

Section 4 - What types of communities: what types of transport?

Panel Discussion

Richard Bourn
London Campaigner
Transport 2000

Theo Steel

Neil Johnson
Senior Parliamentary
and Policy Officer
RICS

Michael Schabas

THE CHAIRMAN: This is your session. It can last anything from two minutes to 45 or 50 minutes, depending on your enthusiasm for it and what more you want to learn from today. I will not drag it out just for the sake of it.

It occurred to us that there might be things that have not been covered today. We have expert witnesses on the platform, so there is plenty of expertise. If you have a local issue or a problem on which you would like advice or suggestions, please raise it.

JOHN DUFFY (CAPITA SYMONDS): I am not sure how many people are left from Cambridge or Cambridgeshire, but they use the tariff system, and have done so for a few years now. I wanted to make the panel and others aware of how that is working. They raise at least £5 million a year in contributions, generally through fixed trip rates and fixed fees per housing unit, towards transport, education, open space and similar issues. How much thought do the panel think goes into the circumstances of each development site - the difficulties of developing it and the infrastructure in the shape not just of roads but the utilities and so on?

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone else? Come on - help me.

FRED HARRISON (LAND RESEARCH TRUST): If you are struggling to find themes, I want to know more about the concept of sustainability as the transport industry sees it. Martin, you rather unfairly put the two railway representatives on the spot by asking them whether they could deliver jobs to prevent long-distance travel. It is not the railway industry's business to provide jobs: its job is to move people between jobs and the rest. What is the dynamic that causes the displacement of people over long distances and apparently creates a need for long-distance travel? Some mechanism of sprawl generates that, which the transport industry then seeks to satisfy; but it then fulfils this process of displacement. We need a deeper understanding of what sustainable communities are.

DAVID GEORGE (KENT THAMESIDE DELIVERY BOARD): Whose job or responsibility do the panel think it is to deliver this essential transport?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will take the sustainability question first, because it is a general point. Let us talk first about whose responsibility it is, and then about the tariff. Can I start with Neil Johnson: what is your understanding of sustainability from the transportation point of view?

NEIL JOHNSON: It is a very interesting question, and one to which Government have not so far paid due attention. They have the idea in their head about what a sustainable community is - almost a 1960s idea, of environments in which we all live a fantastic life entirely in tune with one another and everything that is going on around us, making very little demand on the environment, by all different definitions of that word. But I am not sure that they have thought everything through yet. Our understanding is that one of the keys to sustainability is that transport is operated in a sustainable manner - that is, we will not be engaged in hugely long-haul commuting and so on.

The plans that Government have proposed shows that they are up front about the fact that one of the advantages of Thames Gateway is that the affordable housing will be able to house key workers from the whole of London. That is great, if you are going to

be working in the Fenchurch Street area; but if the shortage of nurses is in south-west London and around Heathrow, they would have one hell of a commute.

Some of our members were talking a short time ago about the fact that the Government's insistence on building on brownfield land in the Thames Gateway is increasing the value of that land. They were saying that many employment opportunities in those areas are starting to move away from those communities, as businesses find that they can get a good return from selling their land and moving elsewhere. Policy makers have not addressed the points you raise as they should.

RICHARD BOURN: I am glad this question has been raised. The definition of sustainability in the presentations had nothing to do with the environment or with society: it was purely the economy and the maintenance of growth in the economy. Fred Harrison defined sustainability this morning as a steady state of growth that is not susceptible to sudden shocks. Since the notion of sustainability comes from a discussion about the environment, I thought that that was a very unsatisfactory definition. The Government's position on sustainability in transport and other areas is also unsatisfactory, particularly because they have not made the connection between global warming and transport. Although they have adopted a target of reducing global warming or climate change emissions by 60% by 2015, I think, they have not proposed a set of policies to ensure that people reduce the climate change effects of their own travel patterns.

Even in London, where we have fairly progressive transport policies, it is apparently all right to travel as far as you like as long as you do not do it by car. In other words, if you want to travel long distances for work or other purposes, it is perfectly okay to do so by public transport. I cannot agree with that. There was a very important discussion this morning about whether it is all right to commute longer distances, but for a variety of reasons, not just environmental ones, I do not think it is. For example, Londoners are already travelling further to work than anybody else in the country. On average, they spend almost an hour a day travelling. I do not think they want to spend any more of their lives travelling; it is purgatory already. They want to travel short distances.

We need a debate about the location of jobs and housing, and particularly how to get jobs into the areas where new homes are going. We need also a more specific debate about how people can be encouraged to work near where they live; or how employers can be encouraged to employ local people. It is striking that, although Transport for London predict that the population of London will increase by 10% by 2016, and the number of jobs will increase by 14%, the amount of travel predicted to occur by that date will go up by 26%. So not only will more people be travelling, but those of us who are already in London and who survive to that date will travel further. We will each be travelling about 15% further to do the same things. The number of journeys that people make has been constant for decades, but what is not constant is the total distance they travel.

We have to get a hold on the distances that people travel, and start ensuring that the things we do for work, health, education, retail and leisure are within reach of where people live. It is a question of access to facilities of all sorts. It is a vital social inclusion as well as environmental issue, and we need to get a grasp on it.

MICHAEL SCHABAS: Don't believe everything that engineers' models produce. The only reason that their transport model shows people travelling 20% more is that they want to justify a lot of rail schemes. They therefore assumed that the real cost of travel relative to incomes would go down, because people would go on getting richer and travel would go on getting cheaper. That is the only reason why there would be 20% more people travelling, and I would not say that it was necessarily a fait accompli or a good thing. I also do not know how you stop people travelling. Everybody can get a job near where they live, or they can move house to be near their job; but people do not want to do that.

RICHARD BOURN: Reducing the need to travel is a very misunderstood notion. It does not mean restricting people's freedom to travel; it means restricting the obligation to travel, which is a very different thing.

MICHAEL SCHABAS: Nobody needs to travel. Everybody can either change jobs or change their home. People make a choice and a trade-off. You can try to influence that trade-off by taxes, by congestion charging, by charging higher rail fares. If you abolished the green belt, housing would be built closer in and the miles travelled would be shorter - but not necessarily the time that people spend travelling.

The sustainability question is fundamental. It is a great buzz word, but I do not think that people think about what it means. Travel is the greatest user of fossil fuels, but if electric car technology was perfected and became cheap, people would still be travelling more and we would still be building roads for everybody. Therefore, I think that rail is fundamentally a good thing. It is also a good thing socially, because people understand their neighbours and friends and other people if they see one another on the train, more than if they see one another on the motorway.

It would be great to design a transport system so that people can interact, with a whole city, a large region like London - which is fantastic; 16 million people - all working as one metropolis with reasonable journey times. We try to do that with Superlink, with reasonable consumption of energy because it is all electrified. If you do not want people to travel so far, that is a pricing decision. Raise rail fares, raise fuel taxes and make people travel less. The choices are there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Theo, what is your definition of sustainability?

THEO STEEL: It is ironic that the biggest increase in personal disposable income has occurred at a time when rail fares have been RPI minus 1 for seven years, after 20 years of being RPI plus 2 except in election years. I think that the Government can take a lead by getting some of the resources in London out of London. Why do we have so many ruddy hospitals in London, which take up a lot of space? They are there because they have been there historically and there are many vested interests in them staying there. It would be an extremely helpful addition to the economy in Southend to have 1,000 jobs from some more hospital facilities.

Freedom of choice in education works in South Essex as actively as anywhere. The LOTS study found that the biggest travel gap was that 15% more people travelled for educational reasons in the peaks than at other times. Some policies have worked

against sustainability, and those are the places we could start. Home working is likely to have some effect. I am delighted by that, because we discount some season tickets considerably: if people go into work only two or three days a week, they will buy return tickets, which get me the same money for two thirds of the travel.

From an economic point of view, the longer-distance trains are generally more economic than short-distance ones: they go faster and you can get more productivity out of them. It is important to have mixed-income areas rather than putting all the support workers in east London and expecting them to work to work all the way across London. Letting the market work could be sustainable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could each of you answer this question? Apart from the transport, what is making people travel those distances? Is it the fares; is it stamp duty on change of house; is it the fact that education varies so much between areas? What is making people travel so much?

MICHAEL SCHABAS: It is the complexity of their lives. People live in one place, a man or his wife gets a job somewhere else, the kid gets into university. They get a better job on the other side of London that pays more money, but they have to travel a long way - they take the job.

NEIL JOHNSON: I think that there is inflexibility in the housing market, which means that it is relatively easy for me to get a job on the other side of London, but I cannot sell my house as easily. There are issues in the complexity of people's lives. But there might be a slight glimmer on the horizon in terms of changing working patterns. Graduates coming out of university at the moment have a very different vision of their lives. Whereas we might all be indoctrinated with the command and control mechanism - we will go and sit in an office and send emails to everybody else in our office - younger people see a different way of doing it. That may address some of the peak commuting issues in London and elsewhere.

THEO STEEL: The housing situation is not as flexible as it was, and the travel opportunities are greater than they were, because of the M25 or whatever else.

RICHARD BOURN: For the reasons mentioned, a mismatch of jobs and housing is one thing; but most travel is not connected with work - it is connected with recreation, education and other things. There is a very real danger that, in the sustainable communities, so-called, in south-east England, we will create dormitory communities, whose inhabitants travel long distances to jobs elsewhere. My final answer to Fred Harrison's point is that the most sustainable travel is that done by foot or bicycle, and the second is public transport, with the car very far down the list. But the most sustainable thing of all must be to reduce the need to travel in the first place, so that only short distances need be travelled.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fred, do you want to come back on that?

FRED HARRISON: This is the heart of the problem. I agree that conservation is a priority. I did not mention it this morning because of time. The fact that the Green Party has put land taxation at the heart of its fiscal strategy is an indication, thank goodness, that a group of politically aware people are conscious of the relationship

between the economy, the environment and fiscal policy in determining patterns of urban growth.

Think of what Neil has just told us. We will not end up with sustainable communities in the Thames Gateway, although the ODPM wants them, because the existing business owners are seeing that they can cash in the chips of their land values and move out. Jobs are moving out and key workers, subsidised by Government, are being moved in, who will then have to commute long distances. That is the impact of the land market and the tax system working to displace people from the sustainable communities that are supposed to be created in the Thames Gateway. We should not miss the model that is at to cause the problems of long-distance commuting.

SIMON PAYNE (CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL): Surely our responsibility here is to focus on the vision that is supposed to be in the sustainable communities paper - that we should create these new communities as far as possible with attractive environments and with jobs as close as possible to the homes, and with all the community facilities, so that people will choose to locate there. That is the vision, and the rail operators, the bus operators and everyone else need to help us as authorities or practitioners to deliver that. That is what we are after - the most sustainable outcome.

If the rail operator in Cambridge asks to triple the size of the car park, when I know that the cheapest house in Cambridge is £200,000 and the car park will add to those pressures because people will want to use the train to commute to London, that is not sustainable and is not helping local authorities to deliver sustainable communities. This broad picture means that everyone should co-operate. It is not a perfect world - we have to deal with a lot of difficulties already - but the worst case would be if we just said that something was a bit Stalinist or that the business case was completely different. We have to co-operate and see what is possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us move on to the question of whose responsibility it is to deliver. I suppose that this question is like a bucket of steam: how do you pin down the responsibility? We have heard that Transport for London is the agency for delivering transport: if they do not get it right, we know who to pin the responsibility on. Outside in the growth areas, there are the districts, the counties, delivery boards, English Partnerships and all the other agencies, different railway companies and so on. So the question is important: whose job is it to deliver this?

RICHARD BOURN: Inevitably, it starts with central Government. They have to create the right conditions for providing a public transport framework on which we can locate sustainable communities. We have heard a lot about buses today. There is clearly a place for buses, and we have been strong supporters of the huge improvement in bus services as a result of the Mayor's policies in the last four or five years. But the sustainable communities in south-east England will need rail, light rail or ultra-light rail services rather than buses in order to give developers confidence to develop sites without the fear that, in a few years, they may lose their public transport services. They need permanence of public transport provision, and we will only get that from rail. The Government must examine the cost of public transport provision more carefully than they have done so far, and must make some money available for investment in rail schemes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Another growth period, in Victorian times, was led by the railways - by the private sector, of course. You are saying that the same model is applicable.

RICHARD BOURN: Except that I do not know that it will be led by the private sector this time. I think that successful cities throughout the world have recognised that the provision of a public transport framework must be a cost on the public purse. They do not expect all the costs to be borne by the private sector. I do not think it is reasonable to expect that: I think that the public transport system is a public good, which provides more than transport benefits. The Government cannot apply some private sector model to public transport provision.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you see them leaving it and then trying to use a tariff system to get back as much as possible?

RICHARD BOURN: The system of section 106 agreements and the money contributed by developers - and how other aspects of the agreements work, such as workplace travel plans and the role in them of local authorities - needs a thorough examination. We have not got that right yet. Those are low-cost measures with huge benefits.

THE CHAIRMAN: Neil, how do the RICS see it?

NEIL JOHNSON: Central Government have to take responsibility for this, and at the most senior levels. Delivering sustainable communities is a huge issue, which affects not only transport but housing, employment and infrastructure provision for health and education. Senior Ministers seem to be very good at going to photo-opportunities with a nice sustainable house in the gateway; what they need to do is start banging some heads together among their colleagues in senior Government and making sure that they can deliver a genuinely sustainable community rather than just talking about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that the responsibility of the Department for Transport, or is it in the Cabinet?

NEIL JOHNSON: It is in the Cabinet.

THE CHAIRMAN: So with health, education and other bits and pieces, you feel that transport needs to go up that ladder?

NEIL JOHNSON: Transport is a critical element, but this is bigger than just transport. It needs very senior level buy-in from politicians and the Cabinet. Tony Blair set up a Committee, which he was to chair, to co-ordinate the sustainable communities plans. I think it has met once, if that. Leadership has to come from that high level, because the issues are so huge and reach across Departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Michael, you have this big scheme. You are showing leadership and trying to have a vision. Who in Government do you talk to? Who ticks the box so that you can do it?

MICHAEL SCHABAS: Who is here from the ODPM? [*No answer.*] I know that they were all put in purdah so that they could not talk, but I am disappointed that they could not listen. [*Laughter.*]

Neil said that Government policies had not been entirely worked out, and that there were some inconsistencies - which I thought was probably an understatement. It is an observation about life in the real world. The idea seems to be that someone in central Government is going to figure out the right answer to everything and implement it. We tried that, didn't we? Prescott got the ODPM, he appointed Alistair Morton to solve all the problems of the rail industry, he set up Cross London Rail Links with TfL to come up with Crossrail, and you saw what a wonderful scheme they came up with and are now promoting. It is a pig: it just does not do anything.

I think that Martin Tugwell was right: people have to come up with the right ideas and promote them. He should have stayed to listen, too, because it is his job to figure out which ones make sense, to test them, to advise and to tell the democratically elected politicians, "This scheme is totally bonkers, but this other one seems to make sense," and then to back those and implement them. That is how things have happened. That is how the sewers were built in London 150 years ago. It is how the Tube got built. Government were involved all the way along as the gatekeeper on schemes, sometimes as the funder - and sometimes as the implementer, which is not nearly as important. Where do the innovation and ideas come from, and who judges them? That is the democratic process.

THE CHAIRMAN: You remind me of something, Michael. I had lunch with a civil servant to talk about the delivery agenda in Ashford, and he said, "It's important that you do not bring central Government problems - that you bring us solutions." I agree with you: if we are looking for central Government to solve the problem, that will not happen. For all the reasons of political agendas and the difficulties of joining things up, it has to be in the partnership you described. Where do you stand, Theo?

THEO STEEL: Going beneath the region in terms of building railways is quite challenging. There is a role for individual stations in individual towns to get the best deal specific to the place. I am very supportive of making Cambridge station more accessible by road, and allowing buses to get through the centre more effectively.

THE CHAIRMAN: Richard, although you have talked about central Government getting the framework right, your organisation is very much in favour of the small improvements that collectively add up to a big improvement, aren't you? This echoes what Theo said: if all the stations along a line took a very progressive view, if all the highway authorities helped them to sort out the parking and access and so on, there would be a huge improvement down the line without a lot of major public grief.

RICHARD BOURN: That is absolutely right. There has been a lot of discussion of transport schemes that cost a great deal of money, when we can make great progress with very small schemes, often called "soft measures", which require no major physical infrastructure at all but can make a very big difference to transport conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN: What happened to the experiment that the DfT were working up with you on a series of soft measures in a medium-sized town?

RICHARD BOURN: That is proceeding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which is the town?

RICHARD BOURN: Doncaster is one, and there are two others in that part of England. No results are available yet, and we await them with interest. In case people do not know, we are talking about a pilot project in three towns for the implementation of a range of soft measures - walking and cycling facilities, workplace school travel plans, home working, small bus and rail schemes, innovative systems for public transport passengers, personalised travel marketing and so on. Those things individually make quite an impression, but together, we contend, they could make an impression that is much greater than the sum of the parts. That is being tried out in a DfT-backed pilot project.

THEO STEEL: It is interesting that Doncaster is supported by a huge new centre immediately adjacent to the railway station. It is quite impressive when you tumble out into the regional centre in places like Doncaster.

THE CHAIRMAN: On the jobs agenda, you were talking about some stations which could be locations for jobs, with individual stations and planning authorities working together to approve things.

THEO STEEL: It could be jobs or it could be housing. People are just beginning to come and talk to me about the car parks we lease. If you put what is there on a stack, you could release the rest for housing. That is a sensible way of getting some quick wins.

DAVID GEORGE: I welcome those comments, and generally agree with the panel. The Fasttrack project in Kent Thameside is a bus-based system, delivered initially by the local authorities to kick-start it, with private developers contributing later on. The essential point that I keep making to our partners is that, although it is clearly a transport project, it is not a conventional one. We have a very good public transport system, given the area as it stands. This is a regeneration project, a project for delivering growth - a layer over and above what we need to make public transport work. Therefore, my answer would be that, if you want the growth, you should be leading and promoting, driving forward and taking responsibility for delivering the extra things over transport systems that are essential to delivering this growth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, in a concentrated development like that, if you want to work up that sort of point, you need to put a business plan together and use the planning tariff to give that level. We have been discussing today a far more dispersed pattern, which is less easy to do.

DAVID GEORGE: I accept that; but all the time there is a lag between putting it in early and making it sustainable and viable in its own right. The growth in the growth areas will take a while to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are many examples of how the private sector can fund a piece of infrastructure. Money is not the problem - the problem is the financing issue.

They do not want to pay for it until they have let the office or occupied the houses, because of their cash flow. If they have to pay the cash up front for that infrastructure, the scheme becomes non-viable. That is where we need some banker arrangement, probably from English Partnerships - I know that they are looking at that - or from the Treasury itself. There has been discussion about setting up such a fund, in which the Government would act as a bank, probably with the private sector. People would borrow the money to put in the infrastructure, and then try to repay it. There is a lot of risk in doing that - the performance risk in the construction of the infrastructure and the economic risk in the performance of the economy, for example. If Fred is right, you should sell your house today. We cannot assume that the Government can bear all that risk. That is an issue that the Treasury are looking at.

Let us look now at the tariff issue. Simon Payne is from Cambridge: can you help on that?

SIMON PAYNE: I need to start with a confession. I am Director of Environment and Planning at Cambridge, but I have only been there for three months, so I am not as familiar with the tariff-based approach there. However, I came from Stratford-on-Avon District Council, who developed a similar approach in conjunction with Warwickshire County Council. On the website www.stratford.gov.uk you will see that the approach was essentially a formula based on trip generation. The innovative nature of the approach was recognised with a commendation in the RTPI awards last year. It produced a shopping list of essential transport infrastructure; the payments were made into a central fund; and when priorities on the shopping list could be done, they were funded from that bucket of money. That provided flexibility in timing and so on, and bringing forward schemes with the greatest priority when they were ready to go. It is worth looking at that approach.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that helpful?

JOHN DUFFY: My question is about the whole concept of tariffs and how they would be fixed. Although a fixed tariff is good in itself, because it gives the developer some idea of how much is expected, it does not necessarily take account of each particular site's own costs. That is extremely important.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that is right. I know a little about tariffs and the way the argument is developing. You look in your area for the big schemes that need delivering - transport, swimming pools, major schools and other educational facilities. You add them up and see where mainstream Government funding might support them. You see where you might get some gap funding from Europe or elsewhere, and then you see what sort of tariff you might need to charge. There is some iteration around that process.

You have a standard fee for the tariff. If you follow the Ashford planning authority's view, you do it around development units - so much for a certain floor space and so on - and you set a tariff for that type of development. Then you put it up and put it down according to the type of site you are dealing with. The site might be severely polluted, and will need a lot of public infrastructure such as car parking and some affordable housing. You look at all that, and you say, "That is not a site on which we could do a tariff." But if it is an unencumbered greenfield site, which already has good access, you

say, "We could up the tariff on that." You have to argue that through your development plan. Phased sites come forward, and you consider the economics of each and fix the tariff accordingly. That needs a lot of skilled people on valuation and finance and a lot of negotiation and argument, but eventually it is a clear way of leveraging the finance in.

If you collect that money, central Government have to deliver mainstream funding to get the developer contribution. With the Milton Keynes 25% tariff up front on planning grant, the developer is not going to pay the remaining 75% if Government grant has not come through to complete the funding package. That is why it is essential that the Government get their act together on mainstream funding on a whole range of things, and start joining it up, and, more importantly, spreading it over five to seven years, which is very difficult, given their election cycle. There are real problems in harnessing that system, but a number of delivery vehicles are going down that path, and will be putting proposals to Government over the next six to nine months. So watch this space.

MICHAEL SCHABAS: It is very common in North America. I have personally paid development levies twice. The reason that it is popular in the States - this is probably a point that our friends in TfL, who have come from New York, are not totally aware of - is that they have a fragmented fiscal structure. The state and the Federal Government compete for taxing. The Treasury here is not too keen on local authorities doing that, because every £20,000 that you get from a developer is £20,000 that the Treasury cannot tax back from the developer in other ways. It is cost. They would have captured a good part of that anyway - 40% or something like that. That is why you have those constraints in this country, and there are probably good reasons for them.

ROD ANDERSON (SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL): I am probably the only representative here from the Solent and South Hampshire area. There will be a gap, certainly in our area, between the value added to a site and the costs we want to get out of it, because we are looking at so much more than transport. The affordable housing agenda is distorting the market, so we are not in a pure market economy. Those of us who are not in the growth areas will have a real problem in securing Government commitment to bridge that gap.

Secondly, I come back to the point I made about revenue. Most of the planning system requires us to seek capital contributions early in the life of a project, which must be difficult for developers. I would like a mixture of some capital early for infrastructure and some on-going revenue support. It seems to me that it would be less difficult for someone who is making a development to produce a revenue stream than to produce capital right at the start of the project. I wondered whether the panel had views, or could advise me, on whether such mechanisms exist, or whether I am trying to swim upstream.

MICHAEL SCHABAS: It is a case of "buy now, pay later", and the Treasury are always suspicious of such arrangements. In the case of the Jubilee line, Canary Wharf's contribution was £100 million up front, which was borrowed from the European Investment Bank, plus a levy per square foot for about 500 years into the future. [*Laughter.*] The Treasury's concern was to make sure that was locked in so that they had to pay if they went bankrupt. You can put structures in place, but the lawyers and

the bankers cost a lot of money to do so. If it is a really big scheme, you might be able to do it, but for little bits and piece you will just have to get the money up front.

THEO STEEL: All my experience of developer inputs - whether as a recipient of good in the form of Braintree Freeport station, for instance, or in negotiating from the other side - is that capital is much easier to obtain than revenue support. I would encourage everybody to try to get the agenda towards making revenue support a little more flexible. That probably works quite well in the spend pattern of a development, in supporting it when the development is fructified rather than at the beginning. Therefore, I think that there is some interesting logic here. But I have recently seen a number of things that I would have liked to do fall down on revenue support rather than capital. I think we have skewed too far to capital.

RICHARD BOURN: We have often cited Cambridge as an example of good practice. I know little about that, but I understood that Cambridge was taking money from developers as a condition of planning permission, and that money was going into a pool which could be used pretty much at the local authority's discretion. I do not know why that money need be used only for capital support: can it not also be used for revenue? Is that not what has happened?

SIMON PAYNE: The key to securing this is to make sure that it is embedded in policy, either through the local plan or through what I guess would be supplementary planning documents. The mechanism in relation to revenue funding is to seek a provision over five or 10 years to support the proposal. The other factor is that the development cake is only so large, of course. One has to recognise that, and prioritise what one seeks to do. The policy process is the appropriate way to do that: it allows the development industry to make a challenge, and it provides certainty when it is fixed. To my mind, the answer is to be very clear on the priorities, and, if there is an element of revenue, to make sure that it is expressed in the policy framework and that it takes account of the realities of the development process. Ultimately, if you demand too much, either you will not succeed through the appeal process or the development will not happen.