_to_house_building_BSA_2017.pdf NHBC Foundation. (2017). Small house builders and developers. Current Challenges to Growth. Available at: https://www.nhbcfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/NF76_WEB.pdf

Leinberger,C, Back to the Future -The need for Patient Equity in Redal Estate Finance, The Brookings Institution (Washington 2007)

Leinberger, C, Financing progressive development, The Brookings Institition (Washington 2001)

OECD (2005) Guiding Principles for Regulatory Quality and Performance. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/fr/reformereg/34976533.pdf

Penfold, (2010). Review of non-planning consents. [Online].(Last updated 5 July 2010). Available at : https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-consents-required-for-development-other-than-planning-permission-penfold

Prince's Foundation (2007) Valuing Sustainable Urbanism. A Report Measuring & Valuing New Approaches to Residentially Led Mixed Use Growth. Available at: https://www.ads.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/0707vsureport_0.pdf

Prince's Foundation (2010) Delivering Sustainable Urbanism. A report identifying the strategic land and infrastructure investment model of delivery as supporting high quality urbanism and design outcomes.

Prince's Foundation (2014). Building Communities. What people want. Available at: http://www.housing-communities.org/Housing-Communities_DIGITAL.pdf

RIBA (2018) 10 Characteristics of Places People Want to Live. [online] (last update 5 November 2018). Available at: https://www.architecture.com/knowledge-and-resources/resources-landing-page/ten-characteristics-of-places-where-people-want-to-live

Shelter (2017), *New Civic Housebuilding*

Slack E, Municipal finance and the pattern of urban growth, CD Howe Institute, (Toronto 2002)

TCPA, (2018). Raynsford Review of Planning in England [Online]. (Last Update Nov 2018) Available at : https://www.tcpa.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=30864427-d8dc-4b0b-88ed-c6e0f08c0edd

Volk, L and Zimmerman,T, Development Dynamics, The Wharton Business School (Philadelphia 1998)

Ward C, Welcome Thinner City, Freedom Press (London 1987)

Ward, M.R., Finance and Marketing for Housebuilders, Nottingham Trent University (2004)

Articles

Coin Street Community Builders (2019) Coin Street Community Builders History and Background. https://coinstreet.org/who-we-are/history-background/the-campaign/

CPRE (2017) Public has little faith in Government to build 'right homes in right places. Available at: www.cpre.org.uk/media-centre/latest-news-releases/item/4682-public-has-little-faith-in-government-to-build-right-homes-in-right-places

Eidelman, S., Pattershall, J., Crandall, C. (2010) Longer is Better. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. Vol 46 (6), pp.993-998

Finch, P. (2016) Community architecture has survived, albeit in a mutating form. Architect's Journal. 30 June 2016. Available at: https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/opinion/community-architecture-has-survived-albeit-in-a-mutating-form/10008048.article

Holyoak, J. (2018). Comment: 30 years on from meeting that sparked a revolution. Available at: https://www.business-live.co.uk/news/news-opinion/comment-30-years-meeting-sparked-14414816

Powe, N. and Hart, T*., 'Housing development and small-town residential desirability'*, Town Planning Review, 82(3) p.317-340.

Schofield, J. (1991). Construction History Vol.7. The Construction of Medieval and Tudor Houses in London. [online]. (Last update 1991). Available at https://www.arct.cam.ac.uk/Downloads/chs/vol7/article1.pdf

Henry Thomas Riley, ed. (1860) Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber Custumarum, Rolls Series, no.12 (2) pp 86-88. Available at: http://users.trytel.com/~tristan/towns/florilegium/community/cmfabro8.html

UK Land Directory (2004) Vast Majority Supports More House Building. Available at: http://www.uklanddirectory.org.uk/majority-supports-house-building.asp

A2. Evidence-gathering

a. **Summary of evidence-gathering**
b. **Summary of findings from site visits**
c. **Summary of evidence from round tables, evidence sessions and specialist interviews**

a) Summary of evidence-gathering

Since starting work in January, the BBBB Commissioners have completed an extensive evidence gathering programme. This has included:

- *Regular monthly meetings of the Commissioners and Advisers* to share evidence and views and to set the direction and review progress

- *Seven visits to over 17 housing and development sites across the country* including Cambridge, Northampton, Newcastle, Newham/Olympic Site, the South West including Cranbrook, Sherford, Newquay and Truro, a charette in West Oxfordshire and a separate visit to Poundbury. Visits have included discussions with over 50 developers, planners, architects, local authority representatives, residents and other relevant experts.

- *Interviews with a very wide range of experts* from the fields of housing, planning, development, architecture, academia, roundtable discussions with housebuilders and their industry body, Home Builders Federation, National Housing Federation and their members, and representatives from local authorities and organisations with a specific interest in housing development in rural areas. This has included meetings and interviews with specialists in the fields of property data and analysis, economics, planning law and those with experience of working in The Netherlands. We have held five evidence sessions, four round tables and five additional meetings with specialists. In total, we have interviewed over 120 people.

- *The Chair and Commissioners have also attended conferences* to discuss the work of the Commission, including the MHCLG design conference in Birmingham in February, the Place Alliance meeting of built environment experts and academics in early April and the CIH Housing Conference in June 2019. The design conference in Birmingham included attendance at an MHCLG-led workshop with communities, to hear their views about what makes a great place to live.

- *Scoping of five research projects* to gather further information about consumer/public preferences and attitudes, the factors that contribute to the achievement of well-designed schemes, the points in the development process where design can be influenced and how this process could be improved and the commercial value of well-designed schemes.

- *Launch of a call for evidence* including letters to influential organisations within the sector and an open invitation for anyone to provide information via an online questionnaire.

Responses were invited by 31st May 2019. In total we have received 73 responses to the call for evidence including responses from special interest groups, professional bodies, amenity groups, architects, local authorities, developers as well as members of the public. Some of the organisations responding had also carried out survey of their members in order to produce their response, including Civic Voice who had responses from over 790 members and RTPI who had responses from more than 750 members.

An overview of evidence gathering meetings in more detail is set out in the tables below.

Monthly Commissioner/Adviser meetings		
Commissioner/adviser meeting – 1	15th January	First formal meeting of the Commissioners and advisers. Discussed terms of Reference and ideas for work programme.
Commissioner/adviser meeting – 2	5th February	Second formal meeting of the Commissioners and Advisers. Discussed Chairs briefing note and work programme.
Commissioner/adviser meeting – 3	5th March	Third formal meeting of the Commissioners and Advisers. Discussed emerging findings so far and ideas for research.
Commissioner/adviser meeting – 4	9th April	Fourth formal meeting of the Commissioners and Advisers. Discussed emerging findings so far and any further evidence gathering/research required.
Commissioner/adviser meeting – 5	5th May	Fifth formal meeting of the Commissioners and Advisers. Discussed emerging findings so far and any steps towards developing the interim report.
Commissioner/adviser meeting - 6	4th June	Sixth formal meeting of the Commissioners and Advisers. Discussed emerging findings so far, early draft interim report and next steps towards developing the interim report.
Commissioner/adviser meeting – 7	2nd July	Seventh formal meeting of the Commissioners and Advisers. Discussed emerging interim report and next steps towards its finalisation.

Visits to housing and development sites		
Visit 1 – Cambridge	18th February	Visited housing and development sites in the Cambridge area and discussed issues with local residents and planner/developer experts. Sites included Accordia, Great Kneighton, Trumpington Meadows and Marmalade Lane.
Visit 2 – Upton	8th March	Visited urban extension housing scheme in Upton, Northampton and discussed issues with local residents, architect, planner, developer, scheme management experts.
Visit 3 – Newcastle	29th March	Visited city housing scheme in Newcastle, The Malings, developed on difficult brownfield site and Smiths Dock, a riverside regeneration area in North Tyneside with new homes being built using Modern Methods of Construction. Discussed issues with local residents, architect, planner, developer experts.
Visit 4 - Olympic site	5th April	Attended walking tour of around 5 housing schemes around the Olympic site in Newham. Included talks by architects who had designed the schemes and discussion of issues.
Visit 5 - South West	30th April to 1st May	Visits to schemes in the South West including Cranbrook, Sherford, Nansleden, village scheme at Tetcott, Tregunnal Hill, Belvedere and mixed-use scheme at Tregurra Park in Truro Discussions with developers, architects, resident representatives eg Town Council, local church leader.
Visit 6 - West Oxfordshire, Charette	16th May	Attended a Charette held in West Oxfordshire to see the process in action and hear views from local organisations and residents.
Visit 7 – Dorset	28th May	Visit to Poundbury in Dorchester to hear presentations from the landowner and strategic developer and architect. Included an extensive walking tour of the development.

Evidence interviews and roundtables with industry experts		
Evidence session 1 - Housing delivery	28th February	Full day of one-to-one interviews with representatives from organisations involved in housing delivery such as developers and land promoters.
Evidence session 2 – planning	7th March	Full day of one-to-one interviews with representatives from organisations involved in planning.
Evidence session 3 - what is beauty?	14th March	Full day of one-to-one interviews with representatives from organisations involved in research and evidence gathering about public attitudes regarding beauty and popular appeal in housing and development (e.g. academics, psychologists and opinion pollsters).

Evidence interviews and roundtables with industry experts		
Evidence session 4 - long term management and stewardship	21st March	Full day of one-to-one interviews with representatives from organisations involved in long term management and stewardship of housing schemes (e.g. community land trust experts).
Evidence session 5 – Architects	28th March	Full day of one-to-one interviews with representatives from organisations involved in the architecture and design of new housing.
Roundtable 1 – Housebuilders	11th April	Roundtable discussion with developers and Home Builders Federation to identify how they plan for good design/beauty within their schemes and identify issues.
Roundtable 2 - rural issues	11th April	Roundtable discussion with representatives from organisations with an interest in rural development such as landscape architect, charity and rural developers
Roundtable 3 - Local authority issues	13th June	Roundtable with local authority representatives.
Roundtable 4 - National Housing Federation members	13th June	Roundtable with National Housing Federation representatives and members.

Meetings with specialists		
Specialist meeting 1 – Rightmove	5th March	Meeting with Rightmove research team to identify potential data sources and analysis that could be useful in helping to identify consumer wants and needs.
Specialist meeting 2 - Christopher Boyle	26th March	Meeting with legal expert to identify potential challenges regarding changing planning/legal framework.
Specialist meeting 3 - Dieter Helm and Fiona Reynolds	24th April	Meeting with experts to discuss economic, environmental and landscape issues.
Specialist meeting 4 - Tony Fretton	14th May	Meeting with experts with experience of working in The Netherlands and with a different approach to planning and development.

Conferences and debates		
Conference 1 - MHCLG design conference	13th February	Involvement in workshop with community representatives to hear their views about 'What makes a good place to live?' Presentation and Q+A session with BBBB Chair to discuss objectives of the work with an audience of designers, planners, architects and development experts.
Conference 2 - Place Alliance	2nd April	Presentation and Q+A session with BBBB Chair to discuss objectives of the work with audience of design and academic experts.
Conference 3 - CIH Conference, Manchester	25th June	Presentation and Q+A session by Commissioners giving an overview of the work of the BBBB Commission.

Research studies scoped
1. Review of prior design quality policy initiatives and measures - an historic overview through desk research
2. Identifying cost and value associated with well-designed homes and neighbourhoods - assessed through comparison of property market metrics for well-designed and standard residential properties
3. Defining beauty - identifying popular features from consumer preferences in the property buying process
4. Codifying beauty - identifying from case studies of well-designed schemes and urban expansions, the tools and techniques that have enabled a positive outcome and enabled the maintenance of quality over time
5. Building in beauty - identifying the critical points in the development process where the quality design of homes and neighbourhoods can be secured and opportunities for making improvements to practice

b) Summary of findings from site visits

In total, we have visited over 15 recently-developed or developing sites. We were keen to visit a variety of places at different scales with different development models. A representative sample is set out below. This is not to suggest that these are necessarily 'perfect models' of best practice, 'beautiful' (or 'ugly'). Nor is it to suggest that any of these design and development approaches represent, in and of themselves, 'the solution.' However, it is to give a flavour of the range of places and developments we have visited. We will draw more directed conclusions from each visit in our final report. Facts cited are as reported to the Commission and have not been independently verified.

1. Marmalade Lane K1 Co-Housing, Orchard Park, Cambridge

Landowner	Cambridge City Council
Developer	TOWNhus, a partnership between TOWN and Trivselhus
Architects	Mole Architects
Local authority	South Cambridgeshire District Council (Planning Authority)
Client	Cambridge Co-Housing
Number of homes	42
Funding model	The developer, Trivselhus, raised the finance for the scheme. In turn, each member of the co-housing group raised mortgage finance to cover their home purchase
Density	42 homes per hectare

Context and high-level history

The principle of co-housing is that residents will come together to live in a development with shared spaces and facilities that help to create a strong sense of community, whilst also being able to retreat readily into their own homes.

The land for this development was owned by Cambridge City Council. When, due to the 2008 financial crash, a commercial approach to the site fell through, the council was persuaded to support an innovative housing scheme including a strong community focus and more emphasis on environmental performance.

The site formed part of the much larger Orchard Park development that was mostly owned and promoted by Gallagher Estates, and benefitted from the outline planning permission given for the whole Orchard Park development.

Key site features

Homes at Marmalade Lane are set out around a shared-space lane and a communal garden. The communal garden is private (i.e. only residents have access). The shared-space lane (Marmalade Lane) has public access with one side of the street being the 'front' of houses and the other being back gardens of the next row of homes. Homes are privately owned; most have private outdoor space (though some is accessible to the public). There is also a very generous communal space and 'Common House.' Residents share in collectively-owned

and managed spaces that give the co-housing community its rather special character and shared purpose. The Common House is a place for people to meet, eat and do their laundry. The shared garden is a place for children to play and food growing. The workshop is somewhere people can work, make things, and store tools.

Homes range from one-bedroom apartments to five-bedroom houses, mainly set around the communal gardens. Many of the flats are set in deck access homes and are low rise in two or three storeys. Homes are customisable to buyers' requirements and built using TOWNhus's precision manufacturing, making them green, economical and super-efficient to run.

Observations

As a result of the 2008 recession, the developer, Gallagher Estates, working on the surrounding Orchard Park scheme, pulled out of completing this scheme. Cambridge City Council therefore had to consider other ways of disposal and were persuaded to allocate the site for co-housing and bring it to market with a brief for best value within that context. In other words, they did have to sell the site for more to a volume housebuilder. Critically, they also agreed to take full payment for land at the end of the process. This again made it easier for the co-housing group to finance and develop the project.

Cambridge Co-Housing Group is currently made up of residents who have now purchased properties at the scheme and the group has had to be flexible over the 19 years since it was formed as human lives and needs have evolved. Only one of original members remains. It has certainly been a long process: ten years looking for land, six years negotiating the land, four years in planning. It was critical to partner with organisations that could interpret from vision to client's brief.

Some of the planning issues for the application related to the way that the planning system dealt with mitigating demand rather than facilitating sustainability (e.g. planning policies required higher levels of parking to support standard demand as opposed to sustainable living).

2. The Malings, Ouseburn, Newcastle

Landowner	Newcastle City Council
Developer	Carillion/Igloo
Architects	Ash Sekula (P+HS Architects also appointed to delivery stage)
Local authority	Newcastle City Council
Number of homes	76
Funding model	First of six sites in Ouseburn Framework Development Agreement between Newcastle City Council and Homes England
Density	138 homes per hectare

Context and high-level history

The scheme is a development of a central, riverside brownfield site, formally used for industrial purposes including a pottery, scrap metal traders and warehousing.

Key site features

It was a difficult site to develop – steep, sloping and in need of remediation. A dense, mainly residential scheme of 76 homes of varying sizes and types with access to local amenities, such as the Toffee Factory (a business/training centre), local bars, cafes and a microbrewery.

The design of the homes was inspired by the local house type, the 'Tyneside Flat', which seeks to create dense, residential living spaces within a form similar to terraced housing. The scheme design also draws on the character of the local area, for example through the use of local materials to reflect the colour of the existing, surrounding buildings.

Observations

It was reported to us that residents were very positive about the scheme, enjoying the riverside views, easy walkable access to the city centre, a strong sense of community - facilitated by allotment gardens, roof terraces and bicycle storage facilities - and the celebration of local heritage.

The resale prices of the residential properties in the scheme are performing well in comparison with those in the surrounding local area. The scheme has won a range of design awards for innovation, including Housing Design Awards 2016.

Some of the commercial space that was built into the scheme has yet to be taken up. There were also some concerns from residents about availability of parking spaces.

3. Smiths Dock, North Tyneside

Landowner	Originally purchased by Places for People, now a joint venture between Places for People & Urban Splash
Strategic masterplanning	Places for People
Developer	Places for People and Urban Splash Joint Venture
Architects	George Clarke, ShedKM, TDO Architecture, Simpson Haugh
Local authority	North Tyneside Council
Number of homes	Masterplan: 815 Currently built: 114
Funding model	Major site-wide remediation and infrastructure works, including infilling of tidal docks funded and delivered by Places for People as master developer. Development finance facility for the PfP US JV provided by Places for People at market on-lending rates
Density	Varied densities across the site ranging from 70 – 110 homes per hectare

Context and high-level history

The scheme is the development of a major riverside site previously used for shipbuilding and as docks. The aim was to create a new type of residential offer, with a rich mix of sizes and types of homes to appeal to families, younger and older people, so as to rejuvenate a

neighbourhood dominated by former dockyards. In this way, it is similar to previous dockland regeneration schemes such as in Liverpool. The overall ambition is to create around 850 new houses and flats in a busy new mixed-use neighbourhood of homes (some by the waterside), green spaces, play areas, watersports, food and drink and shops.

The site was purchased in 2006 and required major remediation including the infilling of four of the former seven docks. This was followed by early investments in infrastructure, including new roads and electricity networks. Construction began in 2017 and, to date, two sections of the housing development have been built, Plateau and the Smokehouses. The scheme is expected to complete in 2025.

Key site features

Plateau is a small scheme of 34 homes built using innovative, modern construction techniques, with a range of housing sizes and types, including large and smaller townhouse-style designs suitable for families. There are two designs of homes within the scheme:

- The Town House - tall, 4-bedroom homes, designed by ShedKM architects

- The Fab House - 3-bedroom homes, designed by George Clarke and TDO Architecture

The Smokehouses is a new waterside apartment development of 80 flats. The design is drawn from the smokehouses of nearby Fish Quay in North Shields and uses materials inspired by the local shipbuilding heritage, such as zinc cladding and pitched roofs. The homes were designed by architects, Simpson Haugh.

Observations

The homes feel light and spacious. Many have views over the River Tyne.

The use of factory-fabricated homes has permitted rapid onsite construction, although higher upfront costs have meant that this approach has not saved money overall. It has also allowed prospective occupants to personalise their homes. Some room layouts can also be adapted as requirements change.

Both housing schemes are close to local amenities, such as shops, cafes and restaurants in North Shields and Fish Quay, and to local transport links to Newcastle City Centre.

The early investment in infrastructure was an important feature of the scheme that has enabled the housing development to be delivered relatively quickly.

4. Nansledan, Cornwall

Landowner	Duchy of Cornwall and around 13 other landowners
Strategic masterplanning	Duchy of Cornwall, with master planning by Leon Krier
Developers	Three local housebuilders: CG Fry and Son, Morrish Builders, Wain Homes
Architects	ADAM Architects

Local authority	Cornwall Council
Number of homes	4,000 homes as well as shops, businesses and school Currently built: 101 homes (66 open market, 35 affordable)
Funding model	Duchy of Cornwall as strategic developer in a consortium with local developers who build out specific parts of the overall scheme

Context and high-level history

The development is located on a largely greenfield area on the edge of Newquay, Cornwall, on land previously used for livestock and cereal farming.

Early work in 2004, involving the community in an Enquiry by Design process established the ambition for the development and focussed on the question: "What could a new development do for the local area?" The ambition was broad and included consideration of both the local economy and creation of employment opportunities, and health and social benefits, such as the creation of a mixed and diverse community.

The masterplan assumes a long (50 year) timescale for fully developing the scheme with eight key phases or 'quarters'. Each quarter will have its own character while also being part of the wider scheme. The first phase was started in 2014 and the second phase is now well underway.

The design is governed by ten Principles of Development set out in a Pattern Book in 2005 that include a social, environmental and economic focus such as commitment to public involvement and consultation, local identity, viability and sustainability.

The scheme integrated the development of a new road within the footprint of the scheme, the Newquay Strategic Route, which otherwise might have been designed as a by-pass.

Key site features

The ambition is to create around 4,000 homes as part of the overall development as well as commercial, retail, community space including a new school.

The masterplan aims to create streets and squares with a mix of homes of different types and sizes. The design of the homes takes inspiration from the existing local homes and draws on the character of the area, for example by using locally-inspired colours such as pinks, blues and yellows, local materials such as local slate and stone, and by incorporating detailed design features such as symbols of local flora.

It also aims to retain existing, and create new, areas of greenspace to support biodiversity, to create opportunities for residents to enjoy, and for use as community allotments for food growing and other projects that bring the community together.

Observations

The development already offers a mix of attractive, good quality homes and a neighbourhood which encourages walkable access to the town centre, to local green spaces

and to neighbourhood shops and small businesses, including cafes. A new community school is close to completion and is within walking distance of most homes.

The character of the development is very locally distinctive with a strong sense of place that celebrates local heritage, including through the use of Cornish names for the streets and neighbourhoods.

The majority of the homes already sold have been bought by local people, but the scheme has also attracted some new residents from beyond Cornwall who have re-located and set up businesses in the new neighbourhood.

Nansledan is partially developed and it will be some time before it is completed in full. Some aspects of the landscaping are not yet in place but there are plans to develop the streetscape further by planting new trees.

5. East Village, Olympic Site, Newham, East London

Landowner	Various landowners; land bought up by London Legacy Development Corporation once it was formed in 2012
Architects	Range of architects, including dRMM, Niall McLoughlin, Piercey Co, Glenn Howells, Eric Parry, AHMM, Patel Taylor, Studio Egret West, Alison Brooks, A Studio, Sheppard Robson, Allies and Morrison, O'Donnell & Tuomey, Stanton Williams and Lifschutz Davidson
Local authority	London Boroughs of Newham, Tower Hamlets, Hackney and Waltham Forest in partnership with the London Legacy Development Corporation (the local planning authority) and the Greater London Authority
Number of homes	Legacy Communities Scheme masterplan: approved in 2011, provides for the regeneration of the park into five neighbourhoods and up to 6,870 homes
Funding model	Olympic regeneration project provided funding for land purchase and strategic masterplanning of the area. Receipts from regeneration of the park will be directed to repay the funding provided by the UK Lottery Fund and infrastructure and other funding provided as loans by LLDC
Density	64 hectares in total within the LCS, densities in line with London Plan over the period of the permissions formation

Context and high-level history

The East Village development is part of the wider Olympic legacy development led by the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC). This is a long-term plan for regeneration to 2030. The overall vision is for 7,000 new homes, three new neighbourhood centres, 10,000 new jobs and three schools, as well as the existing park and leisure facilities which were developed as part of the Olympics.

East Village development is on the east side of the Olympic Park and aims to create around 3,000 homes and one new school. The land was previously used for various industrial uses.

The London Legacy Development Corporation has a strategic developer role as well as planning powers. High quality design is one of their stated strategic objectives.

Key site features

The East Village masterplan aims to create streets and squares with a mix of apartment blocks providing homes of different sizes and tenures, including homes for private and market rent and a range of affordable housing.

The new homes are located next to the Olympic Park, approximately 100 hectares of green space with a range of high-quality sporting and leisure facilities that is close to the major shopping centre at Westfield. The homes are well connected with access to rail and tube.

Observations

The development offers an easy neighbourhood through which to walk. Good use is made of local landscaping, including street streets and greenery within the neighbourhood squares.

The apartments have a strong sense of architect-involvement in their design, with a variety of different styles, offering choice for prospective residents.

The scheme is partially developed; it is expected it will be 2025-30 before it is fully completed. Whilst East Village does include some local cafes and restaurants, the full range of neighbourhood amenities are yet to be fully developed.

6. Cranbrook , East Devon

Landowner	Hallam Land Management
Strategic masterplanning	David Lock on behalf of the developer consortium, Savills, East Devon
Developer	Taylor Wimpey, Persimmon, Bovis, Galliford Try
Architects	DLA Architects, Design Development Architects, Stride Treglown
Local authority	East Devon
Number of homes	Ambition for 8,000 homes with around half having been permitted and 1,900 already built. Includes 30% affordable housing (social rent and shared ownership) in the first phase, reducing in subsequent phases.
Funding model	Private sector consortia of developers, with support from Homes England in relation to affordable housing provision, RDA funding, funding for schools and to encourage low carbon features. Support also provided from the Healthy New Towns programme.
Density	40-45 homes per hectare

Context and high-level history

The requirement to build extra housing in this area formed part of Devon's 2001–2016 Structure Plan and was included in East Devon's Local Plan 1995-2001. Initial proposals were for 2,900 homes and a railway station, with ambitions now rising to 8,000 homes. The first houses, and St Martin's Primary School, were completed in 2012.

The scheme has attracted opposition. There have been over 15,000 objections, with local people reportedly having concerns about whether so many new homes were really needed, about the loss of farming land and about the social mix of the development.

Key features

The development features homes with a mix of size, type, tenure and style built alongside a new school, community centre, local amenities and next to a large area of green space. The scheme has good transport links enable easy access to Exeter and include Cranbrook Station (opened December 2015) which provides hourly train services from Cranbrook into Exeter. Support from the Healthy New Towns programme encouraged the inclusion of cycle and pedestrian-friendly routes to encourage active lifestyles.

Observations

Whilst the masterplan set out ambitions to create a new town centre for Cranbrook, this is still in the very early stages of development and will be added alongside later phases of housing.

Resident representatives reported positive experiences of living in Cranbrook, which they felt had good access to Exeter and local green space, a strong community and entrepreneurial spirit. They felt though, that the current provision of community facilities was inadequate and that more space was needed to enable community activities to be further developed. There were also reported concerns about car parking, sound-proofing adequacy in new homes and a lack of local facilities, especially for teenagers. Some concerns were also raised about public transport connections to commercial centres, and into and out of Exeter.

Some concerns were expressed about the impact of conditions that were attached to funding streams, such as the requirement for rapid delivery of affordable housing – this created difficulties in terms of phasing in the new homes alongside other aspects of the development. Earlier investment in, and delivery of, community infrastructure to support the new homes would have been beneficial. The scheme is partially complete and is expected to be fully developed by 2031.

The mixed-use town centre component remains to be delivered, and this appears to be proving challenging.

c) Summary of evidence from round tables, evidence sessions and specialist interviews

Roundtables and evidence sessions

Our 14 evidence sessions to date have focussed on a range of topics and included individual interviews as well as roundtables discussions with a wide range and large number of experts and specialists. In total we have engaged directly with over 120 experts and industry or resident representatives. A summary of the main points from the evidence sessions is set out, by topic, below.

Public opinion. At our sessions on 14th and 21st March, we spoke to experts who have researched, or have practical experience of, what people like in the built environment, including Ben Page (Chief Executive of Ipsos MORI and former CABE Commissioner), Dr David Halpern (Chief Executive of the Behavioural Insight Unit and author of *Mental Health and the Built Environment*), Anna Mansfield (Director of Strategy at Publica), Professor Matthew Carmona (author of many relevant studies and Chair of the Place Alliance), Ian Harvey (Director of Civic Voice), Robert Adam (author of several statistical and polling studies of what people want in the built environment), Mark Southgate (Chief Executive of MOBIE), Dr Anna Bornioli (author of studies into urban neighbourhoods and well-being) and Dr Chanuki Seresinhe (author of studies of relationships between what places look like with mental health).

Their expertise was derived from a wide range of sources including polling over 30 years, on-the-ground engagement with community groups, psychological studies and academic research of planning and placemaking, or of correlations between urban form with mental health and physical health.

A range of factors were cited as contributing to people's feelings about what makes a good place and about what contributes to the creation of a poor-quality scheme. Among these were:

- The aesthetics of building and places does matter in understanding public support. As Ben Page put it: "We regularly look at attitudes to housing…. What's clear is that people say that beauty matters. We are generally conservative with a small "c" in terms of what we like."

- However, aesthetics is not the only thing tha matters: "If you ask people which is more important beauty or affordability, they say, by 38 / 32, beauty trumps affordability. However, functionality and sustainability trump beauty." And the key is that people should have access to a home: "Having a house will trump beauty. Having jobs will trump beauty."

- There are regional trends in preferences. As Ben Page put it: "If you ask the public, 'What kind of house would you like to live in?', you get the answer: 'bungalow' or 'detached

house'. In London, there is a strong preference for terraced housing. Towers are the least popular housing type."

- Good urban design can include the need for natural surveillance, ease of navigation, good quality public space, access to sunlight, active frontages around public space, use of materials that create a 'quality' feel, greening of spaces, a mix of uses. People like to see care and attention given to detail.

- Quality is lower where there are features such as rear parking courts without opportunities for surveillance, and where there is low commitment to maintaining the scheme over the longer term.

- Much research has been carried out on these topics which needs to be more clearly applied in the design and development of schemes. We can be increasingly confident about what tends to be 'good' or 'bad' for you. As Matthew Carmona put it: "A lot of design quality is not subjective … if we choose to believe it there are lots of things we can say are good or bad for you"

- The 'Anything anywhere approach is the issue'. Large-scale development is most likely to feature low standards of design. There is a design disconnect between perceptions of professionals and the public. Surveys have shown that a lack of effective and meaningful engagement with communities is a major issue, especially with large housebuilders.

- The price of land is a critical factor. There needs to be clarity from the outset, including on levels of affordable housing as this affects scheme value and viability.

- In new schemes, buildings should be a secondary consideration once the streetscape, landscape and infrastructure is in place and account should be taken of the fact that function can change, so an approach that allows for adaptability is key.

- Schemes work well where there is a long-term interest, such as a landowner keen to protect their reputation and a pension fund investor who wishes to create good quality development and make money.

- Design review was recommended as one good idea although it was recognised it could go wrong as well. As Matthew Carmona put it: "I would absolutely recommend design review to councils … [but when] experts are parachuted in who come in, walk the site, don't talk to us and then leave again, that is the way that bad design review happens"

Planning. At our sessions on 7th and 14th March we spoke to a range of experts on planning and the development system including John Rhodes and Tom Dobson of Quod Planning, Nick Raynsford (President of the RTPI), Richard Blyth (Head of Policy at the RTPI), John Myers (Convenor of London YIMBY and the YIMBY Alliance), Ian Painting (Barton Willmore), Stephen Ashworth (Partner and specialist in planning law at Dentons) and Lord (Matthew) Taylor of Gross Moor (author of a 2015 report on garden villages & former President of the National Association of Local Councils). Their expertise was derived from planning practice, development, research, government and lobbying.

A wide range of points were made about the adequacy of policy and practice. These included that:

- The revised National Planning Policy Framework is better in terms of design, however, there is an inevitable tension between accelerated development and delivering good quality schemes.

- The NPPF allows local planning authorities to respect design but the reason for poor quality development is the interpretation of national policy at local level.

- The mid-20th century planning system never had beauty at its core. We need to put beauty into the heart of the system from the beginning, ahead of site allocation, so that design objectives are factored into the consideration of land purchase. "The word design has lost its currency, because it has been misused and people link it to what is actually poor design. It shouldn't cost more money for good design."

- The NPPF is good in terms of plan-making but local planning authorities lack sufficient confidence and resources. They find it difficult to retain those scarce resources, to produce and defend strong policies. This is particularly the case as (as two of our advisers put it) 'in comparison with the more rule-based planning systems of other countries, our system is hugely reliant on case-by-case judgement. It is therefore intrinsically resource intensive'

- The NPPF only works when implemented by those who feel empowered. "Anything anywhere approach is the issue. Large-scale development is the biggest issue on low denomination design."

- The system relies on strong local political leadership. Why is this necessary? Should a system be reliant on strong leadership? Community views affect the views of politicians in agreeing to local development.

- And the approach needs to be consistent at the national level (e.g. the Secretary of State and Planning Minister advocating national policies). There is a view that Government doesn't appear to stand by its own policies on design and quality and that the focus is on delivery rather than quality.

- Education of planners on design and also on leadership is important.

- Matching resources to local demands is important and use of techniques to better utilise planning resources such as Planning Performance Agreements.

Architecture. At our session on 28th March we spoke to a range of architects including Graham Morrison (of Allies and Morrison), Teresa Borsuk (of Pollard, Thomas and Edwards), Luke Tozer (architect), Simon Bayliss (of HTA Design), Francis Terry (of FTA), Richard Partington (of Studio Partington), Stephen Taylor (of Stephen Taylor Architects), Bruce Buckland (of Buckland Architects) and Meredith Bowles (of Mole Architects). Their expertise was derived from practice over many years particularly in residential development. A wide

range of points were made about the definition and importance attached to beauty in the design and development of schemes. These included that:

- Beauty is not equally weighted with function and structure. Architecture tends to give more priority to function. "Beauty comes from exceptionally hard work and doesn't come out of a flash of inspiration. Beauty is perceived when you feel comfortable to perceive it; in place-making."

- Beauty is seen as a subjective view but there are very common threads and consensus around what beauty is such as symmetry. "Familiarity, safety, legibility are very important, but so are surprise and interest and joy. Beauty is like a smile, you know it when you see it, but struggle to describe it - like a wet bar of soap that slips out of one's hand when trying to find the words."

- There are tensions to recognise in the design of schemes such as the desire for a good neighbourhood with services and facilities which are walkable and having access to private outdoor space and car parking. "If you took a blind man from medieval times and showed him around London, he would know the street pattern. It's the space between buildings that is beautiful; buildings themselves come and go. Buildings should be simple and replaceable, but spaces should be more complex."

- Details are important, elements such as the style of windows define cultural identity. Other cultural traits are important to understand, for example in some places there is a very suburban mentality which sees strong boundaries and private green space. It's much harder to create urban extensions with elements of shared common ground e.g. allotments and other community spaces. "If you haven't experienced other places e.g. Florence and Rome, then your view comes from a reaction of prejudice of inexperience."

- Volume housebuilders do not tend to use architects' skills. Housebuilding is seen as a cost driven activity where the aim is to minimise costs in order to maximise projects. "A building of any style done with passion, vigour and training is bound to be good. It's those that are delivered without these considerations, but overbearing cost issues, where there are problems."

- Procurement processes tend not to build in a focus on design/quality. Focus is given to delivery of product and pace of delivery. "Procurement designs out beauty. Skilled in design is not skilled in procurement. Procurement is not skilled in design."

- Education and training is important. A stronger teaching of (architecture and urban design) history will lead to better understood designs. "Education starts with philosophical meanderings before learning to apply our craft. Shape, form, colour, composition; is cultural. It is subjective, but an architectural education should be able to interrogate this. Architectural history is very important."

- Stronger requirements for achieving good design are important for example through design codes, design and access statements and use of tools and processes such as

design review. "Design Review Panels should have an independent constitution which gives them a power at planning committee."

Housing delivery and views from developers. At our sessions on 28th February, 7th March and 11th April, we spoke to a range of housebuilders and developers including Jonathan Falkingham (Founder of Urban Splash), Kim Slowe (founder of Zero C), Nigel Hugil and James Scott (CEO and Director of Planning for Urban & Civic), Phil Barnes and Nigel Longstaff (Land Director and Director of Planning for Barratt), Kristy Lansdown (of Lendlease), Roger Zogolovitch (CEO of Solidspace), Chris Fletcher (Development Director at Grainger) , Michael Finn (Group Design and Technical Director at Barratt), Philip Lyons (Chief Executive of Housebuilding, Countryside), Stephen Stone (Chairman, Crest Nicholson), Peter Jordan (Strategic Land Director at Persimmon Homes), John Tutte (Executive Chairman, Redrow), Nick Rogers (Director of Design, Taylor Wimpey), Stewart Baseley (Executive Chairman of Home Builders Federation), Peter Andrew (Deputy Chair of Home Builders Federation), John Slaughter (Director of External Affairs, Home Builders Federation) and Tony Pidgely (Chair of the Berkeley Group).

Their points included that:

- Beauty is a response it invokes. "An extensive library will contain books which are not all the same size or bound by the finest Moroccan leather, but the content, the memory and the well-thumbed nature is what is beautiful."

- Design and commercial ambitions must both be driven to support each other. "Areas of low land value are forgotten England!"

- Developers should be creating consensus and engaged with stakeholders. Proactive engagement with the community needed before it adopts the defensive position. "Beauty comes from social interaction and discussion about buildings."

- Design competitions are a good way of radical engagement. Building for Life 12 principles are used by some major housebuilders and research has been undertaken with residents and housing associations to assess whether these principles work. People respond more to early engagement in the concepts and principles. Rejection by the community is more likely if a scheme is viewed as a fait accompli. Character and connectivity to existing external environment are what tends to swing public opinion. "We fall in love with places and then think about what we would want in order to live there."

- An exemplar scheme also requires a committed landowner who is not focussed on the bottom line but wants to leave a legacy, a landowner with a conscience.

- Organisations taking a longer view tend to take account of fluctuations in the market and embed stewardship. This generally does not apply to large housebuilder organisations. "The word beauty will not feature as currency with large scale large housebuilder architects."

- The housebuilding industry is reluctant to change, as is the supply chain, and the buying public have a limited choice at any particular time in any particular location. "We don't belong to the HBF. We sell homes, not products."

- The architectural profession is not under-skilled, but it is not applied properly as part of the large scale housing development process. Architects' skills are used to better effect in smaller, or self-build, schemes. "The professions need to be as diverse as the community they serve."

- Fast and good quality decisions from local planning authorities, and the resourcing of such, is desperately needed in the form of intelligent client leadership. Planning needs to be seen to be an inspirational facilitator rather than an obstruction. "Take the politics out of house-building."

Long term management and stewardship. At our session on 21st March we spoke to a range of landowners and investors about long term ownership. These included John Bibby (Policy manager at Shelter), John Lewis (Executive Director for Thamesmead at Peabody), Trevor Cherrett (Wiltshire Community Land Trust), Richard Upton (Deputy Chief Executive at U+I Group), Hugh Ellis (Policy Director at TCPA), Simon Marsh (Head of Sustainable Development, RSPB) and Stephen Hill (Director at C20 Futures).

Points were made about the importance of considering the long-term aspects of how to manage and maintain homes and places to maintain a sense of quality. These included that:

- Affordability and beauty are intertwined. Access to beauty is less likely for those least able to pay. However, there are examples of Alms houses that are now grade I listed and tourist attractions, originally built as social homes, with local builders and local materials. We should be able to deliver elements of beauty without unfeasible costs. "There's no reason we can't have visual integrity - even though there is a difference in tenure or income levels."

- The planning for a place must include consideration of how to cover the costs associated with its maintenance in the long term. Taking a long-term view is important in the development of a place.

- Developers need to see the long-term value and legacy in what they build. Great places have more value over long-term. But potential for tension between short-term and long-term political and commercial objectives.

- There are different models e.g. Victorian streets were built and 'walked away from' by the developer, but they worked because homes are maintained by private owners who cared for them, with streets adopted and maintained by local authority. Other models are in place at Letchworth Garden City and Milton Keynes, and in some new developments. Community Land Trust models also offer a way of pooling resources to create a sustainable approach to land stewardship.

- There has been a decline in policy emphasis on design compared focus on delivery, for example, in the National Planning Policy Framework, 5-year housing land supply and delivery targets are pre-eminent. "Aesthetic control is weakest planning tool in the pack."

- There is a need to construct a powerful legal duty to include a focus on beauty. "Overarching capstone piece of legislation needed in planning – giving design its status."

Issues relating to development in rural areas. At our session on 11th April we spoke to a range of landowners and investors about long-term ownership. These included Merrick Denton Thompson (Former President of Landscape Institute), Fenella Collins (Head of Planning, Country Land Association), Gary Charlton (Landscape and Conservation Policy at Natural England), John Lyall (Lyall, Bills and Young Architects), Paul Miner (Head of Strategic Plans at Campaign to Protect Rural England), Keith French (Landscape Architect and Director, Grant Associates), Dee Haas (Chair of CPRE Hampshire) and Ulrike Maccariello (Development Manager, Hastoe Group).

Points were made about the importance of landscaping in contributing to the creation of beauty in the built and natural environment. The discussion centred around how land, form and natural systems influence how a settlement sits on the land and how it sits within the landscape and particularly the relationship with biodiversity. Further points made included that:

- In designing new places, an appreciation of the context is important to understand how development should fit into the elements that are already valued. "Proxy we're using for beauty is character of place, and this is where you can engage with people."

- Community involvement and engagement is important, such as through character mapping and Neighbourhood Planning. Communities ought to be engaged in the change process much earlier on than they currently are. "Engage with the community about change so far in advance that the community doesn't adopt a defensive position. It's incredibly powerful for the community to be involved in future speculative visioning."

- Biodiversity offsetting is becoming more central. Net gain policies could exclude the other elements which need to be balanced. It is important to retain a broad focus when considering issues relating to the natural landscape and to avoid narrowing the focus onto specific issues. "Lack of joined up thinking across Government departments and planning means that priorities such as commuting, degradation of the countryside, industrial strategy etc. aren't being balanced with delivery of housing. Too much focus on delivery at the expense of planning."

- The character of the place overall creates a sense of beauty, buildings will come and go but the place will last for centuries. We need to be able to find the emotional connection and understand how we capture that.

- Declining skills, resources and expertise is leading to difficulties in applying regulations aimed at creating and improving landscaping. "There isn't the understanding of place and management of land."
  The need for consideration of landscape, water management, interaction with agriculture and biodiversity at the 'larger than local" scale was also raised, and the need to plan at this level of scale.

Views from local authority representatives were heard at our roundtable discussion on 13th June with the Town and Country Planning Association's New Communities Group and a number of their members including Anna Rose (Local Government Association), Sara Whelan (Planning Officers Society), Peter Richmond (Bournville Village Trust), Simon Harrison (Ebbsfleet Development Corporation), Cllr David Walsh (Dorset Council), Luke Mills (Uttlesford District Council), Nick Lloyd Davies (Runnymede Borough Council), Sally Anne Logan (Ashford Borough Council), Alex House (TCPA) and Julia Thrift (TCPA).

The meeting included a wide-ranging discussion on the issues related to the work of the Commission, including the views of local authority officers planning for large scale development and Garden Villages on how beauty and quality can be achieved in the built environment. A range of points were raised, including:

- There is a need to be specific and clear about what design quality means.

- Landowners and speculators are least interested in design codes because they see their involvement as too early on in the planning process to be concerned with design. By the time a developer applicant comes on board, costs are locked in and there's no room to discuss design in a meaningful context.

- Different stakeholders with different priorities aiming to balance cost and risk over time, as well as submit an application, at pace, means that there is little willingness from an applicant to change what has gone before. An application can be based on an old masterplan which the land promoters are wedded to but doesn't contain the flexibility for review. "There's a finance v pace conundrum."

- There need to be structures and processes in place to pin down quality from the start and more ownership in the decision making to help with place leadership.

- There is a challenge to ensure that the original vision and passion for place is retained. Particularly when the environment e.g. policy, finance and legal frameworks, moves on. "Bring back the passion, bring back the belief."

- Usual development procurement means that, as pace goes by, the nuances are lost. Community leadership and democracy should be able to help retain a focus on quality.

- Creating a collaboratively designed master plan between the site developer, local planning authority and design panel would produce a robust suite of conditions which would tie the developer to deliver and ensure that nuances won't be lost.

- The importance of negotiating early with developers and creating the right quality reference documents.

- Design codes can be rigid and lack flexibility. These limitations should be accepted and capacity for review built-in. It's important that all stakeholders understand what good quality design is, and what is negotiable and non-negotiable. "Running an organisation successfully means that their default mechanism is strategies and 'I'll tell 'em how to do it' approach. But planning needs people/professionals who are interested, committed

and passionate about delivering quality in planning. People are the ones who get around the issues, not a document."

- Design code compliance is important, or a prescribed process followed to explain any divergent approach.

- Problems with large-scale delivery is austerity and 5-year housing land supply; local planning authorities can work as hard as they like but still get an uneven result. "Local planning authorities As don't deliver the houses, we have no tools to force the developer to build. Local planning authorities need to be measured against permissions." "5yr housing land supply isn't a tool but a green card to anything anywhere." "Local planning authorities don't deliver the houses, we have no tools to force the developer to build. Local planning authorities need to be measured against permissions."

- Where there are agricultural land values, the planning system encourages speculation. And so the focus is on housing numbers with no emphasis on design.

- The language needs to be changed to building community and building homes; planning and delivery of homes and communities is not all about land supply and building a product.

- Having a call for sites instils an adversarial approach into the planning system.

- Local planning authorities need to have better tools and the confidence to be able to use them. There needs to be shared ownership across the council and members to have the understanding of place making value and confidence to take good decisions. "Place making is being at the centre of the table and everyone around that table understanding it and promoting it. Place making leadership must be delivered by the leaders."

- It is important, especially in regeneration projects, to think about succession, such as who will be managing and stewarding the conversation with the masterplanners over time.

- There is no cross-programming of education between highways and planning/architecture schools. There needs to be true learning across the disciplines of the built environment.

Views from representatives and members of the National Housing Federation were heard at our roundtable meeting 13 June which included Duncan Neish and Clare Paredes (National Housing Federation), Jeff Astle (Executive Director Development and Sales, BPHA), Pete Bojar (Executive Director Growth and Assets, Great Places), Charles Glover-Short (Head of Public Affairs & Corporate Research, Optivo), Chris Montague (Assistant Director (Development), Stonewater), Ed Tibbets (Head of Design and Planning, L&Q), Clare Tostevin (Director of Growth, Rochdale Boroughwide Housing), Hannah Trubshaw (Senior Planning Manager, A2Dominion), Roger Wilshaw (Director, Policy Research and Public Affairs at Places for People), and Elanor Warwick (Head of Strategic Policy and Research, Clarion).

The meeting included a wide-ranging discussion on the issues related to the work of the Commission, including the views of housing associations on how beauty and quality can be achieved in the built environment. A range of points were raised, including:

- Housing associations have a place-maker's perspective of new development with their on-going stewardship role as landlord. Organisational commitment is needed to deliver lasting quality places for the long-term. "Long-term interest in the place drives all the ingredients which deliver sustainable communities."

- Beauty is not necessarily the right thing to aim for - the goal should be quality. The sector should aspire to quality across the housing stock, with no differentiation across tenures. "Housing Associations have often been the pioneers of quality." "Don't get stuck on just delivering the units of today, focus on building communities for the future."

- A significant proportion of the housing stock of member associations comes from affordable housing built by the private sector in fulfilling commitments in s106 agreements. The sector needs to get more involved in how such development comes forward, before they collect the keys. "Segregation can come down to a lack of understanding about what you're inheriting." "There's a need to get the right supply chains in place so that we don't compromise on quality."

- Housing associations are aware of the need to make places, including infrastructure, landscaping and public realm, and not just housing. This includes taking hold of the design quality agenda for themselves, and not being led by developers. "Investing in the infrastructure and public realm creates a place, the buildings come after."

- The wish to see wider commitment from the public sector to designing developments that aim to enable walking and cycling and avoiding car-dependent development, going beyond the rhetoric. "In market towns and villages you start designing from the car parks." "When you go outside of London the policy anchor isn't there."

- The planning system is not well resourced to ensure quality, rather than just granting permission for the right numbers of homes. There is a need to close the skills gap in the public sector to better be able to assess the design quality of schemes and places. A challenge to this is competition from the private sector. Higher planning fees could help. "The design champion was the victim of the rent cut."

- A feeling of lack of trust in the system, with a perception that new development will be poor quality. There is a need to show people that quality can be achieved, to overcome opposition to new development. "Good design means that you can talk about design as a process, rather than beauty."

- Issues relating to lack of training for members. One Chair of a Planning Committee had only two hours of relevant training. Member engagement at plan making stage, not just reacting to opposition to applications, would help. "Without the vision of beauty and what you can sell to a community, you're on a hiding to nothing and you're not going to win any friends or build a reputation." "Local objections, local politics and NIMBY-ISM is a key factor in steering response to delivery of development." "NIMBY-ISM runs deep."

- Some housing associations are now looking at developing larger schemes by bringing in partners. But often housing associations are competing with each other and can't compete with private sector on public land, including university land, when the land owner is looking for the best receipt. "Public sector land - best value seems to mean best receipt."

- Design standards, such as codes, can help achieve quality - with a clear hierarchy from national, local and site specific and with the right degree of flexibility to allow delivery. The Scottish system was cited as an example of this. Communities need to be able to understand the guidance material and use it to hold developers to account. Clear communications and consultation are needed.

- It is easier to talk about design quality in London due to indicators, such as space standards, in the London Plan, which are easier to measure. Elsewhere, developers decide how to pitch quality and design in the planning process. A low bar for quality favours developer's pockets at the expense of quality places. "London has a strategic planning system. The spatial level at which is being planned is crucial for consistency."

- Design in the National Planning Policy Framework has become a test to pass, but it should be seen as an overriding objective. "'Good design is indivisible from good planning' has been lost from the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework. The National Planning Policy Framework has been watered down, and so is the process between the permissions process."

Interviews with experts

On 5th March we met Timothy Bannister, Director of Data Services at property experts, Rightmove, to discuss potential data sources and analysis that could be useful in helping to identify consumer wants and needs. Points discussed included:

- The types of data that it may now be possible to access from keyword searches by prospective home owners looking for a new property. Some of these may be used as a proxy for 'beauty' such as access to local neighbourhood amenities including parks and green spaces and good quality local schools, as well specific property features such as the character and age of a property and availability of parking facilities and outdoor space.

- The types of analysis that it may now be possible to carry out to show trends and patterns of change in local housing markets over time.

On 26th March we met Christopher Boyle QC, who specialises in planning and environmental law, to identify potential challenges regarding changing the planning legal framework.

On 24th April we met Dieter Helm, Professor of Economics at the University of Oxford and Fiona Reynolds (Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge) to discuss economic and landscape issues. Points discussed included:

- The 25-year Environment Plan is there for the benefit of the wider environment, but also for people to protect and improve their well-being.

- In planning new development, it is important to consider how a development fits in with the Government's 25-year Environment Plan, net environmental gain, natural capital, the context of the development, and the environmental implications. This can be more important to a successful place than the buildings themselves.

- The impact of 'greenness' impact on mental and physical health is clear, scientific studies show this. Green space helps people improve exercise and helps tackle obesity. Children without access to green space and good air quality will likely see an impact.

- The biodiversity impact is less easy to measure. Measures need to be developed. It is also important to look at where waste is generated and where it is likely to end up.

- There is a challenge in terms of how to get 10 million people, 3-6million more houses, and infrastructure, and achieve the 25 year Environment Plan objective for 'the next generation to inherit a better environment than the previous generation'.

- Some current patterns of new development, for example Oxfordshire, are not necessarily sustainable. Every village gets 500 homes, no new infrastructure, 30min journeys are now an hour, no public transport. Congestion adds to pollution which lowers air quality.

- There is a need to plan properly for this at strategic level, not doing it on a site by site basis.

On 14th May we met Tony Fretton, an architect with extensive specialist experience of working in The Netherlands, and his colleague, Jim McKinney, to discuss any insight into the benefits of different ways of working. Points discussed included:

- The relative ease of working in the Netherlands and the greater likelihood of that which is designed being built according to the architectural and planning conception. An observation was that a fundamental difference is that a Dutch developer will ask the question of how, from a design perspective, they can optimise the site; whereas a British (London) developer will ask how many units (homes) they can fit in.

- The Dutch practice of the public authority commissioning area master plans prior to sites being released was raised. Dutch designers see master planning as a distinct design stage; and that the exercise has a different set of drivers to the exercise of architectural design. Very often UK designers approach master planning as 'big architecture' which is too restrictive in terms of form and often ill adapted to meet changing needs of a master plan to flex and adapt over time.

- In the Netherlands the scheme is highly specified through the master plan and therefore the profitability will be known from the outset and not a matter for negotiation; the key determinant of additional returns come from building a scheme that is very attractive. This is in contrast with common UK practice where architecture and master planning is conducted in context of unknown outcomes.

- That planning and master planning decisions should be brought upstream within the site allocation and planning process, such that once land is allocated it should have strenuous criteria attaching to it so that more creative design in conformity with a plan is enabled. This method provides much greater certainty to developers and the market generally. They did caveat that not all schemes embody great architecture.

- Another positive aspect of the more certain Dutch model is that infrastructural needs of communities can be planned for. Their view was that much development is coming forward in the UK without adequate assessment of requisite infrastructure.

- Recognition that the cultural contexts differ but that there is a need to learn from Dutch practice and mesh this with the tradition of UK land and property and planning.

- Use of modern methods of construction in The Netherlands. The use of concrete form construction dominates and this is architecturally adaptable and also relatively speedy. They see the opportunity for the application of modern methods of construction in the UK for new settlement sites where large repetitive areas are being laid out.

A3 - Sections from some submissions received

Our call for evidence invited individuals and organisations to provide information in response to a series of questions set out below.

Call for evidence questions

1. Do you consider that securing 'beauty' should be a broad objective of the planning and development process - whether in the natural or built environment?

2. Can you provide evidence of the best ways of creating homes and communities that have achieved a) sustainable and walkable densities b) achieved high levels of public support c) high levels of well-being and d) environmental sustainability?

3. Can you provide evidence of ways of creating homes and communities in other countries, which have been successful in achieving a) to d) in question 2?

4. Do you consider that collaborative community and stakeholder engagement processes (such as planning for real, enquiry by design, charrettes) are effective in securing more publicly accepted development? If so, what stage of the planning and development process are these most effectively used?

5. Can you provide evidence on the benefits and problems associated with introducing, and enforcing, design methods such as master plans, design briefs and design codes, in the creation of homes and communities?

6. How ideally, could the planning and development process in England foster higher standards in design, over the long term?

7. What first steps do you think the Government should take towards fostering higher standards in design through the planning and development process?

Call for evidence responses

In total we have received 73 responses to the call for evidence including from special interest groups, professional bodies, amenity groups, architects, local authorities, developers as well as members of the public. More detail is set out below.

Type of respondent	Number of responses
Amenity groups	9
Architects	7
Consultancy and other businesses	10
Government agencies	3
Housing Associations	2
Housebuilders	2
Local authorities	6
Members of the public	15
Other interest groups	11
Professional bodies	8
Total respondents	**73**

Some of the organisations responding had also carried out survey of their members in order to produce their response, including Civic Voice who had responses from over 790 members and RTPI who had responses from more than 750 members.

Points from **members of the public and amenity groups** included:

- A main point from the Civic Voice survey of over 790 members was a feeling that '*if aesthetic appeal (or beauty) of a new development was given more prominence in the planning process it would make it easier for new developments to win community support'.* Just under 70% of responses agreed with this.

- On the question of 'beauty' as an objective a selection of views included:

  '*In the case of new residential developments, whether large or small, residents and communities aspire to a home they find desirable, where they would like to live. They expect it to be safe, comfortable, convenient and affordable.'*

  '*Respect the local vernacular and draw on character. Successful urban areas are a mixture of styles and designs which by their variety give interest and character.*

  '*An aesthetically pleasant environment is a crucial part of making an environment a desirable place to live and a place where one can feel at home.'*

- Views were also provided on the value of collaborative community and stakeholder engagement, including:

'Collaborative stakeholder engagement should start at the concept stage of any development.'

'Engage with local people, be transparent regarding options, listen to views.'

'When we achieve early stage presentations from developers it allows community experience and ideas to be put forward which can improve uses, designs and impacts which make them much more acceptable and also, on occasion, improve viability.

Points from **professional bodies and other interest groups** included:

- RTPI summarised responses from its survey of over 750 members as 'clearly indicating their fundamental belief in the role of planning and planners in promoting quality design in place making'.   Key points from the member survey included that good design helps communities accept new development e.g.:

   '87% reported that in their experience, good design helps communities accept new development' and '77% reported that design quality is equal to a range of other considerations in helping communities accept new development'

- Design Council summarised its response as:

   'Design Council believes that design needs to be recognised as the golden thread running throughout the development and planning process, with greater focus on public engagement, with support for communities to develop the skills they need to play an effective role. Alongside this, it is crucial that additional resources are provided to rebuild design skills and capability in local planning authorities, with a greater focus on a whole place approach to designing and planning the homes and communities we need and delivering healthy place making.   This should be supported by a refreshed and more accessible online hub of Design Council/CABE resources.'

- *The response from RIBA included:*

   'Beauty is an objective of architecture. However, it is only one element of creating a successful building or place. Architecture brings together the diverse requirements of a site to create something which is both functional and beautiful. This role has been recognised by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government describing architects as "guardians of quality". Beauty must be incorporated into a broader definition - quality design - which is focused on securing positive outcomes for the people that will use and interact with the place. '

   'This can only be achieved through improving the planning and development process, not being prescriptive about the style of new development. Raising standards, improving the resourcing of the planning system - particularly design expertise - and properly assessing the as-built performance of buildings will be far more effective solutions to the problem of poor-quality housing.'

'Local context is also crucial in determining what will be considered beautiful in a particular area, meaning designs should be developed in conjunction with local communities to ensure that local insight is embedded into new development.'

- The TCPA (Town and Country Planning Association) raised issues such as the relationship between planning and people, the need for planning to support the health and well-being of communities, changes required to the dominant development model and the importance of national design standards and use of strong public authorities to drive quality and delivery.

Points from **consultancies and other businesses** included calls for innovation including in:

- Development models such as:

    - 'not for profit, socially responsible' housebuilding, as advocated by Nationwide Building Society, as a means of achieving high quality schemes

    - 'Community Land Trusts', as advocated by the National Community Land Trust Network, as successful ways of winning public support for new development as communities are fully involved in the delivery of a local scheme.

- Approach to construction and industry skills, as advocated by MOBIE - Ministry of Building Innovation and Education in its promotion of modern methods of construction as a means of delivering high quality homes and attracting a new cohort of people into the construction industry with a focus on new skills such as design, manufacture and digital competencies.

    'These are more attractive and rewarding to today's employment entrants and they could help drive greater diversity in the construction workforce.'

- Changing the culture of opposition to new places, as advocated by David Lock Associates, such as through:

    'Changes to the national school curriculum to create a focus on the benefits of planning, new communities and the need for change'

    'Changes to the planning system to enable a wider (and younger) demographic of society to engage in the debate about their future communities.'

Points from **Government Agencies** included:

- On the question of 'Beauty as a broad objective for planning and development process', both Historic England and Natural England, believe that securing beauty should be an aspiration of the planning system. Natural England advises the consideration of protecting natural landscapes to ensure that natural beauty is conserved. Natural England also encourages consideration of the character and distinctiveness of the area. Historic England also suggests that the incorporation of beauty within the planning system should include the historic built environment. In doing so, they suggest this needs

to be reconciled with the existing concept of *amenity* and would be best achieved if it were to be included under the concept of 'good design' in the NPPF.

- The three agencies refer to the growing evidence which links design quality and green environments with better health and wellbeing. For example, Green Infrastructure (GI) is seen as positively influencing: *"mortality rates, certain types of morbidity, mental health, quality of life, and is associated with less stark inequalities in health."*

- The three agencies collectively agree that collaborative community and stakeholder engagement processes are effective and should be encouraged, more so during earlier stages of planning.

  As expressed by Historic England, it is important for this type of meaningful engagement to occur at a specific time;

  "Too early and there is insufficient detail upon which to base comments and that lack of detail can raise expectations as to what is, and is not possible. Too late and the opportunity for meaningful influence is lost and there is a risk that the process is viewed as tokenistic. Both approaches can be harmful to the long-term relationship with the community. Community engagement needs to take place at a stage where enough detail of the proposal has been developed, but there remains enough flexibility to shape what is being proposed."

- Sport England has pointed to examples of where quality has been delivered through the use of design codes, through engagement with the local planning authority, and the provision of social infrastructure and its long-term maintenance.

- Although master planning can help to establish the principles and standards for development, Historic England suggests that the production is not always reflective of high-quality design and in order to overcome this issue, developers should incorporate community voices into the development of master planning, design briefs and codes.

- Natural England suggests that planning authorities are given the necessary tools which would enable them to work in compliance with design principles. This would assure local communities, who had actively contributed towards the early stages of the planning and design process, that development would be delivered in line with agreed proposals.

- With regard to how the planning and development process could foster higher standards of design in England, Natural England implies that this could be achieved by incorporating the national framework of green infrastructure standards into wider design guides as well as into the 'National Planning Policy Framework'.

  Sport England offers four different ways in which this could potentially be achieved:

  - Embedding Active Design Principles to create walkable densities

  - Activating environments using a whole systems approach

  - Prioritising social infrastructure with appropriate mechanisms to maintain their integrity throughout construction

- Encouraging future professionals using training

- Historic England believes the encouragement of community engagement would be a credible technique in adopting higher standards in the process. This would create awareness of their strategic role and further improve the quality of outcomes.

- In terms of actions Government could possibly take in order to adopt higher standards in design, Historic England suggest that "a robust assessment of current standards, the implications of recent changes, and a series of recommendations as to how improve the status quo". In doing so, the Government would be able to keep up to date with the current standards of design and support and/or improve them.

Points from **Housing Associations** included:

- G15 members understand the importance of beauty, however, they also point out that successful place making involves more than just "aesthetic consideration". Focusing primarily on 'beauty' may mean undermining principles of 'good design'. The latter of the two will be more able to produce consistency of design standards in new homes and communities.

  "Beauty or visual appeal should be considered as part of a broader focus on 'good design', which also encompasses more practical considerations such as safety, sustainability, accessibility, ease of navigation, tenure mix and how public realm encourages communities to congregate."

- Through experience, G15 members highlight the importance of effective collaborations between stakeholders and communities, stating "*involving existing residents and surrounding communities in design proposals at an early stage leads to better outcomes for all concerned*"

- Hastoe Housing Association believes that including local people in the site selection process means that communities are able to understand the development better.

- Hastoe Housing Association also raised the issue that although design briefs can be useful in planning, it is often difficult to specifically tailor to the needs of individual, rural communities.

- Design codes give communities the opportunity to offer their contributions towards the architectural development in their area. G15 members offers a solution for making design codes beneficial in their respective architectural vernaculars:

  "One potential drawback is the possibility for a narrowing of design possibilities, but, provided design codes are sufficiently local and are not excessively prescriptive and start dealing with the absolute minutiae of design, they should enable a balance between creativity and sensitivity to context."

- Some considerations were suggested for Government as a way of implementing higher standards in design through planning and development process:

- Implement the Future Housing Standard set out in the Spring Statement

- Better design standards mandated for neighbourhood/local plans

- Zoning land for Affordable Housing

- Funding for local authority planning departments

- Government funding linked to higher build standards

- Better connectivity and communications

- Develop new legislation to create a new set of national minimum design standards.

- Government should enable housing associations to acquire land more cheaply.

Points from **housebuilders** included:

- Incorporating elements of the natural environment with their own developments is a way in which 'beauty' is added to the places created. This is also considered as influencing better health and wellbeing for customers.

- Redrow Homes Limited provided a range of views, including a belief that the responsibility for high quality design and place making rests with developers, as well as the local planning authority. Redrow proposed that the Government should help to promote the use of 'standard' house types that are popular with the public in new development.

- Design codes and master plans used for larger sites are beneficial in guiding the development and design process. Conversely, when used for smaller sites this may result in poorer quality and delay in outcomes.

- Five recommendations for the Government to take as requested by 'This Land'

  1) *Scrutiny of major schemes by a national design review expert body*; issuing an independent scrutiny body to oversee and review design standards.

  2) *Strengthen the role of regional spatial planning authorities and plans*; regional spatial planning powers to be given to appropriate people in order for them to take strategic decisions about large scale development

  3) *Genuine community involvement in development planning*; support engagement methodologies, being honest and open with the community. The earlier this is done in the process, the more likely it is to be successful.

  4) *Ensure the built environment in better taught in schools*; this would ensure the wider community is educated on the built environment.

  5) *Encourage greater use of data and evidence-led approaches in development*; understanding customer lifestyles through data and insight to create a meaningful sense of place in developments

Points raised by **local authorities** included:

- Securing 'beauty' as an objective is commonly agreed, however it is recognised that delivering this in practice may be challenging due to its subjective nature.

- Collaborative engagement between stakeholders and communities is encouraged, particularly at the pre-application stage.

- Master plans, design codes and briefs enable the creation of high-quality places and are valuable in the planning process. They also allow for community engagement.

- In order to adopt higher standards of design within the planning and development process, it is important that we are able to pinpoint the causes of poor design.

- Environments which are deemed as sustainable, incorporate the use of public transport, cycling infrastructure and great architectural design.

- Investing in training and development schemes for planners, designers, developers, councillors and the public, would stress the importance of taking a holistic approach to placemaking.

- Celebrating accomplishments and effort through design awards in order to ensure higher standards of design.

- Stronger design policies should be established within the NPPF.

Points raised by **architects** included:

- Beauty should be an objective of the planning and development process - but based on a good understanding of the specific locality.

- Designers and planners should spend more time looking at the historic towns, villages and neighbourhoods that work well. Decision makers should be informed about recent, high-quality schemes.

- The popularity of Bournville could provide a checklist for new neighbourhoods: a high-quality natural environment; an imaginative and coherent overall planning framework; high architectural quality of the built environment; a socially mixed community; sustained estate management capacity with involvement of the community.

- Government should create a National Design Framework as a partner top tier document to the NPPF.

- Public engagement in the design process (or co-design) is a key factor in achieving successful sustainable schemes. Views of future residents of schemes should also be included and not only existing neighbours, who already have homes, and who may only see negative impacts.

- Housebuilders should be involved early in the process to ensure the designs that secure permission do not get watered down later. Design codes need to be followed through and not just used to obtain planning permission, then avoided during construction.

- A good masterplan process is one that understands what exists to begin with, fully engages all stakeholders and parameters at the outset, and commits enough resources to ensure the vision remains consistent through the process, whilst allowing pragmatic flexibility.

- All councils should have a design review process and respond to its conclusions.

- Bring architects back into housing - and make sure that there are enough planners with good design skills. Planning has all the necessary tools to undertake high quality spatial planning, but what planning authorities lack is the resource to use these tools effectively.

- The market needs to be diversified so that buyers can be offered higher designs standards. The planning process needs to favour those who can offer and deliver higher design standards.

- The change from car-based towns to higher density public transit cities can only be achieved when a critical mass is reached. This can be as part of regeneration of existing urban areas, as well as greenfield sites with higher densities and greater sustainability. Public transport is key to sustainability, but also diversification of development types.

A4 - Previous reviews and opposition to development

More detail on previous reviews cited in chapter 5

Previous reviews that are relevant to the work of the Commission are set out below. These

- *The Independent Review of Build Out.* Sir Oliver Letwin's Independent Review of Build Out was published in October 2018.It sought to explain the significant gap between housing completions and the amount of land allocated or permissioned in areas of high housing demand. It sought to identify practical steps that could increase the speed of build out and increase housing supply consistent with a stable housing market in the short-term so that over the long-term, house prices rise more slowly than earnings. The key finding was that volume housebuilder absorption rates were the critical constraint to build out speeds. The key recommendations relevant to our work include to

  - *"introduce a power for local planning authorities …to designate particular areas within their local plans as land which can be developed only as single large sites, and to create master plans and design codes for these sites which will ensure both a high degree of diversity and good design to promote rapid market absorption and rapid build out rates;"*

  - *"give local authorities clear statutory powers to purchase the land designated for such large sites compulsorily at prices which reflect the value of those sites once they have planning permission and a master plan that reflect the new diversity requirements;"* and

  - *"give local authorities clear statutory powers to control the development of such designated large sites" either through Local Development Companies or a Local Authority Master Planner."*[1]

  The government's response stressed the increased focus on diversification of tenure in the NPPF and referenced our work on design quality.[2]

- *The Raynsford Review of Planning.* The Raynsford Review of Planning, chaired by former housing and planning minister Nick Raynsford, was commissioned by the TCPA (Town and Country Planning Association) and published in November 2018. The Review was set up to identify how the Government could reform the English planning system to make it fairer, better resourced, more focussed on people and capable of producing quality outcomes, while still encouraging the production of new homes. The review responded to complaints that over the last decade the system had become unsustainable. The review made 24 recommendations. The themes included: a legal duty to promote people's health, safety and well-being; strong community participation; minimal

---

[1] Letwin, O. (2018), *Independent Review of Build Our Rate*, p. 6. The full report and findings is at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-build-out-final-report

[2] Statement made by James Brokenshire on 13th March 2019 in a Written Ministerial Statement. Available at https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2019-03-13/HCWS1408/

outcome standards for space and quality; clearer national and regional policy; a plan-led system; creative and visionary planners; and increased funding.[3] As a follow up to the report, the TCPA has campaigned for the introduction of a 'Healthy Homes Act' to introduce minimum standards for all new homes, including those delivered under Permitted Development Rights

- *The Farrell Review of Architecture and the Built Environment.* The Farrell Review of Architecture and the Built Environment, led by Sir Terry Farrell, was commissioned by the Government and published in 2014. The review looked into the potential contribution of built environment education, cultural heritage and the role of Government and other organisations in promoting design quality in architecture and the built environment. Key recommendations which have been taken forward by Government or others include: architecture moving from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG); the House of Lords establishing the first ever Select Committee on the Built Environment; the Government recruiting a Head of Built Environment and Head of Architecture; the creation of the social enterprise, Public Practice placing architects and urban designers into local authority planning departments; and the creation of the Place Alliance as a movement campaigning for place quality.[4]

- *The Review of Non-Planning Consents.* The Review of Non-Planning Consents, led by Adrian Penfold, was commissioned by the government Department of Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) in 2009 and published July 2010.The main aim of the review was to identify opportunities to: "deregulate, as a means of supporting business investment in development; support a commitment to sustainable development, and its emphasis on greater local involvement in planning and development, and to ensure that the processes that underpin local community decisions are efficient, effective and do not create unnecessary burdens and barriers to investment." Key recommendations included improving co-ordination and governance; addressing resource pressures; accessibility of information; simplifying the non-planning consents landscape; improving proportionality; clarifying the boundary between planning and non-planning consents; making changes to specific regimes; and, integration of planning and non-planning consents. Over the last decade, many of these recommendations have found their way into policy particularly on statutory consultation and simplifying the environmental development consent regime.[5]

- *The Report of the Quality of Life Commission - A Blueprint for a Green Economy*, commissioned from Zac Goldsmith and John Gummer by the Conservative Party in the run up to the 2010 election, to consider how sustainability could be embedded as a cross-cutting objective of policy. This brought together the views of many leading

---

[3] The full report and findings is at https://www.tcpa.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=30864427-d8dc-4b0b-88ed-c6e0f08c0edd

[4] The full report is published online at http://farrellreview.co.uk/

[5] The full report is published online at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-consents-required-for-development-other-than-planning-permission-penfold.

environmental planners, businesses and organisations. Although now almost 10 years old, much of its analysis into development models and settlements patterns remain relevant.[6]

- *The Report of the Urban Task Force.* The Urban Task force findings put place quality firmly on the map in government thinking and while focussed narrowly on urban regeneration, many of its findings equally apply to the greenfield scenario. They remain valid and have informed our thinking.

There are a range of current reviews which are also relevant to our work. These include the Law Society Commission on Leasehold Enfranchisement Reform, the Business Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee Inquiry chaired by Rachel Reeves MP and The UK2070 Commission.

More detailed review of 'what went wrong' in the twentieth century, chapter 6

- *Building technology.* The first is that it has just become possible to build cheaply and simply at huge scale in a way that was simply not technically possible until seventy or eighty years ago. The convenient properties of steel, glass and concrete, and the ease with which buildings can now be poured on to their foundations, rather than built up from them renders financially possible a newly elephantine size. The ugly and unsustainable templates of the industrial estate and the business park were not achievable a hundred years ago, when bricks and mortar were the primary structural materials. The technology also now exists to create buildings of immense height, which are prized by some, but which feel threatening to many and often serve to destroy the very urbanism and sense of place from which their value is derived.[7]

- *Increasing labour costs.* Associated with these technological changes during the twentieth century were changing relative costs of labour and machinery. Broadly speaking, after World War I the cost of labour increased and building techniques or technologies that minimised the need for manual labour became comparatively more attractive. This was a welcome development for those performing the labour. But perhaps it should not be a complete surprise that modernism celebrated the machine age at precisely the time when that became very economically sensible.

- *Confusion about cars and towns.* Also important is that for seventy years we got profoundly muddled about how to manage the interaction of the car and the urban realm. As important writers such as Jan Gehl and Jeff Speck have brilliantly set out, it is just hard to make for liveable, popular and, yes, beautiful places if there are too many metal boxes hurtling past you at fifty miles per hour.[8] For several generations urban designers and planners laboured to interlay fast roads, flyovers and tunnels deep into cities' hearts. They turned blocks inside out - so that the backs faced streets and the fronts faced in with consequent problems of crime and ownership. They created overly

---

[6] One of our commissioners, Gail Mayhew, served on this commission.
[7] We debated whether the use of buildings, and the scale required by, for example, online fulfilment factories led to a new ugliness but in fact the need for immense buildings (for example ropemaking in Chatham) is not new.
[8] For example, see Gehl J, (2010), *Cities for People.*

complex separate grids of vehicular and pedestrian infrastructure (bridges and isolated walkways) which often proved expensive to manage and dangerous to use. So intent were they on helping people to pass *through* towns that, as the amount of traffic increased exponentially, they forgot that the primary role of settlements is a place to *be*. In parallel, the relatively high-density Victorian suburb where you could still walk round the corner to the local high street, school or local friends was banned by new space requirements and reinvented at ever lower densities increasingly reliant on cars for the most basic of human needs. And this was not without consequences in levels of neighbourhood ties and community. As research from the US, Europe and the UK is now showing car-dominated neighbourhoods can be very lonely places - to say nothing of poor air quality.[9]

- *Rejection of the traditional settlement's variety and pattern.* In parallel with these largely technological changes were changes of mindset. Self-consciously and deliberately twentieth century planners and architects rejected the traditional town with its clear centre, composed facades, mix of uses and its walkable density. Such a rejection of the traditional town encompassed but went far beyond the modernist rejection of vernacular architecture and the 'sense of place'. "*The street,*" wrote Le Corbusier, "*wears us out; it is altogether disgusting. Why, then, does it still exist?*" There were reasons for this. One hundred years ago our cities were smoke-infused and polluted, smoggy fulcrums of filth and high death rates. (Though in fact better sanitation seems to have removed the 'urban mortality penalty' by the 1920s.[10]) At any rate we have encountered in our evidence much consternation at the injuries done to older settlements though much of the twentieth century by buildings' scale, nature and positioning. To pick just one example, the Matlock Civic Association wrote in their evidence to us;

  > "*The impression is gained that before the 1970s the existing character of Matlock, and the need to perpetuate traditional stone buildings, was often overlooked. Matlock is not alone. Between 1950s and 1980s development throughout the United Kingdom brought a rash of buildings which are out of scale with their surroundings, obtrusive flat roof buildings, discordant building materials and poor window design.*"[11]

---

[9] For a very specific and recent UK example see Hart, J., Parkhurst, G. (2011) *Driven to excess: Impacts of motor vehicles on the quality of life of residents of three streets in Bristol.* For a wider and more international discussion see the work of Jeff Speck or Robert Putnam.

[10] In the 1880s, for example, US cities had a 50 per cent higher mortality than rural areas. By the 1920s this gap had been closed. Sternberg, E. (2009), *The science of place and well-being*, pp.253-4.Key legislation in the UK included the Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metropolis) Acts 1853 and 1856, the Public Health (London) Act 1891 and, later, the Clean Air Act 1956,

[11] Evidence submitted to Commission call for evidence, May 2019.

Reason for opposition to development[12]

General reason for opposition	Specific reason for opposition	Total (%)
Loss of greenery	Green spaces would be lost	30
	Wildlife and conservation negatively impacted	19
	Landscape negatively impacted*	17
	TOTAL	**66**
Overall design	Character of local area negatively impacted	22
	Landscape negatively impacted*	17
	Development poorly-designed	15
	Not type of housing local area needs*	12
	TOTAL	**66**
Services and infrastructure	Pressure upon infrastructure (or local services or facilities) would be increased	36
	TOTAL	**36**
People and use	Not type of houses local area needs*	12
	Changes demographic makeup negatively	10
	TOTAL	**22**
Specific site	More suitable site available (derelict land or unused building)	16
	TOTAL	**16**
Local control	Development does not follow plans local community have endorsed	12
	TOTAL	**12**
Housing need	More housing not needed locally	12
	TOTAL	**12**
Flood risk	Increases flood risk	7
	TOTAL	**7**
Economy	Local economy negatively affected	3
	TOTAL	**3**
Other or don't know	Something else	7
	Don't know	2
	TOTAL	**9**

* Reasons marked with asterisks have been allocated to two separate categories as they 'cut across' categories. 1,398 respondents each allocated two reasons for their opposition, hence summing to more than 100 per cent.

12
https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/m722hm6rfg/CPREResults_170805_housingdevelopment_W.pdf.

Reason for support for development

General reason for support	Specific reason for support	Total (%)
Overall design	Development well designed	21
	Type of houses local area needs*	20
	Character of local area positively impacted	9
	Landscape positively impacted*	6
	TOTAL	**56**
Specific site	Suitable site such as derelict site or unused building	31
	TOTAL	**31**
People and use	Type of housing local area needs*	20
	Changes demographic makeup positively	9
	TOTAL	**29**
Support for greenery	Green spaces would be saved	8
	Wildlife and conservation positively impacted	6
	Landscape positively impacted*	6
	TOTAL	**20**
Economy	Local economy positively affected	19
	TOTAL	**19**
Local control	Development follows plans local community have endorsed	11
	TOTAL	**11**
Housing need	More housing needed locally	11
	TOTAL	**11**
Services and infrastructure	Pressure upon infrastructure (or local services or facilities) would be reduced	4
	TOTAL	**4**
Flood risk	Increases flood risk	4
	TOTAL	**4**
Other or don't know	Something else	5
	Don't know	7
	TOTAL	**12**

* Reasons marked with asterisks have been allocated to two separate categories as they 'cut across' categories. 334 respondents each allocated two reasons for their support, hence summing to more than 100 per cent.

Participants' preferences for development[13]

What do people want from development?	Level of support (%)
Maximum green space	91
Pedestrian-friendly development	91
Strong sense of place and neighbourhood	85
Respecting historic form, styles & materials	84
No high buildings	83
Improved pedestrian paths	82
Public green space	81
Variety of dwelling types and prices	81
New community facilities	81
Conventional streets & blocks	81
Independent retailers	81

Participants' dislikes for development

What do people least want from development?	Level of support (%)
Blank walls	1
Smaller pavements	5
No improved pedestrian access	8
Removal of historic buildings	9
No arcades or colonnades	9
No street trees	9
More traffic	10
Dislike of houses	11
High buildings	12
Dislike of conventional urban blocks	13
No desire to help cycling	13

---

[13] Prince's Foundation (2014), *What do people want?*

A5 - Glossary of Terms

Affordability
Housing affordability is calculated by dividing house prices by annual earnings.

Affordable Housing
Affordable housing includes social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market.

Absorption Rate
The rate at which newly constructed homes can be sold into (or are believed by the house builder to be able to be sold successfully into) the local market without materially disturbing the market price.

BIMBY (Beauty in my Backyard)
The BIMBY Housing Toolkit is a simple and practical online tool which enables communities, organisations, local authorities and developers to collectively or individually create a regional BIMBY Housing Manual. It is specifically designed to give both certainty to house builders, who can be sure of their housing's popularity, whilst also granting security to the community and local authority that new building projects will tie in with local preferences and needs.

Charrette
A specific type of interactive workshop to generate a shared understanding of opportunities and constraints of a site between members of the community, other stakeholders and an inter-disciplinary team of built environment professionals that leads to the development of options.

Design Code
A set of illustrated design requirements that provide specific, detailed parameters for the physical development of a site or area. The graphic and written components of the code should build upon a design vision, such as a masterplan or other design and development framework for a site or area.

Design Guide
A design guide is a concise document that promotes and sets clear design expectations, identifies design requirements for character and development types, and can include visual aids to illustrate good practice, as well as checklists and possible solutions to highlight the design standards expected in a local area.

Enquiry by Design

The Enquiry by Design (EbD) process is a planning tool that brings together key stakeholders to collaborate on a vision for a new or revived community. This is developed through a workshop facilitated by The Prince's Foundation.

Environmental Net Gain

An approach which aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than beforehand.

GIS

Geographic information (GI) is data about something's location and includes features such as buildings, roads, railways, population density, height and flooding data. GI can also be used to tell you about the people in a particular location, for example their age profiles, crime levels or movement patterns. You need a geographic information system (GIS) to read and analyse map data.

Local Development Order

An Order made by a local planning authority (under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) that grants planning permission for a specific development proposal or classes of development.

Local Plan

A plan for the future development of a local area, drawn up by the local planning authority in consultation with the community. In law this is described as the development plan documents adopted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A local plan can consist of either strategic or non-strategic policies, or a combination of the two.

Masterplan

A masterplan sets out proposals for buildings, spaces, movement strategy and land use in three dimensions and matches these proposals to a delivery strategy.

Mixed Use Development

A 'mixed use' property or development is one that has both residential and non-residential elements.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

NIMBY

Acronym of Not In My Back yard

Outline Planning Permission

An application for outline planning permission allows for a decision on the general principles of how a site can be developed. Outline planning permission is granted subject to conditions requiring the subsequent approval of one or more 'reserved matters'.

Permission in Principle

A form of planning consent which establishes that a site is suitable for a specified amount of housing-led development in principle. Following a grant of permission in principle, the site must receive a grant of technical details consent before development can proceed.

Permitted Development Rights

Permitted development rights are a national grant of planning permission which allow certain building works and changes of use to be carried out without having to make a planning application.

Placemaking

Placemaking is a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces.

Tenure Mix

Four types of tenure, owner-occupied, private rent, rent from Housing Association and rent from Local Authority.