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Appendix 1

The Housing Market Offer

The following searches were undertaken on national property portals, Rightmove or Prime Location for three-bedroom houses for sale in the specific search area identified.

From a visual review of the primary façades shown on the website I categorised the houses as housebuilder-vernacular or not, based on the style characteristics set out in chapter three. (When this was not the primary image used to identify the property I looked at the image gallery of that property for the main façade).

1 - Bicester, Oxfordshire, 15 May 2015
(ref fig. A1 at the end of this search list for screenshots of the search).

Rightmove
- 22 properties
- 20 housebuilder-vernacular style = 91%

The two more modern looking properties are part of the same development of polite contextual design; red brick, with render/stone bands at floor and parapet levels, flat roofs, featuring large floor-to-ceiling windows and projecting balconies.

2 - Skipton, Yorkshire, 15 May 2015

Rightmove
- 31 properties
- 30 housebuilder-vernacular style = 97%

3 - Shrewsbury (+10 miles), 16 February 2017

Rightmove
- 104 properties
- 79 housebuilder-vernacular style = 76%

Of the non housebuilder-vernacular properties: fifteen are stripped vernacular; 10 are more modern design.
4- Hampshire, 16 February 2017

*Rightmove*
- 344 properties
- 298 housebuilder-vernacular style = 87%

Of the non housebuilder-vernacular properties: fifteen are stripped vernacular; 10 are more modern design.

5- Slough (+5 mile radius), Buckinghamshire, 18 August 2017

*Prime Location*
- 107 properties
- 83 housebuilder-vernacular style = 80%

Of the non housebuilder-vernacular properties: eight are stripped vernacular; 13 are more modern design.

6- Swindon, 18 August 2017

*Prime Location*
- 78 properties (one had no photo so 77 for purposes of percentage calculation)
- 74 housebuilder-vernacular style = 96%

The three non housebuilder-vernacular properties are stripped vernacular.

7- Stoke-on-Trent (+5mile radius), 21 December 2018

*Rightmove*
- 141 properties
- 110 Housebuilder-vernacular = 78%

The non-housebuilder-vernacular properties include: a number of stripped vernacular properties; two townhouses with less decorative features and a large juliet balcony; and six what I would call semi-stripped vernacular with casement rather than smaller sub-divided windows. All of the properties have pitched roofs.

8- Bury St Edmunds (+5mile radius), 21 December 2018

*Rightmove*
- 25 properties,
- 25 housebuilder-vernacular style = 100%

**Totals**
A total of 852 properties were assessed across the eight searches. 719 of these properties were in housebuilder-vernacular style, an average of 84%.
Figure A1. Example search: Screen shot of new build house search in Bicester 15 May 2015
Appendix 2

Housing Design Awards
– Analysis of 10 years’ Completed Winners, 2007-16

In the 10 years 2007-2016, 14 completed project awards (two of which were for specific Large Housebuilder Awards) were given to nine of the top 20 volume housebuilders, out of a total of 52 awards (Housing Design Awards, 2017). That’s 27% of awards (or 24% excluding the specific Large Housebuilder Awards) going to the top 20 housebuilders who produce over 60% of new homes (ONS, 2017a). There were no traditional or housebuilder-vernacular style winners. Eight of the awards (15%) were in what I term a ‘modern vernacular’ style (ref chapter one for characterizing definition). Of these, only one, The Avenue in Saffron Waldon by Hill was by a top 20 housebuilder. The other housebuilder winners were in a more modern style, sometimes with vernacular-like elements, such as pitched tiled roofs on smaller scale house scheme. Seven of the 14 volume housebuilder winners were of large, urban developments of flats, all but one of which are in London.

In terms of how representative the winners are of other national trends, suburban or rural locations were under represented (34% of awards versus 79% of households (DCLG, 2014)), as were developments containing houses (52% of award winners included houses in the scheme – some of which only partially- versus houses comprising 75% of new build homes (DCLG, 2017)).

Analysis shown in tables 1 and 2 below.
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Table 1
Analysis of winners for location, type, housebuilders and style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of awards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60% average urban</td>
<td>21% urban households*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21% urban households*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban or Rural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43% average suburban/rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54% average in London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20 VHB</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22% of total excluding VHB award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern vernacular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15% of total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes winner of Large Housebuilder Category
* ref EHS 2012-13
** ref Live table 232 (for 2012-13 year)
*** ref Housing Statistical Release Sept 2017

Table 2
Housing Design Awards Completed Winners by Top 20 Volume Housebuilders (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barratt Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Wimpey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloor Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratt Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Nicholson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy and Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Modwen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Anvil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Wimpey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratt Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Large Housebuilder Award (category only for 2008 and preceding years)
Blue shading = large flatted development (total 7)
Orange shading = in ‘modern vernacular’ style (total 1)
Summary of Housing Design Award Winners 2007-2016

Note: Top 20 housebuilders annotated in red

2016 Housing Design Award Winners
6 total: all urban; 4 London, 1 Newcastle, 1 Manchester; 2 include houses, 4 all flats.

SUPREME WINNER
The Malings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Architect - Ash Sakula
Developer - Carillion Igloo
Contractor - Gentoo Tolent
Planning Authority - Newcastle City Council

Frampton Park Baptist Church & Apartments, Hackney
Architect - Matthew Lloyd Architects
Developer - Telford Homes plc
Contractor - Telford Homes plc
Planning Authority - London Borough of Hackney

Baylis Old School, Lambeth
Architect - Conran and Partners
Developer - Henley Homes
Contractor - Henley Homes
Planning Authority - London Borough of Lambeth
MAYOR’S HOUSING DESIGN AWARD
Ely Court / Kilburn Park (formerly Cambridge and Wells Court), South Kilburn
Architect - Alison Brooks Architects and Lifschutz Davidson Sandilands Architects
Developer - London Borough of Brent / Catalyst Housing
Contractor - Willmott Dixon Housing Ltd
Planning Authority - London Borough of Brent

LONDON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION AWARD FOR SUSTAINABLE HIGHER DENSITY
The Scene, Walthamstow
Architect - Pollard Thomas Edwards
Developer - ISHA and Hill Residential
Contractor - Hill Partnerships
Planning Authority - London Borough of Waltham Forest

GRAHAM PYE AWARD FOR PLAN FORMS
hoUSE, New Islington, Manchester
Architect - shedkm
Developer - Urban Splash
Contractor - SIG
Planning Authority - Manchester City Council
2015 Housing Design Award Winners
6 total: 4 urban, 2 suburban; 3 London, 1 Derbyshire, 1 Saffron Walden, 1 Andover; 2 include houses, 4 all flats. 1 ‘modern vernacular’ (The Avenue)

SUPREME WINNER
Parkside, Matlock
Architect - Evans Vettori Architects
Developer - Barncroft Homes
Contractor - Barncroft Homes
Planning Authority - Derbyshire Dales District Council

St Mary of Eton - The Mission, London E9
Architect - Matthew Lloyd Architects
Developer - Thornsett
Contractor - P.J. Hegarty
Planning Authority - London Borough of Hackney

1-6 Copper Lane, London N16
CUSTOM BUILD AWARD
Architect - Henley Halebrown Rorrison
Developer - Springdale Gardens Ltd
Contractor - Sandwood Design & Build
Planning Authority - London Borough of Hackney
MAYOR’S AWARD

Portobello Square, London W10
Architect - PRP Architects LLP
Developer - Catalyst Housing Group
Contractor - Ardmore
Planning Authority - Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea

GRAHAM PYE AWARD FOR FAMILY HOUSING

The Avenue, Saffron Walden
Architect - Pollard Thomas Edwards
Developer - Hill
Contractor - Hill
Planning Authority - Uttlesford District Council

RICHARD FEILDEN AWARD

Bradbury Place, Andover
Architect - Design Engine Architects
Developer - Enham Trust
Contractor - Drew Smith
Planning Authority - Test Valley Borough Council
2014 Housing Design Award Winners
7 total: 4 urban, 3 suburban; 3 London, 1 Cambridge, 1 Kent, 1 Gloucestershire, 1 Bath; 3 include houses [check if Bath does too], 4 all flats

SUPREME WINNER and GRAHAM PYE AWARD
Abode, Great Kneighton, Cambridge
Architect - Proctor & Matthews
Developer - Countryside Properties
Contractor - Countryside Properties
Planning Authority - Cambridge City Council

Mint Street, London E14
Architect - Pitman Tozer Architects
Developer - Peabody
Contractor - Galliford Try Partnerships
Planning Authority - London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Royal Road, London SE1P
Architect - Panter Hudspith Architects
Developer - Affinity Sutton
Contractor - Higgins Construction
Planning Authority - London Borough of Southwark
MAYOR OF LONDON AWARD
Kings Cross ArtHouse, London WC1H
Architect - dRMM Architects
Developer - Argent Property Development Services LLP
Contractor - Kier Construction
Planning Authority - London Borough of Camden

Horsted Park, Chatham Kent
Architect - Proctor & Matthews
Developer - Countryside Properties
Contractor - Countryside Properties
Planning Authority - Medway Council

RICHARD FEILDEN AWARD
Hanhm Hall, South Gloucestershire
Architect - HTA Design LLP
Developer - Barratt Homes, Bristol
Contractor - Barratt Homes, Bristol
Planning Authority - South Gloucestershire Council
Bath Riverside, Phase 1 & 2, Bath
Architect - Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios, Holder Mathias Architects
Developer - Crest Nicholson Regeneration
Contractor - Crest Nicholson Operations
Planning Authority - Bath and North East Somerset Council

2013 Housing Design Award Winners
6 total: 1 urban, 5 suburban [assuming Chesterfiled is]; 2 London, 1 Harlow, 1 York, 1 Essex, 1 Chesterfield; 5 include houses, 1 all flats. 1 ‘modern vernacular’ (Derwenthorpe)

SUPREME WINNER
Newhall "Be", Harlow
Architect - Alison Brooks Architects
Developer - Linden Homes
Contractor - Galliford Try
Planning Authority - Harlow Council

GRAHAM PYE AWARD
Barking Riverside - Buzzards Mouth Court, London IG11
Architect - Sheppard Robson
Developer - Barking Riverside PPS
Contractor - Bellway Homes
Planning Authority - London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

MAYOR'S HOUSING DESIGN GUIDE AWARD
Church Walk, Clissold Park, London, N16
Architect - David Mikhail Architects
Developer - David Mikhail Architects
Contractor - Eurobuild Contractors
Planning Authority - London Borough of Hackney

Derwenthorpe Phase 1, York
Architect - Richards Partington Architects
Developer - Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust, David Wilson Homes
Contractor - Barratt Homes Yorkshire East, David Wilson Homes
Planning Authority - City of York Council

RICHARD FEILDEN AWARD
Hargood Close, Colchester
Architect - Proctor and Matthews
Developer - Family Mosaic
Contractor - ISG Jackson
Planning Authority - Colchester Borough Council
Mastin Moor Residential High Support Unit, Chesterfield
Architect - OMI Architects
Developer - Turning Point
Contractor - ESH Construction
Planning Authority - Chesterfield Borough Council

2012 Housing Design Award Winners
5 total: 3 urban, 2 suburban [assuming Chesterfield is]; 2 London, 1 Dorset, 1 Leeds, 1 Suffolk; 2 include houses, 3 all flats. 1 ‘modern vernacular’ (Officers Field) [Tibbys...]

SUPREME WINNER, GRAHAM PYE AWARD, RICHARD FEILDEN AWARD
Officers Field, Osprey Quay, Weymouth, Dorset
Architect - HTA Architects
Developer - ZeroC
Contractor - Acheson Construction
Planning Authority - Weymouth & Portland Borough Council

MAYOR’S HOUSING DESIGN GUIDE AWARD, COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AWARD
Bridport House, Hackney, Colville Estate Phase 1
Architect - Karakusevic Carson Architects
Developer - London Borough of Hackney
Contractor - Willmott Dixon
Planning Authority - London Borough of Hackney

**Saxton, Leeds**
Architect - Union North  
Developer - Urban Splash  
Contractor - Urban Splash Build  
Planning Authority - Leeds City Council

**St. Andrews Phase 3, Tower Hamlets**
Architect - Glenn Howells  
**Developer - Barratt London**  
Contractor - Barratt London  
Planning Authority - London Borough of Tower Hamlets

**Tibby’s Triangle, Southwold, Suffolk**
Architect - Ash Sakula  
Developer - Adnams/Hopkins Homes  
Contractor - Hopkins Homes  
Planning Authority - Waveney District Council
2011 Housing Design Award Winners
4 total: 4 urban; 3 London, 1 Leeds; 0 include houses, 4 all flats

SUPREME WINNER
Granary Wharf, Leeds
Architect - careyjones, chapmantolcher , CZWG , Allies & Morrison
Developer - ISIS Waterside Regeneration
Contractor - Ardmore Construction
Planning Authority - Leeds City Council

Arundel Square, London N7
Architect - Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects
Developer - United House Developments, Londonewcastle
Contractor - United House
Planning Authority - London Borough of Islington

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AWARD, GRAHAM PYE AWARD
St. Andrews, London E3
Architect - Allies and Morrison, Maccreanor Lavington Architects, Townshend Landscape Architects
Developer - Barratt London, Circle Anglia
Contractor - Barratt London
Planning Authority - London Borough of Tower Hamlets
Peabody Avenue, London SWIE
Architect - Haworth Tompkins
Developer - Peabody Trust
Contractor - Mansell
Planning Authority - London Borough of Westminster

2010 Housing Design Award Winners
4 total: 3 urban; 3 London, 1 Somerset; 3 include houses, 1 all flats

OVERALL WINNER
Icon Street, Somerset
Architect - Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios
Developer - Crest Nicholson
Contractor - Crest Nicholson
Planning Authority - Mendip District Council
Public Realm Architect - Grant Associates

Armour Close, London N7
Architect - HFI Architects
Developer - Homes for Islington
Contractor - Mansell
Planning Authority - London Borough of Islington
Barking Central, London IG11
Architect - Allford Hall Monaghan Morris
Developer - Redrow Regeneration
Contractor - Ardmore Construction
Planning Authority - London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Public Realm Architect - muf

RICHARD FEILDEN AWARD WINNER
Claredale Street, London E2
Architect - Karakusevic Carson
Developer - Tower Hamlets Community Housing
Contractor - Hill Partnership
Planning Authority - London Borough of Tower Hamlets

2009 Housing Design Award Winners
3 total: 1 urban; 1 London, 1 Devon, 1 Cambridgeshire; 2 include houses, 1 all flats. 1 ‘modern vernacular’? (South Gate)

OVERALL WINNER
South Gate, Totnes
Architect - Harrison Sutton Partnership
Developer - South Hams District Council / Midas Homes / Sovereign Housing
Contractor - Midas Homes
Planning Authority - South Hams District Council

Angel Waterside, London N1
Architect - Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects
Developer - City Wharf Development
Contractor - City Wharf Construction
Planning Authority - London Borough of Islington

Hereward Hall March, Cambridgeshire
Architect - Proctor and Matthews Architects
Developer - Home Group Developments
Contractor - Inspace
Planning Authority - Fenland District Council
2008 Housing Design Award Winners
5 total: 4 urban; 2 London, 1 Stockport, 1 Salford, 1 Milton Keynes; 3 include houses, 2 all flats. 2 ‘modern vernacular’? (Chimney Pot Park, Rostron Brow)

OVERALL WINNER
Chimney Pot Park, Salford
Architect - Shed KM Architects
Developer - Urban Splash
Contractor - Urban Splash Build
Planning Authority - Salford City Council

Adelaide Wharf, London E2
Architect - Allford Hall Monaghan Morris
Developer - First Base with English Partnerships
Contractor - Bovis Lend Lease
Planning Authority - London Borough of Hackney

Bourbon Lane, London W12
Architect - Cartwright Pickard Architects, B & C Architectes
Developer - Octavia Housing and Care
Contractor - Como Homes
Planning Authority - London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
RICHARD FEILDEN AWARD
Rostron Brow, Stockport
Architect - TADW Architects
Developer - Northern Counties Housing Association
Contractor - CSC Construction
Planning Authority - Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council

LARGE HOUSEBUILDER WINNER
Oxley Woods, Milton Keynes
Architect - Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners
Developer - George Wimpey, South Midlands
Contractor - Taylor Wimpey
Planning Authority - Milton Keynes Partnership

2007 Housing Design Award Winners
6 total: 4 urban; 3 London, 1 Cornwall, 1 Sheffield, 1 Plymouth; 3 include houses, 3 all flats. 2 ‘modern vernacular’? (Gun Wharf, Broadclose)

OVERALL WINNER
Tabard Square, London SE1
Architect - Rolfe Judd
Developer - Berkeley Homes, East Thames
Contractor - Laing O’Rourke
Planning Authority - London Borough of Southwark
The Sinclair Building
Architect - Project Orange
Developer - Sinclairs
Contractor - Ackroyd & Abbott
Planning Authority - Sheffield City Council

LARGE HOUSE BUILDER WINNER
Tachbrook Triangle, London SW1
Architect - Assael Architecture
Developer - Barratt West London
Contractor - Barratt West London
Planning Authority - Westminster City Council

MEDIUM HOUSE BUILDER WINNER
Gun Wharf, Plymouth, Devon
Architect - Lacey Hickie Caley
Developer - Devon & Cornwall Housing Association with Midas Homes
Contractor - Midas Homes
Planning Authority - Plymouth City Council
SMALL HOUSE BUILDER WINNER
Melody Lane, London N5
Architect - Julian Cowie
Developer - London Wharf
Contractor - London Wharf
Planning Authority - London Borough of Islington

RICHARD FEILDEN AWARD
Broadclose, Bude, Cornwall
Architect - Trewin Design Partnership
Developer - Guinness Trust & Westcountry Housing Association
Contractor - Midas Homes
Planning Authority - North Cornwall District Council
Appendix 3

Online Survey Questionnaire

Copy of online survey conducted through Survey Monkey, December 2015 – February 2016

For ethics approval ref Appendix 8
Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

About This Survey

You are invited to participate in a research study titled *Visual Attitudes to Housing in England*. This study is being conducted by Gillian Horn from the University of Sheffield. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are an adult living in England. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time.

The purpose of this research study is to understand public preferences on the visual appearance of new build houses in England and whether they ally with what is offered in the market and with building professionals’ preferences. It is hoped that this study will contribute to an improved understanding of public preferences in housing appearance for those involved in the design and supply of new housing in England.

If you agree to take part in this study you will be asked to indicate your preferred facade in a series of paired images of houses. You will also be asked some general questions about you, such as your age and level of education. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential and identifying information such as your name, email address or IP address will not be collected. You will be asked at the end of the survey if you would like to participate in future related surveys connected to this research study. If you agree your email address will be kept securely and only used by the researcher to contact you about future related surveys on this research study. It will not be disclosed to any other parties. It can be deleted at your request.

To the best of our ability your answers in this study will remain confidential; however, as with any online related activity the risk of a breach of confidentiality is always possible. To minimize any risks all data is stored in a password protected electronic format and the surveys will not contain information that can personally identify you. The results of this study will be published in a PhD thesis, targeted for late 2017. The data collected from this survey may be used for subsequent research and publications, online and in print. Participants will not be identified in any report or publication.

For more information about this research study please visit [questionsofdesign.net](http://questionsofdesign.net). If you have questions about this research project please contact Gillian Horn at ghorn1@sheffield.ac.uk.

This project has been ethically approved via the University of Sheffield School of Architecture’s ethics review procedure which is monitored by the University’s Research Ethics Committee. If you wish to raise any complaint about this study please contact Gillian Horn at ghorn1@sheffield.ac.uk. Should you have a complaint that has not been handled to your satisfaction please contact the Supervisor for this study, Professor Flora Samuel at f.b.samuel@reading.ac.uk or the Director of the Graduate School of Architecture, Dr Stephen Walker at s.j.walker@sheffield.ac.uk.

**Thank you for taking part in this research study, it’s your feedback that makes it possible.**
Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

Your Consent to Take Part in This Survey

By clicking “I agree” below you are indicating that you are at least 18 years old, have read and understood this information sheet and consent form and voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

If you do not wish to participate in the research study, please decline participation by clicking on the “disagree” button.

Please print a copy of this page for your records.

☐ I agree

☐ I disagree
Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

Qualifying Questions

Have you lived in England for 5 or more years?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Are you age 18 or over?

☐ Yes
☐ No
Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

A Bit About You

What is your age?

- 18 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 +

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

What is your occupation?

- Architect or architecture student
- Work or study in a design-related field
- Other
What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Secondary education, without formal qualifications
- Secondary education, with ordinary level qualifications (e.g., GCSE)
- Secondary education, with higher level qualifications (e.g., A-levels)
- Further education College or University without qualification
- Further education College or University with graduate qualification
- Postgraduate or professional qualification

Where have you lived in the last 5 years?

- Mostly in a town or city
- Mostly in a suburban area
- Mostly in a rural area

Do you live in...?

- A private rented home
- A Council or Housing Association rented home
- A home you or someone in your household owns
- An institutional home such as halls of residence or care home
- None of the above
Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

Your Preferred Style

The 3 bedroom suburban house is the most typical house type in England and for this reason is the subject of this study.

In the following questions you will see images of new 3-bedroom suburban houses.

Everything about the houses is assumed to be the same for all of the images, except for the style and appearance of the front facade.

You will be asked to indicate your personal preference for each pair shown.

1

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 1A
- 1B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 2A
- 2B

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 3A
- 3B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 4A
- 4B

What factors influenced your choices above?
Your Preferred Windows

In the following questions you will see images of a new 3-bedroom suburban house.

Everything about the house is assumed to be the same for all of the images, except for the proportion and size of the windows.

You will be asked to indicate your personal preference for each pair shown. Some images will repeat. It does not matter if your preferences change through the survey.

1

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 1A
- 1B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

☐ 2A
☐ 2B

Which house do you prefer the look of?

☐ 3A
☐ 3B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

4

4A

4B

5

Which house do you prefer the look of?

5A

5B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 6A
- 6B

What factors influenced you choices above?
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Your Preferred Roof

In the following questions you will see images of a new 3-bedroom suburban house. Everything about the house is assumed to be the same for all of the images, except for the roof form. You will be asked to indicate your personal preference for each pair shown.

1

Which house do you prefer the look of?

☐ 1A
☐ 1B

Questions to those who chose house image A in Preferred Style section
2

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 2A
- 2B

3

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 3A
- 3B

What factors influenced your choices above?


Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

Your Preferred Windows

In the following questions you will see images of a new 3-bedroom suburban house.

Everything about the house is assumed to be the same for all of the images, except for the proportion and size of the windows.

You will be asked to indicate your personal preference for each pair shown. Some images will repeat. It does not matter if your preferences change through the survey.

1

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 1A
- 1B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 2A
- 2B

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 3A
- 3B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 4A
- 4B

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 5A
- 5B
Which house do you prefer the look of?

- [ ] 6A
- [ ] 6B

What factors influenced your choices above?
Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

Your Preferred Roof

In the following questions you will see images of a new 3-bedroom suburban house.

Everything about the house is assumed to be the same for all of the images, except for the roof form. You will be asked to indicate your personal preference for each pair shown.

1

Which house do you prefer the look of?

- 1A
- 1B

Questions to those who chose house image B in Preferred Style section
Which house do you prefer the look of?

☐ 2A
☐ 2B

Which house do you prefer the look of?

☐ 3A
☐ 3B

What factors influenced your choices above?
Visual Attitudes to Housing in England

That's it! Thank you!

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. It's your feedback that makes this research possible.

And thanks to Barratt Homes, Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon Homes for their kind permission to use their images in this survey.

Please leave any feedback below and visit questionsofdesign.net for more information and future surveys on visual attitudes to house design. Please also forward a link to friends and family.

If you are happy to be contacted for future related surveys please leave your email address below.

It will not be used for any other purposes and will not be passed onto any third parties. Your responses to this survey will remain anonymous.

Name

(optional)

City/County

(optional)

Email

Address
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Visual Preference Survey Figures

Figure 1 - Test 1 image pairs as presented in the survey

Original images used and reproduced with the kind permission of Taylor Wimpey (House 1A, 2B); Persimmon Homes (House 3B) and Barratt Homes (House 4A)

House 1

House 2

House 3

House 4
Figure 2 - Test 2, embellished and stripped window proportion images

Original image top left

Figure 3 - Test 2, examples of window size image pairs as presented in the survey

Figure 4, Test 3, examples of the flat and pitched roof options
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Appendix 5

Demographic representation in the survey

Below I set out the correspondence of the survey respondents with estimated national statistics for each of the demographic factors tested, to give a picture of the extent of representation of the survey sample. Some of the factors tested I did not go on to analyse due to under representation in certain categories.

Gender

There was a slightly higher proportion of female respondents than the national average (59% compared to 51%) (ONS, 2017).

Age

Respondent ages were generally in proportion with national levels, with the exception that 18-24 year olds were overrepresented in the survey by 18% and over 65 year olds were underrepresented by 8% (ONS, 2017).

Location type

Respondents living in urban locations were overrepresented compared to national estimates by over 40%, whereas respondents living in suburban locations were underrepresented by 40% (DCLG, 2014). This does not affect the statistical significance of the results which are moderated for in the quantitative analysis statistical modelling, but could bias the relative number of comments that may be influenced by respondent location in accordance with the distortion.

Education level

Proportionally, survey respondents were considerably out of alignment with the general population in two bands - those with GCSE equivalent as their highest level of qualification were underrepresented by 19% and those with post graduate or professional qualifications were overrepresented by 29% (adjusting for the post-graduate qualified architects in the respondent group). Other bands were within a 5-8% margin of national profile estimates (HESA, 2018; ONS, 2017). I did not analyse demographic responses according to education due to these anomalies. As above, this does not affect the statistical significance of the results, but could bias the relative number of comments that may be influenced by respondent education level in accordance with the distortion.

Housing tenure

Survey respondents accurately reflected the national proportion of homeowners (63%) but were over represented in the private rented sector by 9% and underrepresented in the social rented sector by 14% (DCLG, 2014). I did not analyse the survey data in accordance with tenure due to the small representation of socially renting tenants.
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Visual Preference Survey - Quantitative Results: Tables and Charts

Key to terms:

N = sample number

SD = Standard Deviation (the measure of the spread of the data).

SE of mean = Standard Error of the Mean (the standard deviation of the mean)

B = Correlation Coefficient (the measure for the extent of correlation between two variables, measured between -1 and +1, with 0 indicating no correlation).

p = probability value (the measure of the probability of the hypothesis being tested being true. p-values range between 0 and 1, with a low value (≤ 0.05 taken as the cut-off for statistical significance) indicating a higher probability that that the hypothesis being tested is true).

R-squared = Coefficient of Determination (a goodness-of-fit measure of a linear regression model. It measures the proportion of variance between dependent and independent variables. Values range between 0 and 1 with a higher value indicating the extent that the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable).

Adjusted R-squared = Coefficient of Determination adjusted to take account of more independent variables added to the model (it is therefore a truer reflection of variance in multi-variable models).
Table 1 - Frequencies and Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of N</th>
<th>Mean for Embellished Preference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Architect or Architecture Student</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work or Study in Design-Related Field</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Type</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Distribution of Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for embellished style</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 houses</td>
<td>Count 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 house</td>
<td>Count 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 houses</td>
<td>Count 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 houses</td>
<td>Count 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 houses</td>
<td>Count 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for embellished style</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 houses</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 house</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 houses</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 houses</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 houses</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3 – Crosstabulation preference for embellished style by respondents’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for embellished style</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 houses</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 house</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 houses</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 houses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 houses</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 – Crosstabulation preference for embellished style by respondents’ Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for embellished style</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 houses</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 house</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 houses</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 houses</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 houses</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65+
Table 5 – Crosstabulation preference for embellished style by respondents’ Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for embellished style</th>
<th>Architect or Architecture Student</th>
<th>Work or Study in Design-Related Field</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 houses</td>
<td>Count 41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 house</td>
<td>Count 21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 houses</td>
<td>Count 16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 houses</td>
<td>Count 10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 houses</td>
<td>Count 16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count 104</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 – Crosstabulation preference for embellished style by respondents’ Location Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for embellished style</th>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 houses</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 house</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 houses</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 houses</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 houses</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Percent within Dwelling Environment by Preference for embellished style and Location Type.
Table 7- Regression Tableª for Façade Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)ª</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=25-34</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=35-44</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=45-54</td>
<td>-.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=55-64</td>
<td>-.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=65+</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation=Architect or Architecture Student</td>
<td>-.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation=Work or Study in Design-Related Field</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location =suburban</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location =rural</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Preference for embellished style

ª Reference categories for model constant: Age=18-24, Occupation=Other, Location =urban, Gender=female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R-Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted R-Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8- Window Proportions Frequencies and Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for embellished style</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Vertical</th>
<th>Horizontal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 houses</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 house</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 houses</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 houses</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 houses</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Lowest mean | Highest mean
Table 9- Regression Tablea for Proportion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)b</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=25-34</td>
<td>.196 .076 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=35-44</td>
<td>.068 .104 .514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=45-54</td>
<td>.315 .103 .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=55-64</td>
<td>.106 .112 .344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=65+</td>
<td>.053 .106 .619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation=Architect or Architecture Student</td>
<td>.555 .091 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation=Work or Study in Design-Related Field</td>
<td>.318 .085 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location =suburban</td>
<td>-.167 .079 .036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location =rural</td>
<td>-.009 .099 .929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.084 .063 .187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a- Dependent Variable: Preference for vertical proportion

b- Reference categories for model constant: Age=18-24, Occupation=Other, Location =urban, Gender=female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R-Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted R-Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 - Window Sizes and Roof Shape Frequencies and Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preference for large windows</th>
<th>Preference for pitched roof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embellished options, N=422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stripped options, N=240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, N=662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 – Frequencies and Means for Roof Preference by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitched roof preference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect or Architecture Student</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Architect or Architecture Student</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working or Studying in Design-Related Field</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Working or Studying in Design-Related Field (outside</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Occupations</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects or Architecture Students or Working or Studying</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Design-Related Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Related Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>651</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.095</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12- Regression Table(a) for Roof Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)(b)</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=25-34</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=35-44</td>
<td>-.545</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=45-54</td>
<td>-.661</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=55-64</td>
<td>-.449</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age=65+</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation=Architect or Architecture Student</td>
<td>-.646</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation=Work or Study in Design-Related Field</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location =suburban</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location =rural</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a- Dependent Variable: Preference for pitched roof

b- Reference categories for model constant: Age=18-24, Occupation=Other, Location=urban, Gender=female

N        R-Squared  Adjusted R-Squared
651      .130        .116
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Visual Preference Survey Findings
Qualitative Results – Descriptive Categories and Results
Tables and Charts

The descriptive categories

Test 1- Preferred Style categories

Below, I set out a summary of the 15 descriptive categories identified in my analysis of the 546 respondent answers to the question “What factors influenced your choices?” about the four pairs of images in the Preferred Style section of the survey. All quotes cited below are from these answers.

For evaluation of these findings see chapter nine, Survey Findings. For the category summary including total uses, pejorative uses and positive uses and the words that constitute the category refer to Table 1 in Appendix 8.

1- **Detail** was the biggest category, *Detail*, with a total of 174 occurrences. ‘Detail(ing)’ was the most frequently stated descriptive word, used by 116 respondents. The word ‘features’ was also part of this category. A significant majority of uses of this category (69%) were positive towards the embellished houses. The citing of detail was not always a straightforward like or dislike and was often nuanced, sometimes seen as a necessary part of a traditional style and getting in the way of a modern style: “Where the facades were more detailed I tended to prefer them - they looked homier. Altho’ugh I chose the less detailed facade in 2 for the opposite reason - it looked more modern”. Detail was commonly referred to for adding interest and softening the aesthetic: “I don't like pastiche Tudor details but think more generic details like lintels and awnings add interest”; “Don't like 'pseudo-old', but prefer some detailing beyond purely box-like”. It was often linked to an idea of coherence and completeness: “The desire for the building to have a 'face' with the right amount of detail and incident. E.g. a human face with no eyelashes looks wrong”.

2- **Plain** was the second largest category with 115 occurrences, mainly used in favour of the stripped façade option or against the embellished option (a total of 63%). The two main words within this category, ‘plain’ and ‘simple’, were used with different emphases: ‘plain’ was used negatively three times more than positively: “the more plain versions look cheap and unfinished and lack a sense of place”; whereas ‘simple’/’simplicity’ was nearly wholly positive (92%): “simplicity, not too many different/fussy materials, honesty, minimal maintenance!”
3- *Traditional* was the third largest category with 86 occurrences. Overall it was used more negatively towards the embellished façade than positively (40% vs 38%) with 22% neutral uses. The words ‘older’ (17 occurrences) and ‘vernacular’ (4 occurrences) were evenly split between positive and negative use; a mix of finding it ‘pseudo’ / ‘erstaz’ and ‘comforting’/‘visually interesting’. The words ‘old-fashioned’ (8 occurrences), ‘historic’ (5 occurrences) and ‘period’ (9 occurrences) were used pejoratively in all but one case for each: “the traditional decoration. I have nothing against traditional decoration, but it looks inauthentic on a new build house”. There was a strong association of this category with detail (42% of uses).

4- *Decoration* was the fourth largest category, with 84 occurrences, used in majority (58%) in favour of the embellished façade: “The clear embellishments on the houses I chose. The ones I didn’t looked like Sims stock houses before they gave the user the opportunity to personalise them.” As with detail some of the responses were conditioned: “Because the shapes of the structures are mimicking older styles which have additional embellishments and details, the version of these structures which do not have these elements appear ’naked’ or unfinished.” There was some overlap of occurrence of this category with detail (24% of uses) and with traditional (18% of uses).

5- *Pastiche* was joint fifth with 65 occurrences. All uses were pejorative, against the embellished façade option: “I hate modern houses with period windows and ornate porches - looks fussy and pastiche”.

6- *Modern* was joint fifth with 65 occurrences, mainly used positively towards the stripped façade option (65%): “My choice was always with the simpler cleaner design, with less frills. The houses become more modern and minimal looking when they are less decorated”. 34% of uses overlapped with the plain category.

7- *Character* was the seventh most cited category with a total of 59 occurrences. The two main words in this category, ‘character’ and ‘interest’, were never used positively towards the stripped façade: “Historic character. General appearance, eg having wooden beams, and triangular roof over attic extension and doorway. Prefer houses which look older in style and less modern. Makes them look more homely.” ‘Honesty’ was the only word in the character category used in favour of the stripped façades, in all occurrences (4). There was a strong association of character and detail (46% of uses coinciding). This was particularly the case for the word ‘interest’, with a 60% correspondence. There were less associations of character and decoration with 15% overlap. 15% of uses also referred to homely and 20% to bland: “Don't especially like the additional features in 1a and 2b, but houses look bare without them. 3a and 4b have enough other interest to be able to carry the more minimal doors, windows etc”.

8- *Attractive* was the eighth most cited category with a total of 57 occurrences. Only 7% of these were used in favour of the stripped façade, with the large majority referencing the embellished façade: “The fenestration and the extra detailing makes them look more attractive”.

9- *Bland* was ninth most cited category with a total of 41 occurrences. Words in this category included: ‘bland’, ‘boring’, ‘blank’ ‘dull’ and other similar words. They were almost exclusively used against the stripped façade (92%). 44% of uses referred to detail, or lack thereof: “They look bland and sort of corporate if they don’t have nice details like porches
and window pane lines”. 29% of uses linked to lack of character: “I like the contrast of the surface embellishments on the facades. The large clear windows/surfaces make the houses look new, bland, without character; the lintels/wooden decorations/contrast bricks look older and more interesting.”

10- Fussy was the tenth most cited category with a total of 39 occurrences. This category was used wholly pejoratively towards the embellished façade. The words ‘needless’, ‘unnecessary’ and ‘gratuitous’ were always used in relation to decoration, ornament and embellishment: “Simplicity of design, absence of tacky fussy details and some degree of elegance”. 44% of uses referred to Detail and 31% to Traditional. There was minimal overlap with the Pastiche category (8%).

11- Coherence had 36 occurrences. A number of respondents noted their choices were based on fitting into the neighbourhood or the form of the house, preferring a coherent whole rather than necessarily liking particular features. This tended to be towards a more traditional form and keeping the decorative features of the original option: “I think the older styled buildings looked better generally, but only because the style works as a whole. The more modern doors and window sills didn’t work with the traditional red roof and white walls, but a house designed around modern, minimalist aspects would look better as a whole”, though one use was to say that new housing shouldn’t fit in with old design, that “it holds back new and bolder designs”.

12- Homely was cited 34 times. All of the uses were positive towards the embellished façade: “Details like cornices and wood work make the houses look more lived in and homely”. There was a strong association with Detail (32% of uses), some link with Decoration (18% of uses) and Attractive (18% of uses). There was only one overlap of use with Unwelcoming.

13- Unwelcoming was cited 34 times. All of the uses of were against the stripped façade: “Aesthetically I don't like either of them but the ones with more decoration seem friendlier and more inviting. The stripped back ones seem stark and 'unloved'”. There was a strong association with (lack of) Detail (32% of uses) and Decoration (24% of uses).

14- Light was the second smallest category with 18 occurrences, made from uses of the words ‘light’ and ‘view’. The significant majority (78%) of uses were positive towards the stripped façade: “I like lots of light and the mullions in the windows reduce this on the more 'decorated' houses”.

15- Familiarity was the smallest category, with 15 occurrences. A large majority of uses were positive towards the embellished façade (87%); some through direct positive associations with traditional style houses of childhood and some through negative associations of the stripped façade with council housing and looking institutionalised: “Associations with low cost council housing style are off putting.”

Looking cheap (9 occurrences in total) was not categorized but merits note. All referred to the stripped versions looking cheap and a further 4 referred to the embellished façade looking more expensive.

Many respondents (24) expressed a dislike for both, and many had qualified responses to their choices: “They are all horrid, but the lack of detail on the more 'modern' looking ones makes them seem austere.”; “I prefer plain, modern looks. Do not like any of the styles.
shown - although because they are available I live in something like them. Would ban old fashioned rural lookalike.”

Test 3- Roof form categories

Below, I set out a summary of the 15 descriptive categories identified in my analysis of the 546 respondent answers to the question “What factors influenced your choices?” about the three pairs of images in the Preferred Roof section of the survey. All quotes cited below are from these answers.

1- Dislike flat/prefer pitch was the most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 106 occurrences and the most common category in the embellished image test group. There was a marked difference in the frequency of use of this category across the two test groups, used five times less in the stripped image group (31% vs 6%). This category expressed either a dislike for the flat roof or a liking of the pitched. Words used against the flat roof were: hate, detest, dislike and not keen. Words used in favour of the pitch were: prefer, like, pitched roofs, sloping roofs, pointy roofs, having a roof, roof shape. For example: “Pitched roof every time.” In the embellished image test group the majority of uses (58%) were negative, against the flat roof. In the stripped image test group the majority of uses (55%) was instead expressing a positive preference for the pitched roof.

2- Fittingness was the second most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 78 occurrences, and the most common category in the stripped test group where it was used more than twice as much as in the embellished test group (26% vs 11% respectively). This category captures comments that raised either a fitting into the surrounding context - be it immediate neighbours, the assumed suburban setting or national context, or fitting into the overall design of the façade: “flat roof doesn’t work in a suburban context” and “the flat roof shown doesn’t suit the style of property”. Expressions used about context included look out of place, appropriate in the context, fits in, suit/do not suit. For example, “Flat roofs do not suit homes in this country, would stick out.” Words used about the house itself included: balanced, proportions, fit, jar, works well with, for the style, harmony, relationship between, suit. For example: “for that style of house, I prefer a traditional sloped roof” and “I actually like a lot of modern buildings with flat roofs, but this just didn’t seem to work in these particular examples.” Context fittingness was more common in the embellished image test group than in the stripped group (35% vs 18% respectively).

3- Unattractive was the third most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 73 occurrences. This was the second biggest category in the embellished test group, and the sixth biggest in the stripped group, used by 19% and 9% of each respondent group respectively. Many different words were used to express the sense of unattractiveness: ‘ugly’, ‘not/less/un-appealing’, ‘unattractive’, ‘horrible’, ‘boxy/box-like’, ‘institutional’, ‘boring’, ‘ghastly’, ‘unsightly’, ‘tatty’, ‘utilitarian’, ‘unfriendly’, ‘harsh’, ‘brutal’, ‘clinical’, ‘stark’, ‘aggressive’, ‘monotonous’, ‘bald’, ‘bizarre’, ‘weird’, ‘odd’, ‘Frankenstein’s monster’, ‘scruffy’, ‘tacky’. For example, “Is there anything more ugly than a flat roof?”

4- Practical maintenance was the fourth most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 68 occurrences. Proportionately it was used with almost equal frequency by both groups (14% in the embellished and 15% in the stripped). This category captured a range of practical and maintenance concerns, all directed towards the flat roof option. These ranged
from fear of leaks, drainage and damp and views that pitched roofs are more suited to the
British climate, to beliefs that a flat roof would be higher or harder maintenance and
generally problematic. Sometimes these worries outweighed aesthetic appeal: “I actually
preferred look of flat roofs but had one once that leaked with disastrous results - rot,
mushrooms, smell - could not bear to tick my preference.”

5- House-like was the fifth most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 66
occurrences. All but one of the uses was in favour of the pitched roof. It was the third
most cited category in the embellished image test group, where it was more than twice as
common as in the stripped image test group (17% and 9% respectively). This category
captured the feeling that the houses looked more homely and/or house-like with a pitched
roof. For example, “Has to have a roof to look like a house!” and “The flat roof just doesn't
give off a homely vibe. It looks institutional”. This was often linked with other building that
the flat roof image reminded respondents of, captured in the next category, associations.
For example “Flat roof looks harsh and like a block of flats or prison. Less homely and looks
colder”.

6- Associations was the sixth most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 60
occurrences and was more common in the embellished image test group than in stripped
test group (14% vs 9%). Most of this category made direct associations between the image
of the houses and other building types, using the phrases ‘reminds me of…’, ‘looks like a …’,
or ‘gives the impression of…’ Building types referred to include: offices, commercial,
administrative and industrial buildings, small factory, a facility, a prison, a school, a
community centre, council estates, block of flats, 1930s, 1950s, 1960s and 1970s buildings, a
correctional institute, a mental institution, temporary porter cabins (sic), a hospital, shops
and shopping centre, a school gym, a warehouse, a car park and a home. For example:
“Don’t like houses that look like factories”. Only the last, the association with a home, was
used for the pitched roof options, all of the others associations were for the flat roof option,
and all were pejorative. Also in this category are expressions of expectations for something,
such as a suburban house in England.

7- Loft space was the seventh most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 44
occurrences and was equally common in the two groups (9%). Words used included ‘attic’,
‘loft’ and ‘roof space’. The assumption given in all but one instance, was that the pitched
roof would offer additional useful space for storage or conversion. Adaptability and value
were often cited. For example: “Pitch roof offers potential for loft conversion and chance to
add value”

8- Modern was the eighth most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 38
occurrences, but was the second most cited in the striped image test group. This category
had the largest discrepancy of use in the two groups, of more than a factor of five (17% for
the stripped image group and 3% for the embellished image group). The majority of uses of
this category was positive an in favour of the flat roof, for example: “I like the modern,
simple lines”. Some uses were negative, and a number related to the fittingness category,
for example: “flat roofs look too modern, would not fit in and do not last”. In addition to
‘modern’, words used in this category were ‘modernism/ist’, ‘contemporary’, ‘clean

9- Prefer flat/dislike pitch was joint ninth most cited category across the two groups, with a
total of 30 occurrences. This category was proportionately nearly four times as common in
the stripped image test group as the embellished group. It was also more frequently used than the Prefer pitch category by the stripped group (11% vs 6%), in contrast to the embellished image test group who cited the Prefer pitch category ten times more frequently than the Prefer flat category (31% vs 3%). There was a large majority (85% and 90%) within both groups who expressed their preference as a positive liking of flat roofs rather than a negative dislike of pitched roofs. For example, "I like flat roofs!". This contrasts with the responses in the Prefer pitch category.

10- Traditional was joint ninth most cited category across the two groups, with a total of 30 occurrences. The use of this category was similar for both test groups (5% of stripped image group respondents and 7% of embellished image group respondents). Words used in this category were: ‘traditional’, ‘vernacular’, ‘period’, ‘conventional’, ‘English’ and ‘Georgian’. The latter was used with reference to the flat roof, but all others were to the pitched roof form. The majority of uses were in favour of the pitched roof, such as: “For that style of house, I prefer a traditional sloped roof”. But some were not, for example: “Some window configurations just don't work with the traditional pitched design”.

11- Attractive was cited across the two groups a total of 25 times. It was used more frequently by the embellished image test group (6% vs 3%) and was used differently in each of the text group. All but one use was in favour of the pitched roof in the embellished group, in contrast to all but one use in the stripped image group being in favour of the flat roof. Words used in this category were: ‘appealing’, ‘the aesthetics’, ‘looks nicer’, ‘prefer the look’, ‘pleasant’, ‘visually pleasing’, ‘smarter’, ‘classier’, ‘sharper’, ‘elegant’, ‘kerb appeal’.

12- Character was cited across the two groups a total of 20 times. It was used slightly more by the stripped image test group (6% vs 4%). The majority of uses were positive towards the pitched roof, for example: “Houses with shaped roofs have more character”. But a quarter of uses were positive of the flat roof, such as: “Flat roof looks modern, sleek and different”. Words used in this category were: ‘interesting’, ‘more unusual’, ‘different’, ‘individual’, ‘the feel’, ‘comforting’, ‘characterless’.

13- Unfinished was cited across the two groups a total of 11 times. All uses were in regard to the flat roof, such as: “I don’t like flat roofs. It makes the house look unfinished or naked!”. Words used in this category were: ‘unfinished’, ‘incomplete’, ‘bare’, ‘more complete’, ‘something’s missing’.

14- Cheap was the second to last cited category across the two groups, with a total of 10 occurrences. All references in this category in the embellished image test group were towards the flat roof, for example: “Flat roofed houses are unattractive and look cheap”. In the stripped group the responses were mixed, with one reference to the problem of cheap trusses in the pitched roof and another about the possibility of the flat roof looking cheap.

15- Terrace space was the least cited category across the two groups, with a total of 9 occurrences, most of which were in the stripped image test group. This category encompassed the usability of the flat roof space for a terrace, solar panels or extension, for example: “More potential to incorporate green roof on flat roof (and possibly more flexible for solar panels). Flat roofs look more modern, bit more continental”. Phrases used in this category were: ‘terrace’, ‘put on useable volume’, ‘possibility for extension upwards’, ‘garden’, ‘surface you can make use of’, ‘green space’.
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Table 1, Category Summary
(The main use of each category for the two options is highlighted in grey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of uses</th>
<th>% used in favour of embellished or against stripped</th>
<th>% used in favour of stripped or against embellished</th>
<th>% neutral</th>
<th>Respondent words in category (in decreasing order of frequency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>‘detail(ing)’, ‘features’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>‘traditional’, ‘old(er)’, ‘period’, ‘old-fashioned’, ‘classic’, ‘historic’ and ‘vernacular’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>‘decoration’, ‘ornament(ation)’, ‘embellishment’, ‘ornate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>‘modern’, ‘contemporary’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>‘interest(ing)’, ‘character’, ‘honest(ly)’, ‘fresh’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homely</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwelcoming</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘light’, ‘view’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘familiar(ity)’, ‘memories’, ‘similar’, ‘what I’m used to’, ‘remind’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2, Category word use compared for architects and non-architects

| category      | number of occurrences | % of total category use | difference non-architects to architects | % of respondent group use | difference non-architects to architects as a % of non-architect use |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------
| Light         | all                   | 5                      | 2%                                     | 2%                        | -2%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 13                     | 4%                                     | 3%                        | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 18                     | 7%                                     | 7%                        | -1%                                                              |
| Pastiche      | all                   | 11                    | 6%                                     | 6%                        | 0%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 32                    | 10%                                    | 10%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 43                    | 12%                                    | 12%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Fussy         | all                   | 11                    | 5%                                     | 5%                        | 4%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 37                    | 10%                                    | 10%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 62                    | 15%                                    | 15%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Character     | all                   | 10                    | 4%                                     | 4%                        | 1%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 43                    | 10%                                    | 10%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 56                    | 14%                                    | 14%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Plain         | all                   | 11                    | 4%                                     | 4%                        | 2%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 38                    | 10%                                    | 10%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 51                    | 14%                                    | 14%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Traditional   | all                   | 10                    | 3%                                     | 3%                        | 0%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 37                    | 9%                                     | 9%                        | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 46                    | 13%                                    | 13%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Detail        | all                   | 11                    | 4%                                     | 4%                        | 1%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 43                    | 10%                                    | 10%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 55                    | 15%                                    | 15%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Modern        | all                   | 14                    | 6%                                     | 6%                        | 0%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 48                    | 12%                                    | 12%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 62                    | 17%                                    | 17%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Unwelcoming   | all                   | 12                    | 5%                                     | 5%                        | 1%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 45                    | 11%                                    | 11%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 57                    | 16%                                    | 16%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Attractive    | all                   | 13                    | 5%                                     | 5%                        | 4%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 47                    | 12%                                    | 12%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 60                    | 17%                                    | 17%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Bland         | all                   | 14                    | 5%                                     | 5%                        | 4%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 47                    | 12%                                    | 12%                       | 0%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 57                    | 17%                                    | 17%                       | 0%                                                              |
| Total         | all                   | 11                    | 4%                                     | 4%                        | 3%                                                              |
|               | non-architects        | 49                    | 10%                                    | 10%                       | 3%                                                              |
|               | architects             | 61                    | 16%                                    | 16%                       | 2%                                                              |
Table 3, Category type summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Used in favour of the Embellished preference</th>
<th>Used in favour of the Stripped preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total frequencies</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coherent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fussy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastiche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Homely</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unwelcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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