Architecture and the Built Environment

The Farrell Review

Initial Comments by Design Professionals

Compiled by the Urban Design Group

This report is a compilation of comments submitted to an online survey run by the Urban Design Group between Friday 7th and Monday 10th June, to obtain an initial range of professional views on the Farrell Review.

The comments have been grouped by topic and given a summary headline, but otherwise are essentially as submitted with only minor editing,

The report has been structured so that the contents section acts as a summary of the entire document

1st Edition 24th July 2013

Contents

1.1 Britain has some of the best architects and designers in the world but that does not automatically mean that standards of architectural design in England are as good as they could be. Why is this?

Client is key

1. Lack of knowledge by client how to act as an 'informed client' of the process of procurement and building.

2. client being able to articulate their needs and negotiate effectively with professionals to build consensus on appropriate design and cost of projects.

Clients often have low expectations

There are not enough good clients willing to invest in the quality of buildings. Because the planning system allows poor quality design. Because the house building industry is dominated by large companies who control the market and design towards a common denominator.

Many of our designers could be providing significantly higher quality of building design in the UK if there was a greater aspiration for design quality from estates managers, building owners, clients and planning departments.

It is down to the clients and their aspirations for 'quality' design. House builders for example are not that interested in the quality of design nor 'place making' and mixed use environments, therefore regardless of the quality of the design team, the result will be poor.

Notwithstanding the need to recognise and support clients and decision makers that believe in and deliver good design, it is a bit of a chicken and egg situation on process. Some clients, regrettably see good design as something that costs more money and does not result in their view a better product, because end users do not necessarily value good design. Also decision makers, including determining authorities don't necessarily recognise good design, including when it is absent.

Architectural design is in many cases as good as the client.

A lack of vision - Weakness in fundamental structures and philosophies and social ownership of values of traditional town planning - which has lost the idealism of the late 19th c founders (Camillo Sitte, Unwin and Parker, Octavia Hill, Garden city and garden suburbs, Ruskin, William Morris, Arts and Crafts movement and continental equivalents in Ljubljana (plecnik), Vienna (otto Wagner), Bauhaus, Amsterdam school, etc

Look for international exemplars and emulate them

Value engineering wrongly applied to cut back on quality, rather than to maintain quality while reducing cost - It may be that in some instances the clients want buildings valued engineered for cost reasons. It may be that developers do not want use the "best" architects for cost reasons.it may be because planners and planning committees in some instances accept mediocrity. It may be because decision makers particularly around planning are not sufficiently design aware.

Many clients minimise costs rather than use an intelligent approach to quality to maximise profit - The relative lack of value that is placed on design by clients, some of whom economise on design to keep scheme costs as low as possible;

Short-termism damages long-term value

Market forces on schemes put making money ahead of making great places. Short term thinking as we create poor communities.

Too many promoters/developers seek the cheapest short-term solution, with insufficient regard being paid to achieving the best overall solution.

Short term profit has been very damaging to quality in design at all stages.

Standards of design are more often than not dictated by the prevailing development model in this country, which often means that design comes second to generating land value.

The British attitude towards land value, particularly for housing, results in other parts of delivering buildings is compromised.

It seems that (in London) there are too many drains on the profit end of commercial development and therefore design quality gets compromised in order to make up for it (CIL, Mayoral CIL, S106, affordable housing etc.).

The way that transactions take place in the property and construction sector often means that developers are not interested in good design, where the uplift in values occur years after the transaction has taken place. Local planning officers are often not equipped with the resources to ensure that new design work is high quality.

There dominant factors that go into the production of the built environment are economic and financial. Architectural design almost always has to express itself in beneficial economic and financial terms in order to proceed. Architects must learn that language and learn to navigate by those rules in order to play the development game. We can't naively believe that design costs nothing and only brings benefits. Better to make a sophisticated argument and win the trust of your audience than to come across as a groundless dreamer, or worse, be exploited for your talents.

Compared with other European countries there is much more of a short term focus in the UK

Overly narrow focus within the built environment and its professions

The town or city as a whole matters and all that goes to make it work –not just individual buildings

The focus is still on architecture and buildings and not the connecting matrix between, despite an apparent surge of interest in urban design. Red line planning - and architects being more interested in things than people - doesn't help.

Infrastructure ignored - Design must embrace the full range of subjects covered by the built environment, from architecture to transport telematics, from planning to drainage, from landscape architecture to civil engineering . The absence of a representative range of built environment professionals on the Farrell review panel is disappointing.

Lack of a true multidisciplinary approach

Urbanism is not properly embraced by design and architectural professions an element of which showcase their products in isolation from the urban context. They are being allowed to do this in

China and other developing counties where there are the celebrated 'signature' starchitects operating. They will continue to be feted until the unsustainability of the approach is laid bare.

An individual good quality building design does not imply a good quality built environment and can be used as a clever means to hoodwink the planners and the public.

Too many false specialisms.

The built environment industry has become dominated by over-specialised sub-disciplines each with their own non-negotiable codes of practice and guidance systems which are often bloated, dated and questionable. It would appear that some of these exist to protect the interests of their own members, rather than to promote quality or ensure the public interest.

Evidence based practice needed

There needs to be a wholesale review of the guidance systems used in the built environment, on the lines of the Taylor Review, to ensure that what emerges is based on sound knowledge, science and evidence, supports innovation, and is in the overall public interest

Limited cultural appreciation of the value of design

As a result of the low value placed on value of material/design in mass culture in UK - most private clients are unwilling to spend money on good design unless there is a functional necessity or a short-term monetary return.

Overall I think that the majority of people do not understand the cost and value of really good design.

The architectural and design professions are generally undervalued in England. There is little regulatory support to encourage it and architecture and design are generally not recognised as being of economic or social value, in contrast to countries like Germany where the professions are highly valued. There is a lack of design awareness or understanding amongst people generally as it is not taught in schools or colleges -possibly because people have to specialise in just a few A level subjects. This is reflected in the conservatism of many potential clients and the planning profession which is orientated to 'play safe' approach to development. Because of early specialism architects and designers are seen as elitist, and sometimes they act as if they are, reinforcing the disconnect.

The lack of stress on design quality by Government (across the political spectrum), where speed is seen as being king, perhaps not recognising the importance of a more considered approach to place-making;

Government does not value us/ we do not promote our skills.

Government building policy and market regulation play an important role in influencing the quality of the British Architecture, especially in the housing market.

False Elitism - Architecture is controlled by an elite who impose poor architectural styles on the rest of us.

Design conservatism - Culturally, Britain is very conservative and always looks backward to when it was a greater power. Instead of embracing the future as better (ie France, Germany, Spain, Etc) Brits look backward and strive to retain anything and everything from an earlier time, and expect the new to look old.

Economic recession, particularly in government spending, is favouring cheapest (blandest) design.

Being clear about what good design is

A superficial focus on aesthetics that ignores function and other qualities – The design debate on the UK is dominated by the superficial aesthetics of design, rather than some of the more important underlying issues.

I don't think that the benefits that design can bring has been made clearly enough to the general public. Too many people think that design is mainly about making things look pretty - often objects at the expense of three and four dimensional spatial experiences. Perhaps designers need to be better trained in communicating with clients as to what good design actually means and what it can do for the collective. I think it's less about objects and more about understanding people, environment and the complex and dynamic processes which shape all of our lives - day to day.

What is good design? Some people are put off when sites have problems, the millennium bridge was hailed as good design but it failed practically and had to be altered. On the other hand the south bank wheel did not receive unanimous support at first. the RIBA talks about interesting schools but it has not managed to do much yet.

The emphasis on quality of life not as important at profit margin or image - sometimes the client, sometimes the architect is the source of that.

Education

A Common education at undergraduate level - There needs to be a common education in the built environment, allied to professions that are based on genuine science and evidence based practice, not artificial body of knowledge.

Detailing is no longer taught effectively - Universities don't teach it and the Design and Build culture means your architects don't learn it anymore in practice. The result is an architectural profession who doesn't know how to actually build and detail.

Good design requires the use of skilled designers

Architects design only 27% of buildings. Most buildings are designed by surveyors.

Most buildings are not designed by architects. Many that are badly designed to a bad brief, the lowest bid or are approved by an ill-informed planning authority

The key problem is the development process and the domination of surveyors, who have little interest in matters beyond the functional and economic.

The vast majority of new houses built in the UK are built by volume house builders and not by architects, so we are in effect not using the essential value of our built environment professionals, as the majority of major house building is completed by cad technicians, with very little understanding of architecture and urban design.

The function of architect is not protected as in other European countries for project of a certain type (e.g. public or social housing funded by taxpayer) or a certain size. Local authorities not requiring use of architects for the above types of project.

One reason is that architects are only employed in a small number of schemes. In France only architects can sign a planning application and are responsible for it (except for small schemes). A

related reason is the structure of the building/development industry for which quality of design has a low priority.

Funding

Lack of funding for public realm and architecture – Lack of funding available to local governments to invest in public realm and architecture and any available funding it fragmented into too many funds that wastes time bidding.

The way in which development is funded in the UK creates an emphasis on standardisation and cost reduction.

The Fallacy that Good Design is expensive

There is a misunderstanding that good design costs a lot of money and therefore developers and project managers (especially those trained as Quantity Surveyors) tend to leave it alone as much as possible. In addition, the process of applying for planning applications and delivering building regulations seems to recoil at new ideas - they are difficult to work with or 'sell 'to elected members and as such these new ideas and strong design led processes are actively discouraged. All of this is in spite of government guidance which expect innovation and high quality which appears to be simply rhetoric lost in the day to day delivery of projects.

They are possibly inhibited by various constraints, including financing, bureaucracy, rigid development criteria. If by good we mean delivering long term 'liveability' - i.e. a place that is distinctive but also blends with locality, that is sustainable in terms of promoting good environmental performance, supports local economy, mixed use & tenure and that people actually, then there is also more to be done to enhance community-led / owned design.

Policy

Road building bias - Government favours and funds road building which leads to suburban development. It should believe and invest in public transport which underpins higher quality buildings and public realms.

Predict and Provide - Government predict and provide targets for housing is as flawed as predict and provide road building as just increases demand.

Uncontrolled utilities damaging roads - Lack of control over utilities causes roads to be ripped up and increases cost of building trams.

Problems with the planning system

The Planning system does not ensure quality - Planning authorities do not demand higher standards. Government inspectors on appeal do not demand higher standards. Developers say that higher standards are not financially viable, when the answer is to refuse the application and get another developer.

Planning regulations are often a deterrent to high quality architecture particularly in a context where existing urban fabric is dominated by valuable historic places. Planners are too afraid of potential impact of the new to the old.

Building regulations are risk averse - The building regulations are also quite restrictive as they seem to come from a point of view of being afraid of litigation rather than assuming people use their intelligence when moving about in public space.

Policy frameworks need to be strong but also enable innovative approaches and respect local distinctiveness.

Coherent urban design guidance needed - Not all architects are good and some don't pay enough attention to context. Some are compromised by clients budgets. Consultations through planning raise many issues and urban design guidance lacks coherence making it hard for planners to engage pro-actively with architects to achieve excellence

Lack of design sills and resources in the planning system

Planning and council staff turnover is huge – It is rare to get commitment to enforcing and encouraging quality / high standards over long term, and new people arrive and need time for learning curve.

Development control planners need design training - Development control planners have little architectural training, although it has improved.

Development proposals are subjected to a planning system that is administered by people with no real understanding of design. There are few talented designers involved with the decision-making process.

Local authorities need adequate in-house design expertise - Developers can get away with poor design because local planning authorities are under-resourced, often don't have design expertise in house and decisions can be ill-informed.

Public sector spending reductions has left many planning departments short of appropriately skilled and experienced staff who can positively influence design outcomes;

Local Authorities think they do not have the power to push for good design, mainly because of the fear of the Financial power of the developers. It can also be said that despite all the best efforts of CABE Etc officer and elected members still do not have adequate skills. the recent recession(s) have also had a part to play and the economic benefit of (construction) job creation and additional income into the local economy is also helping any type/level of development to be pushed through.

Professional issues

Lack of competition among established architects - I feel that there is a lack of healthy competition resulting in inertia amongst established architects to continue to churn out the same stuff. Small practices that have little experience to deal with mainstream developers do tend to succumb to pressure to value engineer their approved schemes for building , resulting in loss of credibility.

Commercialism versus professional integrity - For the most part only commercial architects or architects who behave commercially get the work. Architects committed to architecture are not wanted

Problems with Procurement and Process

The procurement process value engineers-out design quality. Architects no longer have a consistent role from concept to inception; they have become poodles of the system, retained to obtain planning consent then dropped and so have no role in ensuring the built form is a quality product.

Procurement & government policy are huge issues. - RIBA have done extensive research into why this is - see "Building ladders of opportunity". Government policy - house building policy favours those profiting from house building, not the end consumer.

The Government must respond formally to the RIBA report on procurement - Building Ladders of Opportunity

Designers need to see a project through - Also the whole build process, can often drive out good design from projects if design consultants are not appointed through the process, because the it is not seen as a requirement. The overall planning, procurement and delivery process can also be so complex that good design can get lost in process.

Architects views are not translated to the construction site and therefore to the main users

The structure of profession in so many ways favours large, multidisciplinary companies - things can dehumanised somewhat with this structure.

Projects becoming are 'contactor led' and contractor-profit driven.

 The architect and designers are constrained by a number of factors such as the contractors preferred construction techniques and particularly the cost with the contractor driving down the price of the project to meet client expectations and driving it down further to increase profits. Whilst these projects are often supposed to be 'partnerships' there is still a strong adversarial element and approach from the contractors. Client design management and expectations are often very low. The project managers of new development often have limited experience and can be very focused on a single element of the project rather than having a holistic view. Typically this can be to ensure that the building is configured internally whilst completely ignoring the manner in which the building is set in the local area, how it looks and responds to the neighbours and what the quality of the public realm. Poor financial planning. Limited funding for good quality public realm.

1.2 How can the "everyday" quality of our housing, public spaces and buildings be significantly improved?

Implement the advice already provided by CABE

Ask architect and client to actually live for a year or use space they responsible for designing

Use designers

Housing, public spaces, and buildings should be designed by designers not by developers with standard housetypes and a rubber stamp. Despite any argument to the contrary urban designers are still required to deliver this for their clients and are not in a strong enough professional position to argue that better design should occur. Nevertheless, some involved in the process have absolutely NO skills other than those learn through housebuilder type layout work. Also - a considerable amount of work needs to be made within Local planning Authorities to engage elected members in the process - they misunderstand urban design and its goals - and this is to the determined of project which remain as the lowest common denominator.

Making use of architects and urban designers together mandatory for such projects and any projects above domestic size.

Increase the number of qualified Urban designers and increasing their ability to better communicate what good design means and has to offer in the whole of the built environment.

Multi-disciplinary teams should work closer, more equally, more dynamically, more creatively. The contractual and monetary allegiances and profits should not be unequal to any one of those disciplines - that includes the construction companies. Conractual arrangements should reflect this. The client/ landowner should hold the financial risks and profits. The client/ landowner should be educated.

Basic compulsory design education should be introduced throughout,

Education and CPD promoting innovation and entrepreneurialism - More innovative and entrepreneurial 'conscious awareness' student training and continuing professional development across the entire field of natural and built environment specialisms by sponsored internet courses (including scholarships to pay fees of those with low or no income.

Being more innovative, having more integrity, designing for local circumstance - By not commissioning architecture and buildings with the lowest common denominator in mind. Designs that have been used before, designs that don't upset local planners with their lack of design education and aspiration, shoddy quality UK construction industry driving cheap products, materials in to new projects and dumbing down designs and quality. Lack of innovation and aspiration.

Actively promote the use of talented designers. **Cease to reward mediocrity.**

Raise expectation for quality across the whole built environment – not just new development

Publicising good quality - It would be worth publishing to local authorities examples of good quality housing, public spaces and buildings and informing them why they are good examples and encouraging them to follow similar principles.

There are poor levels of expectation.

Ensuring the community ownership is incorporated as an investment in the long term ownership and shaping and maintenance of everyday places.

Zero-tolerance of neglected/derelict buildings It starts by ensuring that existing buildings and spaces must be maintained well: though councils have powers to address untidy land and buildngs through S215 orders, these are rarely used. Even in the heart of London, derelict buildings are tolerated, roads are inadequately maintained. This is a sign of lip service to quality.

Local councils should take a lead and have pride in their areas, and be held to account if they do not.

Clients are key, where the client cares a good result ensues. There is massive potential to expand custom built housing where the client is actually going to live in the premises in the long term.

Use taxation

Tax vacant properties and greenfield sites to favour improving empty or brownfield properties so they are not empty and blight neighbourhoods

Tax Second Homes. Also tax second and more properties to reduce second and holiday homes.

Hypothecate tax from increased densities to invest in better public transport, walking, cycling and public spaces to improve these areas.

A culture that values and demands quality design

Commitment on the part of all interested parties to the quality of the local environment, good design and adequate resourcing of the public realm.

We do not demand quality; we just take what we are given and generally complain about it. I think we need good, socially aware public and private clients to allocate the resources and insist on the quality. We do enjoy quality (Tate Modern, Millennium Bridge?) but won't do anything to get it G B Shaw said something about the English never wanting a National Theatre but once they have one they will fight to the death to keep it.

Get design into the educational curriculum, get people addicted to the pleasures of design. In all seriousness many 'everyday' people can't see the poverty of our built environment, and to change this cultural state will require a multi-pronged approach. No single strategy will suffice.

By allowing designers to design, and by celebrating the new rather than always presenting it as a negative, which is commonly done in the national press.

Increase the continuity of knowledge- In the long process of designing for urban growth, many stakeholders come and go and years can go by. Good knowledge transfer is the key to making the end product close to the original vision. This involved both professional and political accumulated wisdom. Educate consumers- The lack of awareness of the purchased product is astonishing. This is a state of affairs that developers like and they are unlikely to lead to more sophisticated purchasers; it is another situation where the roots go deep. It is as if there is a lack of a national design consciousness where good design is not credited so to start crediting good design is important.

Involve the local community

Responding to local people - By taking more heed to the actual concerns of the local people, listening to what they say and putting it into practice.

Ensuring that communities are involved at the earliest opportunity to help shape the concept and use of property and space.

Designers (& developers) need to allocate sufficient time and targeted attention to reflect resident / neighbourhood views and ideas

Economics and Market Efficiency

Completely restructure funding and procurement processes and taking the power out of the hands of solely the major providers who have no interest in either quality or quantity, only their margin. Clearly not likely to happen, therefore I am not optimistic, we are tinkering around the edges.

greater public sector invovlement in the land supply, as done in the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden and other countries. This is a very consistent thread running through this paper by the Scottish government and RICS Scotland
http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/12/31110906/21

Encourage small innovative practices - Nurture and listen to the creative mind, don't always go for big name award winners to get decent design, move away from commercialised practices and give chance to small dedicated firms, there are many good architects who don't get a chance to design at all that is waste of talent and skills. Increase opportunities for small niche practitioners to form and develop. Encourage large organisations to work with small one man band practices.

Encourage the quality and individualism that comes from smaller architects into the market, discourage cramped noddy housing by mass housebuilders. Geting public housing started again.

Public sector should be involved in regeneration and growth- By regeneration not being wholly private sector led, and developers not making as much profit, although it is accepted that this is partly as a result of the more commercial outlook and tolerance of reason associated with it, than many parts of mainland Europe

Provide homebuyers with accurate information - Educating the buyer and providing more choice, such as reducing the dependency on volume house builders, Market housing not in bedrooms but in size. Competition and procurement overhaul.

Housing- help better design by good guidance, buyer awareness,

People don't buy on the basis of design quality - I rarely have met people who's decision on buying a house was primarily dependent on architecture and design quality. Quality of housing and public space is about providing the right type, size and environment to the right people for the right price. Urban Design is the key to improve this aspect combined with a new and more flexible approach on planning.

Clients and commissioners

Commissioners of these projects need better design skills and an understanding and empathy of the impact that the developments will have on the neighbouring area, particularly the quality of the environment but also the social and economic impact Improved dialogue between the commissioners and the local community. Improved communication on what is expected from the community / council> this may take the form of development briefs or public engagement Management and maintenance needs to be considered early in the design process and with dialogue to those that will be responsible.

Through education, for those in deicsion-making, but also to raise general awareness of the costs, measures, impacts and benefits of design in the environment.

By defining better briefs and getting housebuilders/ clients to want to make better places. Possibly consider getting joint funding for schemes so that public and private sector work together to improve public environments, rather than just relying on the private sector.

Construction process

Promote and hold onto good design throughout the project and into maintenance and management. Plenty of good designs on paper are not delivered because of cost savings during construction. Long term maintenance of the public realm is also vital.

Design objectives

Design places based on use by people operating on foot (does it work for a mum with a buggy and a toddler) as the priority and scale up to connecting to infrastructure from that point - not grand plan down.

Public spaces- more public investment in the public realm; less gating or creeping privatisation of public space; more focus on locally distinctive materials.

Put context above architectural ego - Other buildings; attention to Ruskin's principle- more respect for townscape as a whole and resistance to architect or corporate driven ego buildings like the "walkie talkie" and most out of place tall/bulky buildings.

Strong emphasis on sustainability, water, biodiversity, human scale

Density is critical when talking about/ planning new spaces- low density houses that surround opens paces are never going to provide the activity or surveillance required.

Density and available services meaning that being out and about is part of life, not some kind of recreational decision, and then you do your shopping at the major supermarket. Think more about the spaces between buildings.

More imagination. Less slavish reference to the past. Less conservatism. Focus on quality.

Detailed design

1) promoting local materials and bringing back traditional skills
2) Vernacular methods of construction- has anyone tried to build a traditional terraced house- down to the detail- all built as it would have been?. but with modern regs?.

Spend more money on finishes, landscaping and tree planting. Encourage local planning authorities to have planning policies to use conditions on all development to plant trees.

Understanding and using appropriate mixed uses, deploying varying housing typologies and appropriate densities, and understanding how vehicle movement and its design can be managed from a pedestrian rather than a vehicle perspective.

Policy and planning

National Policy - The expectation should be on all everyone in the built environment to produce quality: owners of land, developers and their teams and the local authorities. However the majority of this responsibility should be within the framework from which everyone operates - national policy.

National Policy should not be flexible and generic about good design. It should have very carefully thought out policies about design quality that go beyond the objectives of urban design and of the aspects of form.

Convert the British planning system from a box ticking, dead hand of regulation and administration body to a creative force of vision and regeneration.

Having a stronger policy framework to encourage and support 'good design' whilst leaving architects and urban designers with enough freedom to express their proposals.

Introduce a design police

Need for a rigorous quality system - Initiatives like Building for Life are good ideas in their aspiration, but unfortunately not strong enough both in content and in delivery. A sharper more detailed version of this or something similar - (such as the BREEAM communities initiative) which assesses major development proposals in a holistic way (including design quality) was mandatory as set out by national government and rolled out across all local authorities as the instrument in which applications are dealt with, assessed and implemented, then we would see a definitive step-change in behaviours and attitudes to design quality across the country.

Standards for housing and open space - review possible national implementation of space standards for housing and open space (increased costs could be balanced against removal of S106 agreements etc)

Housing and public space standards need to be greatly improved. Housing should be seen not as a mass development commodity, but as providing places that meet peoples needs and improves their quality of life, creates and improves communities, and achieves civic pride and a sense of belonging. This could be achieved through community based planning initiatives.

Space standards, allied to design awareness - Key for housing is improvements in space standards but issues such as building in relation to context, an understanding of proportion and scale are important.

Councils creating with/without private sector design consultants flexible best quality design standards as part of the LDF.

Planning reform. Planners have too great a focus on specifics - materials, renewables, use...etc. Planning should be reformed to encourage high quality development rather than deter thinking outside of the box as it does now.

Higher design standards for residential design. Currently the minimum standards are far too low. Other cities/ countries aim a lot higher in this regard- larger minimum room standards, compulsory private open space requirements, higher thermal & acoustic insulation standards etc.

Design review as in west coast USA - see john punter - assume he is a key player in this - if not he should be.

Government and local authorities must be more demanding and lay down rules, not on style, but on levels of quality (building for life is a good starter). They also need to lead by example and some times take risks. Investment in housing and public spaces needs to be increased.

The best that can be hoped for currently is that the architect is nominated and retains a role during working drawing and implementation stages. If planning departments were better resourced they could check on what gets built out conforms to the consented drawings. & apply more stringent enforcement. Building for Life recognised there was a role in educating the public in being more demanding of quality - why do consumers fuss about the look of other things they buy & are prepared to pay a premium for design (aka Apple products) but not their housing.

Planning System

It is quite fashionable to bash the planning system, but it is here where proper standards and expectations should be embedded. Education is required in order to help local planning authorities demand and achieve better, and also to help local communities understand what they could and should be expecting from new development.

Improve the skill base of local authorities- The recent cuts are one incident in many over the years where local authorities have had their professional capabilities diminish. It is now common to have one, possibly part-time planning officer, managing and guiding design development, where

historically there would have been several. But the scale of housing delivery forecast and the quality control needed of those new areas would mean that a team the size of a Development Corporation would be required to handle it.

Don't let profitability compromise quality - Remove the obligations on planning authorities to ensure that projects are bought forward in a way which ensure that a certain level of profitability is achieved which often compromises quality

Enforce the codes on sustainability

Design skills for planners and councillors - Ensure that those involved in operating the planning system have a good appreciation of design issues, including, of course, councillors. We also need to do more to record and promote best practice and to more widely share the lessons of what works and what doesn't ; there is far too much re-inventing of wheels going on.

Promote quality urban design through the planning system - Quality was improved through the previous planning regime, the promotion of urban design, the activities of CABE etc. coalition government cutbacks and attacks on public spending are putting all of this into reverse.

Don't accept development at any cost.

Use Planning Teams qualified in urban design and architecture- Planning teams who deal with planning applications on housing developments ought to comprise at least one Architect and Urban Designer in their teams, and who would have a power to refuse applications in case the quality is not of minimum acceptable level. Consequently, developers would be then in a 'forced' to employ qualified architects and landscape and urban designers in order to produce designs of such level of quality.

Planning authorities must give clear and coherent guidance on urban design - "Everyday" quality is very much the province of planners and lack of coherence of urban design guidance, complexity in process and lack of weight accorded to urban design versus economic issues in decision making needs to be addressed

Inspectors should back up planning authorities who refuse on appeal. There should be greater promotion of good quality eg. Accordia, Abode.

1.3 Would having a formal architecture policy (as some European countries do) help to achieve improved outcomes? What might be the potential aims of such a policy? What might the benefits be and how they could be measured?

Policy needs to cover integrate the whole of built environment, including transport, and infrastructure, and not just architecture.

Training is needed

General

We're terribly good as a country at producing endless policy and papers and fine sounding reports and rubbish at ensuring any of this is applied in practice. There is a real gap between aspiration and end product.

What we need to do to promote quality is to see things in the round; architecture, urban design and planning, as it seems to me that potential difficulties are not too far behind when we depart from this script. I'm also not sure how an architecture policy would be received in the UK, and I am not sure whether one is necessary, given that at the level of say, local planning authorities, the powers already exist to incorporate design policies as part of, or supplementary to, local plans and policy. There are a number of good examples of urban design strategies, design codes, public realm guidance and so forth, but these things do not exist everywhere....which could be to do with lack of knowledge about their value, or perhaps lack of resources to do produce them.

Scope ...

A formal Built Environment policy would be better than one focusing on Architecture. This would make all parties more aware of the issues that happen outside the building, its appearance and setting.   The Policy aim should be to create a high quality environment in keeping with the Bruntland Commission "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."[1][2]

An 'architecture' policy is not what we need, however a policy on the quality of public realm and the built environment could help.

Urban Design Protocol - An urban design protocol, on the lines of Australia and New Zealand should be considered.

Need for complementary policies to make an architecture policy effective - I doubt it would do much good without taxation and transport reforms.

A formal policy should be legible and limited in scope so as to avoid unneccessary additional bureaucracy. Some key issues that should be addressed are:
1. Introduce national design curriculum for key age groups - benchmarked against mainland European education.

2. Revising procurement policy to encourage/enable small/innovative practices to compete with larger, more experienced practices - minimum % of frameworks over key thresholds should be provided to practices with limited experience to encourage new thinking in publicly funded architecture.

The most important thing is not to produce vast quantities of policy and guidelines, but to publicise and educate.

Supportive comments

A national policy statement expressing aims and objectives would be useful and commitment to quality and ecologically sound design.

A formal architectural policy to actively and positively promote integration between the entire field of natural and built environment specialisms would achieve improved outcomes. Population growth of Ceredigion census district from 1971 to 2011 is an example - remarkable growth but with so little environment and ecological disbenefit that UNESCO enlarged Dovey Estuary Man and Biosphere to include Aberystwyth, the growing 'capital city' of Mid Wales, and its urban, suburban, rurban, and rural environs, attracting big government grants to enhance housing, public spaces, buildings and private sector, public sector and voluntary sector transport provisions and services to, from, and in the reserve.

Yes I think it would. It is important though not to limit the policy to architecture alone, but to consider it across the scales from urban design principles about urban structure, urban grain and then architecure. Good quality architecture is extrmely important, but should fit within a regulatory framework which is wider than the extents of individual buildings and plots.
 Aims – to streamline and consolidate design policy so that the public and private sector are in simple agreement in understanding about what constitutes high quality sustainable development, what types of urban form are acceptable, (as a minimum std) relative to a range of densities; a national std of minimum space standards; targets regarding energy efficiency;   Design Policy should request at a minimum a sign off from a registered architect for any development over way 500m2, and a registered (recognised) practitioner in urban design for developments 10 dwellings or more. A similar approach about Registered Landscape Architects should also be taken. There has never been a more important time for developers and the public sector to be more integrative and collaborative as teams from the outset. Design Policy at a national level should establish a protocol about the 'make-up' of teams, the requirement for registered professionals and their respective protocols of professional conduct.
Benefits: removing the need for circa 426 local authority planning departments to have to re-invent the wheel about what constitutes 'good design' every plan period.   Simplify and streamline the planning process to remove 'subjectivity' in design assessment and to promote sustainable forms of development. To ensure the best urban forms and design quality through collaboration from the outset. (This cannot work retrospectively).

Guidance is always helpful to set the standard bar and define what is not acceptable. Existing design guidance has been beneficial in the industry including many placemaking guides. I have been facinated by the Dutch model where the level of flexibility and open mindness has allowed design to flowrish and not formal policy. There is a great talented generation of architects in the country who would love to design great architecture but are often held back by planning and developers. You can not force good design but you can let it happen if the conditions are right.

I'm not sure that it would. I think the issue is not necessarily the policy or the skills of our designers / architects but more importantly the financial and political interventions in the design process. Of course, one cannot disagree with consultation or deliverability / viability but these are currently in the post NPPF climate running the design process above the desire to deliver good design. However, this shouldn't stop us from introducing new policy. Our aim should be to make 'design' a strong element of the delivery of development. It appears rarely on project management programme and does not allow for the cyclical design process - I think a policy that requires this to be demonstrated more would be a distinct improvement. Whether some sort of 'measurement' is worthwhile is subject of much discussion. The Building for Life criteria and scoring has been around for some time but has achieved very little within my own professional sphere and is often 'bastardised' by house-builders. If the 'measurement' was formalised and required by some sort of national or local policy then it may be considered favourably. What must not happen though is for a process to be entered into that adds another layer of bureaucracy.

Benefits of a formal policy, apart for better quality urban spaces, would also include forcing architects to think beyond the boundaries of their own project.

It would definitely help to regulate the market and change the market behavior towards a higher living standard. For example the European policy limits the housing rental income and protects tenants' right which results in more stable rental market and higher housing quality. Some European policies also help to control new housing development standard that would lead to a healthier market. Other policies may apply to retrofitting and guidelines to achieve grant for such.

Yes, formal adoption of the Urban Design Compendium would be a big step.

Policy with teeth at the delivery end of projects would be beneficial.

Such a policy could be of enormous benefit, provided it is: - Flexible - Pro-active - Involves a spectrum of disciplines - Supported by exemplar projects - Involves both public and private sectors The policy should raise standards and awareness through awards/exemplars, and develop a manifesto for promoting realistic achievable goals that are understandable and applicable to all development types, including affordable housing and public sector works. The benefits would be to set up a database (like CABE etc) but one that was less design-led and concentrated more on places and people rather than buildings: that dealt with demographics, economics and legacy rather than a set-piece. Conceptual and virtual or economic strategies should also be promoted to make the focus on mechanism, not just photographs of built designs. Success could be measured against international exemplars, tested by commercial success, people-satisfaction, educational criteria, movement statistics, integration/accessibility, sustainability factors, other associated developments initiated by the core initiative. The key issue, in my view, is to maintain a highly contextual approach, without which there is a real risk of a broad policy being irrelevant, shallow, non-specific or impossible to adopt or utilise meaningfully. It must also maintain sufficient flexibility to accommodate evolving regulations, practice, technology and best-practice thinking so that innovative solutions to spaces and places may be embraced and encouraged.

Yes. A formal architectural policy would mean that the value of architecture would have to be recognised and incorporated into policy of all Government departments. For example, this would over time, influence educational policy, including teaching in schools, design of the school environment, etc. the policy should not determine architectural style. However it should not be limited to design of buildings, but also to that of the public realm, urban and landscape. The benefit would be to create a better environment for people. The pace at which and how it is incorporated into policies could be measured and monitored, eg. Inclusion in county and local development plans

Yes, architects and designers must be defended

Neutral comments

We do have 'formal' policies - or did- embedded in our planning system. Our key difference with our mainland European neighbours is the 'silo' mentality that carves up the environment into discrete parts. The disdain that architects feel towards planners is one cause of our poor quality environment

Its not all about policy, some of it is in design culture / practice e.g. Germany & Netherlands have a greater degree of community dialogue and ownership in the design & planning processes. Design standards need to allow room for creativity and focus on desired outcomes rather than rigid prescription.

I am not sure that other countries have a 'formal architecture policy' beyond requiring standards of quality. These may indeed refer to height of buildings, set backs, relationship between public and private, plot ratio, etc. but that means codifying for particular areas, not a general policy. What many European countries do is that the public sector takes the initiative and draws masterplans which developers have to comply with; these masterplans may be quite detailed.

There is a need to ensure there is urban design guidance as a supplement to the NPPF: this is the most important issue at present. The worry is that the Farrell review acts like a diversion: yet another initiative that reduces focus.

It depends on how prescriptive any formal policies are. They should encourage innovation and design not aim to enshrine specifics through narrow minded top down imposed design guidelines that stifle imagination, different approaches and creativity.

It depends on what the policy states and how developers/ case officers respond to it on the front line.

It would certainly be helpful if they publicised more widely good examples of high quality design and why they are high quality. It would also be good if there was perhaps a little more emphasis in schools to the advantages of good design and good architecture.

Yes, such policies will have outcomes, but they also run the real possibility of becoming outmoded across time. Policies must be reflexive, open to review, and the outcomes made public. The means of evaluation for these policies should also be seen as an educational opportunity for the wider public, and not just celebrated within the design professions.

We have plenty of policy but it doesn't guarantee good design and good neighbourliness. Public education and curbs on corporate power is better than policy. Start by trusting the people, ceasing planner-bashing and avoiding politically driven schemes like eco-towns that were never eco. More focus on building height and bulk in relation to surroundings would help too.

Concentrate on sustainability targets and outcomes - design will follow and can be flexible

The reintroduction of a Chief Architect at local authorities would help, an individual who who would be a formal consultee on all planning proposals, and should be given sufficient clout and influence to deliver better results.

Would this be any different to what is required in terms of good design through planning? If not then I can't see it improving outcomes.

maybe - what teeth do they have and what are the values they embody?   eg: public spaces: other countries leverage more from developers, and more carefully: public space in the right place, able to be used - not just for show (eg One London, can anyone actually enjoy this?!).   re streets: other countries value walking and realise negative effects of cars (noise, fear, pollution, taking up space) need to be minimised/ avoided. the money poured into 'black hole' of Highways or Transport departments (and into the pockets of term contractors) is astounding - with zero oversight, compare the condition of roadway vs pavement in any UK town, and tell me what is considered more important. if 'architecture policy' is only about aethetics, no point in doing - having Design Panel in San Francisco hasnt prevented dozens of ugly, inhumane (and prohibitively expensive) blocks of new 'mixed use' , has it

Comments against

Architectural policies would not work. a comprehensive lift in design consciousness would. Planning briefing and urban design policies would help stop the big mistakes. Building for Life 12 would be a start.

I doubt it as there are very different ideologies that are in conflict that cannot be reconciled in a single policy. There are the urbanists (building on precedent and physical evidence) and the anti-urbanists (conceptual, symbolic and confusing the natural and the urban) and you would have to choose which way to go.

I would not have any confidence in an architecture policy as it would presumably serve business interests rather than social, aesthetic, spatial or environmental quality. Urban design policy too has become a political plaything which can be ridiculed by an incoming administration.

I do not think personally that a new formal architectural policy would make a significant difference to the current practice. At present, both at local and at national level, there is a number of policies that promote good architecture and design and protection and enhancement of heritage, and which are clearly incorporated within local plans and PPSs, however, their impact on the quality of design is on many projects is minimal - the policies are either missinterpreted, distorted or simply ingnored as there is no actual test of the design quality which would prove the compliance of the design with the actual policy. Therefore I believe that any new formal archictural policy would have a very similar destiny.

Policies destroy creativity because they are written by a committee of bureaucrats and interpreted by people with less talent. You cant write a a policy for quality space but we know it when we are in it.

No, England has a specific culture of trial and error that is very attractive in how we do architecture here, a formal architecture policy will diminish that and could inhibit the exploring approach. There is already much too much policies and codes. Encourage organic growth holistic and integrated approach rather than use of cods and policies.

A stronger urban design culture might help.

Other comments

Design guides/guidelines for external spaces tend to be interpreted in ways which can have unfortunate effects on individual sites, though are helpful used with caution.

Any such policies should be developed to local levels to respect local decision making and local distinctiveness.

1) having a formal architecture policy will be a start for ten.
2) it will depend very much at local level what the impact is of th policy? how does it influence developers/ industry generally?
3)As an architect- urban designer myself, i do feel that there is a dissappointing lack of recognition of the role of design/ urban design in creating of successful places.
4)Maintaining the original design intent, community involvement, area based impact- rather than just on building basis- ways to easure the policy

I am interested to know more about why Germany in particular achieved such high quality urban spaces, coupled with consistently good design standards.

Bring architects into planning management. Encourage planning authorities to employ architects as chief officers, this was done in the 1973 reorganisation but it has lapsed. Employ architects to attend development management committees, run courses on design for planning committees,

We need more CPD delivered by designers to the local authorities - many of the agents in the local authority seem to use their own guidance - which is often very good, simply as a check box exercise. Architects need to be better educated about things other than simply buildings.

More promotion of what good quality architecture actually means is needed.

Trained professionals should have the final say on planning applications, not politicians.

1.4 What can local and national bodies do to promote design quality?

What policy infrastructure would assist them in this important task?

Define 'design quality' please. This is topic of book / tv series, not a five question survey.

Editor's note – this commentator has highlighted a major problem. Many of the responses are written using professional terminology which will mean nothing to the general public. Many of the responses have not been specific. Some respondents, for example call for greater density, but what type of density, measured in what units? A debate on design quality based on generalities is very weak, and carries little impact with the public. It is a challenge to the design professions to make their case in plain language and illustration that the public will understand and support.

Cabinet level expertise, vision and drive

It starts at the top. The cabinet does not have any adequate representation to make the case for good design, the creative industries, arts and culture. Without this, too many fundamental decisions are made ignoring the importance of excellence and long term sustainability and robustness.

Support from the top. Honesty in working towards developing a quality environment. Planning and coordination are essential elements in achieving any quality - time to think and bring together the people, the interests, the resources and the solutions.

Political leadership towards higher quality is missing; we cannot have a system where planning policies change at the whim of whatever party is in charge.

Design Quality is an objective concept, and should be isolated from political whim.

Long-term leadership for towns and the built environment by politicians has been lamentable. The focus is largely on day to day services rather than the decade long perspective necessary for the future of a town. The media is also responsible for focusing on negative issues all the time, and generally criticising, rather than cheering on those who are trying to improve an area.

Leadership at all levels

Leadership - Emphasis the skills required by local communities to lead themselves to a better future. National bodies should be geared to educate and provide missing local skills where necessary rather than trying to deliver top-down solutions.

Government needs to take the promotion of 'good-design' a lot more seriously than it does, and to encourage good-design through the planning process, recognising that well-designed places are not

only more likely to be the kinds of places that people want to be in, but also more sustainable over-time and economically successful. A greater emphasis on design training for those operating the planning system would also be helpful, and this includes what I said earlier, but at the professional level must be tackled at the time architects, planners and urban designers are trained. A more widespread use of design review panels may also be of assistance, although these things can take time.

Design quality needs to be recognised at government ministerial level and allied to other initiatives including economic, transport, education and other regeneration initiatives. It needs to be able to be addressed both horizontally and vertically in terms of financial and political structure, and tied in financially with other departments rather than being isolated in its own. This needs to trickle through to local government and local interest bodies, and find champions in each borough and local authority region to take on the dissemination and promotion of relevant projects.

local authorities should be proactive and draw masterplans / lead infrastructure – Masterplans which need to be imposed on the developers. They should also take the lead in laying the infrastructure for a development area and recouping the cost either when they sell the land or through a development charge.

Leading by example should be an important step in the right direction.

Quality of leadership on planning qualities – Ensure councillors have the right skills on planning committees instead of people with the right local interest and connections (????)

Zero tolerance for neglect of the existing built environment

Use the powers already available to maintain quality in the built environment – from design through to maintenance and litter control- Publicise the powers available under S215 of the Planning Act. Remind the public about the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse, and introduce a similar code of practice for the maintenance of highways and the public realm.

Promotion, Education

Publicise good designs and investigate and then campaign to change the reasons that prevent good design in the UK.

Awards, recognition and publicity for good design. Publicity for poor design, naming and shaming.

More education and CPD.

More organisations like A+D Scotland - stop cutting their funding (CABE)

Better education including visits to best practice examples throughout Europe and elsewhere.

Single professional voice?

Maybe the RIBA, CABE, Landscape Institute and Urban Design Group should merge to project a coherent view and speak with a single loud voice. The government only seems to hear builders and developers moaning about the planning system.

Quality rating systems

Promote Building for Life 12.

Audit Local Planning Authority Design Policies - Audit LPA to see what design policies they have in terms of the built and natural environment. There must be a best case scenario to base it against.

System for development funding, design and planning

Local authorities should actively take part in design rather than reacting to design presented by architects or developers - Improving design requires local authority to engage properly in the design process. Currently LA play the role of judging design presented by architects. A more beneficial process would be if LA and designers work more closely together to develop design.

Stronger role for design in planning process, developers should pay full cost of providing design advice - in my experience they would welcome this when the advice is good.

Make the planning process focus on the long-term urban design of an area, rather than merely address housing supply - Local plans are primarily exercises in developing sufficient forward supply of housing land and poorly informed by consideration of urban form. There should be a requirement for an urban design input into the creation of local plans. Local plans should also be taken through a design reviews process - half the design decisions are implicit in the selection of development sites.

Avoid Multi-disciplinary meddle muddle

They can have educated and informed planning officers, estate managers, and others involved in the delivery of good quality projects in the built environment. They too often meddle leading to a dilution of the singular vision required for the delivery of excellent public buildings. Generally authorities only get involved at a deep level with better quality buildings feeling that they have the opportunity to 'design' themselves, rather than imposing a level of quality across the multitude of mediocre schemes that get planning permission everyday.

Commit to ecosystem approach

Clarity on Quality – what is good urban design and architecture

We need to take forward our contemporary understanding of what constitutes 'good' urban design and sustainable environments and stand up for it in polices at all levels - especially the strategic. We

can recognise the conflict with economic priorities. This means more controls, more design briefs and strategies and frameworks and codes. A slimmed down CABE should be reinstated and given proper funding for design review and support. The CLG needs to be reformed to take on urban design and heritage moved from the DCMS to the CLG.

Local authorities need to recognise the value of good design, maintain design expertise in house and apply sufficient weighting to the importance of design in determining planning applications. This needs to be backed up by the national policy framework and appeal decisions.

We know what's wrong with the poor quality of everyday housing –

- the way roads are laid out, and car parking dealt with,
- barely detached boxes,
- lack of urban quality & a suburban idyll,
- standard house types dressed up in different guises producing lack of a holistic integrity,
- minimal landscape etc.

Standards help somewhat but there remains a problem of judgement s about design being linked to taste and reliance on quantification rather than determinants of quality.

Community role

Communities should become informed clients - Programmes such a Locality Brokers is enabling communities to become 'informed clients' in their work to develop community owned property. The promotion of design quality needs to work both within the professional networks but also through other channels, on the demand side, such as community sector networks such as Locality, the public sector and business sectors to develop understanding, improve client confidence and create better investment decisions. Funders into the community sector also need to consider their investment approach. Since design decisions are made at the concept stage which in many cases for the community sector is often done pro bono, often based on least costs, because this stage is not often funded. This can undermine good quality design. Investment programmes should support concept develop work on a paid for basis or provide for retrospective funding of successful schemes. This is a blockage that relates to procurement which needs to be addressed at a national level.

Adopt tools and techniques to promote community ownership and ideas. The Localism Act policy goes a step towards enhancing this but such policy without commitment (time, money, political will) to effective participation will be ineffectual - designers, developers etc need to invest in developing good participative processes

Strengthen role and influence roles of Community rather than professionally based bodies such as local civic societies, conservation area committees etc

Create resident's urban design forums - In terms of local initiatives, residents urban design forums would help, where residents are given some training and then regular come to get her to review new buildings. where there are good examples locally that exhibitions are held in local venues to highlight good quality schemes

Systems

Don't let procurement and financing systems dominate

Important infrastructure projects must be icons of good design, not PFI exercises.. A different definition of public 'value' as more than just monetary short-term value could help, in particular in site disposition. No public finance for poor projects (see kick-start disaster)

Employ fully qualified architects and urban design practitioners at greater proportion than now is the case.

Ensure appropriately qualified consultants are working on all aspects of a project at the appropriate stages. Enforcement of what was proposed at a planning stage.

A fund to promote better than standard schemes - Consider helping to create a fund to support the improved quality of 'standard' schemes so that the quality of materials can be enhanced. Otherwise, under the current financial climate, schemes will remain cheaper as you cannot constantly rely on private developers to pay for everything.

Design review

Appoint Design Review Panels carefully, listen to what they say and implement recommendations. Reduce the power of English Heritage to save/protect every vaguely old looking brick wall in our cities.

Design review can be very variable in quality, from making genuinely helpful suggestions that can transform a development, generate value and reduce costs; to providing vacuous, sycophantic drivel. A quality standard for design review would be sensible. Design review needs to happen very early on in the design process. Design review panels should be multi-disciplinary with architecture, landscape, environmental and engineering points of view necessary to ensure that urban design can be properly reviewed.

Long term review

Commission retrospective & impartial reports on completed schemes & buildings in use.

It is imperative that the performance of developments is judged after their completion and after several years of use. A number of local authorities undertake user/residents surveys, and this should become not merely the norm, but used to inform current planning policies and the approvals given to new development

Policy infrastructure

Legislation, not policies, is required.

DCLG should take lead in design and heritage

Revive CABE

CABE was pretty much doing everything it could; reinstate it if possible. The circumstances of its closure are mysterious, given that it passed the public bodies review process.

Being truly independent and sufficiently funded is essential if any organisation is to make a real difference. Governments tend to abolish or starve quangos or funded bodies when they "go native." Neither Incentivising localities to welcome development, helping developers or making them pay for essential infrastructure like transport or leisure, as practised by the present government will help good design, which is driven towards being cheapest and worst.

Policies

Local and national bodies can introduce their own policies to promote design quality as an integral part of their Corporate Social Responsibility policies. National policy and guidance should be informed with support/advice from cross disciplinary organisations such as the Academy of Urbanism and Urban Design Group

Re instate Planning Policy Statements. Under-resourced local authorities are vulnerable without them.

Standards

Pint of milk test - standards for local amenities in new housing areas. Sustainable development should include new housing needing to promote sustainable transport - either through provision of public transport, local services. If it cannot, then it should not be built.

Better minimum standards for all new housing. These standards should be policy and un-negotiable. The standards should not differ between affordable, social and private housing. This would be a very important step to reducing stigmatisation (genuine tenure blindness).

An agreed national policy should require all local authorities to adopt its requirements. Local authorities should identify what makes each respective place important, and build on its local identity through additional policies to suit their location.

Regulations should aide innovation and variety by avoiding focusing on design form and but rather on built quality - Regulations may insist less on design forms but more on built quality? For instance, school design regulation may look back to what happened in 50s and to encourage new design layout and new learning programs etc. Rather than trying to format all education building design.

Urban Design supplement to the NPPF - As a supplement to the NPPF gov should set out a limited number of key UD docs and advisory bodies, explain their status and how/when they should be used. All local plans should have UD policies and guides on specific topics where needed

Local Plans should address design - design guides published alongside Local Plan should be a material consideration. Planning authorities should robustly push for a wider series of benefits for schemes coming forward.

Design Review should be a pre-requisite for all major development proposals. Urban design frameworks and masterplans should be set-up within design teams of council planning departments, in conjunction with external consultants if required. There should be adequate and free support from a national level body such as CABE for achieving this.

Useful, rather than primary school standard character statements - Character assessments must offer more than superficial and meaningless words, but a robust description that gives sufficient information for an area to be accurately reproduced.

- accurate specification of the materials used, and the style of use, sufficient to enable replacement materials to be obtained.
- architectural style – accurately described
- urban form – accurately described
- Socio-economic system in which the development was created and the function the buildings performed.

Design Champions and mentors in every council and with a remit beyond the environmental department. Councillors on Planning committee's must have attended workshops to understand the requirements of good quality design as defined through the documents of CABE et al. CABE should be retained and focus on being a resource for design quality. There is only a need to invent the wheel once it has been destroyed

A revision and update of the current design policy document would be beneficial. I think the government ought to release a companion guide to the NPPF or similar. I think this needs to be 'sold' to elected members also,

1 the infrastructure is in place- it needs to be recognised at the right levels- Design Panels/ professionals are in place and have been advocating change.

2) cross sector working will be benificial- even at LA level to understand how the impact on development industry will impact on policies or vice versa

1.5 What other recommendations would you like to make relating to this particular theme?

Government must provide the strategic basis for the built environment

The Government should have an official position and strategy in terms of design, and have the courage to back it up. It's no good ministers bleating about "pig ugly" development without having the conviction to do something about it.

Establishing a civilization that is resilient and does not exceed environmental limits

Embed urban design architecture and landscape architecture
There is a need to make the value of urban design, architecture and landscape architecture part of the national framework, siting how design impacts either positively or negatively on all aspects of life - from the quality of education, quality of healthcare, and the need to achieve net gains in the social, economic and environmental aspects of development.

Government should promote an holistic approach to design in the Built Environment and do not focus solely on architecture. Most people have a clear idea of what architects do - design buikldings - but do not consider the built environment. Promoting the use of Built Environment as a term at the expense of Architecture would create better quality places! Individual buildings are important, but it is the sum of the parts that matters so much more.

Do not islolate architecture- architecture by nature is part of a wider context- it surely is more about impact on an area/ neighbourhood

Government must provide a national energy

A national transport strategies
Development in the UK is hampered by a lack of a national transport and energy strategy.

Procurement and early stage investment at a national level between key stakeholders.

Engage key strategic bodies
Engaging key strategic bodies for each sector, in delivery of programmes to educate and support communities looking to take on assets, develop property and public spaces on how to secure better design quality.

Ensure communities are properly involved
More obligations under the Localism powers to involve communities at earlier stages in decision making around concept and design supported by a programme of education about what good quality design means.

Highway design

Road design standards that put people first over traffic, and calm traffic - e.g splay treatment, road widths

Public realm

The public realm is public and should be designed, managed and controlled by the public authorities. This includes the relationship between it and the adjacent buildings.

Promote pedestrian and place-oriented initiatives - Devolve transportation projects from being MERELY about transportation delivery - Organise events and festivals to erode moribund places

Divert funding from private development towards more meaningful public realm works - Join up development sites with linked initiatives using "City Tile" style concepts

Media exposure for built environment professionals

Write planners and architects into TV soaps and explain the problems, not easy but the recent documentary in planning showed good decisions can be made.

Professionalism - Ensuring there is a supply of skilled professionals who are employed in the built environment

Whilst it would be great to say that there should be a clear requirement to use high quality architects and urban designers I am not convinced that there are sufficient people of high enough quality to go round. Nothing is more dispiriting than persuading a developer to use an architect only to see them appointing someone of limited ability. Getting the team right is essential but getting the quality of our teams right comes first. In an ideal world for example, we might wish for fewer, better architects. Then making their use obligatory would bring real progress.

Ensure that only open minded architecturally educated individuals are able to engage with the aesthetic elements of the planning process. If architectural / design input is required then it should be provided by those with the relevant experience. But they should also be selected to be mature and open minded enough that they can understand that architecture is a creative process and that there are many different ways of designing a scheme, not just their own.

Greater recognition for the importance and the necessity of the role of the architects for improving people's lives and society.

Encourage the collaboration of design professionals in a non-competitive environment

A need for balance on quality and cost

In the current economic climate it is essential that money is used wisely and that design quality standards do not increase cost and hamper viability. High quality of architecture does not necessarily mean better place although is a component of it. We should focus our intellectual and financial capacity in creating places that work first and foremost and than be more innovative to add design flair to these places. High quality architecture and design should not drive up cost.

Quality in the environment need not cost more but, as an aim, it needs to be respected. Maybe we need a different word because "quality" like "sustainability" have become pretty meaningless.
Design review process as in west USA - talk to or involve john punter

Post occupancy surveys

Greater emphasis could be placed on adaptability and on capturing post-occupancy experiences of a place (as well as wider neighbourhood views) to allow for review and revision of sites where possible.

Research funding on mixed use

Fund research into different mixed-use typologies

Reform of government structures and rationalisation of responsibilities for the built environment

The government structures and their relationship with expert and non expert third parties need to be simplified - especially DC CABE role in relation to LPA in dealing with major planning applications

Set up government department linked to other initiatives - Establish coordinating, evolving central study group - Appoint local and regional champions -

Communities and context

We need better bridges between design, planning and people/communities. Designers need to become more humble to the complexities which exist in local places and local communities. Extreme rationalism and extreme individualism has a lot to answer for. However, we all need to develop a better Socio-economic context within which to work. Many of the core issues also come down to a failing economic system in which we all need to make a living.

National debate on quality

There should be a proper national debate about what good architecture is.

Governments need to be aware of the benefits and costs of good design

Many governments past and present have not been sufficiently educated about good design. It is often seen as a costly added extra; whereas the cost of poor design is something that remains with us for many years. Despite the mistakes of the modern architecture movement and post war planning, there is still a lack of recognition that the costs of poor design should not be tolerated, and good design must be the only kind of design acceptable for the country.

An active role for the state in the production of the built environment, alongside market provision

In total contradiction to the current government's ideology, the state should have an active role in the production of the built environment, alongside market provision. this provides alternate development environments within which to promote better design. The market militates against good design except at the most elite levels where design serves as a mark of distinction.
An informed client with confidence and a vision that drives schemes forward is one of the first pre-requisites. there are so many players in the process now it's not surprising compromise results in dilution of design.

Greater government support of the built environment profession – political and financial

The government would benefit from being more supportive of the built environment professions. I think that we have many of the tools that we need to promote and encourage good design, but some of them seem to be falling into disuse, due to a combination of lack of care and lack of resources. If we want to do better in the future then we need to resource things properly...surely this would be an investment in all of our futures rather than a cost ?

Education in urban design for people undertaking masterplanning

Better education of all planners and architects who undertake masterplanning. All should be required to complete an MA in Urban Design

Greater focus on creating places – with landscape and urban design considered at the outset

Architects and clients need to stop thinking of the external environment as an 'after thought'; design teams should include good landscape architects/ urban designers at the start.   Architects need to stop thinking of 'egos' and concentrate on creating 'places' that respond to their context.

A revival of public sector architecture

Public service architecture in the UK, working together with private firms was once the envy of the world. Now there are no public sector architects. Almost everything is done by bidding.

Create a level playing field for small and medium architecture and design practices

The government procurement system and 'one stop' mentality disadvantages smaller practice contribution.

Procurement is another big obstacle, let younger and less well established practice be able to design, as opposed to choosing those who show they have already the right amount of PI.

Simplify and rationalise the building regulations

Many building regulations seem increasingly unnecessary, arbitrary, open to abuse and varied interpretation.

Encourage architecture and design to be focused on quality rather than on process

Architecture is process, risk and contract, not quality driven. On recent past performance most people mistrust the motives, practices and products of government, enterprise and professionals. Restoring mutual trust should be the first priority.

Providing true long term leadership for the country for regions, for cities for towns and for villages.

Elect Jan Gehl prime minister.

Providing a planning framework that facilitates innovation and addresses risk-aversion

Experimentation is a big part of innovation but planning authorities & public sector funders, being very risk-averse, tend to work on precedented projects & shy away from innovation. If we want to operate at a global standard in terms of design quality we have to find the right balance or risk & experimentation.

Ensuring the planning system employs sufficient people who have the skills to do the job

Redundancies across LPA have included large numbers of experienced and qualified design staff. Funds from planning and CIL fees should be ringfenced to fund a minimum of 1 additional post in each LPA

2.1 In what ways does architecture and built environment design contribute to the UK economy?

Direct exports

Design education, expertise and excellence for UK consumers and to sell abroad.

British architects and designers are very successful abroad; they are part of the export value of the UK economy. If other countries believe they are value for money, it follows that they also would do so at home. Moreover (and this is discussed below) well designed buildings and spaces are known to work better, just as a well designed car works better than a badly designed one.

We export our talents and earn money for the economy. We foster products that get exported (unfortunately increasingly rare as government strangles small businesses)

Construction industry as part of the Domestic Economy

In terms of value it is a huge part of our GDP

It takes hundreds and thousands of people to build and improve the environment that puts people in work and generates a perpetuating economy.

The construction industry has long been recognised as a generator of growth. The planning system (including control of design) is often seen as a barrier to the industry. Evidence shows that in the long term, good design generates higher values than poor design.

The construction industry is a major component of the UK economy and the design stages are part of that process/ If this slows down, everything else slows down with it. Improved planning decision making and removal of planning policy gaps needs to be sorted asap.

It is an integral part of the construction industry including transportation and infrastructure. It's also exportable. Denmark has had great success in architecture and built environment design in their domestic economy, and has been able to develop this service globally as a major export, which has attracted people to the country. Other than a few large commercial businesses, the UK has lagged behind.

Image "Place marketing" – attracting investment

It can create heritage and places that people want live in, work in, and wish to visit. It can lift people's desires and aspirations. How this supports the economy has been well documented many times in the past, and this has not changed. Clough Williams-Ellis said that "good design is good business"; he was right, and proved it with Portmeirion.

Creates an image of pride and progress which can attract business.

Style and sense of unique place, making that place unique and a desirable destination Construction industry Regional capitals of distinction Infrastructure design linking places, regions, countries "London is cool"

Improve image and increase competitive and comparative advantages of the UK.

Creates identity and sense of place.

Can create new iconic sense of place, eg new east London dock areas, can re-contextualise older industrial areas - eg Gehry, in Bilbao, in MIT Boston.

Good quality urban environment can help attract investment and encourage regeneration. The extent to which there is a direct link requires more research, building on CABE's work

Sense of local identity and attachment to a place

Placemaking is a huge factor. Good quality design gives a distinct sense of place which makes a location recognisable & encourages people to relate to them.

Quality of life

By making great places to live, work and play and reducing the spectacular reliance on cars. This will lead to improved healthy living, mentally, physically and spiritually.

Wellbeing is the most important factor that comes before economics

Economics should not be a primary consideration, the value of architecture should be measured first and foremost on the basis of people's well-being. The benefits of that will help diminish the converse situation where the built environment is an aggravating factor when people are faced with their own predicament raising mental health issues and tension in families and communities. The UK approach to everything in life seems to be based on making a profit, getting financial added value.

Improving public health through encouraging active lifestyles

Reducing demands on social care by creating places and spaces that encourage social contact and friendship

Attracting and retaining a skilled workforce that will provide the basis for a successful local economy

It helps to make this country into a nice place to live in. This attracts people with ideas about how to live and produce items which can be sold. Workers like to work in well designed buildings and will try to find jobs in attractive locations.

The quality of our place makes for vibrant and co-cohesive places in which people what to live and work. Good companies need good people and good, well educated and highly skilled people don't want to live in poorly made places.

Business

Ease of doing business
Attracts visitors and footfall

Productivity

Good places to live and work do improve productivity.

Regeneration

In poorer/ rundown communities focusing on regeneration the investment in the built environment can result in multiple outcomes: with careful procurement can lead to short term construction jobs, development of local supply chains. in the longer term redeveloped or new property can be a catalyst for new economic activity not only in the property but as a result of increased confidence in an area for example the impact of Coin Street builders over 30 years + work in the South Bank.

Helping an area cope with economic and social change

Good design' interior, exterior and 'inbetween' landscaping can clearly add value to a site and also to the surrounding area. It can be used to stimulate creativity, also establish dynamic spaces that allow for challenging times e.g. pop up shops in addressing high street crisis

Greater demand for individual developments/buildings

Higher letting rates
Higher property prices

Tourism

the tourism dimension. The Olympics and the Jubilee last year in London proved that local and international tourism in the UK is key. Part of our offer is our high quality cities and towns - from historic environment to the evening economy design has a key role to play.

Profile: high quality and well known environment = tourism promotion (including eg business tourism) and this means design relating to identified qualities of built and natural environments. Not every (in fact, only a very few) development can be "iconic"!

Increased land values/profitability of development

There are much higher values for land and resulting development when good design is employed. I have seen a scheme of only 33 houses see an uplift of £500,000 land value after a good architect was employed as he was able to vastly increase the quality of placemaking while adding 9 extra units to the development!

On another case, the use of design review requesting further changes to the form and design of a new development added a further 20 apartments to a development of 201 dwellings.

There is no doubt that architecture and other design professions can have a marked impact on the value of land and buildings. However I think the opposite has happened over recent years in many very large-scale developments where mediocre to weak quality has prevailed on many housing estates, wasting the opportunity to create a positive legacy and in so doing weakening property values. High quality and innovative architecture generates its own bespoke set of markets in how different elements of a building work, fit together etc and this is very positive. What is not evident in many parts of the UK is the creation of more bespoke architecture, which has a bigger more positive impact on the economy than the volume house builder approach has. **Self build housing should be promoted in this light.**

People choose to live in places with a high quality of life (Berlin, San Francisco etc) a huge amount of this relates to the quality of the built environment.

Well designed and well maintained public parks create higher property values.

46

Parks, rivers, lakes, streams designed into a town add to quality of life, can add 20 per cent to property prices.

Efficient use of land

Good quality architecture and building design produce higher densities on one hand and create attractive settlements on the other hand - both elements have positive impact on housing market and economy as well.

Obvious but un-quantified

Good quality design has to be built which requires investment into the economy. Good quality design creates value of the physical environment both in terms of hard cash and the values of the environment, community and wider society (re CABE - The Value of Design)

Greatly,   In ways that have not/ cannot be measured- tourism, landscape, education etc

Short term cost – long term value

Unfortunately design is both an economic value and a cost centre. It depends on who you talk to, and what their time frame of interest is. Short term investment and development interests do not stick around long enough to benefit from the value uplift, which may only become apparent years down the line.

Cost of poor design

Poor design cost money in so many ways. Shorter lifespan, more maintenance, less commercial success etc. Good design reduces whole-life cost.

Crime

Obesity

Social exclusion

Car dependency and congestion

Dependency on fossil fuels, and vulnerability to price increases

Dependency on imported energy, exacerbating balance of payment deficit, and exposing the economy to energy insecurity

2.2 It is claimed that high standards of architectural and built environment design add economic value. Can this be demonstrated and, if so, how?

2.2 It is claimed that high standards of architectural and built environment design add economic value. Can this be demonstrated and, if so, how?

NB – the difference between "financial value" with "economic value"

Economic value should always include both social and natural assets and not only financial factors. As such the value to health and wellbeing provided by good design cannot be ignored, see CPRE London paper on Green Infrastructure that talks about economic value of natural ecosystems, including to health, food production, climate resilience, air quality etc http://www.cprelondon.org.uk/resources/item/2216-living-london-cpre-guide. Equality an emphasis on issues like walkability has been shown to benefit local economies in terms of increased footfall etc.

Pre-existing work by CABE

Many of these questions have been covered by extensive CABE publications. the Farrell Review should seek a mechanism by which this literature gets refreshed and maintains its currency. The cost of preserving this literature through updates would be far less than reinventing everything.

Quantitative Examples -/Actual or Potential

Built a small new square in Great Queen Street which increased land values by up to £26m annually and including commercial floorspace this could reach £50m annually.

We have two schemes in Swindon which can demonstrate this as a result of better design quality. One example was through the design review process and the other through the use of a good architect employed for a site which already had planning permission for a poor quality scheme.

CABE have demonstrated this previously. More work could be done on this to ram the evidence base down the throats of those who just see it as a waste of money. Why do we have to ask this question again when it has been proven over the last 10 years?

Figures from tourist agencies show that visitors are attracted to historic sites. Answer to 6.(2.1) adds the employment factor, surveys have been made and more will help to convince doubters.

Living Streets has published, is publishing, information about the economic importance of investing in public realm.

Look up historic examples- that are still standing and are generating revenue for the country- what is they were cheaply built and crumbled in 50 years- as some of the buildings now being built will do!

Read *The Economic Value of Urban Design* prepared by the now defunct North West Development Agency (NWDA) which is an excellent demonstration.

There are a number of reports produced by the Princes Foundation, Savills, CABE etc all demonstrating the good design adds economic (as well as environmental and social) value.

2.2 It is claimed that high standards of architectural and built environment design add economic value. Can this be demonstrated and, if so, how?

It can be clearly demonstrated that places perform better (higher visitor numbers, higher turnover in retail, higher yield etc) when PUBLIC REALM is improved; whether this works just for architecture without the public realm as well I do not know

Transport for London have produced a toolkit called Valuing the Urban Realm - this shows the economic benefits accruing from investment in public space. https://toolkit.urban-realm.co.uk

Look at house prices in places like St.Andrews, Edinburgh, Pretty fishing Villages in the East Neuk of Scotland (or around the UK) People flock to them both for Holiday houses and as places to retire. The urban density in many of these places is among the highest in the country and yet command some of the highest prices.

London's South bank/ Tate modern/ Millennium bridge is a great example of the combination of high design standards adding economic value to an area. Eden project in Cornwall is another. High line in New York. There are various examples around UK - however it is not just high standards of design that create success, they are part of a wider process.

Look at examples - eg Frank Gehry's, Bilbao guggenheim and his MIT building in Boston.

Qualitative / Assertion / General

It depends what you mean by high standards. A slick building envelop may look well on the front cover of the Architectural Review, but may be the last thing that the locals really need and therefore must be questioned as to its 'good design' credentials.

Turnover in well designed places is better than in poor ones.

Yes to the point that if this particular element of development has the power to attract new high value businesses. However, this may not be the case for all sectors and all spectrum of provision within each sector.

There is a growing amount of evidence that quality environments add value, both economic and societal (eg health). Developers know that houses fronting an open space have higher value than those not fronting it. This is an obvious example but there are plenty of others. The links between health and environment are now incontrovertible.

Yes, in relation to higher densities and quality design homes. Quality design includes many elements which make houses attractive for buyers: energy efficiency, places with attractive outdoor spaces, smart floor plans that are efficient and logical, visual appearance of the buildings, skilled detailing, innovative design and many many other elements.

Ask investors what factors attracted them to a particular area, offering a range of possible reasons to rank

You need to do some studies comparing and contrasting good and poor schemes and doing before and after comparisons.

By an improved quality of life for people using the buildings and living in the area, across a wide range of factors.
Better places people spend more time and more money.

2.2 It is claimed that high standards of architectural and built environment design add economic value. Can this be demonstrated and, if so, how?

Clearly, well designed and attractive places generally have a higher economic value, than a poorly designed , unattractive equivalent. taking case studies, this can be demonstrated in every city/town/village. The difficultly is getting standard house builders to look at the economic value of quality and how it doesn't necessarily affect profit.

Better building lasts and is more adaptable. Whole life and maintenance costs are lower
About wellbeing and happiness - see above

By polling visitor destinations Analysing movements of people back into cities Looking at corporation HQ set-ups in former industrial areas Reviewing development cost/profit Retail house price indices Company profits in regeneration areas
See above.

This question has been asked repeatedly over the past 100 years. And it is astonishing that we keep asking it. Why not invert the question: eg what are the costs of vehicular traffic clogging/ratrunning London streets?

Not Quantifiable

The complex nature of design means that it produces far reaching effects which may not have inextricable links with their cause. Recent comments from politicians about 'proving the value of the arts' shows a gross misunderstanding of this. Design is embedded in culture which is the one thing that sets us apart from other animals. It's value is therefore clearly huge but not measurable.

is it too simple to say that better designed/higher quality schemes generate more cash which then filters into the economy because in general they cost more?

2.3 What is the commercial value of our historic built environment for the UK brand and for local economies and tourism?

Quantitative Examples

One would need to extrapolate the reasons that tourists give for visiting certain locations and apportion the value of that, based on the time & money spent at certain destinations. According to English Heritage there were 54million heritage site visitors in 2010. According to Visit Britian Heritage tourism supports £12.4billion a year and an estimated 195,000 full-time jobs. Of every £1 spent as part of a heritage visit, only 32p is spent on site. The remaining 68p is spent away from the attraction itself – but as a direct result of visiting heritage – in restaurants, cafés, hotels and shops, for example. This 'heritage motivator' is what produces the substantial economic-impact results that we find through the research. See:
http://www.hlf.org.uk/aboutus/howwework/Documents/HLF_Tourism_Impact_single.pdf

Check ONS/GRO Scotland for evidence.

Tourist footfall.

See visitor numbers for major attractions, and how many depend on historic built (and natural) environment. The extent to which historic environments also feature in global advertising, and in influencing developments overseas (including Japanese replication of traditional buildings and townscapes) is also a significant point.

Qualitative Examples

Vienna and Venice are regarded as the finest cities in the world bar none. The reason is their historic built environment.

As far as can be ascertained, precisely no tourists have travelled from Japan to visit Thurrock Lakeside, Dartford Bluewater, or Cribs Causeway Bristol.

Locality knows from its work on community asset transfer and community rights that communities are keen to take on the range of historic property from lidos to mills, workhouses to nuclear bunkers to bring them into new life to benefit the community – socially and environmentally as well as economically. Many of these potential assets are in areas of market failure and their regeneration can act as the cornerstone for the improvement of a locality.

The Historic Built environment is particularly valued by visitors to the UK. The English village has a particular strength of quality of distinctiveness.

Goodness me another question that is self explanatory. Did you see Britain's Got Talent, the winner was a puppet show focusing on the Heritage of Great Britain. by a Hungarian group. if they get it how come this review doesn't?

There aren't many places worth visiting that do not have historic importance. The only ones are probably shopping centres.

Very high and needs to be recognised by careful control. It sometimes helps if English Heritage would employ more experience advisors who have confidence to allow some new work and not insist on like for like replacement.

There is great value in the tourism and creative industries sector. However, our present planning system does not recognise this. Indeed it works against it. For example too many of our best cathedral cities and historic towns are being hit with housing targets that pay no regard to their special national and international importance coupled with the delicate nature of their urban framework and built environment.

In my opinion the commercial value of historical is substantial looking at the performance in the market of Historical housing stock as well as new provision that replicate historical features. However, a new approach for more contemporary buildings should be embraced to allow the current and future generations to make a stamp on the built environment development. The Netherland is an example of this.

Local and International tourism / city breaks etcetera are most important to some of our smaller regional and sub-regional centres. Many of our cities rely on their historic environments and culture for a solid portion of income.

Not everything is worth saving and to have high quality NEW stuff we have to reduce the primacy of the old stuff in every location. Context matters and 'historic' is a relative value.

The UK brand is a very sad expression: is the UK a kind of soap powder???? However, as tourism is one of the main contributors to the UK economy and as a substantial proportion of tourists come for the historic built heritage, there is little doubt that the latter has an important commercial value. Furthermore the imaginative re-use of the heritage is always admired by visitors.

Examples in arts and crafts movement, designed towns (medieval, garden suburbs etc)

The historic environment is absolutely important but so is new development of the highest quality. I believe France has shown a good mix of both respect of the old and welcoming of the new.

Hugely important. People do not come to visit the UK to use its shopping centres and office blocks. People come to see the sights and as far as the international brand of the UK is concerned, built heritage is key. Why else are Bath, Cambridge, Oxford etc such tourism hotspots?

Britain is an historical place and that is why it is special. The layers of history create the sense of place but we have forgotten how to create 'special' places- towns, villages etc because 'place building' isn't on the agenda because of a number of reasons (economy, lack of expertise, lack of funds, lack of client vision)

It earns its keep at a higher level than any other part of the built environment, in function, in attracting people to historic places, in eco or carbon terms over whole life. The UK is not a "brand." It is a nation, a people, a feeling, many things but not a brand.

How many foreign visitors come to the UK every year to see the likes of Big Ben, the Tower of London, the Albert Dock, etc.?

The historic built environment is central to the commercial value of the UK brand. It can play an important role to local economies and tourism, but is often interpreted as preservation at the expense of developing other areas of local economic activity.

immense. duh. so let's spend billions of Lottery ticket money on redoing it, and ignore the fact that at the same time Council's are struggling to refill sandboxes in public play areas.

Not Quantifiable

There is value but it can't be quantified

immeasurable. ironically much of it was developed under circumstances with no regard for historic value or the tourist economy. in a way, good design stands apart from commercial value, and can be appropriated by commerce for various ends at different points of its history (ie the reprogramming and reuse of industrial and ecclesiastical buildings).

Possibly incalculable. Certainly very high. This is why place making has to be highly contextual to be of value.

Not Quantifiable

2.4 How do we ensure the culture of architectural and built environment design excellence is part of a perceived national brand identity that can be exported and how can our expertise (such as place-making and sustainability) be offered to a rapidly urbanising world?

Don't impose Western Architecture and urbanism on the rest of the world

It is vital that we do not impose a western pattern of architecture and urban design on the rest of the world, but encourage development that reflects local climate, culture and family tradition. Technology is important.

Do not try to inflict British design which might not work in a different climate with a different living pattern. The short answer to this is DON'T

Do NOT make standards for uniform application. Much of the culture of our places is in their differentiated identities. Too many formulaic, modish design responses are already undermining this. Beware damage in this regard by over powerful policy departments eg H&S, Highways, PLanning (block planning instead of plot planning). Evidence - how many visitors to the UK want to go to Milton Keynes - or of that matter how many Brits want to?

i am not entirely supportive of the expansion of 'British' expertise in other cultures; the attitude of exporting such expertise runs too closely to a form of cultural imperialism. UK experts should seek ways of enabling indigenous forms of design to emerge, and not simply assert itself as superior.

Need to identify the nature of the expertise, and ensure that it is generic; NOT seeking to export UK-specific design solutions!

Communicate –

Use normal language – avoid technical slang

First avoid technical slang such as place-making and sustainability. Working abroad to promote good design has language difficulties, in French the common use of soutenir goes with food! Help the local people to appreciate what quality of environment they have. Arrange study tours,

Use social media, and show how the past can provide guidance for the future

Communication, and in particular the use of social media can be extremely important. People appreciate what the country's past has to offer, and so we need to ensure the future does to and get the message out there.

Develop a Reputation for excellence

The UK must become accomplished in creating good and sustainable places within the UK

Try to design proven good and sustainable urban places in your own backyard first, then the notoriety will follow naturally. At the moment the UK remains several decades behind other

European nations due to its obsession with everything having to show to generate a financial added value over other benefits such as well-being. Private initiatives are too much relied upon.

Through UK exemplars in higher quality urban deign

By realising some higher quality Urban design - we need more exemplars and we need to develop an economy which is a stakeholder economy with a focus on long-term aims and objectives. We then need to channel expertise though colleges and Universities - with increased ties between other part of the globe. We also need to do something which demonstrate that we can generate appropriate local responses rather than more of the same old international style....

Commit to excellence at all times - don't focus on exports for their own sake

Maintain an architectural and design iconography

Design new icons such as Trafalgar Square and the gherkin.

Sustainability of UK design industry depends on having a domestic market

These expertise and excellence are already exported and some British consultants now have more work abroad than at home. This may not be possible on the long term if the home base work is not nurtured as they need to develop their ideas and expertise at home before going abroad. A lot more investment is needed at home, so that examples can be shown and expertise consolidated. The competition from other countries is very strong!

Much of the work is already outside the UK.

Transform attitude towards designers

Transform culture and education - not really possible. Britain is still hide-bound by the class system and architects, landscape architects, urbanists, planners etc are regarded either as 'trade' or as something indulged in by 'gentlemen'. Until these skills are truly valued and also incorporated back into the public sector, we're unlikely to get an improvement in attitude or an understanding that this is a serious issue.

Be truthful about design excellence

It depends how are perceived excellence is exported. Is it being used as a sop (by 'good design') by developers and governments to push through their rapid pace hyper developments or is it being used as a critical tool for reformation of unsustainable practice that threatens the future of the planet?

Encourage two way exchange

By encouraging two way exchange – its not all about export.

Provide quality training for designers and architects

It is already, our architects are in demand all over the world. But also by ensuring that future generations of architects are able to be educated in an affordable way, that allows are schools of architecture to be some of the best in the world. By ensuring that our government develops the

centres of excellence and invests in the research that is able to nurture the talent here in the UK. It is instructive that some of our best architects best projects are in Europe rather than in the UK.

What Expertise should be Marketed and Promoted Internationally?

Underlying principles of urban of development
By working to recognise, test and build the principles, which will travel, rather than the 'solution' which will fit anywhere.

Sustainable Place Making
We have to take advantage of our expertise in sustainable place-making, ideas such as measuring the quality of large-scale sustainable developments (BREEAM Communities as an example).

Suds and Waster Sensitive Urban Design
Understanding how to be efficient with water and how to create sustainable drainage systems within large scale developments is a crucial issue in many parts of the world and this knowledge and expertise should be shared.

Olympic Legacy
The legacy of the Olympics should also be promoted as much as possible

Urban conservation
We need to revisit our past successes and learn from them. Our expertise in urban conservation and our massive experience of creating new towns are all being neglected and forgotten. It is a rich area for examination by the Review. Equally, national planning policies must recognise the special nature of our greatest urban assets. It is a massive error for the NPF to treat all places as the same.

Adaptation
Perhaps, the best skill that exists in UK is the ability to adapt and reinterpret, building upon existing fabric and giving it a new future. This means that places appear to change organically while maintaining a sense of their past history. Kings Cross in London is a good example of where this is happening. In a rapidly urbanising world, much of the past is being torn down instead. There are other areas of unique skills that can and should be promoted. The quality of good architecture and good public space in new development, ecologically sustainable approaches based on best practice examples, Good quality housing all need to be promoted as an exportable design service.

Star architects / engineers
Let's really push star architects/ engineers, and eccentrics. i thought the Design Council already doing this? oops their funding has been slashed 40% n the last three years!

The understanding of the long term urbanisation process
UK could be a valuable case study for the third world. From uncontrolled development during early industrialisation, problems of sanitation and congestion, the engineering response and the problems that brings, the introduction of planning systems, the consequences of over-regulation and under-regulation. The growth of awareness of sustainability and what to do in the 21st century.

Promoting the national brand

The British Tourist board seems to do fine on the first part.

Generate integrated branding strategy and market the whole thing as one.

Study tours

Promotion of study tours by civic leaders in rapidly urbanising cities, so they can see what we have done well, done badly and could do differently.

There is no national brand – and it is not like soap powder

There is not a perceived national brand regarding architecture and build environment design. It is dangerous to put Nationalism in the equation.

End the cheap "brand" and "export" mentality. All places in the world have their individuality and quality if left alone. Our policy should be to help ourselves and other to do better. Feeding the world would avoid 2 million child deaths each year. Design excellence is local, not global.

A national brand identity is a dangerous concept. It has to evolve and be regional and local too. "Cool Britannia" is a toe-curler. We have to promote: - Localism - Heritage - Innovation hand in hand with tradition (technology, design, ingenuity, craft) - Music/fashion/culture - We have to recognise out culture's ability to assimilate and reprocess other design influences Expertise can be distributed through: - successful economic stories - better transport links and accessibility - familiarity with city structures and solutions to issues such as density v quality (cf Kensington and Chelsea) - Transport infrastructure solutions including road taming, and rediscovering lost villages and high streets - Developing (literally) new city economic hubs such as at Canary Wharf and Edinburgh Exchange - Focussing place-making on culture and the arts as a financial positive too - Mixed-use centres of high density focussed on transport hubs

Promoting skills internationally

The Depart of Trade and industry to promote these skills overseas and at such events as the Venice Biennale and other national exhibitions .

Promote acknowledged strengths

Consider the perceptions that already exist- which are the areas that the country is better known to excel in - Education, service industry- can this existing credibility be used to promote building design./architecture to begin with?

Who could do it

RICS International works to promote surveyors expertise internationally, RIBA, the green building council and Urban Design Group and others could do the same, including promoting professionals to work with key international agencies in the urbanising developing world including Africa and Asia e.g. UN Habitat.

2.5 To enhance market leadership in built environment design how can we ensure that the UK is leading and responding to innovations in technology, sustainability and communications in an era of rapid globalisation?

Close the researcher practitioner gap –

Few practitioners seek research information; many researchers do not seek practitioners who can use their research findings. The result is that Research Council funding is being wasted. Research Councils should be held to account. As an example, relatively few practitioners appear to be aware of the £50 million EPSRC funded Sustainable Environment Initiative.

Hold research councils to account on the awareness and uptake of the research that they fund

Research councils command massive budgets that greatly exceed that of CABE at its height. Yet this research is practically invisible in terms of influencing the day to day work of design practitioners. Apparently research findings have had little impact on

Ensure research contributes to practice in the real world

The UK government needs to support skills development, as well as applied research and practitioner-led innovation of new approaches, including through the research councils e.g. ESRC and AHRC, Technology Strategy Board, as well as showcasing of UK skills in the international arena

Let research proposals be reviewed by practitioners to challenge whether any findings will be usable.

Support universities to be vibrant and relevant in the research they undertake and the courses they provide

Ensure that universities excel in research. And maintain excellent grad and post grad courses with outside teaching but with a greater proportion of UK citizens. Reduce their reliance on foreign income.

Demonstrably high quality built environment education (in this context note the demonstrable adverse effect on potential overseas markets of actions and pronouncements of UK Government and UK Border Agency .

Get rid of the bloated and artificial bodies of specialist practice knowledge that stand in the way of genuine interdisciplinary working and innovation

An example is the guidance base for highways is of very poor quality, lacking a science or evidence base, but rather being based on tradition, and yet runs to thousands of pages.   Other examples include the absence of a rational description of density – where units per hectare could be single bedroom flats or five bedroom town houses.

2.5 To enhance market leadership in built environment design how can we ensure that the UK is leading and responding to innovations in technology, sustainability and communications in an era of rapid globalisation?

Get government to encourage, or at least be receptive to innovation

The Department of Transport has a poor record in leading innovation, generally being ten to twenty years behind best practice, and very much relying on the work of individuals to make the case for change. It has tried to catch up in recent years, but is being hit by resource cut backs.

Resist the tick box approach to design that ticks boxes by engaging a multiplicity of different specialists to tick individual boxes, with the consequence that cohesive design falls apart

Create a knowledge and evidence based body of guidance that all practitioners in the built environment can share

These areas of knowledge need to be challenged and reduced so that there is a common knowledge base that can be shared by all people who wish to practice in the built environment.

Be truly omni-disciplinary - address areas including:

ICT/Smartphones – impact on human lifestyles, travel styles, transformation of the usability and appeal of bus transport

Changes in retail patterns brought about by ICT/internet

Intelligent transport systems and Intelligent speed adaptation – which will change the face of vehicle use

Waste management systems that are integrated into the design of the built environment

Design of utilities – that are efficiently incorporated into the built environment rather than added as an afterthought

Sociology and anthropology used to enable a better understanding of human need, and to inform the design and management of the built environment, including looking at areas such as "pro-social behaviour"

Support for research in human behaviour and it's application through design, and for developing organisational processes that can be used to create positive community planning are essential. There needs to be parallel support in humanities/social sciences comparable to traditional technological based research programmes.

Grasping the ideologies

By demonstrating a grasp of the differing ideological approaches that lead either to the frenzied search for more sophisticated fixes for a broken system or of postulating a new model rooted in natural systems and an understanding of the role of urbanism in the rapid urbanisation of the planet.

2.5 To enhance market leadership in built environment design how can we ensure that the UK is leading and responding to innovations in technology, sustainability and communications in an era of rapid globalisation?

Training in urban design and innovation

Train people in urban design to appreciate the different formats needed for different cultures.

Make sure that we are up to date, how many architects have solar panels on their own houses?

Aim for good design everywhere rather than occasional iconic development and starchitects.

Stop building architecture and stop making students into stachitects. Bring some authenticity back into architecture and stop colluding with homogenised global capital. Recognise that small scale and diverse is collectively more resilient for us all in the long term.

Ensure that the relevant education strands are supported by central government funding and fund promotion.

Use SMEs as a power house for innovation

I am constantly amazed by the new ideas there are in small / micro businesses. Unfortunately it withers and dies under the burden of red tape.

Local firms need to be helped to develop their expertise, not through subsidies but through investment and more work.

Unsure about this one, but we do have a lot to offer. If the huge engineering firms can avoid dominating the discourse, that might help second tier firms to shout a bit louder.

Leadership by government, by clients Is needed

Needs to be led from the top; government needs to emphasise & enable.

Create opportunities for generalisation of the technology, sustainability and communications across the board. Lead with leaders who empower knowledge, creativity and innovation.

By demanding more from sustainability and visioning at every level.

Without client vision and aspiration, there will be no product- apart from a few exceptions which is currently the case. The Government needs to break the cartel of the national housebuilders and allow creative responses to sites- truly working with local partnerships.

Promote the UK as a case study of industrialisation and post industrial urbanism

We need to recognise our nation's individuality without reproducing others' successes, yet acknowledging these influences on our changing design culture. We need the confidence and ingenuity to recognise and promote the talent and experience we have in these emerging fields, to celebrate them and to promote them, to grow them internationally. We can learn best from the cities that we know have grown in the last century, the regional grouped centres of Manchester/Salford/Leeds/Bradford, of London, of Glasgow. Also we can learn from out post-industrial decline and fading coastal places where regeneration has failed - and why.

2.5 To enhance market leadership in built environment design how can we ensure that the UK is leading and responding to innovations in technology, sustainability and communications in an era of rapid globalisation?

Investment in education, and encouragement of fresh thinking and entrepreneurship.

Systemic changes needed

Land ownership and assembly methods

Change land ownership and assembly methods. Increase the skill base of local aurhorities. Allow for good knowledge transfer across all stakeholders and communities. Educated consumers about design.

2.6 What other recommendations would you like to make relating to this particular theme?

Become omni-disciplinary and knowledge based.

Allow more knowledge based evidence from other industries to affect the debate about good design in architecture, particularly where it touches on human need and sociological phenomena.

Open up cross sector forums- let building users influence designs and demand for better standards.

End users and wider stakeholders need to be involved in order to ensure that a policy is realistic and accountable.

The various professions across the built environment need to collaborate more, and also collaborate to get their message across to Government that "good design is good business"

Ensure nations retain the design that stems from their culture, climate, and country.

This is a post imperialist age. We are not always right and it s important to recognise that other nations should be encouraged to value their own styles.

Out and out modernism isn't always the answer. Historically sensitive and traditional designs can also be of great value.

Study local identity and aspiration, avoid one size fits all.

Recognising the balance between local value and international applicability, and developing a vehicle to ally the two through a series of propositions and initiatives.

Invest in innovation

Look at the built environment industry like any other that needs investment to develop innovation.

Stop navel contemplation

The architectural profession as a whole needs to spend less time contemplating its own navel as if it is the centre of universe, take off the blinkers, and see there's a much bigger world out there than they've been seeing since Victorian/Edwardian times and the demise of the Empire..

Commit to excellence

Market leadership is less important than a commitment to excellence

3.1 How does architecture and the built environment contribute to our society and its identity and how should we evaluate this?

(a)   How does architecture and the built environment contribute to our society and its identity...?

Adaptability over the course of time

Architecture contributes to our society in as much as it can adapt to the frequent changes over time. Most historic periods have produced buildings that switch uses from residential, to commercial to retail to religious and vice versa often without the intervention of architects and planners. That allows buildings to stay contributing to society over generations and gain heritage value as time goes on. That has not happened in the 20C where demolition is usually the only way out.

Ask some anthropologists, and keep asking them, so that there is continuous improvement in design.

Identity – association with a place

Historically architecture and design has been an expression of the society and its identity and that it's how it should be. Therefore, architecture and design should focus more to address the current issues of society, lifestyle, culture change, mobility, demographics etc.

Greatly - **the society identifies itself with a local architecture and local environment**. People who live in the environment which has its own identity and character seem happier, more protective and care more for it.

It provides a link with the past and the feeling that we are part of a long standing community.

Architecture contributes to sense of place...there are many number of books written about this.

Architecture plays a huge part in defining who we are & who we perceive ourselves to be. E.g. Industrial heritage, country houses, corporate identity...etc. The only way to quantify this is through understanding people's perceptions.

They are at the core of how people identify with place and society.

We often define ourselves and where we are from by our built environment. For example, I am from the Potteries, and define myself through this link. When people think of the Potteries, they think about pot works, bottle ovens, these make the place unique. Other people from other places probably do exactly the same.

High quality design and thoughtful and appropriate architecture can transform the urban experience.

Can help create and build 'Communities'

Can create places people want to live in and improve, this attracts others, encourages and provides foundations for development of communities, communities create self caring human society - this is worth having - because it helps people make money. And that is what really matters - unfortunately no one can deny this.

"We shape our building, thereafter they shape us" - Churchill. This is as true in Ross - on Wye as it is in the 1960s social housing experiments of Tottenham, Hulme etc.

It helps to assist society to create the framework for sustainability, activity, prosperity, safety and security.

Enabling the serendipity of social interaction in the public spaces and streets.

(b)   ...And how should we evaluate this?

Public participation in process of evaluation

Involvement of the public in a debate about architecture and built environment should be a part of the process of evaluation.

Through surveying the quality of life and visitor attraction

By noting how much people like living in a place. Check crime figures.

Quality of life surveys, number of tourists attracted etc - there are many such surveys by various bodies. Don't really need to focus much more on this as most accept it is good to aim for high quality - how to achieve it is the hard part.

Space is a machine that forms, controls and can kill. This can be evaluated by **measuring the happiness and success** of the societies that live within a space.

It can be evaluated by studying **how people use space, surveying how they relate to place**, e.g. What places give them happy memories, or sad. How they rate the importance of certain places in their lives, what do they feel important in moving about their community (quality of paving, planting, etc.) research like this has been done by various universities internationally.

Audit of all neighbourhoods.

The key to this is place and landscape. Quality in both of these contributes to well-being.

Compare house prices of a conservation area with new built.

The built environment determines how we use and react to a place**. If it is poor, it creates problems; conversely, if it is good, it creates a positive environment to live in.** We need to be far more attuned to what makes individual places and design with that, rather than 'shock of the new' and egotistical architectural solutions.

3.2 Do we value heritage, whether historic or recent, evenly throughout the country?

Not as much and why

Not at all. Compared with Europe, the protection and value of historic, but not listed structures is marginal.

No.

No.

We may value but not sure it's evenly throughout the country.

Of course not - perhaps the public do, but the design/house building profession does not in general. There is a perception that all development is bad and therefore we shy away from looking at the difficult challenges in favour of 'neutral' solutions.

Probably not but it is difficult to say. Mostly the value seems to be measured through nostalgia: the idealised past is always better than the present; this is a barrier to innovation and change.

Impact of policy makers (government) - The problem is that it is not valued evenly through time. One political administration will treat heritage with respect, and the next will ignore it, leading to huge and irreparable damage.

No, too much conservatism all over the country.

Locality Members are spread across the country: in urban and rural areas, in more wealthy areas and poorer areas. Consistently there is demonstration of an interest in heritage, **what varies however is the capacity and capability to engage with people, value, celebrate and develop that heritage**.

Lack of care – No, at best we pay lip service to it. A simple study of current proposed growth figures for key historic towns, compared with other places demonstrates very clearly our current lack of care for the best of our built environment.

In fact there are cases where heritage is overvalued as are cases where is not valued enough. There is **need for more innovative ways of using our heritage stock and provide greater flexibility in the relationship between new and old**. A new building adjacent to a historical building does not have to look the same.

Variations in perception, context and quality of heritage –
Different people will value heritage (new and old) differently – due in part to their understanding, perceptions, direct and indirect experiences. Equally there is variation in the quality, maintenance and scale of sites throughout the country, in urban, suburban and rural contexts; therefore it is unlikely we would find a uniform view on its value.

Yes, although this does vary wildly from person to person, organisation to organisation & authority to authority. The way in which heritage is valued also differs massively.

Better question: are we overlooking valuable heritage only because some periods aren't currently fashionable?

We do, but very unevenly; this is probably less a geographical variation but response to the nature of heritage and especially recent heritage (post-war buildings and areas; heritage of Cold war etc seen as very minor interests, for example).

Variations in regional economic powers -
No, variations are conditioned by the local quality of the built environment, by class, and by the economic power of capital in the locality - on the latter compare the historic environment control structures and outcomes in the London City Corporation with Westminster council - Tony Tugnutt better placed to comment.

No, differences mainly class based, but also determined by profitability and power of capital in decision making process -e.g. Compare Westminster with city of London

No - not enough in less wealthy areas

Regional differences –
No, there is a greater respect and desire for a mix of old and new in the south. The north is fixated in the old world.

Depend on the audience in question. But most places have a local heritage interest group of some kind or other.

No - look at large areas of the West Midlands for example

No. Again, referring to the Potteries, there is not as much value paid to the city's past as there should be, and many places can probably stay the same. The exception to this is probably in London.

Bigger focus in the SE, Wales and Scotland.

Insensitive developments - Too many insensitive schemes allowed in London in the name of progress e.g. the monstrous Walkie Talkie.

Yes, overvalued
Yes.

Yes - probably too much. I am writing this from a listed Grade II eighteenth century thatched cottage. We need to promote a high standard of ordinary and make less fuss about satellite dishes, protected hedgerows and other more ephemeral issues.

Heritage' is overvalued in this country, especially in our urban contexts, and this leaves little room for modern contemporary buildings, places or values to the detriment of the place as a whole.

3.3 How do we make sure that new architecture understands and responds to its cultural and historic context?

A robust design review.

Communication at local level is key

The importance of early and genuine **community engagement** is key. As well as stakeholders – drawing on the diversity of a community in commissioning new architecture can inform even the most modern building to be able to respond to its cultural and historic context.

By **encouraging more discourse locally** and not delegating it upwards to the powers that be. There is usually huge amount of local knowledge that remains dormant that could inform many a new project.

Stronger role for community organisations like civic societies and CAACs - the idea that local community groups reinforce pastiche and conservative values, can be scrutinised. Generally any weakness in this area is easily balanced by design aware professionals.

Clearer and much wider **articulation of client and designer intentions** and how these respond to context and policy. "Design statements" not "design and access statements" used in wider public engagement by all parties involved in decision-making?

Improvements in designer training and design process

By training architects in a way that makes them understand the development process - who procures buildings and funds them and the values and perspectives of other built environment professionals, actors and stakeholders.

Teach students architectural history and theory properly. Most haven't got the slightest clue but spend weeks on parametric modelling.

You need to train architects more on how to assess the key morphological elements of character in an area which can inspire new schemes.

By ensuring that it is part of the design process and **that designers are able to explain how they have responded to it.**

By making architect less superior and arrogant by training - dissolve the profession and return architects to a process of master builders through lifelong learning.

Education-Designers need to understand that what they design are not objects, but key pieces of a human jigsaw, and that there piece needs to respond to others, otherwise it won't fit in.

Education in historical forms of architecture, need to be reconsidered in design schools from a critical standpoint. The modernist bias and the naive belief in zeitgeist alienate the architectural profession from broader popular tastes. This is not to say we become artists in pastiche, but there must be genuine respect for social conditions, historical mindsets and popular tastes, a deep empathy for what exists rather than a cool disdain.

Can ensure understanding by teaching it, but responding becomes a choice that the architect takes!

By understanding the past, the context and responding to it in a sensitive way.

Listening and responding to the 'users' of an area (workers, residents, visitors) is a critical part of the process. Involving local people and wider society in celebrating new and historic sites requires making them relevant and accessible.

Well trained architects respond to context. Developers couldn't care less and invent a fake historic context. Look at the names given to houses in developers catalogues (the Elizabethan, the Tudor, the....).

Clear distinction between new & old is useful as it enables a 'true' reading of the existing. There should also be emphasis on design which contributes to the style of its time.

It tends to be too slavish and conservative at present, facade retention of mediocre buildings a classic example - it's a reaction to the poor build quality of contemporary buildings. Also, it is safer to be conservative when seeking planning consent by doing pseudo vernacular rather than unabashedly contemporary. Sadly, where will the heritage of the future be?

Make use of media to increase awareness

We often don't, because we don't value our everyday environment. Use TV soaps to wake people up to the appreciation of their particular surroundings, more stories about design. We are doing well with Antiques; the same coverage is needed for Architecture.

Activities, including educational as well as entertainment e.g. Grand Designs TV series, can also help to raise the profile and therefore make significant such sites in the eyes of the public.

Better integration between professions

Better training. Perhaps fewer, better schools of architecture producing fewer, better architects. This applies also to all of the professions involved. Highway and traffic engineers have a massive effect on the quality of the built environment but are frequently badly trained and poor team players. We need better integration between the professions.

Durability of materials

Materiality (durable materials that have texture and have been proven to resist the test of time) and massing are key considerations, but form should not have so much weight. Currently there is too much obsession with the pretty street face of the Victorian or Edwardian terraced houses.

Changes to planning and policy process

Look at bigger picture in planning and conservation consents -
Currently done through Conservation Area Consents and Listed Building Consents, undertaken by conservation officers who are normally archaeologists and architectural historians. My experience comes from my employment with County Council, **where the processing of these consents would focus most often on a very particular part of the project or a building, which would be analysed in isolation from its surroundings.**

It would be very productive to employ architects or urban designers who would be able to look at a bigger picture to ensure that impact on cultural and historic context.

Good urban design policy. Use of character appraisals and emphasis on achieving local distinctiveness. Too much homogenisation through volume builders and retailers

Need of moderation in consents - Local authorities' major redevelopment planning decisions should be moderated by another government body as a check on forced or over enthusiastic/ blinkered/ myopic ideas.

Local plans should emphasise this.

Design statements by architects need to address this as part of applying for planning approval and be assessed as part of the planning process.

Experienced LPA officers working with the private sector.

Conservation in local planning authorities needs to be given **a stronger statutory role** and funding.

Greater emphasis in the planning system requiring architects to do so.

Stop starving cultural heritage of all kinds.

Good practice examples

Conservation planning, conservation area, listed building control as developed in places such as Westminster, Edinburgh, Bath, York, Chester, plus the more sensitive rural district areas (others in the IHBC better placed to cite best practice authorities.

Over-valuing heritage may be a hindrance to change

Why should it? Historically architecture and urbanism rode roughshod over the previous layers and there are arguments for still doing this in some places. See above, 'over-valued heritage' is one of Britain's problems - this ensures that every person's impossible dream continues to be to live in a thatched cottage! The relevant professions and Britain's arts and culture systems should promote change and contemporary approaches as a default approach not as something we have to fight for...

By being less sentimental about purely the physical nature of any heritage asset.

3.4 Are there characteristics in older buildings and places that are valued which are lacking in new buildings and places? What should the design of new places learn from the best of the past?

Vernacular architecture

Yes; Craftsmanship - the use of local skills and materials. Understanding detailing that is regionally and locally characteristic of particular places.

A principle of building from local materials should also prevail, as is applied in all vernacular type of architecture all around the world.

Not all old buildings and places are 'good' but generally they respected the context, the local materials, and the scale.

Absolutely: missing often is quality craftsmanship.

Space standards

First - space standards in housing. Then there's nothing wrong in valuing 'prettiness'. I lived on a deprived council estate for 20 years and what was depressing was the ugliness of the external environment.

Standard of space and adaptability is a component that has deteriorated.

Space standards and materiality for buildings and public spaces for the pedestrian, allowing people to 'gather' for places, are key elements that one can draw from past architecture.

Lack of variety and richness

Absolutely, in particular in **modern designs there is a lack of detail** and also what I would call a lack of elegance which often relates to a lack of orderliness and 'settledness' you find in older buildings. Too often the modern architect seems to want to make a jarring statement. Not enough is done to reflect that people want to relax and rest and feel settled in a place. You can do this in older areas because of their rich detail and settledness. The lack of detail in many modern schemes where the emphasis is more on the overall shape of the building is alienating for many people.

Yes, lots. One that springs to mind is recessed windows! They create articulation, shadow lines and enliven elevations in a way that mirror and glass do not.

Variety in scale, materials, details, art, richness, and uses is missing from new places. However, response to materials can be simple (e.g. Bath stone in bath rather than looking for alternatives just to be different!). **New developments are generally mono- cultural in there makeup** and sense of place which destroys the rich tapestry of historic towns and villages.

Intimacy, beauty, tradition, etc.

Craft, space, expense.

Often, yes - and this is one of the reasons that the quality of place is lacking, but it's not just architectural character, but also the type of use, and type of development. For example, I find many UK town centres quite soulless - particularly places where large commercial retail and office developments have replaced the historic fabric with just a few landmarks remaining. Reading town centre springs to mind.

Quality and richness. Many modern structures let down, sometimes quickly, by lack of quality of materials, detailing, and workmanship even where design itself is good. Plainness is often not well liked/appreciated in public surveys of built form.

Longevity and human scale of urban matrix

Short frontages rather than large floor plates. Windows that are used to light the inside rooms, rather than being regarded simply as an architectural feature with no clear function. .

Some of the most enduring buildings are those which operate at a human scale; regardless of technology and purpose of a property/space it is those that have facilitated the development of human relationships which have prevailed through use. I would suspect that a set of characteristics that could translate into a set of principles would be more useful than a set of features.

Longevity and human scale are often lacking in new places. Dictating how people should organise their life rather than responding to how they want to shape their life. Communication and engagement are the key.

We have little to learn from old buildings other than that larger spaces are usually nicer (but they cost more!) as our current regulatory environment is very different; **however, older places, towns, cities which grew up around a walking culture can give us good lessons in layout of urban form**, creation of attractive streets and spaces. These have often grown slowly however it is relatively easy to analyse their DNA and apply some of their qualities to new, 'instant' spaces.

Old spaces were designed and built gradually over long periods of time, decades and centuries. There is a huge amount of knowledge that can be learnt from the layouts and forms of these places.

The plot is more important than the building itself in providing scale and proportion to streets (aka Almere) hence the pleasure of certain streets over time as opposed to Essex Design Guide/ Poundbury self-conscious variety in one timescale.

Human scale - keep access roads small and exclude cars and trucks wherever possible.

Material qualities (strength, resistance to weathering, consistency of surface finish) tend not to be as good in cheap machined materials. As a result, cheaper buildings tend to look over-designed or have cosmetic imperfections.

Off course but generally ignored for 'better' ideas since WWII. Better legibility, better materials and workmanship, pedestrian focussed, sociable, friendly and safe.

YES. Humility and pragmatism. We should understand that cheap oil will run out eventually and that it is undermining the health of all of our communities (as well as the quality of the built environment). It's a relatively recent phenomenon and we are slowly but surely making inherently less socially cohesive, less economically and environmentally resilient settlements and developments.

Proximity to public transport

We should build more urban places like high streets built around public transport that can support better buildings and spaces and not suburban estates.

Appreciation of local context

Building in a historical continuity of place and people and reigniting the activities those make for a rejuvenated local economy.

We need to care more about streets and spaces and be less hung up on novelty buildings and 'wow' architecture. 'Delight' is an undervalued commodity.

Designers need to learn methods and ways of thinking from the past, not copy types of places. We have new technologies to resolve new problems and to adapt to new ways of living; how we use these and how we adapt them to a specific place is what a good designer needs to find. On the other hand**, developers (public as well as private) need to think of places as a whole: not develop housing but neighbourhoods** (that can be learnt from the past!).

Very new sites often draw considerable interest and excitement in the media e.g. The Shard but such attention is not necessarily enduring. Participative educational activities as organised by groups like Open City (http://www.open-city.org.uk) are important in addressing building wider public understanding and appreciation of new and old sites.

Use character appraisals and understand what to pick up on and how new elements might integrate.

Each era has its own character. The aim of conservation is to help us read these layers more clearly, and help the city to be more legible through its culture context.

Community and identity

Yes, Sense of place, identity, community, aesthetic beauty, natural landscape etc. are the real values that many people (cultured people?) and which consequently determine the price of residential property. Old buildings, history, continuity (people and families having lived in a place for generations), help reduce the anonymity of globalised society.

Yes, simple really. Proposed new places need to be designed to be lived in happily as well as being economic. Any schoolboy or girl will tell you that and any adult will lose the plot and most professionals will wrap the sentiment in high flown language. In provincial France not so long ago (and in UK a little longer ago) a new bank building would be designed to create a dignified locally respected building of some quality and permanence. The development industry in UK now is not oriented this way very often (exception Swiss Re?).

Political influence

Also, don't hide the significant link between non-democratic forms of property ownership and good design! Despots make great patrons. it is important to characterize the politics behind great design of the past.

3.5 What is the role for new technologies in conservation to enable older buildings to meet modern needs and to be adapted with less impact on their historic features?

Facilitate use of natural materials

Natural products are likely to bring the greatest longevity to the building fabric. Generally fossil fuel based materials have a limited life space breaking down far in advance of the core historic structures. Where possible use technology to improve the production and application of natural materials (lime based products and natural insulation for instance) and teach skills to go with it.

Enhancing building performance

Experiences of introducing new technologies to enhance building performance in terms of **energy saving** (insulation and passive) have highlighted that technology alone will bring immediate results – user involvement in the needs assessment, design and application of those technologies is an essential part of the process.

There is nothing new about this: buildings and places have been adapted throughout history with the introduction of new technologies. At the same time we shouldn't be too precious and preserve every door handle in a building. **For instance solar panels on a roof will not ruin the building and may preserve it by reducing its carbon imprint.**

Could make buildings satisfy sustainability.

More research needed on eco measures and historic buildings. Planning policy needs to be more flexible in this area, but pro-actively supporting sympathetic means to achieve integration of eco features.

Facilitate adaptability of a building

New technologies need to help old buildings become suitable for new uses. This is the true definition of sustainability.

I'm not a conservation specialist, but many older buildings can be adapted with minimal impact on their historic features, through introducing appropriate new uses. For example, I've just been reading about a disused church that has been adapted as a sports hall.

Sensitive handling

What is wrong with exposing the impact? Buildings need to be updated constantly to meet new demands and opportunities, it is not always appropriate for this to be 'invisible' - designers are good at working out ways of adapting old for new and this should be done with a more robust attitude while retaining sensitivity.

Huge opportunities. - if sensitively handled - others in the IHBC better placed to cite best practice.

Ensuring that new technologies are not **incompatible with old** (e.g. gypsum plaster on non damp-coursed walls).

New technology is a powerful tool but not the objective. Same applies to new materials. The Park Hill regeneration scheme can be a failure in this case. There is a massive difference between retrieve the architectural identity and reform the architectural identity.

Beware of seizing every new technology as a potential panacea. If you tell people "if you don't grow you die" it just means the sooner we die. Science can be the most dangerous religious belief in the world. Scientists may think they are above religious belief. But they see infinite increase in empirical information as a good thing. If it's infinite it means someday it will take a madman or terrorist with a device no bigger than a pistol to shoot off an atom bomb. Is that a good thing? If we don't put a stop to invention for its own sake soon, it's the end of the world."

New technologies 'is not the most helpful approach' **should be 'appropriate technologies'** which achieve the desired outcomes.

Prioritise thoughts. Decide what forms the character and must stay. Decide what can be changed without causing harm. It is not easy to decide if a later feature should be removed and replaced with the earlier design. Buildings are not supposed to live in a time warp. Some should not be touched because of their particular features of interest. This needs skilled knowledge and humility as one can insist on a point too strongly and achieve the wrong result.

Very important and probably under-researched; problem of varying responses by decision makers across the country to innovation relating to historic structures. Again a wider education/ professional development issue.

Wireless working is beneficial. But issues over air conditioning, fire and access remain still.

3.6 What other recommendations would you like to make relating to this particular theme?

Greater awareness of the value of local heritage

More awareness created at a local and national level of the value of local heritage buildings and structures.

Educate decision makers on significance of broader context

As a listed building owner I find it incredible that conservation officers get into a lather about minor exterior changes yet cheerfully allow pleasant rural villages to be despoiled by a plethora of recycling bins and parked cars everywhere.

 If planning committees are not trained and not advised correctly, standards will fall. This is a direct chief officer responsibility and should not be delegated for important sites.

Lessons from past

Learn from past methods to solve future problems. Don't get attached to details and look at the big picture.

Look beyond appearance to the experience of historic buildings.

The past needs to be the foundation for all new buildings.

Stronger policies

Putting conservation on a more statutory basis - others in the IHBC better placed to expand on this - Rosemarie Maqueen.

Recycle old stock

Let's start building homes which are made to a standard beyond the current 25 years and let's make better use of the well made historic stock rather than whole-scale demolition and so called regeneration.

Significance of landscape

This will be disastrous if the landscape environment is thought of only in terms of 'built environment' and/or 'historic environment'.   People and places need planted places. People need biodiversity too. Where is mention of the LANDSCAPE of built environments?

4.1 What is the potential contribution of built environment education at primary and secondary school level, both as a cultural subject in its own right and as a way of teaching STEM (science, technology, engineering and maths) and other subjects?

To re-introduce human scale

STEM subjects in their traditional format are great for exploring the macro scale - space travel, astronomy etc and the micro scale - iphones and chips - but pretty terrible in giving us anything at the human scale. We need to ensure that as the money runs out for macro and micro scales the relatively modest sums of money by comparison needed to produce better results at human scale are catered for in the curriculum.

More could be done to use the built environment for field work (e.g. measurements, analysis).

Creating design awareness from early on

This is a very good avenue to explore. Geography should be reinstated in the core curriculum and history should take in urban and architectural history. Teaching people about basic building physics is a good idea too.

I don't know how the national curriculum works but the built environment is a wealth of resource in education. The skills required to create great Built environments require an understanding of the sciences (making sure building don't fall down), the arts; both visual and understanding the spatial qualities, humanities and society, and can focus in detail on many of the major issues affecting us on a global scale such as sustainability and climate change.

There is a significant role in education from primary school onwards.

Should be integrated into many subjects at school level. Various built environment careers need to be promoted in schools too.

The built environment is intrinsic to the way we live, like music and art. But rarely is anything taught about it in primary and secondary education.

Health and safety has prevented school kids from experiencing how buildings are put together.

Huge. And hands-on **- it relates to what children see all around them, makes them look and appreciate and articulate**. Aka Forest schools - built environment could equally contribute.

History of architecture would be a really interesting subject to cover...possibly in art. Or technology, if one has to shoehorn it into STEM. It's an all-encompassing subject.

Raises awareness.

I feel that education is possibly the most important aspect of improving the design of our built environment, and it should start at an early age. How many children love playing with Lego? I did,

and we can use simple things such as this to foster an interest in the built environment, and other subject areas.

It is invaluable! There use to be projects in schools that **involved kids in their local communities, learning a variety of skills through observation, analysis and problem solving.** They were cut because of funding issues and the requirements of the curriculum.

Huge! This is essential if the quality of architecture and the built environment is to improve.

Such education, including adult learning opportunities, offer considerable and potentially life-long value, such as **enhancing the degree and quality of public engagement in relation to the build environment** and certainly in the application of STEM, as well as other topic.

This will vary from LEA to LEA and school to school. **We need ECO schools**, learning about your local area (history/how it operates/what goes on etc). All of these things can be linked to STEM in some way or another. **A built environment 1st and secondary education syllabus would help.**

Great potential if arts education is allowed to flourish alongside STEM.

Vague question! High and under-exploited potential; use environment as means of linking numerous subjects.

Need for more design consumers, not designers

Is there evidence from other countries more successful in their built environment that this is necessary? I don't believe so. An overall respect for the environment and an exposure to culture in general, and an ethic of making things well, should instil the principles needed for young people to understand the value of architecture. Besides the protection of the function of architect, the erasure of the developer's mentality and cowboy builders - wanting to make a profit quickly, having no care for the end product, through regulations of the trades - would do more to help create better places.

In terms of culture, a lot. Not so sure about STEM, as buildings are so complex creatures.

Encourage young people to look and engage with architecture and the environment.
By demonstrating to children that the street around them and the places they use in their lives, are just as much a part of their space as their own house and garden.

The target of education should not be geared towards the development of more designers, as there is an oversupply. However, it **should be geared towards the creation of more design consumers (i.e. general connoisseurship)**, so that popular demand would drive the need for more design. 'design-literacy' programs should be targeted at significant fields such as real estate, planning and development to broaden design's appeal, and the creation of parallel 'design-enabling' professions beyond architecture and urban design itself.

Understanding places and the uniqueness of places (in terms of architecture/ landscape/ built environment/geography) is important but is something that grows with you. **Getting kids / students to understand the importance of places is important to establish 'worth'.**

Built environment in the form of civic pride should be an integral part of all these.

Great educational environments encourage children to take pride in their own education.

Would require enough skilled resources

At primary level its integration in geography is already established and can be further progressed. With the changes to the currently curriculum I am unable to see how it could be developed as a separate subject. Speaking from a personal point of view as someone who went on to studying building surveying I can see it as a means of teaching these subjects but it **would need a significant programme of resources to help teachers not familiar with the issues** to engage particularly as there are so many similar initiatives vying to get into schools.

Enormous, but it needs good teachers, there are not enough men teaching in this area. School standards have slipped; the first year for many courses at universities now is to get the students up to old A level standards (info from lecturer at Lincoln on an official visit).

4.2 What is the role of architecture and the built environment in enabling a better public understanding of issues related to sustainability and the environment?

Encourage community engagement to increase awareness

To take more leadership roles at the local community level - i.e. where we live rather than where we work - ideally bring the tow together more to reduce carbon footprint.

In 2007 CABE estimated that the built environment accounts for around half of our national carbon emissions (http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http:/www.cabe.org.uk/files/sustainable-design-and-climate-change.pdf). The importance of explaining and demonstrating approaches/solutions that embed sustainability in the architecture and design, and enhancing opportunities for public involvement in those approaches cannot be underestimated. **Understanding of sustainability is best established through direct experience / involvement in the delivery of good practice.** Open House / City weekends that demonstrate what is practically possible with real-time examples - including addressing the challenges of delivering sustainability - is a good example. We need to adopt multiple interventions to enhance public understanding: http://www.sustainablebrands.com/news_and_views/behavior_change/driving-behavior-change-pioneering-practice-tipping-point-and-beyond

To improve consumer habits

Many people have lost the basic understanding of how to use a house (air it in the morning etc.) and **have no idea about water and energy consumption**. There is a lot to catch up with that could make a good environmental impact.

Many Locality members have done this, maybe as a requirement of funders and/or under their own initiative. This can have a significant impact on a community not only in terms of direct education, but creating a sense of pride in **a new community owned property that not only belongs to the community but is of high quality, and affordable to run and maintain. It begins to introduce high environmental standards as the norm, not the exception.** This role has a long term impact to create change in personal and professional spheres as well as creating a new generation of buildings that will be social, environmentally and economically sustainable over the long term.

Substantial - the population (and LAs/RSLs) should be encouraged to retrofit every house with better insulation, water and energy reducing systems and energy generating systems so that everyone is conscious of the issues and aware of the impact on the environment.

If people understand that their homes consume resources and that they can be wasteful or not, depending on both design and usage, they will understand wider issues of sustainability. It can be shown through smart meters for instance. Carrots and sticks also help.

Absolutely key. It is the built environment and human activity that impacts most on the environment and climate change issues.

Set examples and publicise them

Architects should lead the way through their own project. It should be inherent to their design. Unfortunately the great majority of architecture schools do not see such approach as a priority when training future architects.
I think there is a significant role to play - perhaps designers should go into schools as part of their corporate and social responsibility programme (if they have one).

More prominence should be given to exemplars.

Proper knowledgeable solutions are being prevented by the green deal and the code for sustainable buildings. Points make prizes but not good buildings.

Perhaps buildings need to reveal their sustainability credentials more publicly and design in a public facing monitoring.

Build a neighbourhood -
It helps people realise that having a solar panel on the roof is pretty useless if your house is 10 miles by car from the nearest shop.

Sustainable examples.

Clearly, architecture and the built environment have an important role in terms of where we live & how we live. Pushing the boundaries of sustainable design is an important consideration of the built environment, but I doubt whether anyone in 'mainstream' is really considering this at present.

Greening of built environment has a wider message.

Through LPA documents and professional institutes at a level beyond the normal professional, the regional architecture centres do a good job in this respect.

The same as everyone else's role and responsibility; it is just that architects, urban designers and landscape architects have the ability to visualise the issues.

4.3 How can high standards of design be achieved and promoted through neighbourhood plans?

Local community engagement

By combining local knowledge and intelligence with expert advice brought in to deal with particular gaps in knowledge rather than imported blanket solutions.

The new powers under the Localism Act, enable communities to:
- Work in partnership, rather than conflict, with potential developers
- Help communities consider and decide on design standards prior to development proposals being bough forward.
- Enable councils to engage with communities in planning issues at an early stage
- Enables design standards to be considered in light of the issues outlined above in your questions.

By writing the expectations into the plan, using exemplars and ensuring that communities are engaged with.

Neighbourhood plans are an education tool and if people get involved (which is a big if) they will learn.

By educating the neighbourhoods of the long terms advantages they clearly bring - with case studies/exemplars etc.

Let the locals say what they want and give them examples of good policies to inspire them.

Consultation.

Local response to development is an important consideration. Having worked on a number of Neighbourhood plans, people's reactions to development is mixed but is generally anti development. This is because we have designed so badly over the last 70 years. **People need to be made aware of good development and what can be achieved.**

Plans should focus on the specific aspirations of a community & set out infrastructural change which needs to take place to make it happen (flexibility of use classification, pedestrian infrastructure, economic strategy inc. car parking for visitors to the area, how local people are encouraged to engage...).

I don't think neighbourhood planning is the right tool for achieving design quality as its output, but it can raise awareness of the built environment for those involved in the process.

Involvement of local bodies / Council

Educate local councils, put well written policies in the plan and then make sure they are adhered to by the decision making bodies. Easier said than done, as today in local government it is not always a good idea to stick your neck out. Protect chief officer posts if possible.

Dialogue with Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Forums about the definition and delivery of 'good' design will be a central part of that process, as well as establishing 'plain English' tools to assist the review and revision of place design, based on user (resident) experience.

Empowerment of neighbourhood plan makers

There is very little likelihood of this happening. Neighbourhood Pans are required to be produced by ordinary members of the public with little money available for any professional input or advice. What they will get is likely to focus on the planning aspects of development; it is hard to see how any component of 'design' would be included at all. The councils would be expected to 'deal with' design as usual at the next stage of the process - NP's do not deal with planning applications.

Empowerment and understanding on the part of the plan-makers of what good design looks like.

By giving neighbourhoods real powers and funding, not token window dressing under the heel of local councils.

By linking with LPA documents and/or generating their own which will have well in depth knowledge of the local area through those unpaid residents who help to write it. But generally not enough built environment professionals get involved with local (political) issues.

Sufficient central government funding.

Change in approach to planning

Encourage custom build housing.

Use of urban design policy and advice as per UD supplement to NPPF.

A lot of the neighbourhood plans are land use planning-led and not design-led, yet if it were the other way round, people may grasp the implications better and quicker, and this may lead to better results and more acceptance of how and why development is needed.

Sustainability, energy, water and biodiversity outcomes are paramount.

Neighbourhood plans should set high standards of design that need to be achieved in approving development proposals.

4.4 How can we better ensure that awareness and support of high standards of design are shared among all the professions concerned with architecture, the built environment, and quality places?

Shared foundation year

A common education in the built environment - a shared undergraduate foundation year, joint projects at undergraduate level that span departments.

A foundation course for all degree courses that leads to built environment professions would allow each profession to work more closely with others.

There really should be a common foundation year (at least one) for all built environment professionals to better understand the contribution each plays and have enough knowledge to challenge other professionals, and then only specialise after a **good common grounding.** Architect planners, for instance, used to be very powerful.

We need to establish better design teaching at architectural/ landscape architectural schools with regards to place making and **make sure students understand roles/ and how disciplines can work together** to create beautiful places. We need to put place above ego's and show what makes a beautiful place- the combination of all disciplines.

Collaboration and interaction between professions

By healthy debate across professional boundaries.

More than one lecture on the degree course. The values and impact of good design need to be identified and promoted as an ongoing theme throughout professional training and CPD. **Working in partnership on cross sector initiatives** broader than the property professions that are seeking to address these issues – such as Locality Brokers- to reduce the gaps between the sectors and suppliers and clients.

Combine with all other environmental professions as happens in the Commonwealth with BEPIC (Built Environment Professions in the Commonwealth). **Do not try to take the lead, but persuade.** If one profession states it is the leading the other, this will upset the others. We cannot have the capacity to know all about this fascinating subject and we must take other professionals' advice.

More joint training and education. More integrated practices sharing common aims of achieving design excellence.

Collaborative approach where building design process is combined with other design components such as urban design, landscape, masterplanning, highways and planning.

Let us **share a vision** of what is good and where we need to be.

Collaboration.

Communication and collaboration amongst the various professions.

Educate for Good Knowledge Transfer.

By insisting on evidence based planning through community engagement and baseline assessments. Then by encouraging/insisting on more collaborative and interdisciplinary working.

This is a very important issue and all concerned professions need to value each other's contributions. How? **Possibly multi-disciplinary affiliations** . . . .

Role of professional bodies

Show what is in it for each one, and refer to the ethics code in each organisation's constitution.

There is a plethora of design guidance, standards and exemplars - some form of independent consolidation of such guidance (Design council / Urban Design Group hub-site, toolkit...) would assist broader awareness and potentially uptake.

Urban Design Alliance - it seems to have died a bit - needs proper revival.

Such bodies need to more clearly work together, rather than apart. There are still disappointing gaps and "silo mentalities" here. Too many examples in practice of entrenched dismissive views.

Through cross disciplinary training and **promotion of organisations** such as CABE, Academy of Urbanism, urban design group within professions, including engineering, property professions, and training of elected representatives

Government interventions

The government should back up decisions to refuse so that people are forced to know that good design is required.

Make a stronger commitment to sustainable outcomes.

Get planners, engineers and local politicians on board.

A number of professionals probably already have this awareness but the developers do not. **As long as developers are** seen as the solution to the built environment problems and they are **not obliged to follow certain rules, nothing will change.**

4.5 How can we ensure fair representation (gender, ethnicity, class, etc) and better preparation for those wishing to enter into higher education and the built environment professions?

Start at school level

Better education at school level. No point of trying to remedy later.

Better careers advice - get practitioners into schools. More pro-active encouragement to engage under represented sections including women in some fields. Tackle male dominated culture - a lifetime task!

It is already happening organically. Designers recognize talent wherever it is. Kids need to be made aware of the joy of playing with adult Lego.

Encourage interest from an early age to all people.

By allowing a fair cross section of people into our schools.

Can only ensure equitable treatment of those who apply**. Promotion much earlier in schools is about the only way to attract a more diverse group,** and prepare them for higher education in the built environment, and this would certainly need much more explicit involvement and contribution from professional bodies.

Role of professional networks

Professional networks should be more open, **be willing to collaborate with other sectors** and less 'closed shop'.

More use of mentors to help integrate entrants into the professional networks.

Promote the relevant professions in schools.

Through developing people's interest and offering maximum opportunities to all.

Flexibility in course durations, fee options

Create more flexible progression routes which also allow for time gaps in progression.

Impossible now with fees for a five year course so high. Perhaps we should revert to a three year course and then two more years on an atelier system in a teaching office.

Grant funded courses via research councils, including industrial placements need to offer greater flexibility for applicants, including **part-time grant options and allowing professional experience in**

place of academic qualifications, might help enhance opportunities from a broader cross-section of society.

Inclusion and diversity

By tapping into local concerns and communities through the design and build processes we engineer for production.

More needs to be done to attract women into surveying and construction.

Speaking in a personal capacity as a woman who trained and worked for a while as a building surveyor: Universities and employers being demonstrably committed to driving out direct and covert sexism.

Monitoring and enforcement of employment policies in architecture would go a long way in addressing women having to make a choice between career and family. The class system in the UK will not be eradicated as long as the class mentality remains (in all classes) and good education is not accepted as a universal right open to all (e.g. university costs paid through taxpayer's money and entrance to best schools and universities based on anonymous and written entrance exams, i.e. merit only, not interviews where private schools pupils who are taught how to 'discourse' best in front of the examiner get the best chances to get in).

Start at the top and start at government level (central and local) - **enact the requirements of the Equality legislation in every aspect of the public sector** and publicly supported panels, appointees, boards etc. **This is poorly done at the moment.**

Business management

Entry is no longer the issue for planning and architecture. It's what happens afterwards with regard to the content of professional work.

Teach architects business management and get off the high horse of doing an art that justifies working 12-15 hours every day without getting paid.

Architects not having to cut their fees and both clients and architects being realistic about amount of time required to complete a project would help alleviate the shocking culture of overtime and thus underpaid or unpaid work, and thus address the gender issue too.

Less adversarial and negatively critical training, less reliance on working ridiculous long hours so more family friendly work-life balance.

An overall change of culture is required in reality. But this would be like turning round an oil tanker.

4.6 What other recommendations would you like to make relating to this particular theme?

Reforms in education

The value of informal and adult education needs to be recognised, using networks and structures that existing to inform and support communities in engaging with this issue.

Would like some explorative work done on ateliers. We ought to talk with educationalists also as we are customers.

If there is a serious review of educational policy, it should include consideration of brining design of the built environment into arrangements. And we should not lose sight of the fact that doing so could be fun!

Responsive design should be promoted where we design places where people feel comfortable living and/or working and are affordable.

Professionals visiting schools.

Innovative approach to design

Quality of architecture should not be based on increased cost but flexible planning, innovation and technology.

Other

Start at the top and the bottom of the various political and professional power bases simultaneously and where necessary side step the system.

Code of conduct that doesn't allow exploitation.