



Cambridgeshire
Horizons
driving forward sustainable communities

Cambridgeshire Horizons

Endurance House
Vision Park
Histon
Cambridge
CB4 9ZR

www.cambridgeshirehorizons.co.uk
Tel: 01223 714040



Cambridge City Council

The Guildhall
Cambridge
CB2 3QJ

Tel: 01223 457000
www.cambridge.gov.uk



South Cambs District Council

Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB3 6EA

Tel: 08450 450000
www.scambs.gov.uk

Quality of Life Programme

BALANCED AND MIXED COMMUNITIES
A GOOD PRACTICE GUIDE



Cambridgeshire
Horizons
driving forward sustainable communities

Contents

Section	Page
Foreword	1
Summary	2
1 Introduction	6
2 Housing and economic growth	8
3 Mixed communities	10
4 Financial realism and affordable housing targets	15
5 Managing affordable housing	16
6 Tenure mix and layout	18
7 Mix and variety of facilities	20
8 Mixed use development	24
9 Design, distinctiveness and flexibility	28
10 Integration and accessibility	30
11 Green infrastructure	32
12 Relationships with existing communities	33
13 Monitoring and delivery	34
Appendix 1 Monitoring indicators	36

Foreword

The Cambridge Sub-region has an extremely ambitious housing target to meet over the next ten years. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan makes provision for an additional 47,500 homes to be built between 1999 and 2016, and many of these homes will be provided in new large-scale developments on the fringes of Cambridge and some of the market towns, or at the proposed new town at Northstowe.

These large-scale new developments present major challenges to planners and developers alike. How can we ensure that they are not just characterless housing estates but are places where new communities can grow and prosper over time? How can we ensure that these new places are attractive to all age and income groups and meet a wide range of local housing needs? How can we ensure that new communities get the support that they need in the early phases of development so that they stand the best chance of success right from the start?

These questions were raised in early 2005 in discussions between Cambridgeshire Horizons and representatives of the local authorities and major developers who are planning the new communities in the Cambridge area. We felt that there was a need to learn from good (and bad) practice in planning and delivering new large-scale housing developments, and decided to commission research that would provide some guidance for our future plans. I am delighted that this research has resulted in such a practical and well-structured report, and I commend it to everyone who is involved in the challenging task of planning and delivering major new housing developments, whether in the Cambridge Sub-region or elsewhere in the UK.



David Trippier

Sir David Trippier
Chairman
Cambridgeshire Horizons

This report has been prepared by Three Dragons and Halcrow for Cambridgeshire Horizons, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Cambridge Landowners' Group. Cambridgeshire Horizons is a company established by the Cambridgeshire Local Authorities to drive forward the delivery of the growth strategy for the Cambridge Sub-region. The Cambridge Landowners' Group represents some of the developers and landowners of the major development sites that have been allocated in the adopted Structure Plan in the Cambridge area. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are the Councils responsible for taking forward the major developments.

The preparation of the study was overseen by a Steering Group drawn from the sponsoring bodies and representatives of the Housing Corporation and English Partnerships.

"It's men that make the city, not the walls around them" **Aristotle**

Summary

Our brief was to identify examples of mixed, balanced and socially inclusive communities in the UK and elsewhere with a view to informing the achievement of a well-integrated mix of decent homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes within sustainable new communities in and around Cambridge.

We draw upon a combination of stakeholder interviews with nationally representative bodies, local workshops with public, private and voluntary sector representatives who are actively involved in delivering new communities in the Cambridge Sub-region, a literature review and a series of eight case studies, of which six were drawn from outside the sub-region and two from within it. Our case studies were Cambourne and Cherry Hinton within the sub-region and Caterham Barracks, Emersons Green (South Gloucestershire), Hampton (Peterborough), Milton Keynes, Oakridge (Basingstoke), and Poundbury.



Key lessons – housing mix

There is no magic tenure mix. The ideal mix of tenures and households will depend on local need, the local economy and demographic trends. Specification of a wide range of house types was identified as a better way of creating mixed communities than focussing on affordability.

A wide mix of household types requires a wide mix of dwelling types. Whilst any guidance on housing mix contained in Local Development Documents is likely to be indicative only, it is recognised good practice for masterplans and area action plans to provide more specific guidance on the mix of housing to be delivered. Such guidance should take into account the desirability of providing housing for a range of household types and age groups, as well as creating pathways of housing choice to enable people to mature and grow old within the same location should they choose to do so, as well as offering accommodation for a range of households from the same family should they wish to put down roots in the new communities.

Desirability in market terms is not the same thing as establishing a vibrant community. It is possible for an area to be relatively lacking in prosperity whilst still being viewed by residents as a good place to live and playing an important role in the housing market.

Local plan policies on density will have a material impact on housing mix and nationally have substantially increased the proportion of smaller units provided. This factor will need to be recognised and provided for in planning the overall dwelling mix for the new communities. By measuring density across each community it should be possible to provide a wide range of densities within each community so as to accommodate the maximum range of household types.

Various stakeholders and case study interviewees raised concerns that high levels of social rented housing meant high levels of child density and this in turn leads to higher levels of anti-social behaviour. We did not find any robust evidence to support or rebut this case. But we consider that it would be prudent to keep overall child densities under review and planning should

be sensitive to development approaches which lead to very different child densities in different tenures.

The new communities cannot be considered in isolation. Who lives there will have an effect on who lives elsewhere and will alter the balance of existing neighbourhoods. If new communities are seen as the most desirable places to live (in both the market and the affordable sector) this will impact on the mix of households living elsewhere in the locality and may be sufficient to tip marginal areas or estates into failure unless delivery of attractive new residential neighbourhoods is balanced by measures to enhance the attractiveness of existing neighbourhoods and ensure that they share in any general uplift in prosperity or housing standards.

Key lessons – housing and economic growth

In order to ensure that the new communities effectively meet the housing needs of the Cambridge Sub-region, whilst providing maximum support to the local economy, more information is needed about the potential mix of households and income groups who will be seeking housing in the new communities and in the City and the surrounding villages.

Greater clarity is needed on the potential role of the new communities and on whether they will all perform similar functions within the Cambridge housing market. Such clarity should inform the “vision” for each settlement.

We recommend that Cambridgeshire Horizons commission further research into the range of potential demands for housing across the sub-region with particular emphasis on the role of the new communities in meeting housing and economic need.

Key lessons – financial realism

There are potential trade-offs between the number and the size and tenure of affordable units provided.

Resources (both public and private) will have an impact on the range of affordable housing provided. It may be better to provide a smaller number of affordable units which are targeted to meet the full range of needs than to provide 50% affordable units, of which the majority are small units.

The local authorities will need to work closely with the various agencies involved in the provision of affordable housing if genuine mixed communities are to be achieved.

Key lessons – housing management

In developing a sub-regional strategy for allocations we believe that the local authorities should consider:

Whether all the new communities should have the same mix of residents;

What the relationship of the new communities is to each other and to existing residential areas (in what way should the approach taken to the new communities differ from that for allocations to existing areas);

What the potential impact of the new communities is on existing areas (particularly on occupancy of existing social rented estates);

How choice based lettings will impact on the new communities and what are the implications for existing areas.

They should:

Develop an approach which can support family and friendship ties (to help ensure community cohesion in the new communities);

Ensure provision of a range of affordable housing to meet the full spectrum of need from all households who cannot afford to buy;

Accept a degree of under-occupancy to create flexibility in establishing mixed communities and allow young people to move to the new communities and put down roots;

Consider contributing to tenure diversification in the existing social rented sector by encouraging existing tenants to move to the new communities and offering the properties thus vacated for shared ownership or intermediate rent.

Summary



Key lessons – tenure mix and layout

There is no obvious 'best' method of mixing tenures, although 'ghettos' of affordable housing are best avoided. We found examples where physical integration had been achieved through pepperpotting, buffering (i.e. providing a graduated range of different house types within the same street, starting from small affordable units and going through to large executive market housing), clustering and development of separate sites but to the same physical appearance. We recommend that consideration should be given to the use of all four techniques in developing affordable housing in the new communities in Cambridgeshire.

This will offer maximum flexibility to accommodate a range of household types.

We would caution against an approach which adopts innovative built forms for affordable housing but not market housing. This can lead to obvious 'ghettoisation' and if innovative design does not stand the test of time brings a degree of stigmatisation with it. This should not be interpreted as a plea to avoid innovative design, but rather a recommendation that innovation embraces all tenures.

We recommend that house builders be required to indicate the tenure of affordable units in their marketing literature.

Key lessons – providing and managing facilities

Good schools are recognised as being an essential ingredient in the creation of successful communities, and will attract young family households (as is the case in Hampton and Cambourne). However, the needs of other groups (e.g. the elderly, young singles, BME households) also need to be taken into account.

Stakeholders stressed that multi-use facilities work well and encourage co-operation among service providers.

Several national stakeholders suggested that the identity of new communities was strengthened if they included a 'drawcard/attraction' which other people would travel to (e.g. a museum, swimming pool, art gallery or county library).

But simply providing the right sort of facility in the right location is not enough – how they are subsequently managed and new facilities brought on stream is of considerable significance.

Stakeholders stressed the importance of involving the local community in both choosing and managing facilities (this includes both existing local people and residents in the new communities). Community Trusts were identified as an effective mechanism for achieving this.

Early delivery of facilities is important to establishing the credibility of new communities.

Key lessons – mixed use

Both the overall balance of jobs and homes and the physical relationship of the two have a bearing on the way a community develops. Whilst genuine integration of the two is more likely to reduce car borne commuting, the degree to which this will impact on travel to work patterns is far from clear.

But local workers can make use of local facilities (where provided) and this will increase the viability of those facilities and the potential range which can be provided. This in turn provides knock-on benefits for those local residents who either do not work or work from home, all of whom will benefit from a wider mix of facilities.

Integrated land uses can also contribute to more effective informal daytime supervision of residential areas.

The offer of facilities within the case studies did not compare favourably even with that which is available within a small market town, despite the fact that in several cases total numbers of workers and residents equalled the population of a small town. This relative barrenness of local attractions could reduce sustainability as people 'escape' in their car and potentially seek to move to more stimulating environments.

Key lessons – design

A clearly articulated vision of the purpose and character of a place, coupled with a sense of history and appreciation of local environment, will do much to contribute to a sense of distinctiveness which will help to build identity and community amongst residents.

A key aspect of the establishment of sustainable communities in Cambridgeshire will be to break away from the one-size-fits-all locations approach to design and layout and to deliver development which reflects the distinctive architectural tradition of the Cambridge Sub-region, drawing on both urban and rural built forms.

This should be based on unifying principles which reflect the Cambridge context, but should also be sufficiently flexible to enable distinctive approaches for individual areas, and adaptation to suit the aspirations of occupiers.

The design approach should be sufficiently robust and flexible to accommodate the range of housing need and to enable communities and households to 'customise' their living space.

Consideration should be given to the use of design codes and charters which build common understanding about the vision for emerging new communities and have benefits in promoting high standards of design at the same time as fast-tracking development through the planning system.

Key lessons – integration and accessibility

Scale of development (and integration with surrounding areas) affects the viability of public transport provision.

Many residents do not work in the nearest town centre so public transport which only goes to the town centre is of limited value in reducing commuting.

Inadequate car parking creates tension and poses potential traffic hazards. Provision of adequate accessible garaging can play an important role in reducing congestion and contributing to an attractive street scene.

Bus services require ongoing public subsidy beyond that which can be provided by the developer.

Key lessons – relationships with existing communities

New development should contribute to fulfilling the needs of the existing community, and its impact on existing communities should be carefully monitored.

Where new development is provided to a higher standard than neighbouring existing communities (e.g. with less traffic congestion or more green areas) consideration should be given to upgrading facilities in existing areas so that they are not obvious 'poor relations' to their newer neighbours.

We recommend that in planning for new development in Cambridge, consultation on priorities, needs and aspirations of the existing community should be key in developing the vision and priorities for urban extensions, and should be ongoing as nascent communities evolve within development areas.

Existing parish councils may not be the most appropriate mechanism for community liaison and there may be a role for settlement based bodies which cross local boundaries and can negotiate from a position of strength with all relevant local authorities and public bodies. Stakeholders highlighted the role of Community Development Trusts in this context.

Key lessons – green infrastructure

Green infrastructure is important, bringing environmental and social benefits. Provision should be planned at the sub-regional scale to achieve maximum benefit.

In the Cambridge Sub-region we suggest that green infrastructure should take the form of a green grid linking with the existing green network in Cambridge and providing a structuring element for new development as well as integrating established areas with the new communities.

Key lessons – monitoring and delivery

Monitoring

Effective delivery of sustainable mixed communities requires careful monitoring of the health of both new and existing communities.

We propose a range of key indicators of economic, social and environmental sustainability.

Cambridgeshire Horizons should review as a matter of urgency:

- What monitoring data is currently available and what additional information is required;
- How such information can be provided in a cost effective and timely manner;
- How the collection of such information should be funded;
- How monitoring information should be reported and used and its relationship to local authority annual monitoring reports.

Delivery

With regard to delivery we believe that there is a need for:

A coherent sub-regional framework which co-ordinates common standards and which should include design guidance and charter(s) to support development quality and streamline the development process;

Area or community based development briefs (area action plans) and charters which set out a distinctive vision for each new settlement and the way this vision is to be delivered. This will be based on sub-regional core principles but will reflect the distinct characteristics of each new settlement;

A sub-regional community facility delivery panel which seeks to ensure adequate and timely provision of community facilities across the sub-region, including in the new communities. This panel should include community representatives and service providers and should have particular responsibility for promoting good practice and ensuring that sufficient revenue is in place to properly resource facilities provided.

1. Introduction

“You see a new kind of urban life now in the natty suburbs of the provincial cities. In theory and on paper it looks a pretty good life. It is very much of our time, bang up to date, with its neat labour saving contrivances and a lot of ingenious machines working for it. It ought to be much more fun than the sort of existence our parents led. It ought, but I do not think it is. People like my parents lived in a real society, were members of a community, whereas a great many of these young flat-and-bungalow couples do not live in a society and are not members of a community. They are young people, eating and sleeping and trying to enjoy themselves in a certain place with no interest in or feeling of responsibility for that place. There is something thin, brittle and mechanical about their life. It lacks richness, human variety, sap and juice just because it has no real social background. Higher wages, shorter hours, more labour saving devices, bigger garden suburbs, though excellent things in themselves, will not greatly improve this way of living. What they cannot restore to it is the social background, the civic feeling, the deep sense of being a member of a community. The people do not really belong to the place they are in, but are camping in it. They are nomads without a tribe.”

J.B. Priestley 1951



1.1

Our brief was “to identify examples of mixed, balanced and socially inclusive communities in the UK and elsewhere with a view to informing the achievement of a well integrated mix of decent homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes within sustainable new communities in and around Cambridge.”

We concentrate on mix and balance, but in the process of our research have clearly identified other key factors (such as facilities and accessibility strategies) which are key to the development of successful communities.

1.2

We start from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister’s (ODPM) definition of a sustainable community – one which is:

- Active, inclusive, safe;
- Well run (accountable governance, representative decision-making, strong informed partnerships);
- Environmentally sensitive;
- Well designed and built;
- Well connected;
- Part of a thriving, flourishing and diverse local economy;
- Well served – with public, private, community and voluntary services, which are appropriate to people’s needs and accessible to all;
- Fair for everyone.

1.3

We then seek to explore what this actually means in practice. We draw upon a combination of stakeholder interviews with nationally representative bodies, local workshops with public, private and voluntary sector representatives who are actively involved in delivering new communities in the Cambridge Sub-region, a literature review and a series of eight case studies, of which six were drawn from outside the sub-region and two from within it. Our case studies were:

- Cambourne, South Cambridgeshire
- Caterham Barracks, Tandridge
- Cherry Hinton, Cambridge
- Emersons Green, South Gloucestershire
- Hampton, Peterborough
- Milton Keynes
- Oakridge, Basingstoke
- Poundbury, West Dorset

1.4

It would be facile to say that we found answers which were either easy or revolutionary. A more realistic assessment is that we were able to draw on the experience of a range of stakeholders who, in some cases for more than half a century, have found that creating places which are attractive in which to live and work requires:

- Economic prosperity;
- Persistent hard work from stakeholders with a long term commitment to the area;
- Good planning and design;
- Timely provision of facilities;
- Revenue spending on measures to maintain the fabric of the community;
- Effective involvement of local people.

1.5

We use this report to explore how those key factors can assist the development of mixed and sustainable communities and how such communities might be evaluated and monitored.



2. Housing and economic growth



2.1

We start from the premise that a thriving local economy is fundamental to the achievement of a sustainable community. Full employment, a range of jobs and training opportunities for young people leaving school and university, a vibrant and diverse business community are all key to the development of a place where people do not just want to live but also have the opportunity to work and access to housing which they can afford.

2.2

The Regional Economic Strategy draws attention to the key role of the Cambridge Sub-region within the regional economy and to the need to develop sustainable communities within the sub-region which will provide affordable homes for people working in the area.

“The buoyant Cambridge economy is of great importance to the region and the UK. However, the balance between economic development, the availability of local labour, homes and infrastructure is crucial to prevent the worsening of problems associated with overheated economies. These problems include recruitment difficulties at the top and bottom ends of the employment profile and severe house price inflation, with rural villages sometimes serving a dormitory function for Cambridge.

The sub-region is a global leader in education, research and knowledge based industry linked to the University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke’s Hospital and other independent research centres. However, it currently has limited capacity to absorb the impact of further housing and economic growth.

The recently adopted sub-regional planning strategy and Growth Area designation necessitates the delivery of sustainable communities, ensuring balance and interaction between housing and jobs supported by sustainable transport links. This also includes the provision of high quality sites and premises for SMEs and facilities to attract and retain larger world class businesses in the sub-region. The national and international reputation of Cambridge gives it a key role in promoting the region and in further developing its economic links to key locations/sub-regions across the East of England”.

P 92 “A Shared Vision,” a Regional Economic Strategy for the East of England 2004

2.3

This sets an ambitious standard for development in the Cambridge Sub-region. Not only is it to lead the region, but it is to compete as a world class player, providing a working and living environment which will attract world class business and ease recruitment difficulties at the top and bottom ends of the employment spectrum. Or, put another way, new development in Cambridge must be sufficiently attractive and affordable to attract people who could otherwise work anywhere in the world as well as providing a secure environment for local people.

2.4

None of our other case study areas were currently seeking to achieve such high standards, although it should be noted that Milton Keynes and Basingstoke in their time both had considerable success in attracting internationally footloose industry and all of our case studies, with the exception of Hampton in Peterborough, were in areas which scored better than the national average when measured against the Standard Index of Deprivation.

Table 1 Index of multiple deprivation at local authority level

(1 = most deprived, 355 = least deprived)

Hampton	Peterborough	100
Milton Keynes	Milton Keynes	204
Cherry Hinton	Cambridge	218
Poundbury	West Dorset	235
Emersons Green	South Gloucestershire	298
Oakridge	Basingstoke	313
Caterham	Tandridge	323
Cambourne	South Cambs	345

Source ODPM 2004

2.5

Given the key role of the sub-region in providing for economic growth, it is somewhat surprising that there is very little information on the likely employment profile or household type of people likely to be working within the area. It is widely recognised that there is a shortfall of accommodation at both the top and the bottom end, of the housing market, but there seems to be little information about the types of households whom the sub-region will be expected to house.

2.6

As identified in other sections of this report, mix and type of households has a substantial effect on the delivery of healthy communities. We believe that it will be crucial to understand the age profile and household types of people working in the Cambridge Sub-region: are they singles, couples or families and to what extent will the emerging age and household type profile differ from that of the present or the recent past? We understand that the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) is considering commissioning research to examine these issues for the East of England as a whole.

We strongly recommend that similar research be commissioned for the Cambridge Sub-region, either within the EEDA study or as a separate freestanding exercise.

Key lessons

In order to ensure that the new communities effectively meet the housing needs of the Cambridge Sub-region, whilst providing maximum support to the local economy, more information is needed about the potential mix of households and income groups who will be seeking housing in the new communities and in the city and the surrounding villages.

Greater clarity is needed on the potential role of the new communities and on whether they will all perform similar functions within the Cambridge housing market. Such clarity should inform the ‘vision’ for each settlement.

We recommend that Cambridgeshire Horizons commission further research into the range of potential demand for housing across the sub-region, with particular emphasis on the role of the new communities in meeting housing and economic need.

3. Mixed communities



3.1

Government policy on mix and balance is quite clear:

“The Government believes that it is important to help create mixed and inclusive communities which offer a choice of housing and lifestyle. It does not accept that different types of housing and tenures make bad neighbours. Local planning authorities should encourage the development of mixed and balanced communities. They should ensure that new housing developments help to secure a better social mix by avoiding the creation of large areas of housing with similar characteristics.”

Planning Policy Guidance Note, No.3, Para 10

3.2

This perspective was reflected in our discussion with national stakeholders who generally started from the view that a mix of tenures and household types is beneficial in terms of supporting a mix of incomes and the ability to sustain a vibrant micro-economy. However, some interviewees commented that it was possible for communities to be balanced and sustainable without being mixed; communities which brought like groups together might well be sustainable and popular without encompassing a range of tenures. This view contrasts with the argument put by other commentators that, in order to avoid social polarisation and extend equality of opportunity to all, new communities need to be open to all income groups.

3.3

It is widely recognised that there is no magic tenure mix. The ideal mix of tenures and households will depend on local need, the local economy and demographic trends. Several commentators made the point that specification of a wide range of house types is a better way of creating mixed communities than focussing on affordability. Another way of putting this is to say as one interviewee did, that:

“We should aim for a critical mass of people at different life stages: children, working age population and the elderly, so that each group can develop their own social networks and facilities.”

3.4

There was also a view that the type of housing provided needs to ensure flexibility over time. In the social rented sector, allocation policies traditionally seek to optimise occupancy (e.g. a two bedroom dwelling will be occupied by a couple with a young child). But it was suggested that ‘under-occupation’ in the social rented sector should be allowed when properties are allocated, to help achieve mixed communities and reduce longer term over-crowding. The three bedroom house was identified as offering the most flexible type of accommodation, which could be occupied by established families but also by young couples to meet their changing needs/ aspirations over time.

3.5

Several commentators referred to the need to take into account consumer preferences and build in pathways of housing choice so that people who move to a community as a young couple or family have the opportunity either to adapt their property or move within the area as their circumstances change. As one commentator put it:

“Unless an area is able to meet consumer aspirations on an ongoing basis, communities will be unable to retain their successful households.”

3.6

Our literature review highlighted the paucity of data on the impact of housing mix, particularly with reference to new communities. However, it also confirmed the importance of wider economic and social factors than simple physical proximity. Based on limited research on mixed communities in Scotland, Atkinson et al (University of Glasgow) have highlighted that physical mix of tenures/house types does not result in social mix. Owner-occupiers in jobs tend to associate with each other, as do social housing tenants who are unemployed. Similar findings exist for some schemes in American cities based on the HOPEVI programme:

“...there is usually limited interaction between owners and tenants because of diverging lifestyles and socio-economic characteristics.”

3.7

There are, however, advantages to avoiding concentrations of deprivation:

“A sustainable community may not require a high degree of social interaction – it is more about reducing the incidence of high levels of economically inactive people in proximity to each other.”

3.8

Adjacency effects are also important. Recent research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation¹ (JRF) suggests that:

“Pursuing mix in new communities and severely deprived communities alone could overlook the residential dynamics that tip existing mixed neighbourhoods towards concentrated wealth or poverty.”

3.9

This reminds us that new communities cannot be considered in isolation. Who lives there will have an effect on who lives elsewhere and will alter the balance of existing neighbourhoods. If new communities are seen as the most desirable places to live (in both the market and the affordable sector) this will impact on the mix of households living elsewhere in the locality. This may be sufficient to tip marginal areas or estates into failure unless delivery of attractive new residential neighbourhoods is balanced by measures to enhance the attractiveness of existing neighbourhoods and ensure that they share in any general uplift in prosperity or housing standards.

3.10

JRF has very recently published a study of three established mixed tenure communities²: Bowthorpe on the western edge of Norwich, Coulby Newham on the south side of Middlesbrough, and Orton Goldhay on the south-west side of Peterborough. All three areas, which have been developed within the last thirty years, have 45–55% affordable housing³ and deprivation levels which are above the national average. The study concludes that:

- Residents were generally satisfied with mixed tenure, which they saw as ‘ordinary’. It therefore provides one way of avoiding concentrations of poverty and the problems which arise;
- Claims made in support of mixed tenure are probably exaggerated. There was little or no evidence that mixed tenure produced ‘bridging’ social capital or a ‘role model’ effect, or affected the reputation of the areas, positively or adversely;
- There is a clear case to be made for mixed tenure: that areas with a limited social range of residents, housing design similarities and a comprehensively planned environment help to produce civilised communities and a relative absence of tenure prejudice. Mixed tenure might therefore be a useful policy tool to prevent anti-social behaviour;
- Another rationale is that it can support extended family networks and this is important both for reconstituted families and for inter-generational support;
- There is a case for either a segmented or a pepperpot approach to mixed tenure, but high quality housing and proper integration of tenure types are necessary to blur the tenure divide;
- Having a high quality planned environment remains important even though social changes have reduced the significance of the local environment and local facilities in people’s lives. Tenure mix by itself will not guarantee the success of a development;
- Stronger friendships were found between children, who mixed without regard to tenure.

Table 2 Tenure mix in the case study areas

Area	Owner occupied or market rent	Social rented	Other
Cambourne (still being developed)	80%	14.5%	6.5% mix of keyworker housing and low cost home ownership
Caterham Barracks (still being developed)	63%	24%	13% mix of shared ownership, sheltered and live/work units
Cherry Hinton	74%	26%	
Emersons Green	90%	10% MoD	
Hampton (still being developed)	88%	12% actual target affordable 30%	
MK average	74%	20%	6% shared ownership
MK Netherfield	26%	74%	
MK Fishermead	52%	45%	3% shared ownership
MK Two Mile Ash	78%	2%	20% shared ownership
MK Willen	83%	4%	13% shared ownership
Oakridge (still being developed)	14%	50%	36% LCHO
Poundbury (still being developed)	80%	20%	Considering including additional element of intermediate housing

Note: where scheme is still being developed mix is aspirational rather than actual.

¹ Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2005) “Transatlantic perspectives on mixed communities”

² “Mixed tenure twenty years on” JRF/CIH

³ All three were developed as mixed tenure estates originated in the 1960s. Orton Goldhay was a mix of sale and social rent, Bowthorpe contained sale, social rent and some self build, Coulby Newham contained sale, rent, shared equity, self build and some housing co-ops.

Mixed communities

3.11

Our case studies encompassed a range of different tenure mixes, ranging from 74% social rent at Netherfield, Milton Keynes, to 90% owner-occupation at Emersons Green. Several points stand out.

3.12

Areas with a higher percentage of owner-occupation are more likely to be perceived as prosperous and desirable places to live, but this usually correlates with better facilities (particularly schools) and a higher quality environment so the effect cannot be ascribed to tenure mix alone.

3.13

Affordable and market housing can be mixed, and within the affordable sector there can be different proportions of social rented and intermediate housing. But the predominant tenure will tend to determine the way in which the area is perceived and hence its marketability. The history of a neighbourhood (in particular whether its roots lie in owner-occupation or social rent) can have a critical and lasting impact on perceived desirability.

3.14

Desirability in market terms is not the same thing as establishing a vibrant community. It is possible for an area to be relatively lacking in prosperity whilst still being viewed by residents as a good place to live and playing an important role in the housing market. Cherry Hinton, Oakridge and Fishermead (Milton Keynes) fall into this category.

3.15

Our case studies included locations with a mix of social rent and owner-occupation and others where the mix was between low cost home ownership and market housing. In Milton Keynes (which had both types of estates) those estates which mixed market housing and low cost home ownership were perceived as more desirable places to live than those which mixed social rent and owner-occupation and played a different role within the local housing market. Caterham Barracks was the case study which most nearly produced a full mix of tenures, including owner-occupation, social rent and low cost home ownership.

3.16

Where problems have arisen on estates with a high proportion of social rented housing, they are often triggered by issues related to estate layout or the design of individual properties. Thus at Netherfield, Milton Keynes, the combination of homes which were difficult to heat with poor estate layout produced a place where people did not want to live, which in turn contributed to neighbourhood decline – but still produced an estate which from having been wholly socially rented has moved to 26% owner-occupation (mainly through the right to buy) and plays a role within the wider Milton Keynes housing market. Similarly at Cherry Hinton the main issue of concern to local residents was congestion due to the volume of traffic and lack of car parking and this was linked to concerns about poor maintenance of roads and pavements.

3.17

However, it would appear to be the case that where a poor physical environment or lack of adequate facilities sets the trigger for decline, this can contribute to a decline in social order and standards of behaviour in public places. Effective estate management and provision of adequate facilities are important factors in developing vibrant communities. What we cannot say from our research is the relative contribution of these different factors. Perhaps the way to view tenure mix is as one of a number of reasons why communities succeed, and that getting the optimum tenure mix (whatever that may be) is a necessary component of a successful community but, on its own, is not sufficient for success.

3.18

In this context schools have a particularly important role to play in breaking patterns of deprivation. There is a close correlation between deprived neighbourhoods and failing schools. Nationally a teenager from a deprived neighbourhood is five times more likely to go to a failing school. This affects academic performance and life chances. In 2002 children from very low income households and in receipt of free school meals (FSM) performed significantly less well at GCSE than the national average – only 23% gained five or more GCSE passes at A–C compared with 54% of all children. But FSM children who were in schools with a low proportion of FSM children outperformed non FSM children in high FSM schools. There are clear advantages for low income households living in a high income area. But, by the same logic, educational attainment could be reduced if there is too high a concentration of low income households.

3.19

This in turn raises issues about child density. Various stakeholders and case study interviewees raised concerns that high levels of social rented housing meant high levels of child density and this, in turn, leads to higher levels of anti-social behaviour. We did not find any robust evidence to support or rebut this case. National statistics indicate that a relatively high proportion of petty crime is committed by young teenagers. It is also the case that most young teenagers do not commit crimes. However, the minority who do, from whatever tenure, can cause distress and insecurity for their neighbours and can play a part in contributing to a spiral of decay. Petty vandalism emerged as an issue at both Cambourne and Cherry Hinton and in the latter case there have been some well publicised problems associated with anti-social behaviour in the High Street.

3.20

We consider that it would be prudent to keep overall child densities under review and to avoid creating the situation where the mix of households in (the different types of) affordable housing differs radically from that in market housing – helping to avoid a 'them and us' situation.

3.21

Dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour will be no more important in the new communities than it is in established areas. However, in the new communities foresight and planning will be needed to put in place mechanisms from the start to deal with these. In practical terms this will mean the close involvement of the police, social services, schools and other agencies who have a role in preventing and tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. The local community also has an important part to play in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour and establishing 'norms' as to the type of behaviour which is expected and should be actively involved in developing appropriate strategies.

3.22

Our research points to the importance of creating communities which contain a mix of age groups and household types. It is therefore surprising that very little information is available on either dwelling mix or household types. The main source of information on dwelling occupancy is the 2001 Census and we reproduce this data below for those case study areas which were developed prior to 2001. This illustrates the unsurprising point that new developments tend to have relatively young populations – as do the older estates of Netherfield and Fishermead which have a high proportion of social renters. Emersons Green has a very high proportion of people of working age.

3.23

Government policy encourages local planning authorities to set out the broad balance between the different types of households which should be catered for in order to meet need within the local housing market. Local authorities should also seek to achieve a mix of housing in order to promote social inclusion.

Draft Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) recognises the value of the planning system in securing the Government's objective of creating sustainable, inclusive, and mixed communities in all areas, requiring Local Development Frameworks to:

- “set out the balance between different household types to be provided for across the plan area, and, where necessary to achieve mixed communities, the circumstances or broad locations in which this balance may be different;
- where there is a need for affordable housing, set out the affordable housing provision target as a number or proportion of the overall level of housing provision, and, where appropriate, targets for social-rented and intermediate housing;
- set out policies to address the particular accommodation needs and demands of specific groups”

PPS3 Section 12, paragraphs (i), (j) and (m)

Table 3 Resident population by age – selected developments

Resident Population by age	Cherry Hinton %	Emersons Green %
0–4	6.4	10.0
5–15	12.8	11.0
16–24	10.0	9.0
25–59	49.6	63.5
60–74	12.5	4.5
75 and over	8.6	2

Resident Population by age	MK Netherfield	MK Fishermead	MK Two Mile Ash	MK Willen
0–9	21.8	16.1	12.3	14.8
10–14	9.9	9.8	7.3	7.5
15–24	18.0	17.5	14.1	10.5
25–59	41.7	47.8	55.5	53.6
60 +	8.7	8.7	10.7	13.5

Source 2001 Census

3.24

Whilst any guidance on balance between housing types in the LDD is likely to be indicative, it is recognised good practice for masterplans and area action plans to provide detailed guidance on the mix of housing to be delivered. Such guidance should take into account the desirability of providing housing for a range of household types and age groups, as well as creating pathways of housing choice to enable people to mature and grow old within the same location should they choose to do so.

3.25

Whilst such guidance will need to take account of financial realism and wider policies on density and sustainability, it will be important to draw upon information on the nature of housing need and the types of market and affordable properties required as indicated by the Housing Market Assessment (HMA). With regard to the emerging major new developments within the Cambridge Sub-region it is important that the local authorities have robust information through a sub-regional HMA which covers the range of tenures and provides guidance on potential demand from households moving to the Cambridge Sub-region to take up employment as well as looking at local need.



Mixed communities

MKSM Study of population and migration

A study carried out in 2005 by ORS for the MKSM Sub-region NHS Health and Social Care Project Team and MK Council looked at the health and community needs of households moving to MKSM. It found that:

- Around 60% of adults moving to MKSM (and before that to MK) were aged 20–39;
- Families with young children dominated the new population;
- The proportion of non-white population was far higher among recent in-migrants than in the existing population;

- Only 28% of recent movers were in-migrants. 55% had moved within the same local authority area and 17% within the sub-region;
- In the context of health there were only marginal differences between recent in-migrants and the existing population.

The study consisted of analysis of census and migration data together with 1,000 personal interviews with recent movers in the MKSM area.



3.26

The HMA will need to be prepared in collaboration with local landowners and housing providers and it should be borne in mind that major landowners can, if they wish, provide specific guidance to developers about the types of housing which they wish to see on individual sites. Their powers in this context go far beyond those currently of local authorities through the planning process.

3.27

Local plan policies on density will have a material impact on housing mix and nationally have substantially increased the proportion of smaller units provided. At Caterham Barracks it was suggested that affordable households were the only ones in the development with children since current planning policies (low parking standards and smaller housing types – 70% two and three bed units) forced families to purchase elsewhere.

Key lessons

There is no magic tenure mix. The ideal mix of tenures and households will depend on local need, the local economy and demographic trends. Specification of a wide range of house types was identified as a better way of creating mixed communities rather than focussing on affordability.

A wide mix of household types requires a wide mix of dwelling types. Whilst any guidance on balance between household types contained in LDDs is likely to be indicative only, it is recognised good practice for masterplans and area action plans to provide more specific guidance on the mix of housing to be delivered. Such guidance should take into account the desirability of providing housing for a range of household types and age groups, as well as creating pathways of housing choice to enable people to mature and grow old within the same location should they choose to do so, as well as offering accommodation for a range of households from the same family should they wish to put down roots in the new communities.

Desirability in market terms is not the same thing as establishing a vibrant community. It is possible for an area to be relatively lacking in prosperity whilst still being viewed by residents as a good place to live and playing an important role in the housing market.

Local plan policies on density will have a material impact on housing mix and nationally have substantially increased the proportion of smaller units provided. This factor will need to be recognised and provided for in planning the overall dwelling mix for the new communities. By measuring density across each community it should be possible to provide a wide range of densities within each community so as to accommodate the maximum range of household types.

Various stakeholders and case study interviewees raised concerns that high levels of social rented housing meant high levels of child density and this in turn leads to higher levels of anti-social behaviour. We did not find any robust evidence to support or rebut this case. But we consider that it would be

prudent to keep overall child densities under review and planning should be sensitive to development approaches which lead to very different child densities in different tenures.

The new communities cannot be considered in isolation. Who lives there will have an effect on who lives elsewhere and will alter the balance of existing neighbourhoods. If new communities are seen as the most desirable places to live (in both the market and the affordable sector) this will impact on the mix of households living elsewhere in the locality and may be sufficient to tip marginal areas or estates into failure unless delivery of attractive new residential neighbourhoods is balanced by measures to enhance the attractiveness of existing neighbourhoods and ensure that they share in any general uplift in prosperity or housing standards.

4. Financial realism and affordable housing targets



Key lessons

There are potential trade-offs between the number and the size and tenure of affordable units provided.

Resources (both public and private) will have an impact on the range of affordable housing provided. It may be better to provide a smaller number of affordable units which are targeted to meet the full range of need than to provide 50% affordable units, of which the majority are small units.

The local authorities will need to work closely with the various agencies involved in the provision of affordable housing if genuine mixed communities are to be achieved.

4.1

Affordable housing policies which are driven by evidence of high levels of need and the need to create balanced communities must, nevertheless, meet the test of financial realism. As recent ODPM research has demonstrated⁴ more than three-quarters of all affordable housing provided through S106 also requires public funding (generally in the form of Social Housing Grant from the Housing Corporation). The Housing Corporation is currently funding around 750 units p.a. in the Cambridge Sub-region. If the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) projections are fulfilled and a target of 50% affordable housing is adopted (and if all of this requires public funding) then the Corporation will need to fund in excess of 2,000 units p.a. within the sub-region.

4.2

Several national stakeholders raised concerns about what happens to delivery of affordable housing if sufficient public funding is not available. These focussed on:

- The impact on land value if affordable housing has to be provided without public funding. These concerns are exacerbated if considerable physical and social infrastructure is also required.
- Pursuit of a high numeric target which resulted in large numbers of small units being provided when perceived need was for family units and a smaller number of larger units might better have met local need.
- Long delays in bringing forward overall housing numbers because of uncertainty about the availability of funding for affordable housing.

4.3

Taking these concerns together with issues about child density raised earlier, we recommend that the local authorities approach the 50% affordable housing target with a degree of caution and maintain an active dialogue with the landowners, housing providers and the Housing Corporation about how best to deliver affordable housing which contributes to sustainable communities within the context of available resources.

5. Managing affordable housing



5.1

The question of who gets access to affordable housing is a critical issue and one where the public sector (the local housing authorities) will have a central gate-keeping role.

5.2

The approach adopted will need to take into account the emergence of choice based lettings and the importance for the area of meeting local housing need and accommodating in-migrant households who can make an economic contribution to the sub-region. Choice based lettings is, in our view, an important step in ensuring that those who live in the new communities want to be there and feel a 'stake' in the new communities.

5.3

We believe it will be critical for the sub-region to develop a co-ordinated allocations strategy for the new affordable housing which delivers a consistent approach to access to affordable housing (not just for first occupiers but subsequent re-lets/resales of properties). Much has already been done to achieve this at Cambourne and sensitive lettings policies were recognised by local stakeholders as a major reason for the success of the scheme.

5.4

However, it is important to put allocation policies for the new communities in the context of wider allocation policies across the sub-region and we recognise that much progress has already been made towards meeting this objective.

Key lessons

In developing a sub-regional strategy for allocations we believe that the local authorities should consider:

Whether all the new communities should have the same mix of residents.

What is the relationship of the new communities to each other and to existing residential areas (in what way should the approach taken to the new communities differ from that for allocations to existing areas)?

What is the potential impact of the new communities on existing areas (particularly on occupancy of existing social rented estates)?

How will choice based lettings impact on the new communities and what are the implications for existing areas?

They should:

Develop an approach which can support family and friendship ties (to help ensure community cohesion in the new communities);

Ensure provision of a range of affordable housing to meet the full spectrum of need from all households who cannot afford to buy;

Accept a degree of under-occupancy to create flexibility in establishing mixed communities and allow young people to move to the new communities and put down roots;

Consider contributing to tenure diversification in the existing social rented sector by encouraging existing tenants to move to the new communities and offering the properties thus vacated for shared ownership or intermediate rent.



6. Tenure mix and layout



6.1

Mixed tenure development will affect both housing mix and marketability. Recent research for ODPM established that:

“There is some evidence that the value of the market units may be reduced by the presence of affordable housing on-site. In some cases the nature of the market units produced on-site is altered by the presence of on-site affordable units.”

Value for Money of Delivering Affordable Housing Through S106, ODPM 2005

6.2

Recent research for the Housing Corporation suggested that:

“Regardless of the level of homes to be supplied, there are divergent views amongst developers about the prospect of developing sites where the affordable housing is dispersed amongst the owner-occupied homes. Two developers interviewed consider that if social housing is to be included on a site, then dispersing the affordable homes is the best way to do it. Another developer specialising in the social housing market is prepared to develop in this way but only where the site is local authority or housing association owned. In developer owned sites this company’s preference would be to separate social housing because they argue that lower house prices are achieved on dispersed tenure developments.”

Andrews and Reardon Smith (2005)

6.3

Our case studies did not provide firm evidence on this point, perhaps because house prices and housing mix are determined by a complex interplay of factors and it can be hard to isolate the effect of mixed tenure development as such.

6.4

National stakeholders flagged the importance of avoiding the creation of ‘ghettos’ of affordable housing and also stressed the role of good maintenance of the public realm and a uniform public realm for both affordable and market housing. Variety of built form is itself perceived as desirable. One national stakeholder suggested that there should be no more than 12 units of any one type in any location. Another suggested that a single street should contain 4–5 house types.

6.5

This leads to the conclusion that mixed tenure provision within major new developments is best provided through an approach which integrates affordable and market housing. We found four possible ways of doing this.

Complete pepperpotting was not attempted on any of our case studies but is currently being tried at Upton Northampton under a scheme developed with the Prince’s Foundation where within a terrace of five four bed units the two endunits are affordable and the three middle units are market housing.

At Poundbury and Caterham Barracks affordable housing was being provided in clusters of 3–5 units within, and physically indistinguishable from, market housing developments of similar types of properties. This technique worked well and in Caterham (see photograph below) at least allowed the developer to provide intermingling of a relatively high proportion (37%) of affordable housing.

A buffering technique (i.e. shading a mix of tenures and house types from larger market housing through to small social rented housing and ‘starter homes’ but ensuring that there is no physical segregation and that all households use common local facilities) was used by Milton Keynes at Two Mile Ash.

At Hampton specific sites were set aside for affordable housing (which arrived rather later in the development) but the terms of disposal specified that the housing should be developed to the same standards and using the same cladding as adjoining homes and this has produced a physically integrated development even though the built form is different.

At Cambourne affordable housing is split into groups of around 25 units, located on prominent parts of the site for integration.



Milton Keynes, Two Mile Ash



Two Mile Ash



Caterham, affordable housing



Hampton



Hampton



Two Mile Ash

6.6

We are not able to comment on the relative desirability of these mechanisms other than to say that built form and physical proximity (provided that it is known in advance) do not seem to have produced ill-feeling between tenure groups. Where people dislike their neighbours, different behavioural patterns appear to be the major trigger for lack of mutual tolerance.

6.7

Several of our case studies produced examples where owner-occupiers had not been told that they would be living close to social renters and this had produced ill-feeling. But in other mixed tenure developments, it was made clear to prospective purchasers that the housing was of mixed tenure and this seems to have avoided any later concerns. We recommend that house builders should be required to indicate the tenure of affordable units in their marketing literature.

Key lessons

There is no obvious ‘best’ method of mixing tenures, although ‘ghettos’ of affordable housing are best avoided. We found examples where physical integration had been achieved through pepperpotting, buffering, clustering and development of separate sites but to the same physical appearance. We recommend that consideration be given to the use of all four techniques in developing affordable housing in the new communities in Cambridgeshire. This will offer maximum flexibility to accommodate a range of household types.

We would caution against an approach which adopts innovative built forms for affordable housing but not market housing. This can lead to obvious ‘ghettoisation’ and if innovative design does not stand the test of time brings a degree of stigmatisation with it. This should not be interpreted as a plea to avoid innovative design, but rather a recommendation that innovation embraces all tenures.

We recommend that house builders be required to indicate the tenure of affordable units in their marketing literature.

7. Mix and variety of facilities



7.1

National stakeholders emphasised the importance of good access to facilities.

“Everyone should be able to access the services and facilities they need easily. This is more important to households without a car but everyone should have the option to walk to the doctor’s or the shops. The surgery, school, local shops, community hall, and leisure provision should all be within walking distance.”

7.2

They also stressed the importance of involving the local community both in influencing the range and type of facilities provided and in their management, a point which was repeated over again in our case studies. However, it should be borne in mind that an active local community, whilst providing much better facilities management and helping to build local commitment, will almost invariably want more than was originally envisaged. This will have implications for the cost of schemes and the effective management of relationships between the local authority, facilities providers, the developer/landowner and the local community.

7.4

The range of facilities provided will vary depending on the size of the settlement and its relationship with surrounding areas. However, discussion with local and national stakeholders enabled us to identify a preferred list of facilities. These included:

- Schools
- Doctors’ surgeries – health centres
- Sports pitches/facilities
- Public open space
- Children’s play areas
- Local shops
- Public house, local entertainment
- Community Centre (which should provide)
 - Hobby space
 - Informal learning
 - ICT and workplace training
 - Visual art space
 - Library
- Police presence
- Multi-use facilities which are flexible
- Joint service providers

7.3

Caterham Barracks provided a good example of community involvement in facility planning. Elsewhere we came across examples where this has not happened and the facilities provided did not always live up to expectations (e.g. the ‘village hall’ which was just a few inches too small for a badminton court), or where facilities were focussed on school provision, with the result that there was little opportunity for community interaction and activity for households who did not have children of school age.



7.5

Stakeholders stressed that multi-use facilities work well and encouraged co-operation among service providers. They also identified a need for ‘appropriable space’ where community events/exhibitions etc can take place on an irregular basis. This should be linked to well-frequented services such as shops or a food-court.

7.6

The case studies highlighted the importance of broadband to local residents. Residents at Hampton are lobbying for broadband to be provided and at Emersons Green a new community website is being developed with specific aims to:

- Provide accurate and timely information to the community;
- Enhance the public presence of people and organisations;
- Help members of the community understand and engage with other people’s perspectives;
- Build bridges between the generations;
- Develop a sense of community ownership, participation and responsible advocacy of change.

7.7

Poundbury, Hampton, Caterham Barracks and Cambourne all have local websites and Poundbury and Cambourne have a newsletter. Our other case study areas did not have a community or area website.



Mix and variety of facilities

Hampton

The development agreement requires the developer to provide roads, open space, as well as sites and buildings for facilities. The type and general location of facilities is specified in the masterplan and the development briefs for the site. The S106 agreement identifies certain 'triggers' for the provision of facilities (e.g. the first primary school was to be in place by the time the 500th house had been completed).

Four primary schools and a secondary school are to be provided. The first primary school opened in 2000 in Hampton Hargate. Vale Primary School followed in 2004. A secondary school is due to be opened in September 2005. The schools are seen as one of the key successes of the new community.

Outdoor sports facilities which include two football pitches, a pavilion, floodlit artificial grass five-a-side area, hard tennis courts, and a netball court were built by O&H Hampton Ltd as part of the infrastructure provision. Peterborough City Council adopted a 125-year lease of the Hampton Hargate Community Playing Field, under the terms of the planning permission, and is responsible for maintenance.

A Medical Centre is located at Serpentine Green shopping centre. Initially problems were experienced in staffing and managing this facility. Hampton Health opened in 2001. Funding allocations from the National Health Service will allow the practice to grow and develop as the population increases.

The Hampton Communities Services Group is situated in Hampton Hargate Primary School. Temporary police headquarters are housed nearby. A library and community hall is planned for the future. Consultation workshops to identify the facilities which are required have preceded planning for the library. This facility is likely to take the form of a multi-use centre, Community priorities for the future facilities, based on a survey of local residents, include: a local pub, broadband, adoption of roads, and a gym.

Caterham Barracks

The Caterham Barracks Community Trust (CBCT) is responsible for managing all community facilities. Linden Homes have been responsible for restoration of buildings and provision of sports facilities. CBCT then has to maintain them in the same condition. CBCT is a registered charity with between 8 and 12 Trustees. Two are nominated by Linden Homes, to be replaced by representatives of residents and employers. The Council also nominates two representatives. The rest are from the community. The land and buildings for community uses are leased to CBCT by Linden. The lease has provision for CBCT to purchase these assets after ten years for a peppercorn rent. CBCT is also endowed with £250,000, paid by Linden in instalments over ten years. In addition Linden paid CBCT £225 for each dwelling sold on the site (excluding affordable housing). Interest on this endowment is to be used for maintaining CBCT assets. CBCT can charge groups for use of facilities (e.g. cricket pitch). CBCT won a BURA Community Award in 2000.

Early successes include the CR3 youth project which runs a skatepark visited by 450+ each week, the cricket club and a play space. A junior football club has also been formed. It now has eleven teams (boys and girls). Future developments include conversion of the gyms into a high quality arts and recreation centre and a Digital Enterprise Centre.

There is an annual management charge on all property owners (from £400-£700 a year for private owners, £260 a year for affordable units). £50/year of this goes towards Health Club membership – which is compulsory. The Health Club has 750 members, 38% of whom are local residents. £50/year goes towards bus vouchers, £100/year towards security costs. The balance goes towards landscaping and maintenance of front gardens, verges and other common areas. The management fees are administered by a Village Association, which reports to the Community Trust.



Cherry Hinton

Cherry Hinton has a well-defined High Street, with a range of shops and community facilities including a library and community centre. A number of people interviewed referred to the 'village' atmosphere and the fact that family ties meant that many people returned to Cherry Hinton after moving away.

The shopping parade is still busy in spite of the arrival of a Tesco Superstore in neighbouring Fulbourn in 1997. There is now also a Tesco Express on the High Street. Other changes include the opening of a charity shop and the loss of a coffee shop as a meeting place for some older residents. It is this generation that seems to feel the change in the village atmosphere the most, commenting on a more 'transient' feel to the area.

7.8

Several national stakeholders suggested that the identity of new communities was strengthened if they included a 'drawcard/attraction'⁵ which other people would travel to (e.g. a museum, swimming pool, art gallery or county library). This would provide more revenue to help support local facilities (e.g. a good local café or pub would have more clientele if there was an art gallery or sports facility or the facility could itself provide an attractive eating venue). It would also help integration with the wider community who would then have a reason to visit the new settlement.

7.9

The range of facilities is important in terms of attracting and maintaining social mix and providing for a range of age groups and household types. Good schools are recognised as being an essential ingredient in the creation of successful communities, and will attract young family households (as is the case in Hampton and Cambourne). However, the needs of other groups (e.g. the elderly, young singles, BME households) also need to be taken into account.

7.10

It is also necessary to allow for changing demographic profiles over time. Today's young children will be tomorrow's teenagers and a lack of suitable youth activities/facilities can result in social problems in the longer term. Similarly today's young parents are tomorrow's retired couples and elderly singles. Flexible facilities which can provide services for all these groups will be essential to the long term robustness of new communities.

7.11

But simply providing the right sort of facility in the right location is not enough – how they are subsequently managed and new facilities brought on stream is of considerable significance.



⁵ The Weald and Downland Open Air Museum in West Sussex was mentioned as a possible example. This Museum rescued derelict ancient buildings from all over South East England to recreate a Medieval/Tudor village.

7.12

At Caterham Barracks we found that a very effective community trust had been set up to oversee the development and long term management of local facilities. This is being funded through a number of sources, including a management charge on all property owners. The trust is able to deliver high quality management and develop new initiatives to meet changing community needs. It also has good representation by local residents and employers which encourages the local community to take responsibility for its own facilities.



Key lessons

Good schools are recognised as being an essential ingredient in the creation of successful communities, and will attract young family households (as is the case in Hampton and Cambourne). However, the needs of other groups (e.g. the elderly, young singles, BME households) also need to be taken into account.

Stakeholders stressed that multi-use facilities work well and encourage co-operation among service providers, which in turn is recognised as key to the delivery of thriving sustainable communities.

Several national stakeholders suggested that the identity of new communities was strengthened if they included a 'drawcard/attraction'⁵ which other people would travel to (e.g. a museum, swimming pool, art gallery or county library).

7.13

Both the case studies and our stakeholder workshops highlighted the importance of planning for early delivery of facilities. New communities can quickly get a bad reputation if new residents and businesses see them as failing to live up to expectations. The lack of facilities such as schools and doctors' surgeries can be particularly problematic, but the absence of 'softer facilities' such as a library or a community hall or somewhere for teenagers to 'hang out' can also contribute to a sense of frustration and alienation within the community. The barriers to early delivery of facilities are usually financial, although poor involvement of stakeholders and delivery agencies in the planning phase can also contribute to poor development programming. Local authorities and developers need to work closely with facility providers and local residents in order to provide timely and adequate facilities which are properly managed and resourced.

But simply providing the right sort of facility in the right location is not enough – how they are subsequently managed and new facilities brought on stream is of considerable significance.

Stakeholders stressed the importance of involving the local community in both choosing and managing facilities (this includes both existing local people and residents in the new communities). Community Trusts were identified as an effective mechanism for achieving this.

Early delivery of facilities is important to establishing the credibility of new communities.

8. Mixed use development



8.1

Almost all of our case study areas included mixed-use provision. In line with Government guidance, this was seen as desirable by local planning authorities both to meet land use allocation targets and to ensure a balance between jobs and workers, helping minimise the need to travel by car to work. It was also explicitly recognised that a mix of residential and employment uses could generate increased daytime demand for local facilities (particularly shops, leisure and eating facilities) as well as adding to the sense of security (which is felt to be so important in modern-day planning).

8.2

There is little evidence to suggest that proximity to local employment has more than a marginal effect on travel to work patterns. The changing nature of patterns of work, changes to key employment sectors, increased job mobility and use of short term contracts and the emergence of two income households all combine to make it increasingly unlikely that people in work can live in close proximity to where they work for any more than short periods.

8.3

Analysis of modes of travel to work indicates that it is Cherry Hinton which has the lowest percentage of car usage (58%) and the highest proportion of people who walk or cycle to work (26%). Elsewhere people who walk or cycle to work average between 10% and 13% of the total, public transport usage is typically 8–10% and car usage 70–80%. Around 8–10% of all workers now work predominantly from home, with an additional unspecified number who may work at home for one or more days a week.

8.4

The relative location of housing and employment varies, depending in part on the size of the new settlement and in part on the development or masterplanning philosophy adopted. It is instructive to contrast Hampton and Milton Keynes (both large-scale developments of more than 5,000 units) which tackle mixed use in very different ways.

8.5

Caterham Barracks and Poundbury, although of similar size, have also taken radically different approaches to mixed use development.



Mixed use development

Hampton

Cygnets Park at Hampton provides 92,000 sq m of office space. IKEA have developed a 1.4m sq ft distribution centre and there is over 726,000 sq ft of warehouse space.

Further light industry is planned as part of Hampton Leys (Phase 3) and Hampton Hempstead (Phase 4), and a 27ha business development is planned adjacent at Cygnets Park. Overall the anticipated employment capacity of Hampton is 13,000 jobs. This will result in a broad balance between housing and employment provision in Peterborough. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that people who work in Cygnets Park do not necessarily live in Hampton, and that people's decision to live in Hampton is influenced by a range of factors other than being employed in Cygnets Park. Cygnets Park is physically separated from the rest of Hampton although the bus service and cycleways from the town centre run through Hampton to get to Cygnets Park.

It is recognised that many people moving into Hampton will commute to work in London, and marketing of Peterborough is very much aimed at London commuters. The planned railway station at Hampton is expected to provide a direct link to London, making the area attractive for commuters, although there is uncertainty as to the future of this proposal.

Milton Keynes (MK)

Housing/employment balance was a key objective, with the intention being to ensure the provision of sufficient employment opportunities to prevent MK becoming a dormitory settlement. Initially, newcomers seeking social rented and shared ownership housing were required to demonstrate that they had employment or other local connection in order to qualify for housing. The provision of a wide range of job opportunities was recognised by the Masterplan as critical to the establishment of a mixed community.

The aim of providing sufficient employment opportunities has been more than achieved. MK is now a net importer of workers, with net in-commuting of around 10,840 and a surplus of jobs over labour supply of around 8%. More than 80,000 new jobs have been created in the city since 1967.

Milton Keynes is designed on a grid with a 'chessboard' of residential and employment 1 km grid squares. The dispersal of homes, jobs and other land uses across the grid squares making up the city was designed to allow for an even distribution of traffic along the grid roads, thereby minimising rush-hour congestion. The physical separation between housing and employment grid squares is the same as that between residential grid squares and this can be seen both as contributing to the sense of a permeable city and lending a bland homogeneity to travel through the city.

Caterham Barracks

The original (pre-Linden) Brief for the site, developed by the Council, prioritised employment uses on the site. The masterplan actually proposed the same amount of commercial/employment space as the Council Brief (57,000 sq ft). In fact only 30,000 sq ft has been provided. This is not a prime location for office space and take-up of commercial and employment premises has been poor.

There are 12 live/work units provided as part of the scheme.



Poundbury, mixed residential and employment



Cambourne, the walk from employment to residential

Poundbury

Ultimately the development will include around 2,250 dwellings and 65,000 sq m of employment space as well as associated community facilities. To date, three significant manufacturing premises and other business space have been provided; all of which is truly integrated into the residential development – with employment and residential uses as neighbouring uses (see photograph) on the same street as part of the Duchy's vision for a truly mixed development – helping to reduce more distant journeys to work.

The employment space provided in Poundbury (both manufacturing and BI) is different from the typical 'business park' environment (as found in some of our other case studies) and reflects the same design vernacular as the housing. The manufacturing buildings were established early in the development, ensuring that house buyers in the vicinity knew what to expect.

8.6

Large employment areas, however planned, tend not to integrate with adjoining residential areas and to offer very limited on-site facilities to workers who typically have to drive to other locations at lunchtimes. Where a major employment area abuts a residential area lunchtime shopping can play an important part in sustaining facilities which are also of benefit to local residents. It is important that the facilities offered are more varied than just a local convenience store or supermarket. Cambourne, which provides a supermarket, library and (it is hoped) a pub/restaurants, scores relatively well in terms of facilities provided but can be criticised on two counts: first, the walk or cycle ride to these facilities is relatively unattractive and time consuming in a lunch break; second, the leisure/retail offer is decidedly limited and does not compare favourably with even a small town high street, never mind the facilities offered by Cambridge itself.

8.7

Poundbury provides an alternative vision where employment is fully integrated within the residential area. This both provides visual interest and helps sustain a wider range of local facilities. These can be readily accessed by foot by Poundbury workers, thus reducing daytime car borne journeys. The Poundbury layout, with its tendency to encourage pedestrian movements by workers, also provides more informal daytime supervision and a greater sense of security to the community. It is too early to say whether Poundbury will achieve lower levels of car borne commuting than other new communities but the true integration of employment and housing uses make this more likely here than in our other case studies.

8.8

There are therefore two issues which the sub-region will need to consider in coming forward with its plans for housing and employment in the new communities. First, what the overall balance should be between jobs and homes (and the macro level impacts of this on commuting) and, second, how employment and housing uses are to be arranged – should they occupy defined (and separate) areas or be integrated?

8.9

Finally, on the theme of mixed use it is worth remembering the 8–10% of workers who work from home⁷. On a development the size of Cambourne this could be 400–1,000 people. Whilst this does not compare numerically with the anticipated 5,000 jobs at Cambourne Business Park, these people are likely to be far more engaged with the local community and potentially likely to stay in the area for far longer. Together with elderly and retired people they add up to a substantial daily presence within the settlement. They too require shops which offer more than just food shopping and are likely to benefit from attractive places to eat, exercise and leisure facilities.

8.10

Our analysis of the case studies suggests that new developments offer a very limited range of retail and leisure facilities. Our view is that the sub-region should plan for employment uses in the new communities in a way which positively encourages workers to be actively involved in local life during the day. Careful thinking about the integration of residential neighbourhoods and employment uses is critical and can have sustainability benefits for both the residential and employment components.

Key lessons

Both the overall balance of jobs and homes and the physical relationship of the two have a bearing on the way a community develops. Whilst genuine integration of the two is more likely to reduce car borne commuting, the degree to which this will impact on travel to work patterns is far from clear.

But local workers can make use of local facilities (where provided) and this will increase the viability of those facilities and the potential range which can be provided.

This in turn provides knock-on benefits for those local residents who either do not work or work from home, all of whom will benefit from a wider mix of facilities.

Integrated land uses can also contribute to more effective informal daytime supervision of residential areas.

The offer of facilities within the case studies did not compare favourably even with that which is available within a small market town, despite the fact that in several cases total numbers of workers and residents equalled the population of a small town. This relative barrenness of local attractions could reduce sustainability as people 'escape' in their car and potentially seek to move to more stimulating environments.

⁷ "Space for creativity," a report from Living East, EEDA, Arts Council for England (East) and Screen East. This refers to the fact that one in twenty people is employed in a creative occupation. Many of these are small businesses with people working from home.

9. Design distinctiveness and flexibility



9.1

Some of the most successful examples of sustainable development are distinguished by their distinctive design, which lends places a perceptible identity and sense of place. The recognisable design and architectural elements of Poundbury, Oakridge and Caterham Barracks set these places apart from other developments and give them meaning for those who live there, as well as an enduring character.

9.2

The design and layout of these case studies is strongly influenced by the origins of the individual schemes and links back to the history of the site and locality. For example, Caterham Barracks takes its cue from the historic layout and architecture of the original barracks site, and builds upon the design philosophy of the traditional English village, focussed around the village green. The use of traditional building materials and re-use and restoration of existing buildings are key elements.

9.3

Poundbury was underpinned by the strong design philosophy of the Prince of Wales and the masterplanner Leon Krier which resulted in the application of tight building codes across the development. Criticised as 'neo-vernacular' and based on the creation of an imagined tradition, the concept nevertheless does contribute to the cohesiveness and distinctiveness of the place, and, moreover, seems to tap into what consumers want.

9.4

Whilst Hampton (see photo) and Cambourne also have a distinct role within their local housing market, providing a range of new housing which would not otherwise have existed locally, they do not have the same distinctive identity which would enable the visitor to say that this is a place like no other which could only have been developed in this particular place and with this particular history.



Hampton

9.5

Distinctiveness is not solely about built form. Whilst the architecture of individual grid squares in Milton Keynes is only exceptionally outstanding, the grid structure and the extensive formal and informal use of soft landscaping does provide a common distinctive identity which characterises all the grid squares as unique to Milton Keynes despite the varying architectural forms within each grid square.

9.6

Milton Keynes also provides an example of how to interlink the old with the new in a way which respects and enhances both. The New Town of Milton Keynes contains 13 existing villages and 5 small towns, all of which have seen a rise in property prices relative to the surrounding area as a result of their inclusion in the New Town and in the case of the small towns have benefited from substantial environmental improvements (including extensive flood prevention measures) which were funded by the Development Corporation. Again liberal use of soft landscaping, a system of linear parks and the retention of some historic areas of open space at the point of transition between old and new all help to integrate the two in a sympathetic manner.

9.7

It would appear that a clearly articulated vision of the purpose and character of a place, coupled with a sense of history and appreciation of local environment, will do much to contribute to a sense of distinctiveness which will help to build identity and community amongst residents.

9.8

However, where distinctiveness isolates a new community from adjoining established areas, this can lead to both physical and social separation. New communities need therefore both to be distinctive but also well connected physically to their neighbouring communities. We return to this theme later in the report.

9.9

A key aspect of the establishment of sustainable communities in Cambridgeshire will be to break away from the one-size-fits-all locations approach to design and layout, and to deliver development based on a distinctive Cambridge 'urban tradition'. This should be based on unifying principles which reflect the Cambridge context, but should also be sufficiently flexible to enable distinctive approaches for individual areas, and adaptation to suit the aspirations of occupiers. As articulated in the stakeholder workshops, the design approach should be sufficiently robust and flexible to accommodate the range of housing need and enable communities and households to 'customise' their living space.

9.10

Masterplans for the individual development areas should therefore capture the unifying principles which underpin the Cambridge urban tradition, providing the link between these individual areas, and with the city itself. These unifying principles may be based on typical historical building blocks (e.g. college courts), which are characteristic of the Cambridge context. They should also reflect the city's reputation for high-tech innovation, with a clear emphasis on the latest technologies (e.g. in relation to renewables) and an emphasis on the use of locally derived materials.

9.11

However, these unifying principles should be sufficiently flexible to enable responsiveness to the landscape and natural environment within individual developments, as well as enabling local communities to 'grow' into them, and to adapt them to suit their needs.

9.12

While the benefits of visionary masterplans as a vehicle for driving forward good design are alluded to above, design codes have also received significant attention recently⁸. Recent research by Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) into the use of design codes and charters in contemporary developments indicates that they have benefits in promoting high standards of design at the same time as fast-tracking development through the planning system.

9.13

Whilst Design Codes seek to set out standards for the design and layout of development, charters are more about the development process, enabling stakeholders to sign up to a set of rules of engagement.

"The charter would be signed by public agencies and linked to local housing allocations. It could form the basis for agreements with developers or house builders as part of the planning process. It could stipulate what each party can expect from the other over a suitable time period (e.g. 10 years). It may be incorporated into development agreements and S106 Planning Obligations. It may be linked to the application of design guides or codes or use of design panels as well as design statements for major schemes."

Better Neighbourhoods:
Making Higher Density Work CABE 2005

9.14

It is recognised that the production of design codes and charters can absorb a significant amount of time and resources. However, it is considered that in conjunction with masterplans a Cambridgeshire Design Code and Charter would have the potential to generate positive places, and to underpin the sustainability of new communities, building on the existing qualities of the sub-region.

Key lessons

A clearly articulated vision of the purpose and character of a place, coupled with a sense of history and appreciation of local environment, will do much to contribute to a sense of distinctiveness which will help to build identity and community amongst residents.

A key aspect of the establishment of sustainable communities in Cambridgeshire will be to break away from the one-size-fits-all locations approach to design and layout, and to deliver development which reflects the distinctive architectural tradition of the Cambridge Sub-region, drawing on both urban and rural built forms.

This should be based on unifying principles which reflect the Cambridgeshire context, but should also be sufficiently flexible to enable distinctive approaches for individual areas, and adaptation to suit the aspirations of occupiers.

The design approach should be sufficiently robust and flexible to accommodate the range of housing need and to enable communities and households to 'customise' their living space.

Consideration should be given to the use of design codes and charters which build common understanding about the vision for emerging new communities and have benefits in promoting high standards of design at the same time as fast-tracking development through the planning system.

⁸ Note that Design Codes are not new, but have been used since the Renaissance, and have been instrumental in Georgian developments and new towns.

10. Integration and accessibility



10.1

Planning for sustainable transport and a concern to reduce car dependence was a key issue for almost all of our case studies. However, experience in a variety of case study locations would suggest that this is difficult to achieve in practice. Typically Masterplans and S106 Agreements called for the provision of cycleways, pedestrian routes and a frequent and reliable bus service. In some cases planning went further and sought to reduce car parking provision and constrain car usage.

10.2

Feedback from our case studies would suggest that these approaches had limited success in achieving the objective of reducing car usage and in some cases caused friction between residents and the creation of traffic hazards through inadequate provision of on-street car parking to accommodate the overall number of vehicles.

10.3

Traffic management is an issue not just for new developments, but, as the case of Cherry Hinton indicates, can also be an issue for older areas where either inadequate car parking was provided to meet modern standards or peripheral development brings increased pressure on the local high street, which in turn generates congestion which disadvantages existing residents. Stony Stratford (Milton Keynes) provides an example where, although surrounding development increased pressure on the local high street, provision of a town bypass, traffic calming in the high street and greatly improved free public car and cycle parking has kept congestion within bounds and contributed to a vibrant and lively high street.

10.4

Ensuring good access between new developments and adjoining existing settlements is key to reducing the likelihood of a 'them and us' scenario developing. Hampton at Peterborough provides an example of new development where the road network acts as a barrier to integration with adjoining established areas (the Ortons).

Cambourne exists in relative isolation from neighbouring settlements and there is little sign in either case that residents have integrated with neighbouring communities. Whilst Poundbury is physically adjacent to Dorchester, there has been limited integration in design terms and use of facilities with the wider town. Although later plans are seeking to address this.

10.5

Discussion with stakeholders emphasised that planning for the physical integration of new communities must take place at a strategic sub-regional level and result in an improvement in transport options for existing communities as well as new ones. The emphasis should be on improving the viability of the existing public transport network and services, as well as cycling and walking across the sub-region. It is recognised that future growth will place the existing system under considerable stress. Nevertheless the scale and programme for new development presents the opportunity to embrace brave and bold initiatives (e.g. congestion charging) and to fundamentally re-think transport provision in the Cambridge Sub-region.

Hampton Peterborough

Policy P10/5 of the Structure Plan requires that the revised masterplan is based on the reduction of dependency on the private car and the achievement of a shift in travel modes with a focus on public transport provision. The original S106 Agreement included a requirement for an enhanced bus service connected with the development, and the developer to use 'reasonable endeavours' to ensure a 30 minute daytime frequency, a 60 minute evening and Sunday service, within 400m of dwellings. The S106 Agreement required the developer to provide land for the construction of a railway station (although the delivery of the station requires a commitment from transport operators) and to provide footpaths/cycleways on key routes.

Public transport in the form of bus services (including segregated busways) was provided at an early stage in the development, with operators being provided with subsidies in the interim period until bus systems are made viable. Bus services to Peterborough operate approximately every 20 minutes between Hampton and Peterborough. A limited service operates on Sundays. However, there are no connections to the neighbouring district of Orton. There is limited available data on travel to work. However, anecdotal information suggests most people travel to work by car. Those who commute to London choose to drive to Peterborough station as this improves journey times and reliability.

Inadequate parking provision is emerging as a key community issue, particularly in Hampton Vale. As the road network has not yet been adopted parking restrictions cannot be enforced. At the same time, the arrangement of parking and garages to the rear of housing is not always successful. Residents use garages/rear parking areas for storage or for a second car and opt to park on the street. The lack of dedicated on-street parking provision (and general shortage of parking) contributes to rush-hour congestion and interferes with the bus service. Bus operators have recently threatened to cease operations unless this issue can be resolved.

Proposals to promote integration and accessibility across Cambridge:

(emerging from stakeholder consultation)

- Reduce the need for travel (in new and existing neighbourhoods) through promoting mixed use;
- Public transport (trains, buses and park & ride) to be made more cycle friendly;
- Promote cycle priority and improved cycleway maintenance across the sub-region;
- Revenues (e.g. from parking and congestion charging) to be retained and re-invested locally;
- Involve employers and facility providers in promoting sustainable travel patterns.

Poundbury

In early days pedestrian and cycle links into/out of Poundbury were weak but this has been addressed. But Poundbury is 1 mile from Dorchester town centre – a long walk, but a feasible bike ride.

A limited bus service into Dorchester (6-8 times a day) does exist but is not very popular. In early days the Duchy tried a bus service which went right into Poundbury but, perhaps not surprisingly given the small scale of the development (under 500 homes), this did not get much patronage.

Caterham Barracks

The project includes several initiatives to try to reduce car dependency. Car parking standards have been reduced to an average of 1.5 spaces per household, and residents have to sign a covenant when they buy a property stating that they will limit their car ownership to the number of spaces which are provided on their property. Linden Homes are paying for a bus service (for the first five years) between the village, Caterham Valley and Caterham railway station. All purchasers get a £200 travel card when they buy a house, and this is renewed annually when the management charge is paid. Services run from 6.30 – 11.00 pm weekdays and 9.30 – 11.00 pm weekends. Two services run per hour and approximately 4,000 passenger trips per day are made. This benefits not just the barracks site but also other communities along the route.

Linden Homes have contributed a total of £500,000 to the bus service. It is contracted to Metro Bus. The intention was that the service would be self-supporting after five years, but it still requires subsidy. Current negotiations are seeking to persuade Surrey CC (SCC) to take over the subsidy. Note, real time travel information was to be provided, under contract by SCC, but this has never materialised and some of this money may be used for cross-subsidy.

Following the closure of the barracks and the adjacent hospital, few people work in Caterham. The majority of the working population commute out to employment centres in Croydon, Crawley or Gatwick (rail 50 mins Gatwick, 1 hr Crawley).

Key lessons

Scale of development (and integration with surrounding areas) affects the viability of public transport provision.

Many residents do not work in the nearest town centre so public transport which only goes to the town centre is of limited value in reducing commuting.

Inadequate car parking creates tension and poses potential traffic hazards. Provision of adequate accessible garaging can play an important role in reducing congestion and contributing to an attractive street scene.

Bus services require ongoing public subsidy beyond that which can be provided by the developer.

11. Green infrastructure



11.1

The provision of green infrastructure can serve a range of purposes (e.g. bio-diversity, flood attenuation, recreation and access). It can also have an important role in defining local identity. Milton Keynes in particular has used green infrastructure to establish 'corporate identity'.

11.2

We found that the green infrastructure provided in Cambourne and Hampton was particularly appreciated by local residents.

Key lessons

Green infrastructure is important, bringing environmental and social benefits. Provision should be planned at the sub-regional scale to achieve maximum benefit.

In the Cambridge Sub-region we suggest that green infrastructure should take the form of a green grid linking with the existing green network in Cambridge and providing a structuring element for new development as well as integrating established areas with the new communities.

12. Relationships with existing communities



12.1

Both local and national stakeholders argued that new development should contribute to fulfilling the needs of the existing community. This may take the form of shared infrastructure and facilities, and facilities and infrastructure can be used to create a physical link between communities and areas. This will go some way to ensuring that any dichotomy between 'old' and 'new' is reduced. It can also potentially solve the problems associated with the early provision of facilities prior to the attainment of development 'thresholds' by broadening the catchment area.

12.2

Social and community integration is key to ensuring the acceptability of new development locally, paving the way for newcomers to be welcomed, and has the potential to generate wider community cohesion, reducing the sense of 'us and them'. The provision of sporting facilities at Caterham Barracks (in particular the youth skate boarding facility) fulfilled a need within the surrounding area and has been instrumental in the integration of the new development with the surrounding area. It has also provided a focus, bringing people from adjoining neighbourhoods into the new area. Similarly, the sharing of facilities (such as schools and doctors' surgeries) between areas or grid squares in Milton Keynes has been instrumental in generating a sense of community which transcends neighbourhood/development area boundaries.

12.3

Where new development is provided to a higher standard than neighbouring existing communities (e.g. with less traffic congestion or more green areas) consideration should be given to upgrading facilities in existing areas so that they are not obvious 'poor relations' to their newer neighbours.

12.4

We recommend that in planning for new development in Cambridge, consultation on priorities, needs and aspirations of the existing community should be key in developing the vision and priorities for urban extensions, and should be ongoing as nascent communities evolve within development areas.

12.5

A particular issue in the Cambridge Sub-region is the fact that so many of the proposed new communities cross local authority and parish boundaries. This complicates decision making and day to day co-ordination and delivery of services. It can also lead to separation by governance as well as geography. This would suggest that existing parish councils may not be the most appropriate mechanism for community liaison and there may be a role for settlement based bodies which cross local boundaries and can negotiate from a position of strength with all relevant local authorities and public bodies. Stakeholders highlighted the role of Community Development Trusts in this context.

Key lessons

New development should contribute to fulfilling the needs of the existing community and its impact on existing communities should be carefully monitored.

Where new development is provided to a higher standard than neighbouring existing communities (e.g. with less traffic congestion or more green areas) consideration should be given to upgrading facilities in existing areas so that they are not obvious 'poor relations' to their newer neighbours.

We recommend that in planning for new development in Cambridge, consultation on priorities, needs and aspirations of the existing community should be key in developing the vision and priorities for urban extensions, and should be ongoing as nascent communities evolve within development areas.

Existing parish councils may not be the most appropriate mechanism for community liaison and there may be a role for settlement based bodies which cross local boundaries and can negotiate from a position of strength with all relevant local authorities and public bodies. Stakeholders highlighted the role of Community Development Trusts in this context.

13. Monitoring and delivery



Milton Keynes monitoring by MKDC

MKDC prepared quarterly and annual reports which record rates of residential and commercial completions as well as other activities funded or undertaken by MKDC. This was complemented by a significant intelligence and data collection programme including regular surveys of local residents and the business community. This information was used to help ensure that house types matched the anticipated household structure, with special innovations to cater for particular needs (elderly, disabled, students, etc).

13.5

We turn now to the question of delivery and propose:

A programme of area based development briefs (as area action plans or their equivalent) which guide the development of each new community and which should be supported by design guidance and development charters;

Area development briefs, and associated guidance and charters, should be backed by a sub-regional development framework which sets standards to be achieved across the sub-region. This does not have to be in one document. The important point is that all relevant strategies, area based development briefs and other plans for an area are well co-ordinated. Topics covered could include:

- An integrated approach to the planning of services and facilities, transport planning, green systems, sustainable construction, waste management;
- An agreed protocol for stakeholder consultation and community engagement (possibly as part of the charter production process);
- Mechanisms for community development and support to community groups;
- Long term management standards for community facilities (including open space);
- Long term management agreements for individual properties;
- A common approach to access to affordable housing;
- An integrated approach to the overall mix of households to be catered for. (In essence, should each community aim to attract the same mix of households or can/should the communities be different and still be sustainable?)

A sub-regional community facility delivery panel which is tasked with co-ordinating provision of facilities (and appropriate revenue support) across the new communities and the wider sub-region in order to ensure comparable standards of service to residents. This role could appropriately be carried out under the aegis of Cambridgeshire Horizons, but would require input from a wider range of players including the local community.

13.6

A key point which came out of both the case studies and the workshops is that effective provision of community facilities requires increased revenue spending and this applies not just in the new communities, but potentially across the sub-region. Whilst all possible sources of funding for revenue spending on community facilities need to be tapped, we believe that there is a case for exploring the use of S106 contributions to support improved provision of services not just within the new communities themselves but as part of a sub-regional upgrade of service provision. But any shopping list of planning obligations (including provision of affordable housing) must be realistic financially; with recognition that not everything which is looked for can automatically be funded by the development.



Key lessons

Monitoring

Effective delivery of sustainable mixed communities requires careful monitoring of the health of both new and existing communities.

We propose a range of key indicators of economic, social and environmental sustainability.

Cambridgeshire Horizons should review as a matter of urgency:

- What monitoring data is currently available and what additional information is required;
- How such information can be provided in a cost effective and timely manner;
- How the collection of such information should be funded;
- How monitoring information should be reported and used and its relationship to local authority annual monitoring reports.

Delivery

With regard to delivery we believe that there is a need for:

A coherent sub-regional framework which co-ordinates common standards and which should include design guidance and charter(s) to support development quality and streamline the development process;

Area or community based development briefs (area action plans) and charters which set out a distinctive vision for each new settlement and the way this vision is to be delivered. This will be based on sub-regional core principles but will reflect the distinct characteristics of each new settlement;

A sub-regional community facility delivery panel which seeks to ensure adequate and timely provision of community facilities across the sub-region, including in the new communities. This panel should include community representatives and service providers and should have particular responsibility for promoting good practice and ensuring that sufficient revenue is in place to properly resource facilities provided.

13.1

It will be important to collect information which allows the development partners (local authorities, landowners and housing providers) to assess the success in delivering mixed and sustainable communities. This should flag up the need to take early action where appropriate if sustainability targets are not being met.

13.2

In measuring the success of sustainable communities, monitoring must look across the board at the 'health and sustainability' of both the new communities and their existing counterparts in the villages and the city. If the new communities thrive at the expense of existing neighbourhoods then their impact in enhancing the status of Cambridge as a world city will be limited. The objective must be to raise standards for all. Only thus can a comprehensive delivery framework be put in place which will provide adequate revenue support from service providers to back-up the quality capital investment within the new communities.

13.3

Information collected has to be timely, targeted and readily comprehensible. Discussion with stakeholders established a long list of possible indicators relating back to the ODPM definition of factors which contribute to a sustainable community (see Appendix 1). It will be seen that data is more readily available on some indicators than others. In some instances it is possible to draw on nationally published datasets. In others the local authorities (in co-operation with housing providers) will need to collect tailored information locally. In others it will be necessary to undertake one-off (but repeatable) qualitative surveys of residents and local businesses in order to provide more subtle information on consumer satisfaction and lifestyle indicators than can be obtained from statistical analysis.

13.4

There is a balance to be struck between measuring what is easy and measuring what is important – and they do not always go hand in hand. It has not been possible within the scope of this project to provide a comprehensive analysis of possible monitoring options. We do, however, recommend that Cambridgeshire Horizons review as a matter of urgency:

- What monitoring data is currently available and what additional information is required;
- How such information can be provided in a cost effective and timely manner;
- How the collection of such information should be funded;
- How monitoring information should be reported and used and the frequency of its collection and analysis;
- The relationship between monitoring progress in the new communities and the annual monitoring reports produced by the local authorities involved.

Appendix I: Monitoring indicators

1. Progress with development

Indicator	Measure	Source
Planning consents granted	Progress against targets – production of trajectories	Local authority data (will require bespoke reports at sub local authority level) <i>Monitoring reports generally produced on an annual basis</i>
Dwelling starts and completions	Progress against targets – production of trajectories	Cambridgeshire County Council Annual Monitoring Survey <i>Monitored on an annual basis</i>
Mixed community	Mix of tenures achieved against target (affordable and market) Mix of dwelling type achieved (size and type) Way in which mixed tenure is delivered	Local authority data (will require bespoke reports at sub local authority level) <i>Can be monitored on an annual basis</i>
Provision of facilities	Progress against programme	Local authority data (will require bespoke reports at sub local authority level) <i>Inputs from service providers required</i>
Employment space	Progress against targets	Local authority data (will require bespoke reports at sub local authority level) <i>Usually monitored on an annual basis</i>

2. Marketability

Indicator	Measure	Source
House prices and turnover	Relative changes in house prices	HMLR data on price changes and transaction levels www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk – (Neighbourhood Profile) <i>Updated with information from Land Registry – although lag (3 years) in data assembly</i> www.landreg.gov.uk/propertyprice/interactive/ppr_ualbs.asp <i>Updated regularly/at least annually</i>
Vacancies and void periods in affordable stock	Time taken to occupy vacant properties and, if available, applicants through choice based lettings	Data from affordable housing providers <i>Should be available on annual basis</i>
Quality/range of employers and facility providers		Will require local monitoring of take-up of employment space and provision of facilities <i>Should be available on an annual basis</i>

3. Active, inclusive, safe

Indicator	Measure	Source
Household composition	Percentages of different household types Change over time	Census and others <i>Based on Census data – updated every 10 years</i> Census should be supplemented by more regular bespoke surveys and/or use of NHSR data
Population age structure	Elderly, children, youth and working age population	www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk <i>Based on Census data – updated every 10 years</i> Census should be supplemented by more regular bespoke surveys and/or use of NHSR data and/or other secondary indicators (e.g. changing school roles etc)
Ethnic/religious mix	Proportional	www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk – (People & Society) <i>Based on Census data – updated every 10 years</i> Census should be supplemented by more regular bespoke surveys
Wellbeing of community	Specific indicators from Index of Multiple Deprivation (e.g. education, health, economic) Unemployment rates, qualifications, skills, participation in education, benefit claimants, teenage pregnancy	IMD and other statistics from government and local sources <i>Some data will be Census based but other information (e.g. unemployment rates, participation in education, benefit claimants, various health indicators) are available more frequently – many annually</i>
Local school performance	KS2 aggregate score (primary schools) Percentage with 5 or more GCSEs (grades A-C) (secondary school)	http://www.upmystreet.com/ Gives results for schools within/closest to post code <i>Updated annually – OFSTED Reports</i>
Crime/anti-social behaviour stats	Incidents per 1,000 – important to identify patterns and changes and geographical variations	http://www.upmystreet.com/ For local authority crime stats per 1,000 population <i>Updated annually with stats from the Home Office</i> See also www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk <i>Notifiable offences (LA level) updated every 2 years (latest 2003/4)</i>
Traffic accidents	Per 10,000 population	http://www.upmystreet.com/ see overview of council traffic accidents (available at local authority level only) www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk Traffic accidents to LA level <i>Data supplied by Department of Transport – updated every 2 years. Latest data for 2003</i>
Leisure, sport, cultural facilities	Facilities per 1,000 population (including consideration of elderly and youth) Measures of participation	LPA data <i>Not usually audited/updated frequently</i> May also require local surveys
Health of community	Percentage of general health good Percentage of households with one or more person with limiting long term illness	www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk – (Health & Care) <i>Based on Census data – updated every 10 years</i>
Participation in activities	Number and variety of local clubs/voluntary groups Membership of clubs/groups	Local authority working with voluntary sector
Number of local voluntary agencies	Membership of local community associations, number of active management trusts etc	Through survey of local organisations and/or resident survey
Anti-social behaviour	Incidence of graffiti and vandalism	Police data and also direct feedback from community on perceptions of anti-social behaviour
Community perspective	Views of the community as place to live and work	Requires bespoke local resident and business survey
Car ownership	Percentage of households with car	Census data supplemented by local surveys <i>Census data – updated every 10 years</i>
Journey to work	Distance and mode	Census data supplemented by local surveys <i>Available at ward level</i>

Monitoring indicators

Indicator	Measure	Source
Modal split		LPA/county transport planning authority data
CO2 emissions		Local authorities are required to carry out reviews and assessment of air quality on an annual basis
Flood incidence		Environment Agency data and s.105 mapping Updated in response to flood incidence
Sustainable construction	Could be percentage of modern methods of construction	Information from developers and housing associations
Sustainable homes	Percentage of lifelong homes standard Use of energy through life of buildings (residential and non-residential)	Information from developers and housing associations
Ecohomes standards	Proportion of buildings attaining Ecohomes 'very good' and above	Information from developers and housing associations
Design codes	Proportion of development designed in accordance with design codes	Planning authority to monitor – but would expect to be picked up at grant of planning permission

4. Well connected

Indicator	Measure	Source
Journey to school	Percentage by means other than car	Local surveys – work with schools
Average journey to work	Kilometres per worker	LPA/county transport planning data
Length of cycle and pedestrian network	Kilometres per dwelling	LPA data
Public transport frequency and reliability	Buses per hour Percentage of journeys to timetable	Bus operator data
Broadband connectivity	Proportion of development with broadband access	Information from service providers

5. Thriving, flourishing diverse economy

Indicator	Measure	Source
Local employment opportunities	Number of jobs/economically active – employee and self-employed	Annual Business Inquiry provides information on employee jobs on an annual basis (Nomis website) Information on self-employed from Census and Labour Force Survey <i>Information available annually (Labour Force Survey – quarterly)</i>
Dwelling starts and completions	Progress against targets – production of trajectories	Can purchase bespoke reports from organisations (e.g. CACI and ASHE) <i>Frequency as required</i>
Occupation	Employment by occupation percentage	Annual Business Inquiry www.nomisweb.co.uk <i>Available by ward</i>
Unemployment and long term unemployed	Unemployment (as percentage of population), broken down by age, gender and duration	http://www.upmystreet.com See also www.nomisweb.co.uk <i>Unemployment count available monthly, Labour Force Survey provides some contextual information on an annual basis but Census remains best source of the complete picture of the make up and economic activity of population</i>
Economic activity	Percentage of the population (by gender) who are economically active	Labour Force Survey – see www.nomisweb.co.uk <i>Available from Labour Force Survey – quarterly/annually</i>
Financial support for voluntary sector	Public and private sector contribution to voluntary sector	Through survey of local organisations
Disabled access	Percentage of wheelchair accessible housing achieved	Developer and housing association feedback
Public support for affordable housing	Subsidy per unit – intermediate and affordable rent separately	Data from Housing Corporation <i>Should be available on an annual basis</i>