CREATE streets

...or (put differently) is this correct?

10th June 2017
Key points

1. Increasingly the **data** is there telling you where people are happy and what they like. Good places can be measured.

2. **Don’t get fixated on one thing. Be wide not narrow.** Encourage planners to see health and wellbeing in the round.

3. **Trust your instincts and other people** – ‘popular design not good design’

4. **Create Boulevards**: could Lewisham Way be a better place?

5. **Certainty** of permitted volume & affordable housing required – process

6. **Flexibility on rules that hinder urbanism.** Town before light. **Squeeze** the plans to get proper urbanism.
A reminder: process often first!

“It’s just great – so much better”
Resident of Myatts Fields talking to Create Streets-led residents group, Spring 2016

“All the residents wanted was to get away from the estate mentality and link in to the local community and use traditional materials. We’ve just about done that”
Jan Durbridge, Chair of local residents committee, Packington Estate, Islington

“the decision-making process for the regeneration of West Hendon was a consultation that was an ultimatum: you either take it or there is a bus going that way. We were not allowed to take part in the decision-making process.”
Derrick Chung, chair of the West Hendon Residents’ Association

One thing that is uncontroversial is that it tends to be stressful – even when it goes well

“Ten years ago or so ago I worked on the Ferrier Estate in Greenwich, employed by Greenwich to regenerate. This was when it was said, “No, no, we are never going to pull it down.” The minute my job ended, the work started to pull it down. Residents were told that they would be able to come back. What Greenwich did not mention was that they would have to win the lottery in order to do so.”
Roy Tindle, chair of the London Thames Gateway Forum

CREATE streets
“architecture and planning does not have an empirical, evidence-based tradition in the sense that psychologists or the … sciences would understand.

There are very few studies that ever go back to look at whether one type of dwelling or another, or one type of office or another, has a systematic impact on how people behave, or feel, or interact with one another”

David Halpern, Director of Behavioural Insight Unit, Cabinet Office
1. Street Score – using 11 categories of data

- Back testing with value & IMD
- Will do with health metrics as well
1. Street Score – and 25 underlying variables

- Density of street trees
- Distance to heritage park
- Distance to normal park
- Amount of public green space
- Diversity of house types
- Weighted offering of terraced & semi-detached
- Building height (wealth)
- Closeness
- Connected node ratio
- Intersection density
- Diversity of amenities
- Land use mix
- Block size
- Etc.....
1. Renwick Road, Barking IG11

StreetScore: 29 (min)

‘beta’ score – further calibration required
1. Winchat Road, SE28 0DZ

StreetScore: 52 (3rd quartile)

‘beta’ score – further calibration required
1. Manor Lane, SE13 5QP

StreetScore: 79 (max)

'beta' score – further calibration required
1. Street Score ‘pro’

- You can either change the weighting or turn ‘off’ some variables

- Or you can model interventions in the built environment... for eg
  - More / fewer street trees
  - Adding height
  - Adding more front doors
  - Increasing / decreasing local amenity diversity
  - Traffic & air quality

- And for more detailed / localised versions (beyond big data)
  - Pavements
  - Traffic treatment
### About 10 urban form criteria can predict 40% to 60% of IMD, value & stated wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greenery</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Tree" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Homes</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Height</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Ruler" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Connectivity &amp; streets</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Network" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Land use</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Puzzle" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Blocks</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Blocks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Space</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Space" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Beauty &amp; design</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Paint" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Facades</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Facade" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Density</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Density" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What makes a place? Be wide not narrow
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Greenery</strong></td>
<td>6. <strong>Blocks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Homes</strong></td>
<td>7. <strong>Space</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>8. <strong>Beauty &amp; design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Connectivity</strong> &amp; streets</td>
<td>9. <strong>Facades</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td>10. <strong>Density</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About 10 urban form criteria can predict 40 % to 60% of IMD, value & stated wellbeing**

**Creating streets**

*Light often dominates*
2. Data on links place to wellbeing

1. **Greenery.** Frequent green spaces inter-woven into the city either as private gardens, communal gardens or well-overlooked public spaces between blocks and where people really need them and frequent them. Large parks are necessary but need not be ubiquitous. Lots of street trees;

2. **Homes.** Somewhere between the very real and valued advantages of suburban living but at greater densities (think terraces of houses with some flats) and without the long commutes and consequent isolation. Children preferably in houses not flats. As many houses as possible;

3. **Height.** Most buildings at human scale height. Sparing use of residential towers and only in city centres for the small number of people who seek them. No children in high rise;

4. **Connectivity and streets.** Streets that ‘plug into’ the surrounding city. A well-connected, highly walkable, traditional street pattern of differing types and sizes with multiple junctions and route choices. Some pedestrian or bicycle only streets, but mostly mixed with generous pavements.

5. **Land use.** Mixed use of residential, commercial and retail wherever possible and where traffic implications can be managed. Retail nearly always interspaced with commercial and dotted around primarily residential as far as density permits;

6. **Blocks.** Blocks neither too big nor too long. Buildings that appear to be buildings not entire blocks. Narrow fronts with many doors and strong ‘sense of the vertical’ to break up the scale of terraced blocks. Clear fronts, backs and internal private or communal gardens inside blocks. No deck access;

7. **Space.** Minimal internal semi-private space. No residential corridors. As few doors as possible off the same ‘core.’ External open space normally less than about 90m in breadth

8. **Beauty and design.** Beauty really matters. Ignoring aesthetic appeal is missing a key trick. Must have a strong sense of place, which normally (but not always) references a place’s history through materials or style. A variety of street types, design, green spaces. Streets that bend and flex with contours of the landscape. Some surprises. Not designed by committee

9. **Facades.** No long blank walls but frequent front doors (ideally with modest front gardens) or shop fronts. ‘Walking architecture’ is more popular, more complex and more valuable than ‘driving architecture.’ Some front doors should have steps for social and public health reasons

10. **Density.** Enough density to be walkable but not to be overwhelming, to undermine wellbeing, or to create high long-term maintenance costs. About fifty-220 homes per hectare
2. The ‘perfect’ urban development? CREATE streets
2. Developers are often using the words but... calling it gardens doesn’t make it a garden

This is a garden
2. Calling it a square doesn’t make it a square

The new Malaysia Square – ask a passing six year old to define a square. You may not get this
2. Calling it a village doesn’t make it a village

Kiddbrooke Village & a real village

This is not a village

This is a village
2. Calling it ‘human scale’ does not make it so

The architects of this described it, with no apparent irony, as ‘human scale.’

This begs the question – which humans did they have in mind?
2. Why do most people on social media laugh at this?

- Greenery – YES
- Implied connectivity – YES
- But what about homes, height, facades, space and beauty?
2. This ticks lots of design boxes... & is prize-winning

Elephant & Castle

- Does beauty matter?
- Do facades matter?
2. These have just been built round the corner

Elephant & Castle
2. Does block structure matter? - what’s a front and back?

Elephant & Castle
2. Green is good for you . . . . normally

Green is good…

- Famous study by Ulrich, showed patients recover better with view of natural scene.
- 9 studies correlate vegetation with lower levels of crime & expected crime.
- Communal gardens & actually gardening can be associated with higher happiness, wellbeing.
- View of greenery gives 5-30% more value.
- Studies link street trees with reduction in speed and crashes, improvement of air quality and of both mental and physical health.

…except when it isn’t

- 8 studies that associate levels of greenery with higher fear and more fear of crime – specifically with denser vegetation. One study does correlate with higher crime.
- Beyond 2-3 blocks people visit parks far less. (US)
- Focus groups suggest preference for personal space vs communal.
- Some popular & complex have unsustainable running costs.
- Health correlates most with scenicness (sic) rather than greenery.
- Consideration must be given to relationship with rest of built environment.

Answer is: Little & Often & Cost-effective to manage
2. Amount & nature of greenery

Tend to be good:
(popular, better wellbeing, higher value over time, sufficient density)

- Little & often
- Views of nature that you actually see
- Safe green space - public well observed
- Clearly public, private or private/communal
- Street trees
- Private or micro-communal performs most crucial role.

Some of the evidence

- **Wellbeing.** Consistent biophilic evidence that green views calming and restorative.
- **Trees.** Controlled observations found correlation between street trees & reduction in anti-depressants
- **Crime.** Buildings, blocks & residents that face more green space had less crime and more sociability
- **Value.** Homes that face green space worth from 3–34% more
- BUT.... popularity. UK flat residents in RIBA focus groups wanted to trade off public for private or private/communal
- Similarly US evidence shows most New Yorkers very rarely visit Central Park. Modest bits of private & public greenery impact more people

Source: Create Streets Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Total number of studies</th>
<th>% showing high rise ‘bad’</th>
<th>% showing no link</th>
<th>% showing high rise ‘good’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with home</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of mental strain, crowing, stress, optimism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression and more serious mental health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural problems for children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of crime</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro or anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of social engagement and social capital</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s’ progress in high-rise</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"the literature suggests that high-rises are less satisfactory than other housing forms for most people, that they are not optimal for children, that social relations are more impersonal and helping behaviour is less than in other housing forms, that crime and fear of crime are greater, and that they may independently account for some suicides”

Professor Robert Gifford literature review

Vancouver high rise residents ...
- less likely than those living in detached homes to know their neighbours’ names - 56% to 81%
- Less likely to have done them a favour - 23% to 48%
- Less likely to trust them - 40% to 60%
- Less likely to believe that their wallet would be returned if lost locally - 55% to 68%
2. Streets are good for you . . .


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of 82 studies examining height or size &amp; some aspect of wellbeing or contentment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67 studies show negative correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 studies do not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental health (UK, 1967)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military families randomly assigned: houses vs. flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of neurosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of going to doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of specialist referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK study (1977): children in high rise suffered more behavioural problems (control on gender &amp; economic status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US study (1982): boys in 14 vs 3 storeys had more hyperactivity &amp; hostility (not girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese study: dressing, helping, lavatory usage all slower to develop in high-rise children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-social behaviour (UK, 1981)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faeces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Create Streets Research
2. Most non-residents actively hate high rise

### London-based recent evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Storey Range</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2015, Oval</td>
<td>- 8 storeys or below</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 9 storeys or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2015, Kingston</td>
<td>- 9 storeys or below</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 10 storeys or above</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Storey Range</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004, Packington</td>
<td>- Wanted 3-5 storey</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Opposed &gt; 8 storey</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supported traditional streets</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Local support for</td>
<td>Block &amp; towers</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPSOS, ING, Stewart, Policy Exchange, Dunleavy, 2001 census
2. This is confirmed by recent MORI polling.
2. People normally prefer human scale for themselves

Evidence from formal surveys, 1967 – 2013 & 2001 census, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A house</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tower block</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A modern apartment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents not wanting tower blocks built near them (2001)</th>
<th>2013 respondents wanting to live in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents wanting to live in high rise apartment (2005)</td>
<td>A house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A small apartment (&lt;10 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A large apartment (&gt;10 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPSOS, ING, Stewart, Policy Exchange, Dunleavy, 2001 census
2. Lower Rise: Better for children, community, bad for criminals?

Create Streets: evidence from controlled studies, 1976 - 2007

1. Makes bringing up children harder

- Mothers on Cruddas Park Estate reporting issues with ‘play, health or personalities of kids’
  - Above 6th floor: 62
  - Below 6th floor: 53
  - In house: 2

2. Inhuman scale discourages behaving well to your neighbours

- In two studies of US students in high, medium, low-rise halls, stamped addressed envelopes returned & donations made inverse ratio to height
- Israeli study: less ‘social support’ & ‘involvement’
- Third study: less ‘community’ & ‘membership’

3. Increases the ease of crime

- 1975 comparison of crime in high vs. low rise estates
  - In flats: 14
  - Outside flats: 28
  - Semi-private space: 604

Source: Gittus, Gifford, Newman, Create Streets
2. Big buildings not cheap to run in long term

Shakespeare Tower, Barbican

- Service charge £8,000 a year
- 11% of this (£880 per year per flat) is on window-cleaning alone
- C.500-700 times what the owners of most, much larger, houses would pay over twelve months to clean their windows every four to six weeks

Source: Superdenisty II Report
2. High buildings less energy efficient

Electricity per m² against storeys in Hong Kong, 2004

- Significant positive correlation between height and energy use per m²
- Every 10 storeys adds ~30kWh/m² to intensity of electricity use

Source: Professor Philip Steadman, UCL
2. Range of studies show density rarely maximised by towers

Foster & Partners, 250 City Road
- 2 towers of 36 storeys
- 7 storey buildings
- Cut off angle 82° & 85°

Equivalent GIA
- 8 storeys court
- Cut off angle only 45°

Source: Professor Philip Steadman, UCL
2. Range of studies show density not always maximised by towers

Source: Professor Philip Steadman, UCL

Grid Architects, 100 Avenue Road
- Block of 5-7 storeys
- Tower of 24 storeys

Equivalent GIA
- Slab plus court
- 11 storeys

CREATE streets
2. Towers on streets – set back & darkness

- Bishopsgate proposals
- Professor Bosselman’s San Francisco study – comfort levels reduced by 20% to 60%.

- Vancouver ‘set back’ held up as the ‘right’ way to build towers

Source: More Light More Power
Upper levels of a tower cannot integrate with surrounding streets and city life in the way in which buildings up to five or six storeys can

- Our normal field of vision is limited to 50-55° above the horizon
- We do not see much above us: When we walk we typically look down 10° - so we see even less.

In a Copenhagen study those living on the ground floor comprised only 25% of all residents, but activities in and around semi-private outdoor space in front of ground floor homes made up 55% of all outdoor activities in the neighbourhood.

Classic study: Professor Peter Bosselmann in San Francisco in 1980s.
- Modelled the likely impact on parts of the city from the expected combination of lost light and increased wind speeds due to the proposed towers.
- Calculated a loss of comfort levels for pedestrians at each of the sites – towers reduced it by between 20% and 60%
Professor Colin Ellard of the University of Waterloo in Canada has carried out virtual reality experiments on tall buildings:

- Participants wore specialised headsets and walked through a variety of urban environments created to test their emotional responses.
- The findings show that being surrounded by tall buildings produces a ‘substantial’ negative impact on mood.
- Backed up by Centre for Urban Design and Mental Health: City dwellers have a 40% increased risk of depression and double the rate of schizophrenia.
• I almost got blown over the other day walking up past the building, when I got around the corner it was fine. I was scared to go back.’

• The manager of a shirt shop opposite the Walkie Talkie added: ‘The wind is so strong on this side of the street we usually have to keep the doors closed so stop the clothes getting blown about. It’s definitely worse because of the Walkie Talkie. I remember before it was built the wind was fine.’

• In Leeds in 2011 a man was crushed to death after strong winds toppled a lorry near the city’s 32-storey Bridgewater Place (3 other injuries there since building built in 2007)

Downdraught or ‘downwash vortex’ effect at the foot of buildings.

The ‘pressure connection effect’ is most intense when there is a pattern of continuously-increasing heights.
2. Connectivity

Tend to be good
- Walkable neighbourhoods
  BUT not overly permeable connectivity (walkways etc)
- Few turns to shops & transport
- Good connections to city
- Easy to walk in, into & from
- Grid but also streets that bend & flex with landscape
- Mixed use streets, & never one-way

Some of the evidence
- Value: Old fashioned high street store in US produces 10 times as much revenue per acre as out of town store & 74 jobs per acre vs 5.9 jobs per acre
- US study: places with higher walkability = $302 more rental value per month & $82 more sales value/sq ft
- UK correlation between spatial accessibility & rateable value per square metre finds correlation of 88%
- In central London 80% of shops are located in 20% most spatially accessible streets
- Wellbeing: people happiest in controlled, predictable interactions
- One way streets have more crime, more accidents & are worth less
- Evidence more mixed on cul-de-sacs

Source: Create Streets Research
2. Connectivity & walkability

Walkability & exercise

- San Francisco (1995): traditional neighbourhood residents made 10% more non-work trips (taking account of income levels, available public transport)
- Multiple studies have backed this up:
  - Study which rated high walkability by greater land use mix, higher street connectivity and high population density found that residents took the equivalent of an additional one to two 15-13 minute walks per week
  - Residents of the most walkable neighbourhoods were nearly two and a half times more likely to get sufficient physical activity than residents of the least walkable
- Crime. Space Syntax analysis of all London crimes within a London borough over five years found that higher local movement within 300 metres of a building can reduce crime by up to 15%
- Cul-de-sacs. Small, hard to reach cul-de-sacs are vulnerable to more crime but ‘simple linear cul-de-sacs with good numbers of dwellings set into a network of through streets tend to be safe’
- Value. American city of Ashville showed that replacing an acre of box retail and parking with finely grained, mixed use, walkable city would increase sales and property tax per acre from $6,500 to $634,000 per acre whilst also increasing residents per acre from 0 to 90 and jobs per acre from 5.9 to 73.7

Source: Create Streets Research
2. Traffic, traffic and traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets for cars are bad...</th>
<th>‘Heavy’ Street</th>
<th>‘Moderate’ Street</th>
<th>‘Light’ Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles per 24 hours</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renters</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean length of residence (years)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends per person (on street)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances per person (on street)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships ‘across the street’</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"A more ‘traditional’ street pattern with a street grid of different alternative routes to the rest of the city has been associated in several studies with lower traffic-based pollution. In one study, as level of street connectivity (measured by block density) increased, some traffic-based pollutants decreased. Two other studies found that traditional street patterns reduce morning rush hours traffic by 10% or some pollutants by 57%. Perhaps most tellingly, a fourth even more carefully controlled study on over 25,000 participants found a significant inverse relationship between the number of street junctions and some pollutants. Put more starkly, blocking off too may junctions to vehicular traffic actually increases overall pollution even if it makes some streets more agreeable.”
2. Conventional blocks lead to lots of good things

- Clear blocks & fronts
- Mews
- Lower crime (Perth & London studies)
- Less traffic
- More walkable
- More useable green space

Source: Create Streets Research, Savills
2. Blocks reach surprisingly high densities…

Source: Create Streets Research, Savills
“Elders who resided on blocks with more front porches, stoops [a small staircase leading to platform and front door] and buildings built above grade had significantly better physical functioning at 24-month follow-up than did elders who resided on blocks with fewer of these architectural features. Although these same three “front entrance” built-environment features were associated with higher levels of social support at baseline, which sequentially were associated with psychological distress and physical functioning, almost all of the total relationship between “front entrance” features and physical functioning, almost all of the total relationship between “front entrance” features and physical functioning was attributable to their direct relationship with physical functioning. In contrast, three other built-environment features—window area, low sill height, and ground-floor parking—had only indirect and negative relationships with elders’ physical functioning at 24 months.

Additional analyses revealed that almost all (84%) of the total relationship between the “front entrance” variable and physical functioning was attributable to its direct relationship with physical functioning, with the indirect pathway through social support and psychological distress accounting for the remaining 16%.


.... But of course we've all but banned steps since 1999
2. Blocks reach surprisingly high densities...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (example area in London)</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
<th>Homes/ hectare</th>
<th>Habitable rooms/ hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Terraced houses (Victorian/ suburban e.g. Wandsworth)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>~50</td>
<td>~250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Terraced houses (Georgian format e.g. Kennington)</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>~75</td>
<td>~300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Terraced houses plus a few flats (e.g. Notting Hill)</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td>~300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mixture of flats plus some terraced houses (e.g. Pimlico)</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>~175</td>
<td>~525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Terraced flats (e.g. Ladbroke Grove)</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>~220</td>
<td>~600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Create Streets Research, Savills
2. Street-based regeneration has highest returns in one study

**‘Complete Streets’ research for Cabinet Office**

In a 2014 study, six post-war London estates in different zones were ‘re-planned’ along street-based & contemporary lines and analysed for density & value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Density, units / ha</th>
<th>Comparison to streets-based, %</th>
<th>Non-first sales Value, £m / ha</th>
<th>Comparison to streets-based, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current built form</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Contemporary’ regeneration</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets-based regeneration</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On average street-based estate regeneration provided about 10% less development but 40-50% more value.
- This was most true for larger sites in outer zones.
- This was least true for smaller sites in inner zones.

Source: Create Streets Research, Savills
2. Old homes are worth more?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre 1919, terraced house</th>
<th>Pre 1919, flat or maisonette</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price, £’000</td>
<td>Price, £’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price in 1983</td>
<td>Price in 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price in 2013</td>
<td>Price in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in price</td>
<td>Increase in price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post 1960, terraced house</th>
<th>Post 1960, flat or maisonette</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price, £’000</td>
<td>Price, £’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price in 1983</td>
<td>Price in 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price in 2013</td>
<td>Price in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in price</td>
<td>Increase in price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Halifax UK Prince Index
2. Urban morphology & value and IMD

Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House type detached [C]</td>
<td>30.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House type semi-detached [C]</td>
<td>60.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering of pre-1900 properties</td>
<td>5.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection density</td>
<td>3.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. no. bedrooms [C]</td>
<td>5.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest her. park</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest listed building</td>
<td>4.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehold or leasehold [C]</td>
<td>4.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House type terraced [C]</td>
<td>4.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest metro station</td>
<td>3.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all green areas</td>
<td>22.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of transport modes</td>
<td>17.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest forest</td>
<td>15.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New build [C]</td>
<td>8.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>8.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of amenities</td>
<td>8.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density (DA)</td>
<td>-3.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street centrality</td>
<td>-3.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest bus stop</td>
<td>-5.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest park</td>
<td>-6.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest rail station</td>
<td>-13.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox. to closest rec. ground</td>
<td>-10.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index of Multiple deprivation

- Population density
- % of unbuilt land
- Density of bus stops
- Street centrality
- Density of dead-ends
- Diversity of amenities
- Density of train stations
- % of green areas
- % of heritage parks
- Connectivity
- Density of metro stations
- Offering of pre-1900 properties
- Diversity of house types

Explanatory power = 72%

Significance test = pass.

Source: Create Streets
2. Facades impact behaviour...

Volunteers posed as lost tourists at both locations. They stood on the pavement, looking confused and with an open map. The 'lost tourists' did not approach anyone. They waited for random passers-by to offer help.

- 10% of passers-by offered help at active facade
- 2.2% of passers-by offered help at active façade
- Seven times as many at the active site offered to let our 'tourist' use their phone (7% versus 1%).
- Four times as many offered to actually lead our tourist to their destination (4% vs 1%).

Source: Happy City Project
2. Is beauty subjective or objective?

Self reporting on where people feel
- Very good
- Good
- Bad
- Very bad

Type of house that attracted the most positive responses

Only location in a neighbourhood characterised by 'bad feeling' responses which attracted 'very good' feelings

Source: Yodan Rofe, Planum
2. Does beauty matter?

A 2011 survey of 27,000 respondents in ten US cities found stronger correlations between a place’s physical beauty and people’s satisfaction with their communities than any other attributes. It had, for example, a correlation of 0.560 with overall place happiness, 0.534 with city satisfaction and 0.510 on recommending a city as a place to live for family and friends. Factors such as ‘overall economic security’ came no where close.

A 2008-2010 Gallup survey of 43,000 people in 26 cities agreed. It found that residents’ ratings of the aesthetic attraction of their cities and green spaces correlated significantly with residents’ attachment to their city. This is turn correlated with GDP growth. In this survey, aesthetic attraction to their city came third in the pecking order behind ‘Social Offerings’ (what there was to do) and ‘Openness’ (perception of openness to different types of resident) as a predictor of attachment. However, it still ranked above education, basic services or safety. A third study has also found that a perception of beauty is significantly associated with community satisfaction and significantly more important than individual demographic characteristics.
3. Trust people – look at views on new housing…

Politicians have been asking the wrong question – not how do you build more homes but how do you make new homes more popular

### Housing preferences by age, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred home, %</th>
<th>Would consider buying newly built home, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### And why….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Advantages/ Disadvantages of New Homes vs Older Homes</th>
<th>Net Advantage (+)/ Disadvantage (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing costs (e.g. maintenance/ utility bills)</td>
<td>+43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to customise/ tailor</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of build</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space efficiency/ layout/ storage</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations on offer</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resale value</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaciousness/ size of rooms</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of green space/ trees/ garden</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character/ distinctive features</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: RIBA, HOA, Yougov*
3. Trust people - people say design matters

What people want, Savills research

- Design trumps ‘rational’ factors

Source: Savills

CREATE streets

2002 CABE Survey

"Architects should concentrate on designing buildings which appeal to as many people as possible.*

"New buildings should be adventurous and different, even if they shock or offend some people*
Q2 I am now going to show you five different types of new housing... to what extent would you support or oppose the building of new homes similar to the photo in your local area on brownfield land?

Type A (Derwenthorpe) 73% 12%
Type B (South London) 23% 61%
Type C (Poundbury) 75% 12%
Type D (Bude) 51% 31%
Type E (East London) 34% 46%

Key: Strongly/ tend to support
Strongly/ tend to oppose

NB – Respondents asked to review initial screen of all five images for a minute before rating each image individually (and order randomised for each respondent) – see methodology note.

Base: 1,000 adults aged 15+ in Great Britain. Fieldwork dates 15-31 May 2015

Source: Ipsos MORI / Create Streets
3. Trust people: preferences in larger buildings

Evidence from polling & surveys, 2002-09, %

Non-residential
- Those preferring options 2 or 3
  - 77%
- Those preferring options 1 or 4
  - 23%

Residential
- Respondents wanting to live in modern non traditional house
  - 1998 poll
    - 5
  - 2002 poll
    - 3
  - 2005 poll*
    - 20

* Sample was self-selected & probably not fully representative

Source: YouGov, Adam Architects
Q1: Which of these would you most want to see built on an urban street very near to where you or a close friend live? (order randomised in Pop-up Poll)

- "CGI" of Georgian-inspired terrace
- "Pastiche" of Victorian housing built in 1999
- "New London Vernacular" housing just built*
- Innovative housing just built*

**CREATE streets**

*Prize-winning. Total of nine awards for these two options*
3. Trust people: Mount Pleasant Circus

- 99% support in local survey of 258 residents
- Developer’s comment: “very beautiful. You’ll never get it through planning.”
- Local comment: “the whole of London would fight for Mount Pleasant Circus”

Source: Mount Pleasant Circus, Create Streets (Oct 2014)
3. Trust people: favourite Street Competition

Grey Street, Newcastle – 20.7%

Hope Street, Liverpool – 14.5%

Victoria Street, Edinburgh – 8.4%

Lamb’s Conduit Street, London WC1 – 7.9%

CREATE streets

CREATE streets
What do you think should be the height limit for Kingston Town Centre?

• 3-6 storeys: 39%
• 7-9 storeys: 43%
• 10-15 storeys: 9%
• Above 16 storeys: 8%

What type of character area would you most like Kingston Town to emulate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansion block above shops</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-London residential</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative modern</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London warehouse</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern medium rise</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern high rise</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern shopping centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your favourite type of London neighbourhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London suburban</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-London residential</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre flats over shops</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern high-rise residential development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern shopping centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Trust people - popular design increases value

Design & value, 2016 Dutch study

- 60,000 housing transactions from 1995-2014
- Vinex programme of walkable town extensions
- Pure neo-traditional sold a value premium of 15%
- Houses which referred to traditional design sold at premium of 5%
- Not a reflection of higher incomes of residents
- 2% discount when more supply – economics trumps place effect?

Source: Create Streets Research
3. Residents simulating estate re-design with architects – it can be done CREATE streets
3. Residents’ master plan through co-design – it can be done

CREATE streets

- One option for how a block-based, connected network of streets might work

- New streets must be safe for children with wide pavements and space for bikes

- Buildings in black should be kept
  - Terraced houses
  - Children's Centre

- Implies a new urban square to east of kept buildings

- Other blocks should have mix of private and communal gardens inside
Create Boulevards events
Not a new idea....

Boulevards plan for London

Stephen Bull, Metro | Sunday 9 July 2003 | 0 comments

Las Ramblas: London's boulevards could rival Barcelona's.

A radical redesign of London could see some of its busiest streets transformed into Parisian-style boulevards. Pedestrianised zones lined with trees and cafes are planned at 100 key sites across the capital.

London boulevards.

London is going in for boulevards, but it is doubtful whether they will bear a striking resemblance to the gay, cafe-lined thoroughfares of her bright rival across the Channel. But the experiment is to be made in aboriculture by the County Council early in the new year, when trees will be planted in the new avenues of Aldwych and Kingsway. Two hundred and fifty ailantus and plane trees are to be planted out in these two thoroughfares. Doubt is expressed whether the acacias will stand the English climate, but those along the Thames Embankment have been found to prosper, so the County Fathers are hopeful. The Strand, in its widest part, will be planted with plane trees, and when the new Parisian cafe is opened on the site of Simenson's famous old restaurant, visitors to London may imagine themselves somewhere in the neighbourhood of the Place de l'Opera; if they only happen to strike there between fogs and showers.
Where could we have boulevards?
Do we have boulevards today?
We have so many options for intensification
We have so many options for beautification
Crowd-sourcing boulevards

Location: St John Street, EC1M
Suggested by @Mr_Bricolage & @SusanLowenthal

Location: Holloway Road, Islington
Suggested by @Mr_Bricolage & @SusanLowenthal

Location: Clapham Road, Lambeth
Suggested by @KeaneMJ

Location: Rye Lane, Peckham, SE15.
Suggested by @TamsieThomson

Location: Rushey Green, Catford, SE6.
Suggested by @Myles_Bartoli

Location: Euston Road, NW1.
Suggested by @richmondie
Back to the future? Pavements and trees
Back to the future? Trams and express busses
Euston Arch as a tram station

CREATE streets
Tactical urbanism in June 2017
Mini charrettes in June 2017
Kingsway with trams

- Outdoor cafe seating on left side of street
- Tram in central boulevard
- Fewer vehicle lanes - taxis and buses only?
- Amenity zone added (benches and planting) along kerb edge
- Flower market shown on right side of street
- Wonderful plane trees retained of course!
Lewisham Way?
Lewisham Way?
Lewisham Way?
4. Regulation in London is not new

- 1189 – First building code, Henry FitzAlwyn – thickness & height of party walls – mainly against fire

- 1212 – Further codes against fire hazards (ale houses, in favour of stone, against thatch etc)

- Elizabethan restrictions on building near to city

- 1605 – James I that all new houses of brick or stone & none within one mile of City boundary

- 1619 – more precise rules on construction

- 1667 – Act for Rebuilding of London – with four distinct types of house, height restrictions, storey heights, materials, thickness of party walls

- 1707, 1724, 1774 Acts

- 1844 Metropolitan Building Act simpler than C18th Acts (hence greater variety of C19th buildings)
  - Streets at least 40 ft wide
  - Buildings not to be higher than width of street
4. 1774 Building Act (1 of 2)

- Following on from 1667 & 1707 Acts
- 1774 Act defined seven rates of house by
  - land area
  - Height
  - Number of storeys
  - Rental value
  - Thickness of party & external walls
- Materials ("brick, stone, artificial stone, copper, tin, slate, tile or iron")
- Obliging windows to be set in recessed reveals
- Proportions of bow windows, shop windows, cornices
- Wooden decorations only on shop windows and frontispieces to doorways

Building manuals and builders then just followed this...
Peter Nicholson, *The New & Improved Practical Builder*, 1823

First Rate House

- Role of George Dance the Younger
- Sir Robert Taylor

CREATE streets
Peter Nicholson, *The New & Improved Practical Builder*, 1823

Second, Third and Fourth Rate Houses
Codes (in varying degrees) form a key component of development control in Germany, Netherlands and France which consistently manage to build many more homes than UK without equivalent level of political controversy.

From first use of form-based code in US in 1981 (in area where no US City code or planning regulations) now many >300 form based codes in US & Canadian cities.

In 2010 Miami, became first major US city to replace historic zoning code with form-based code.

US Department of Defence has recently switched to using them.

**Design codes being used (increasingly) in rest of world**
A 2006 UK Government assessment of 15 different Design Codes contrasted to 4 non coded approaches found that:

- “Significantly, where codes are being implemented on site, schemes have been delivering enhanced sales values and increased land values. When set off against the up-front investment, this to a large degree determines the value added by coding, at least in crude economic terms. The qualitative evidence suggests that the outcome is positive, and for commercial partners, over the long-term, codes seem to be more than paying for themselves.”

- However, same research also found that some public bodies found the greater effort (and cost) often required up-front harder to justify.

Source: UCL, DCLG
4. Example: Seaside, Florida

Case study – Seaside, Florida
- First example of use of form based code
- Was initially widely derided
- Lots were sold
- But it has built the type of variety within a pattern, popular place that people love
- Value of Seaside real estate has increased faster than equivalent areas in Florida
- Lots sold for $15,000 in 1982
- One bedroom cottage just sold for $1.5m
- Flats above shops sell for $800,000 – in last 50 years a hard form to sell in US
- Trip Advisor consistently gives its 5 star ratings ("magical seaside village")
- In fact it is criticised now for lack of diversity which is function of its success & rarity value

Variety within a pattern, popular & valuable

Source: Street Design
4. Example: Melrose Arch, South Africa

Case study – Melrose Arch, Johannesburg

- 18 hectare brownfield site: Johannesburg, SA
- Overall development rights 330,000SqM (228k offices, 40k shops, 30k hotels, 15k residential
- First local development for over 60yrs to create interconnected streets – key to high quality & popular public realm
- Strong ‘one code–many hands’ master plan permitting variation within street-based design code & inclusive use of diverse architects firms
- Complex mixed use with tree-lined boulevard, a main street & two urban squares

Despite very moderate physical location

- Site value increased significantly above market trend (R1.3b to R4.5b in 6 yrs, 254%)
- “widely regarded as one of SA’s most profitable real estate assets” Business Day
- Site now has highest rentals in South Africa (R175/m² to R210/m²) vs.~R140/m² for previous highest value site, Waterfront (which has prime situation unlike Melrose Arch)

- Interesting dense mixed use streets creating high quality public realm. Result of a strong design code to ensure diversity within cohesive plan
- First genuinely mixed used, street-based in Johannesburg for 60 years. It has far outstripped market commercially due to its huge popularity as a place to live, eat, work and shop
- Free access to all in the open street system, unheard of in new development in Johannesburg at time. Public transport brought into the development along the boulevard, to give more direct access to workforce from townships

Source: Interview with developers, investors and urban designer
4. Example: Melrose Arch, South Africa

- Interesting dense mixed use streets creating high quality public realm. Result of a strong master code to ensure diversity within cohesive plan.

- And the results speak for themselves. Area is popular, busy & valuable.

Source: Interview with developers, investors and urban designer
5. Flexibility on rules – terraced houses

- New houses above are 7.5m wide & shallow with wide corridors and wide & shallow stair cases
- 1825 house to right is 5.5m wide & deep
- Both have similar Gross Internal Areas (GIA)
- New terrace could have ~22 houses instead of 16

Source: Create Streets Research
“Given their enduring popularity (and value) you might suppose that they (Edwardian Mansion blocks) would provide the ideal model for today.

But, sadly, modern planning and building regulations outlaw some of the key design features that enabled Edwardian architects to create such opulent buildings on such small footprints. Apartments of this era typically offer spacious and bright front rooms with bay windows and balconies forming their distinctive street facades. Meanwhile the rear rooms are quite dark and have privacy distances way below current standards. To us it seems a satisfactory trade-off, which should be encouraged rather than prevented “

Superdensity the Sequel by four of London’s largest residential practices
5. Light and urban form

CREATE streets

Ironically, it is not possible to easily replicate the built form of this first style in a new masterplan, even though narrow streets and mid-rise buildings often characterise areas that are praised for their quality.

When BRE’s daylight and sunlight targets are mechanistically applied by LPAs the outcome is more often than not high-rise and low ground coverage.

As a response to greater distance between buildings, high-rise development is adopted in an attempt to increase density over a small built footprint. This in turn, can however impact on build costs and delivery periods for new development due to the complex construction requirements of taller buildings.

It is also more challenging to deliver mixed residential tenures in taller buildings due to the impact on service charges. High rise and the resulting town scape can increase planning risk and therefore time scales to consent, which can also affect the development’s viability. Larger and taller buildings further constraint construction phasing, whilst increasing maintenance costs.

Finally, the number of available contractors capable of delivering such schemes reduces proportionally to the size and height of the proposal, making bidding less competitive and increasing construction costs as a result.

Source: GIA, London First
5. Repeating the errors of the past?

Estate in South London

Repeating key design errors of 1960s & 70s – correlated with crime, resident dislike & empty streets

New tower blocks for old in same location

Source: Create Streets Research
1. Increasingly the *data* is there telling you where people are happy and what they like. Good places can be measured

2. *Don’t get fixated on one thing. Be wide not narrow.* Encourage planners to see health and wellbeing in the round

3. *Trust your instincts and other people* – ‘popular design not good design’

4. *Create Boulevards*: could Lewisham Way be a better place?

5. *Certainty* of permitted volume & affordable housing required – process

“This is a ticking bomb as more and more will need maintenance. There are long term issues around renewing cladding, lifts etc in tower blocks – how will this be funded and who will be willing to? I worry that we are creating ghettos of tall buildings.”

A senior planner taking part (anonymously) in our survey on estate-regeneration in summer 2014
### Myatts’ Fields regeneration proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does it have support of residents?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does it have support of neighbours?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does it increase total housing?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does it at least keep social housing equal on same terms &amp; treat leaseholders fairly?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is new spatial layout better and does it ‘plug into’ streets and city?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are new internal standards better and good enough?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does it produce mixed community by tenure and use?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Though there is some discord survey with 36% response rate showed 73% agreement that regeneration has improved lives of residents
- Credible anecdotal evidence that nearby residents prefer new scheme but impossible to be certain
- Yes from 477 to 980 (a 105% increase)
- All tenanted homes reported re-provided on similar terms
- All leaseholders swapped on like for like basis. Option to receive Open Market Value plus 10% if chose to move
- Yes. Proper streets though not always proper blocks
- Buildings meant to reflect neighbouring streets and to some extent do
- Same independent survey says that 80% of residents in new properties agree that overall their accommodation is better than two years ago
- There is a social mix in the new development
- There could and should be more mixed uses (shops & commercial)
Packington - case study of good process & output

London Borough of Camden
Development partner: The Hyde Group/Rydon
Density before & after: 538 > 791
Density uplift: 47%

Architect: Pollard Thomas Edwards
Housing manager: The Hyde Group
Key challenges: Reintegrating estate into urban grain

CREATE streets

1. Resident support? Y
2. Neighbours support? Y
3. Increase total housing? Y
4. Fair treatment? Y
5. Urban design? Y
6. Internal standards Y
7. Mixed community & use Y
We liked the development at Packington
We particularly liked the way the development ‘fixed’ Union Square
Attitude of Rydon (who made a presentation to us) seemed pretty good
Most of us preferred the houses on Union Square to the newer looking ones

Social housing by the canal looked pretty good with nice balconies
However, green space neither public nor private but fenced off & ‘wasted’ (confused blocks as at Woodberry Down)
Myatt’s Fields North – getting it basically right

London Borough of Southwark
Development partner: Higgins and Regenter
Construction
Density before & after: 477 > 985
Density uplift: 106%

Architect: PRP
Housing manager: Pinnacle
Key challenges: Phasing, community engagement

CREATE streets

1. Resident support?
2. Neighbours support?
3. Increase total housing?
4. Fair treatment?
5. Urban design?
6. Internal standards
7. Mixed community & use

Development partner: Higgins and Regenter
Construction
Density before & after: 477 > 985
Density uplift: 106%
Estate residents response to Myatt’s Fields – pretty positive

- **Communal bins**
- **Some older streets kept**
- **Flats in 5-7 storeys and as part of street**

- Range of ‘conventional streets’
- Different types of brick
- Some allotments
- Lots of terraced houses on streets
North Prospect

Plymouth City Council
Development partner: Barratt Homes
Density before & after: 794 > 1107
Density uplift: 75%

Architect:
Housing manager: Plymouth Community Homes
Key challenges: Densifying, retaining street-based layout

1. Resident support?
2. Neighbours support?
3. Increase total housing?
4. Fair treatment?
5. Urban design?
6. Internal standards
7. Mixed community & use
Hillington Square

*Kings Lynn*
Development partner: Lovell LLP
Density before & after: 319 > 302
Density uplift: 0%

Architect: Hemingway Design / Mae
Housing manager: Freebridge Community Housing Association
Key challenges: Refurbishing Existing Stock

- 1. Resident support? *Y*
- 2. Neighbours support? *
- 3. Increase total housing? *N*
- 4. Fair treatment? *Y*
- 5. Urban design? *Mix*
- 6. Internal standards *
- 7. Mixed community & use *Y*
Aylesbury Estate - difficult politics

**London Borough of Southwark**
Development partner: Notting Hill Housing Trust / Barratt
Density before & after: 95 > 147, phase 1A 31 > 139
Density uplift: 75%

Architect: HTA Design LLP, Hawkins Brown & Mae architects, phase 1A Levitt Bernstein
Housing manager: Notting Hill Housing, phase 1A L&Q
Key challenges: politics and phasing

1. Resident support? Mix
2. Neighbours support? ?
3. Increase total housing? Y
4. Fair treatment? N
5. Urban design? Y
6. Internal standards Mix
7. Mixed community & use Y
Aylesbury Estate – review of engagement process

Review of Aylesbury community engagement done by Create Streets in 2015

- Residents' views taken into account on selection & NH was residents' preferred partner
- No engagement on first principles but genuine ongoing consultation above all with key engaged residents including training & visits. Foreign visit a sub-optimal use of resources
- Consultation clearly did influence many secondary issues (e.g. no wood cladding)
- Claims that consultation had influenced design and master-plan were less convincing given comparison of current plans with Area Action Plan of 2010 & none were evidenced

- Other than reviewing bathroom layout (~1,000 visitors) & one exhibition most real engagement clearly run with a very small % of community. No individual poll seemed to have more than 0.6% turnout though we were told that ~1.7% had left comments in total
- This is partially ‘forgivable’ given large size of community, length of history of ‘regeneration’ on site (failure of previous ballot not mentioned) & NH’s brief involvement but also represents profound failure to reach effectively beyond core group of supporters

- Process was responsive consultation not true engagement - ‘big’ questions hardly asked
- Core group tenants present at meeting admitted to a preference for ‘low houses’ & that ‘I do not want towers’
- However, said they personally were happy with trade offs made in the current scheme
- Impossible to know what wider group of residents felt given lack of evidence
- No residents appear to have understood degree to which their apparent preferences could have been better reached with a different typology

- Although Notting Hill (residents’ preferred choice) had engaged vigorously and impressively with community since their selection it is a large and difficult site with chequered history
- No provable or evidenced majority support for approach taken or of meaningful impact on master-plan (we compared current plan to earlier Area Action Plan)
- Close relationship clearly built with core resident group (eg Paris trip) but we felt strongly that time & resources should have been spent on ensuring wider engagement more meaningful
Bacton Estate – strong community engagement

London Borough of Camden

Development partner: LB Camden
Density before & after: 55 > 155
Density uplift: 196%

Architect: Karakusevic Carson Architects
Housing manager: LB Camden
Key challenges: Phasing and decanting

1. Resident support? Y
2. Neighbours support? ?
3. Increase total housing? Y
4. Fair treatment? Y
5. Urban design? Mix
6. Internal standards ?
7. Mixed community & use Y
Blackwall Reach – not a great example of regeneration

**Tower Hamlets**
Development partner: Swan Housing Group
Density before & after: 252 > 1,500
Density uplift: 595%

Architect: Metropolitan Workshop and Haworth Tompkins
Housing manager:

Key challenges:
Blackwell Reach – review of engagement process

Review of Blackwell Reach community engagement done by Create Streets in 2015

- Genuine ongoing consultation and engagement from master-planning onwards
- Evidenced impact on a range of internal and secondary issues
- Evidence of meaningful and genuine use of experts in process normally in a responsive rather than fundamental way

- 110 household involved in home visits (~37%) in 2007
- Quantitative evidence of 2008 vote but only 36% turnout on election and only proven 25% support. 25% support does not seem sufficient to claim clear mandate
- Two thirds residents involved in consultation 2009-11 & since 2011 (7,000 letters sent out)
- This is (just) rated Satisfactory due to quality of evidence and ability of consultative process to reach out beyond core though lack of clear mandate is a major issue

- Residents requested ground floor and traditional style homes
- This was not met though it is very far from clear that space available / viability actually made this (or some closer approach to it) unviable
- As this scheme amounts to replacing one C20th monolith with a C21st version of the same (despite all the evidence to the contrary in terms of wellbeing and popularity) this would not appear to be a good use of further public funds

CREATE streets

- A very poor scheme which repeats many of the failings of the existing estate
- Consultation with declining estate population & little interest from surrounding communities means introverted plan developed lacking strategic view needed for this neighbourhood
- No evidence that this is what majority of residents want
- Would not appear to be a good place to invest public funds in our judgement
Woodberry Down – mid rise to high rise...

*London Borough of Southwark*
- Development partner: Genesis, Berkeley Homes
- Density before & after: 1,980 > 5,000+
- Density uplift: >250%

Architect: Fletcher Priest
- Housing manager: Genesis Housing
- Key challenges: Phasing, density

1. Resident support? Mix
2. Neighbours support? ?
3. Increase total housing? Y
4. Fair treatment? Mix
5. Urban design? N
6. Internal standards Mix
7. Mixed community & use Y

CREATE streets

Development partner: Genesis, Berkeley Homes
- Density before & after: 1,980 > 5,000+
- Density uplift: >250%

Architect: Fletcher Priest
- Housing manager: Genesis Housing
- Key challenges: Phasing, density

1. Resident support? Mix
2. Neighbours support? ?
3. Increase total housing? Y
4. Fair treatment? Mix
5. Urban design? N
6. Internal standards Mix
7. Mixed community & use Y
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Response of estate residents’ tour of Woodbury Down

- We liked green spaces at Woodbury Down
- Strip of green alongside reservoir was lovely
- Green spaces between blocks we saw were also nice
- Community centre also seemed well run with lots going on...
We liked the buildings and streets less

Clear difference between private & affordable blocks

No privacy – pavements ran right past people’s sitting rooms at ground level

Rather big & cavernous!

Response of estate residents’ tour of Woodbury Down

CREATE streets

CREATE streets