

PLANNING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AROUND PEOPLE'S NEEDS

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews sustainability-driven spatial planning policy from the perspective of ordinary citizens as they seek to travel, live and work, and carry out their daily lives within the sustainable city. The original definition of sustainability contained social, economic and environmental components. This paper argues that there has been an over-emphasis upon the environmental aspects, at the expense of social considerations, especially gender, creating a dissonance between the sustainability and social equality agendas to the detriment of achieving inclusive urban design. Policy examples from transportation and land-use planning indicate that sustainability-driven planning policy is working against the creation of inclusive, equitable and accessible cities with particular reference to the needs of women. Sustainability policy is set at too high a level to engage with the realities of everyday life. It is concluded that there is a need for a more user-related, social perspective to be integrated into sustainable planning policy. Public transport needs to go where the people want to go, between the different land uses and facilities. In order to enable women and men of all ages to travel comfortably and easily it is important to make transport systems accessible and usable, with adequate ancillary facilities.

Key words: sustainability, accessibility, gender, disability, transport planning, equality

Written by: Dr Clara Greed, Professor Emerita of Inclusive Urban Planning, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK Claragreed@aol.com Clara.Greed@uwe.ac.uk April 2015

Introduction

Sustainability has been a key driving force of planning policy for nearly 30 years (Bruntland, 1987). But, many citizens have found so-called sustainable policies (especially policies concerned with reducing transport's carbon footprint) have made their daily lives more difficult, whilst not necessarily enabling them to adopt a greener lifestyle. This article discusses the potential conflict between promoting environmental sustainability and creating accessible, inclusive and equitable cities. Having introduced the subject matter, the theoretical perspective will be briefly outlined, along with the methodological approach. Definitions of sustainability and of inclusive urban design will be given highlighting potential bias and lacunae in the UK planning systems' application of sustainability principles. 'The problem' will be outlined in two stages, first regarding the inherited 'pre-sustainability' nature of British cities, and second, the challenges the 'sustainable city' creates for its citizens. In the concluding section, recommendations for creating cities that are both sustainable and inclusively designed will be outlined.

Conceptual and Methodological Perspective

This paper is concerned with investigating in another piece of the urban question, namely, 'who gets what where why and how?' (Harvey, 1975) drawing on examples from the UK. A key determinant in shaping cities is the nature of planning policy and thus the perspective and 'world view' of the policy makers themselves (Greed, 1994a:10). This paper is based around the investigation of the 'dissonance' between what the planners imagine is required and the realities experienced by the urban population as they seek to access and use 'the city of everyday life'. If there is no recognition of the needs of women and other minorities in the policy agenda, and there is limited representation of minority groups, especially women, among planners and other urban policy makers (CIC, 2009), then the spatial needs of minority groups will not register in the professional psyche as being of any importance. Conceptually, the research is concerned with the reproduction over space of social relations, including imprint of gender relations on the built environment (Massey, 1984: 16). The study does not aim to prove a hypothesis or confirm statistically that there is a problem, as it is already widely documented that there is one (Stimpson et al, 1981; Matrix, 1984; Little et al, 1988;

Whatmore and Little, 1988; Roberts,1991; Greed,1994a; Booth et al, 1996; Buckingham-Hatfield,2000; Anthony,2001; Hayden,2002; Reeves,2005; Uteng and Cresswell,2008; Jarvis et al, 2009; inter alia). The paper draws, in part, upon personal experiences of trying to get around the city of man, and thus includes a polemic component arising from years of being stuck in traffic jams, standing at bus-stops, and talking to others about shared experiences whilst waiting. This paper also draws significantly upon the author's research on 'women and planning' for over 20 years (Greed,1994,a; Greed, 2011, 2012; Greed and Johnson,2014). The author headed a national study for the RTPI (Royal Town Planning Institute) on the extent to which gender considerations were being mainstreamed into spatial policy in local planning authorities (RTPI,2003; Greed, 2005). The RTPI research yielded a picture of 'what' the quantitative situation was nationally, whilst a series of 15 detailed case studies was undertaken (basically of good, bad and indifferent local planning authorities) in which the 'small details' and concerns of respondents (of both the planners and the planned) were noted, in order to build up a series of key themes that might help explain quite 'why' (qualitatively) some local authorities were supportive and others manifested resistance, or little understanding of the issues. A qualitative, ethnographic approach (Greed, 1994b) in order to make sense of the policy stances and lack of reference to social inclusion considerations (albeit with initial quantitative contextualisation, usually at a national level. But, there has been limited subsequent application of gender considerations to strategic land-use zoning, transportation and environmental sustainability policy. Likewise there appeared to be little understanding of the implications of applying a gender perspective to detailed local planning and urban design matters, including street layouts, detailed accessibility and equality issues, and childcare matters.

Definitions: Sustainability and Inclusive Design

The need to create sustainable cities is a key driving factor in spatial policy-making. But this paper argues that, in the UK, a partial and incomplete approach to sustainability is used which over-emphasizes the environmental dimension at the expense of social considerations. The original definition of sustainability in the Rio Declaration (Buckingham-Hatfield, 2000), included three components: economic viability, social equity, and environmental sustainability (prosperity, people, place). In other European countries, especially within Scandinavian countries, the social component is given greater importance (Madariaga and Roberts, 2013). But, in Britain, a somewhat 'peopleless' concern with the 'green' environmental issues appears to have eclipsed the social component, detracting from diversity considerations, thus reducing the chances of achieving fully sustainable cities. Friends of the Earth has declared that 'transport is one of the worst perpetrators of sexual discrimination' but the social dimension seems to have been jostled out of the way in the modern day environmental UK sustainability agenda (Oliver,1988). 'Inclusive urban design' and 'sustainability' have become disconnected especially with respect to women's issues. Inclusive urban design may be defined as an approach to the planning, design and layout of our towns and cities that recognises and accommodates the needs of those with disabilities and benefits all those other societal groups, especially women, that are currently dis-enabled by the nature of the built environment. Inclusive urban design would create enabling environments, in which, for example, street layouts would be accessible, functional and direct, as well as being safe, attractive, legible and easy to negotiate (Manley,1998; Imrie and Hall,2001). Such an approach would extend the principles to universal and inclusive design (Goldsmith, 2000) to the planning of entire cities in terms of strategic policy-making affect the nature of transport systems, zoning policy, and policy priorities in terms of the location, distribution and design of the different spatial components, land-uses, transport systems, and other spatial components and amenities that make up the urban area (Anthony, 2001).

The 'Old' Problem: The Un-Sustainable City Of Man

Historical planning policy has resulted in cities being based upon the zoning and separation of land-uses creating unnecessary distances between home and work and thus unsustainable commuting patterns. Post-war UK planning prioritised housing clearance and the dispersal of industry, residential areas and public facilities, thus endorsing low

density, suburban development around our cities thus creating extending work commuting distances and enclosed housing estates for women (Roberts,1991: 70-77) Subsequent governments favoured car use, and the 'Americanisation of British cities' although North American women planners had already warned against the problems of urban decentralisation, over-zealous zoning, and car-dominant cities (Stimpson et al, 1981). Entire districts of cities were bulldozed to make way for urban motorways and car parks for the predominantly car-borne male commuter from the 1960s onwards. Thus a car-based urban infrastructure, with dispersed land-use patterns, was developed, whilst public transport was left to decline. By the end of the twentieth century a range of developments, including out of town shopping malls, hypermarkets, business parks and leisure facilities have located alongside the motorway system, whilst schools, hospitals and local authority offices have all been decentralised in the name of efficiency, thus undermining the viability of existing city centres and traditional towns in the process. All these policies have increased traffic congestion and journey times as people try to travel between different land-uses to carry out their daily tasks. So much so that it is now a virtual necessity to possess a motor car, particularly in cities where public transport has been severely cutback and land uses are highly dispersed and essential facilities, shops and amenities are no longer within walking distance. Women have been particularly adversely affected by these changes because women and men still have different roles and responsibilities, and therefore different travel patterns within the city of man (Anthony,2001). Women constitute the majority of the population and thus 'the planned' (51.1%) (ONS,2012). But women have been poorly served by planning policies that do little to recognise or plan for their 'different' needs and travel patterns in the development of land-use policy (Coleman,2008; Reeves,2005). Women are still predominantly the ones responsible for childcare, shopping and home-making, although the majority of women also work outside the home. This means that women's 'journey to work' is likely to be more complex and multi-purpose compared with the simple uninterrupted, mono-journey to work and back again, of the traditional male commuter, and far more difficult to achieve in cities that are still structured around past zoning priorities and decentralisation. Therefore trip-chaining, and multi-tasking are key features of women's travel, and an inevitable result of trying to combine their home and work. For example, a woman may set off from home, stop off at the childminder, then school, get to work, and return via the school gates, shops and childminder, resulting in complex trip chaining. This daily travel itinerary is difficult to achieve when employment and residential areas have been separated out by traditional land-use zoning, based upon male perceptions of spatial functionality (Uteng and Cresswell, (eds) 2008), whereas for women a range of more personal factors come into play such as personal safety, crime, street lighting, pavement condition, accessibility and practicality (Booth et al, 1996) . Women's journeys are already poorly met by public transport systems that have been designed on a radial basis funnelling workers into the centre during the rush hours, and provide limited off-peak services for women part-time workers, and a lack of transverse, inter-district bus routes. More women than men work part-time or their hours are outside the hours kept by office workers. For example, before the rush hour starts early-morning cleaners have already worked several hours in offices, and factory workers have already left early and commuted out to factories on the city edge.

The 'New' Problem: The Sustainable City

A Negative, Individualised, Condemnatory Spirit (sub-headings)

Far from solving the 'old' problems described above, the new sustainability-orientated planning agenda is compounding these problems and creating 'new' problems of its own, not least because of a lack of a gender perspective on planning, and overall a lack of awareness of social user needs, and the realities of everyday life. Solutions appear to be focused upon restriction, control and penalisation, or upon condemnation of personal lifestyle choices, without offering alternatives based upon investment in structural spatial change and better transport systems and services. In spite of the social class being part of the diversity agenda, one senses a certain contempt for 'the people' within the sustainability agenda. But individuals still have to get to work, they are not free agents, and will have no choice but to use their cars if no other alternative is available. In particular many women are time-poor and the

only way to carry out the elaborate trip-chaining journeys described above is by car. After many years of promoting the motorcar, planners have made a *volte face*, to condemn car use, rather than to promote it, in the name of sustainability : but they still retain the same power to shape cities. Policy proposals to restrict the motorcar and encourage public transport use might at first have been welcomed by the public as a way of easing congestion and making cities more efficient. The restrictions were not accompanied by commensurate measures to increase public transport provision. There appears to be little appreciation within the Government of the necessary investment and infrastructural development, and of all the ancillary preparations and facilities that must be put in place to enable the majority of the population to travel 'en masse' by public transport. A new generation of young green transport planners has arisen who are fired up with environmental fundamentalism. They justify their actions in the name of sustainability and are apparently above reproach because of their zeal for the environment and respect for the Planet. If one dares to say, 'what about women?' one is likely to be told (as I have been many times), 'oh we have done women, you should be concerned with the environment'. There seems to be little understanding of the complex and essential nature of people's journeys, especially women's, and the fact that public transport does not provide the routes, destinations, and timetable provision that women and men require. As a result women travel around cities - with difficulty - using their survival skills and precise knowledge of local bus timetables, with limited time budgets to get everything done. Public transport is inadequate, expensive, unreliable, and infrequent.

The New Emphasis on Public Transport

It is impractical to suggest that everyone should get back onto public transport as the services have already deteriorated (Hamilton et al,2005) and are barely meeting people's existing needs, when only a minority travel by public transport. Some groups never had cars in the first place and find their needs displaced in favour of attracting car driving commuters on to public transport. Existing local bus routes that went around residential areas are being cancelled or diverted to provide buses to serve the more direct routes from Park and Ride car parks to the city centre (as in Brislington, Bristol). Likewise the urban Tramway in Croydon, South London, has improved speed of travel within the town centre but has resulted in existing bus routes coming in from the suburbs being diverted and travel times increased (Greed and Johnson,2014: 240). Much of the hype for people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles gives the impression that public transport is readily available and accessible to all. There are large areas of the country, particularly outside London, where public transport barely exists, with, at the most, infrequent and unreliable bus services. The majority of the population live in suburban areas, comprising both decentralised council housing estates and private residential developments, and many of these areas, particularly in the provinces, lack adequate and reliable public transport systems, and have never had access to the rail system. Many small towns and villages had their railway stations closed down as a result of the Beeching railway cuts (Beeching 1963) and promises of alternative public transport never materialised (Greed and Johnson,2014, ch.12). To save time trains may not stop at intermediate stations because of emphasis on inter-city commuter routes. Therefore, of necessity, many people resort to using their car for the journey to work, because there is no alternative. Penalising the motorist does not give individual citizens the power to re-open railway stations, to create new bus routes, or to change ingrained land-use patterns.

The School Run and Related Journeys

Particular hatred seems to be reserved for 'the school run', an activity predominantly undertaken by women taking their children to school by car and parking outside the school. This activity only contributes towards 15% of rush-hour traffic, but it is widely condemned, for 'cluttering up the roads' (Hamilton et al, 2005). In contrast, no-one criticises the 'office run' or the congestion caused by husbands being dropped off at the railway station by their wives. The school run is portrayed in the media as being undertaken by rich lazy housewives in their '4 by 4' Range Rovers, although many families only own a cheap car and have to make major economies to keep it running. (Seldom does one hear that some male parents do in fact undertake the school run too). One feels a sense of *deja vu*, recalling previous

generations of transport planners who condemned 'women car drivers' and their essential journeys (for work, school, shopping, and childcare) as leisure journeys that got in the way of the journeys of the male bread winner. Greener alternatives are promoted such as the 'walking train' where school children parade along in a crocodile to school with mothers being encouraged to supervise this perambulation. Such schemes assume that mothers will be available early in the morning. In reality, many women are 'time poor' and very anxious at this time of day as they are frantic to get to work. One of the most efficient ways of ensuring that their children get to school on time is to drop them off on the way to work, as part of the morning trip chain, with mothers often sharing this role. 'Walking-trains to school' schemes might be viable in higher density urban areas, but are hardly practical in spread-out suburban locations. However, teachers or official wardens, not mothers, should be provided to staff the activity and should be remunerated for doing so. The journey to school is underestimated, in terms of the numbers involved, and the time and commitment provided by parents to ensuring children get to school on time. Local authorities seem surprised when they find large numbers of children, and for that matter cars, converging on the school gates in the morning and their reaction is mainly negative, to fine people for parking and to condemn the activity. But women are by default providing 'public transport' in their private cars, compensating for lack of government provision. Many the supportive journey activities undertaken by parents are unrecognised, unpaid and condemned, such as undertaking 'escort' journeys to ferry children and teenagers around in the evenings because public transport is so limited and parents are wary of letting their children out on their own.

Many main roads into cities provide a priority lane for those with 2 or more passengers, with cameras checking the numbers of passengers. Although the mothers may have ferried several other people and children in their car in the course of their morning trip chain, by the time they head for the final stretch to work they may be on their own again and find they are not entitled to use the 2+ lane and, although arriving later than others, are also not entitled to use the 2+ parking spaces. Both such contrivances favour the rush-hour commuter on his uncomplicated and unburdened 'journey to work'. Parents, who by their unselfish and complicated car journeys are constantly compensating for the inadequacies of urban form, planning policy and public transport provision are likely to be penalised by these measures. Road charging, for example with the 'Congestion Zone' in central London, is a crude way of promoting sustainability, based upon the ability to pay, not upon the usefulness of the journeys undertaken. It can cut into women's trip-chaining if they have to pass in and out of the zone several times in the day as they undertake their sequence of trips to and from the childminder for example. But public transport also offers insurmountable difficulties. If mothers, taking children to school, try to use the bus, train or Tube in the rush hour, they are likely to get 'condemnatory looks' for 'cluttering up the public transport system' with their offspring. It is illegal to leave small children unattended at home, so pre-school children and most likely their push chairs will have to come along too for the journey. Some escalators still have signs up banning pushchairs, whereas women may be shouted at for using the disabled lift (Lenclos, 2002). Public transport, is far from 'public', and, as the Consumer Association commented years ago, mainly aimed at able-bodied men 'carrying nothing more than a rolled up newspaper'.

Provision of Ancillary Facilities and Local Centres

The promotion of cycling and walking is of value for short local journeys, but expecting everyone to stop using their cars ignores the long distances that many people have to commute to get to work, which in turn are the result of past land-use zoning and decentralisation policies. The closure of local shops and decentralisation of retail stores also makes it increasingly difficult to food-shop without using a car. Twice as many men as women cycle in Britain (WDS, 2005). Deterrents include abuse from male drivers, personal safety fears on cycle paths, road safety concerns and lack of ancillary amenities. Buses, trains, railway and bus stations, pavements, streets, toilets, and public spaces need to be accessible to everyone if the government is serious about creating sustainable cities. It is hypocritical to condemn people for using their cars if they are unable to access the public transport system because of steps, steep gradients, poor lighting, narrow footpaths obstructed by posts, poles and bins, poor lighting and unsafe layouts. These issues

affect millions – not ‘just’ the disabled – but everyone who is disenabled by the design the built environment, but anyone who feels vulnerable or who finds the city difficult to negotiate. Much sustainability policy appears to be framed with little reference to the differences in travel patterns undertaken by women and men. Likewise, emphasis in existing inclusive design policy is generally upon facilitating accessibility at the ‘micro’ street layout level, by remedial measures such as installing ramps, rather than promoting systemic change in land-use and transportation patterns at the city-wide strategic planning level, that would increase access and mobility for all. The Government has made much of creating ‘sustainable communities’ (ODPM, 2003), and one would imagine this would be the ‘magic link’ between ‘sustainability’ and ‘social inclusion’. There appears to be limited acknowledgement or understanding of the range of groups that comprise ‘the community’. After the obligatory, introductory reference to the importance of gender, sex, race, age inter alia, ‘disability’, proves to be the main subject of much inclusive design guidance, thus obscuring other diversity issues that require attention (CABE, 2008; TCPA, 2009). Indeed women are seldom mentioned in key policy documents on accessible and sustainable transport resulting in the need for ‘special’ policy documents on ‘women and transport’ being produced, for example, by the Equal Opportunities Commission (Hamilton et al, 2005), and progressive local authorities (GLA, 2007). A community is not sustainable if it ignores the needs of its elderly constituents (Age UK, 2009:44) and has limited understanding of women’s ‘different’ use of the city and its transport systems (Uteng and Creswell (eds) (2008) and only holds old-fashioned stereotypical views of men’s activity patterns (Reeves, 2005:74). People over 50 years of age now constitute 21 million people (a third of the population) (Gilroy, 2008) of whom over 65% are female so clearly this is another ‘women and planning’ issue. Age UK puts an emphasis upon a city-wide, strategic spatial approach to reshaping the city to meet the needs of the ageing population., stressing the key components of safe streets, transport, pavements, toilets, shops, places to meet, seating etc. The link is made between sustainability and inclusive design by showing that an increased localisation of food production, shops, housing and social facilities reduce climate change and the chances of local flooding, as well as diminishing the need to travel. Recommendations are not limited to ramps and disabled toilets but address city-wide strategic planning policies on transport land-use, and the location of local centres and facilities.

Sensitivity to ethnic minority needs does not figure strongly in the sustainability agenda either; indeed they can be condemned for using too much public transport! A large, Nigerian-led church sought planning permission to rebuild on a site in Dagenham, East London on land designated for industrial use by the Thames Gateway planners, which had remained vacant and unwanted for several years. They were refused permission to develop. They were shocked by this decision because the church had been forced to relocate in the first place as the land they were on was designated for compulsory purchase to make way for the Olympic Games; and they had been reassured by that planners that every effort would be made to find them an alternative site. One of the key reasons given for refusal was that ‘church goes would strain local public transport’ (Planning, 11.09.09:5), as most such worshippers would arrive by bus or foot and few had cars (CAG, 2008; Onuoha and Greed, 2003). In contrast, any other development which did not generate car journeys or require car parking spaces, such as new green office development, would be welcomed as ideally ‘sustainable’ ... (Greed, 2005). Clearly sustainability and social inclusion are not linked in the minds of the planners. The application was also turned down because it was not seen as being of economic value. In reality such churches provide a host of supportive social amenities and services, such as childcare, careers guidance and housing advice that enable the functioning of economic activities. But land uses that contribute to the ‘social capital’ of the area are not included within the remit of ‘sustainability’ within the local planning policy framework (Planning Inspectorate, 2009).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The current approach to sustainability puts a disproportionate emphasis upon environmental factors, with particular concern about transportation issues. It makes it more difficult for people to live their lives without providing viable alternatives, not least because women’s journeys and land-use needs are not given adequate attention in sustainability policy. Rather than introducing negative car-controlling policies, and tinkering around with traffic light sequences and

parking space allocations, apparently to slow the traffic down and to discourage people from using their cars, there needs to be positive measures, such as realistically investing in public transport to give people viable journey alternatives. In the longer term, fundamental structural changes are required to urban form and structure through forward planning policy. If the full agenda of 'sustainability' were taken into account, the social impracticalities would soon come to light. Likewise if the full agenda of 'inclusive design' were taken into account, rather than restricting it to a few 'special' disability measures, the needs of the majority of the population would be met, especially women and the elderly. Adding together women of all ages, who make up 51.1% of the population, plus men over the age of 55 (to capture all the elderly from 55 upwards), over two thirds of the population (ONS, 2012).

Whilst much of the blame for a lack of inclusive urban design rests with the town planners and urban designers, 'planning' is not all powerful. The statutory powers governing the scope and nature of the planning system militates against the implementation of true sustainability policy because so many practical, everyday issues (such as toilets) and 'social' issues (such as childcare), are not 'officially' of concern of the planning system. Such matters are deemed *ultra vires* 'not a land-use matter' within the UK planning system. In contrast environmental sustainability, easily fits into the planning system, because it relates to the physical environment and traditional protectionist concerns of town and country planning. The government did not hesitate to integrate EU directive requirements for EIA, that is Environmental Impact Assessment, into the planning system. There is no parallel requirement that SIA (Social Impact Assessment) should be carried out. So social considerations (unlike environmental requirements) do not feature in the main body of development plan documents. However, some progressive local authorities have included equality policies in the Supplementary Planning Guidance documents (GLA, 2007) and produced guidance reports on spatially-relevant topics, such as public toilets, which fall outside of the scope of statutory planning (GLA, 2006; Greed, 2003).

To achieve truly sustainable transport policy there is a need to relate land-use patterns more directly to women's trip-chaining travel patterns and time-budgeting, and examples of this can already be found in some more progressive municipalities in Western Europe and North America (Madariaga and Roberts, 2013; Fincher and Iveson, 2008). For example, Groningen City Plan in the northern Netherlands requires that childcare provision is planned alongside school buildings to ensure that the trip-chain is simplified for busy parents, dropping off children on the way from home to work, thus making bicycle travel both possible and preferred. This policy is enabled by applying Dutch central government guidance on approaches to urban planning that combine work and family care needs within housing areas. Likewise at the detailed street layout level there has been a concern to link gender issues to traffic management matters, such as traffic calming for many years in Germany (Hass-Klau, 1990). Overall, there is little evidence of gender being taken seriously into account in British town planning (Greed, 2005; Jarvis et al, 2009). Yet, the Gender Equality Duty (DCLG, 2007), requires all local authority departments including architecture and planning, not to discriminate in terms of policy making, allocation of resources, provision of public services, and recruitment and promotion of planning staff. The RTPI has published a Toolkit for practitioners (RTPI, 2003 and subsequent guidance), whilst the Government itself has promoted diversity in planning (ODPM, 2005).

Whilst we await such changes, there is a need to re-evaluate existing priorities and investment. If social and environmental issues were cross-referenced, then sustainable transport policy would prioritise different types of journeys as 'essential'. Rather than building new Park and Rides to meet the existing needs of predominantly male commuters, greater emphasis would be given to local, and off-peak bus services to meet working women's unrecognised travel needs, and, as a result, the routes and timetables would be reconfigured to meet the substantial, unmet, 'off peak' needs of the travelling public. As for car use, new car parks would be built, and not condemned outright, but aimed at meet different priorities, with more flexible combinations of private and public transport modes. If sustainability policy were more 'joined up', collector car parks would be built around all suburban railway stations, especially in Greater London, and around bus termini in the main provincial towns. This would enable people to get to the railway station by car and park, and then use the train. En route to the new car parks they could still carry out the

other parts of their trip chain, such as getting their children to school or childcare, and on the way back carry out essential food shopping and other necessary home-making duties. At present many people use the car for their entire journey as there is no connecting bus route from their residential area to the nearest railway station (which may be 10 miles from home) and once in the car it is quicker to go all the way. A wider picture of travel patterns and their social value would be built up. Supporting services such as toilets, bus-shelters, crèches, cycle lanes, steps, storage and carriage of luggage, and shopping home delivery services would all be integral components of the transportation infrastructure. Nevertheless some enlightened local authorities have sought to demonstrate the linkages between sustainability and social inclusion. For example Plymouth first used a matrix model to link sustainability and gender issues in planning policy making (Plymouth,2001). The Greater London Authority and several of the London boroughs have strongly promoted the mainstreaming of gender into planning policy too but with variable results (GLA,2007). But much more needs to be achieved nationally. As an alternative to spread out, zoned, low density cities, many women planners would like to see the 'city of everyday life' which they define as the city of short distances, mixed land uses and multiple centres as the ideal objective that would fully take into account gender considerations. Such a city structure would benefit all social groups, reduce the need to travel, create more sustainable cities, that would be more accessible, whilst creating higher quality of urban environment for all. It would provide more jobs and facilities locally and help revitalise declining areas overall.

References

Age UK (2009) One Voice: Shaping our Ageing Society, London: Age Concern

Anthony, K. (2001) Designing for Diversity: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Architectural Profession, Chicago: University of Illinois

Beeching (1963) The Beeching Report: Reshaping Railways, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Booth, C., Darke, J. & Yeandle, S. (1996) Changing Places: Women's Lives in the City, London: Paul Chapman

Bruntland Report (1987) Our Common Future, World Commission on Environment and Development, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buckingham-Hatfield, S. (2000) Gender and Environment, London: Routledge

CABE (2008) Inclusion by Design: Equality, Diversity and the Built Environment, London: Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment

CAG. (2008) Responding to the Needs of Faith Communities: Places of Worship: Final Report, London CAG, (Cooperative Advisory Group Planning Consultants).

CIC (2009) Gathering and Reviewing Data on Diversity within the Construction Professions, Construction Industry Council, London in association with University of the West of England, Bristol.

Coleman, C. (2008) 'Women, transport and cities: an overview an agenda for research', in Women and the City: Visibility and Voice in Urban Space (Darke, J., Ledwith, S., & Woods, R.) London: Palgrave, London, pp. 83-97.

DCLG. (2007) Gender Equality Scheme London: Department of Communities and Local Government.

- Fincher,R. & Iveson,K. (2008) Planning and Diversity in the City, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Gilroy, R. (2008). 'Places that support human flourishing: lessons from later life' , in Planning Theory and Practice, Vol.9, No.2, pp 145-163, June .
- GLA (2006) An Urgent Need: The state of London's Toilets, London Assembly and Greater London Authority
- GLA (2007-2014). Planning for Equality and Diversity in London, London: Greater London Authority, The London Mayor's Supplementary Guidance to the Greater London Strategic Development Plan, London: GLA
- Goldsmith, S. (2000) Universal Design: a Manual of Practical Guidance for Architects, Oxford: Architectural Press,
- Greed, C. (1994a) Women and Planning: Creating Gendered Realities, London: Routledge
- Greed, C. (1994b) 'The Place of Ethnography in Planning' in Planning Practice and Research Vol 9, No 2, pp 119-127,
- Greed, C. (2003) Inclusive Urban Design: Public Toilets, Oxford: Architectural Press
- Greed, C. (2005) Overcoming the factors inhibiting the mainstreaming of gender into spatial planning policy in the United Kingdom. Urban Studies, Vol 42, No 4, pp. 1-31, 2005.
- Greed, C. (2011) Planning for sustainable urban areas or everyday life and inclusion. Urban Design and Planning, 164 (2). pp. 107-119.
- Greed, C. (2012) Planning for sustainable transport or for people's needs. Urban Design and Planning, 165 (4). pp. 219-229.
- Greed, C. and Johnson, J. (2014) Planning in the UK: An Introduction London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hamilton, K., Jenkins, L., Hodgson,F. & Turner, J. (2005) Promoting Gender Equality in Transport, Equal Opportunities Commission, Manchester, Working Paper No 34,
- Harvey, D. (1975) Social Justice and the City, London: Arnold..
- Hass-Klau, C (1990) The Pedestrian and City Traffic, London: Belhaven Press
- Hayden, D. (2002) Redesigning the American Dream, New York: Norton
- Imrie, R. & Hall, P. (2001) Inclusive Design: Designing and Developing Accessible Environments, London: Spon
- Jarvis,H., Kantor,P., and Cloke,J. (2009) Cities and Gender, London: Routledge
- Lenclos, M. (2002) Inclusive Design: Access to London Transport, London: Royal College of Art.
- Little, J., Peake,L. & Richardson,P. (1988) Women in Cities: Gender and the Urban Environment, London: Macmillan.

- Madariaga, I.S. and Roberts, M. (eds) (2013) Fair Shared Cities, London: Ashgate.
- Manley, S. (1998) Creating accessible environments. In Introducing Urban Design (Greed, C. & Roberts, M. (eds.)) (1998), Harlow: Longmans, chapter 9, pp. 153-167.
- Matrix. (1984) Making Space: Women and the Man-Made Built Environment, London: Pluto.
- Massey, D. (1984) Spatial Divisions of Labour: social structures and the geography of production. Macmillan, London, 1984.
- ODPM. (2003) Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister,
- ODPM. (2005) Diversity and Equality in Planning: A Good Practice Guide, London: ODPM.
- Oliver, K. (1988) Women's accessibility and transport policy in Britain, in Gender and Geography (Whatmore, S. and Little, J. (eds.)) London: Association for Curriculum Development, pp. 19-34.
- ONS (2012) Social Trends, London: Office of National Statistics..
- Onuoha, C. & Greed, C. (2003) A Retrospective Study of Racism in the Operation of the Planning System within the Inner City, Occasional Paper 15, Faculty of the Built Environment, Bristol: University of the West of England.
- Planning Inspectorate. (2009) Appeal by the Kingsway International Christian Centre and the London Development Agency, Ref: UOOO6 07/LBJ, Report to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, London,
- Plymouth. (2001) Gender Audit of the Local Plan Review 2001 for the City of Plymouth. University of Plymouth, School of Architecture in association with City of Plymouth Council, written by Mhaira Mc.Kie and team.
- Reeves, D. (2005) Planning for Diversity: Policy and Planning for a World of Difference. London: Routledge.
- Roberts, M (1991) Living in a Man-Made World, London: Routledge
- RTPI (2003) Gender Mainstreaming Toolkit, London: Royal Town Planning Institute, by Dory Reeves, Clara Greed, and Chris Sheridan (eds.) see www.rtpi.org.uk for subsequent material on gender and planning.
- Stimpson, C., Dixler, E., Nelson, M. & Yatrakis, K. (eds.) (1981) Women and the American City, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- TCPA (2009) Planning for Accessible and Sustainable Transport, London: Town and Country Planning Association
- Uteng, P.T. and Cresswell, T. (2008) Gendered Mobilities, London: Ashgate
- WDS (2005) Cycling for Women, London: Women's Design Service.
- Whatmore, S. and Little, J. (eds) (1988) Gender and Geography, London: Association for Curriculum Development.

