Governing Urban Diversity:
Creating Social Cohesion, Social Mobility and Economic Performance in Today's Hyper-diversified Cities

Governance arrangements and initiatives in London, UK

Work package 5:   Governance arrangements and initiatives

Deliverable nr.:   D 5.1

Lead partner: Partner 7 (synergo)

Authors: Jamie Kesten, Mike Raco, Claire Colomb

Nature: Report

Dissemination level: PP

Status: Final version

Date: 24 August 2014

Contents

1   Introduction

London is probably the most socio-economically and ethnically diverse city in the EU. In earlier work (see Raco et al., 2014) we argued that policy narratives at the city-wide level present this diversity as an asset that is integral to London's globally-oriented economic growth. Hyper-diversity has also become a symbol of London's cultural and entrepreneurial vibrancy and is marketed in positive terms to attract inward investors and creative workers. We also showed that approaches and understandings of diversity differ markedly *within* London and hypothesised that some of the most innovative, progressive, and positive examples of diversity policies and initiatives were to be found at the local scale.

In this report we use the example of the London Borough of Haringey to explore the ways in which policy narratives and understandings of diversity are being converted into local governance arrangements *'in which public as well as private actors aim at solving societal problems or create societal opportunities'* (Kooiman, 2000: 139). We assess the ways in which local initiatives and actions on the ground seek to positively mobilise diversity or address some of its (perceived) negative implications. We show that rather than acting as a barrier to effective, place-based policy-making, the (co)presence of hyper-diverse citizens represents an asset. Different citizens bring different skills, experiences, resources, and networks to a place and if policy is able to tap into these, then it will become more effective and influential. In this report we address three principal questions: How is diversity conceptualised within a series of local governance arrangements and initiatives? What are the main factors influencing the success or failure of these interventions? Can we identify new areas for innovative policies and governance concepts? The analysis of ten local initiatives proposed in this report is structured according to the primary aim to which each initiative contributes: social cohesion, social mobility, and economic performance.

Haringey (with a 'usual residents' population of 254,926 according to the UK 2011 Census, ONS, 2014a) is a microcosm of London's wider demographics and economics. There are three factors that make it a particularly interesting case study. First, it is an extraordinarily diverse borough: 65.3% of its population defines itself as *not* being White English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British (ONS, 2014b). Its migrant and ethnic minority communities are not dominated by any one particular group. There are also high degrees of spatial diversity between and within neighbourhoods with a clear east-west dividing line marked by a rail line. Almost two-thirds (64%) of the 101,955 households of the borough are considered 'deprived' in one or more dimensions (ONS, 2014c).[1] Some of London's most affluent locations are found in the west. In the east, areas such as Tottenham have long been associated with deprivation and concentrations of marginalised groups. Second, parts of the borough have a long history of urban policy interventions funded by central and local government. Tottenham, in particular, has been characterised as a 'problem' neighbourhood for decades and some of London's most serious rioting in the 1980s and in 2011 took place and/or was triggered locally (see Mayor of London, 2012). Third, parts of Haringey are now subject to large-scale regeneration plans accompanied by the threat of mass gentrification. Transport connections to central London are well developed and this is converting some of its neighbourhoods into prime investment spaces for property developers and overseas

---

[1] All households in the area at the time of the 2011 Census with one or more of the 4 selected deprivation indicators, based on four selected household characteristics - Employment (any member of a household not a full-time student is either unemployed or long-term sick); Education (no person in the household has at least level 2 education, and no person aged 16-18 is a full-time student); Health and disability (any person in the household has general health 'bad or very bad' or has a long term health problem.); and Housing (Household's accommodation is either overcrowded, with an occupancy rating -1 or less, or is in a shared dwelling, or has no central heating) (ONS, 2014).

capital. Some of the initiatives discussed below have arisen in response to these radical development plans and their impacts on existing patterns of diversity and social networks.

We draw on a balance of project types that reflect the wider situation in London and within English cities. Since the election of the Coalition government in 2010, the funding available for neighbourhood renewal and urban projects relating to diversity has almost entirely disappeared. Many local government schemes have been cut back or drastically reduced as authorities have faced cuts of up to 33%. Remaining projects tend to rely on voluntary and/or private sector contributions and partnerships. One consequence of this is that there are fewer projects that focus primarily on economic performance as such projects tend to be more resource-intensive than community-led schemes for enhanced cohesion and social networking/mobility. Thus, in the virtual absence of sustainable state funding, projects have become more piecemeal and less integrated. At the local level attempts are being made to join up initiatives, but as will be shown below this is becoming a more challenging task in the wake of cuts and increasing demands for welfare support. Despite this, we will demonstrate that local projects display a remarkably high degree of innovation, local participation, and commitment. There are many positive messages to be taken from the Haringey case and there has been a concentrated local effort to change broader perceptions of the area for the better.

We conducted 14 interviews with key policy makers, project managers and community activists between February and June 2014. This was supplemented by the collection and analysis of a range of background documents, strategies, and other materials. In the next section we discuss ten initiatives. We then synthesise some of the key findings before setting out some conclusions.

2   Governance arrangements

2.1   Arrangements targeting social cohesion

Haringey Play Streets

Strategy, focus and organisation
Haringey Play Streets offers local residents of Haringey the opportunity to pedestrianise their street for up to 3 hours per week, fortnight or month during the daylight hours by applying to the local authority for a Temporary Play Street Order (Haringey Play Streets, 2014). The aim is to encourage residents to socialise, and children to play together, in their street in order to build stronger social bonds and community spirit in the immediate neighbourhood. The initiative is area-based in nature as an application is made collectively on behalf of an entire residential street. It targets children and adolescents as its primary focus is on allowing children the space to play near their home. Interviews also indicated anecdotal evidence of an increase in social interaction between neighbours on Play Streets more broadly as a result.

The Haringey Play Streets initiative was in a very early stage of development at the time of interview with only two Play Streets active and four more in the pipeline. The first Haringey Play Street (combining Clarendon Road and Avondale Road which have 58 and 108 properties respectively[2], primarily terraced houses with a small number converted into flats) has been in operation since it was piloted in May 2013 and takes place between 2.30pm and 5.30pm on the last Sunday of every month. The second (at Pemberton Road which has 114 properties, also primarily terraced houses) operates between 2pm and 5pm every third Sunday. Just prior to publication of

---

[2]   According   to   Royal   Mail: http://www.royalmail.com/find-a-postcode   and   Haringey   Maps: http://www.maps.haringey.gov.uk

this report Haringey Play Streets informed the authors that they have successfully launched two more Play Streets which operate on a monthly basis at Clonmel/Alton Roads (Bruce Grove Ward in the east of the borough) and Dickenson Road (Crouch End Ward in the west of the borough) and one which operates weekly at Redston Road (Muswell Hill Ward in the west of the borough), plus three more on the way. Other neighbouring London boroughs (such as Hackney with over fifteen in regular operation) have been offering residents the scheme for longer and are at a more advanced stage. As a community-led initiative it is coordinated and run entirely by volunteers from each specific street. The local authority (Haringey Council) is responsible for promoting the scheme, offering advice, processing applications and providing the necessary temporary traffic signs, cones and high visibility waistcoats to organisers. The concept for Play Streets was originally derived from a national not-for-profit organisation called 'Playing Out' established by two parents from Bristol concerned with enabling their children to play safely on the streets where they live. Since their first session in Bristol in June 2009 'Playing Out' has now become a community interest company (CIC) that offers ongoing advice and guidance on the local implementation of the scheme in a variety of localities (such as Haringey) across the UK via their website which hosts comprehensive guides, instructional manuals and promotional videos as well as by telephone, email and via its Facebook page and Twitter feed.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity
The founders of 'Playing Out' state in their 'Step-by-Step Manual for Organisers':

> *'Playing in the street increases community cohesion and brings neighbours of all ages together by providing a sense of common space and shared ownership. It can engender a sense of collective responsibility and thereby increase the safety of the neighbourhood'* (Rose and Ferguson, 2012: 19).

Haringey Play Streets can offer neighbours from very socio-economically, ethno-culturally and demographically diverse backgrounds the opportunity to interact and communicate which they might not otherwise have had as part of their busy everyday lives. Haringey's diversity was highlighted as a positive feature of living and working in the borough by those responsible for setting up Haringey Play Streets, although it was noted that the extent to which interaction and exchange would take place across, for example, socio-economic and/or ethno-cultural lines varied significantly depending on the streets involved as certain parts of the borough (and therefore streets) were more deprived and ethnically diverse than others[3]. In short, the project embodies a pluralist conception of public space and the power of communicative interaction to generate new forms of inter-community awareness and understanding. It promotes interaction as a vehicle for greater cohesion between the diversity of groups who reside in these neighbourhoods. The first Play Streets have been launched in the east of Haringey, building social bonds in the aftermath of the riots in Tottenham in 2011. However, applications to hold a Play Street can be made by all Haringey residents (excluding those on the 'unsuitable streets' list – see below) and organisers were aware that Haringey Council leadership are keen for more to be implemented in the more affluent west of the borough, which has been the case more recently.

---

[3] Both active Play Streets take place within St. Ann's ward in the east of Haringey where: 28.5% are classed as White Other, 23.1% White British, 10.0% Black Caribbean and 8.2% Black African (a downward trend in White British and Black Caribbean residents and an increase in those classed as White Other); 47.7% are born in the UK and the Republic of Ireland (declined from 60.4% in 2001) and 14.7% are born in post 2001 EU countries compared to 9.8% of Haringey; 35.3% are qualified Level 4 or above (40.8% in Haringey); 30.3% are economically inactive in 2011 compared to 39.8% in 2001: http://www.haringey.gov.uk/census11_st_ann_s_ward_profile.pdf.

Main factors influencing success or failure

Practical factors affecting the success or failure of this initiative include the availability of suitable streets (e.g. not on principal, bus or TfL red routes[4] or those without viable diversion routes), a requirement for a majority support from households in the road (no less than 60%) and the willingness of volunteers to organise, promote and steward the Play Street. One of the most significant factors affecting the success of this initiative is likely to be the fact that there is no charge to residents for applying for, or operating, the Play Street, as well as a minimal cost to the local authority for managing the scheme (which is absorbed within existing budgets). In a time of government cutbacks for local public services Play Streets follows a model that appears financially sustainable. Haringey Council highlights the importance of making the initiative as easy as possible for residents to organise and implement while ensuring they are adequately protected (e.g. by recommending organisers purchase public liability insurance). Despite the limited financial implications it was noted by one Haringey officer that the Hackney scheme had received independent funding for a dedicated community leader responsible for the initiative whereas the coordinator in Haringey was doing so in addition to other core duties. Haringey Council had managed to fund two community leaders on a short-term temporary basis for the two pilot Play Streets and were conscious that these initiatives relied on the work of these individuals to get up and running. However, once established Play Streets required no further funding and had not experienced any significant problems having developed a degree of longer term sustainability. Play Streets is also a very visible form of policy outcome given the changes to the local environment which regularly occur as a result. This visibility, combined with the qualitative impact the project has on people's experience of place, helps to foster a sense of progress and achievement on the part of all those involved.

Conclusion

Haringey Council conducted a review of the pilot scheme and agreed to formally implement it across the borough, determining that the scheme contributes positively to *'promoting the well-being of children, empowering communities and supporting community cohesion'* based on feedback from organisers and children involved (Haringey Council, 2013). Our interviewee relayed how residents had made friends with those they have lived near for ten years but had never previously spoken to or had observed their children reuniting with others who live on their street but who had lost touch by attending different schools.

The feedback from council officers on the impact of the initiative has been overwhelmingly positive and there was a sense that the initiative had gone some way towards challenging some of the negative perceptions of Haringey. The initiative has also been strongly supported by the Leader of Haringey Council as a positive response to the riots which took place in parts of the borough in August 2011. The council hopes to have as many as 15 active Play Streets in operation by early 2015 and is seeking further short-term funding to support wider promotion and advertising of the scheme and other community leaders to further develop the initiative in other streets.

Vacant Lot

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Vacant Lot project appropriated and occupied vacant and neglected spaces on hard-standing surfaces or grassed areas surrounding deprived inner city housing estates in London and redeveloped them into community gardens and allotments. The spaces were made accessible and useable

---

[4] Red routes are *'major roads on which vehicles are not permitted to stop… Red routes are mainly used on major bus and commuting routes'.* http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red_route.

for growing food, socialising and play through simple adjustments such as bespoke raised bed timber planters and using bulk bags as growing containers. Vacant Lot was an area-based initiative targeted at local residents of any age or background from a particular estate with the three-fold aim of providing outside space, a place to grow food and a place to socialise. Local residents were offered the opportunity to claim a new plot and to be involved in the process of creating the community growing space. According to its founders the Vacant Lot gardens have become *'a place to meet neighbours, sit in the outdoors, and to enjoy growing fruit, vegetables, salads and other plants in individual allotment plots… plot holders of different age groups and backgrounds meet, exchange food, seeds and gardening advice*[5]. The project objective is to use the physical environment as a shared resource in order to promote cohesion, communication and interaction. It provides an opportunity to establish a 'shared endeavour' for different interests. It also improves the quality of the urban environment benefitting a range of interests. Established in 2009 as a partnership between What if: projects Ltd[6], Groundwork London[7] and Social Housing Providers and Tenants Organisations in the London boroughs of Islington, Camden, Hackney and Haringey it was funded primarily by the Big Lottery's Local Food Programme as a three year project with other support coming from London Waste, King's Cross Construction Skills Centre (Carillon), Camden Jobtrain, Elba, Moneybookers, UBS and construction supported by Hackney College, Furniture Group.

The project was implemented at 21 sites across London and while the initiative itself has been completed the sites remain in use. The Haringey site was Mildura Court, a block of 38 flats on Church Lane in the Hornsey district of the borough, where a plot for each tenant was developed as part of a new garden for the residents. The space was redeveloped in 2012 after the Homes for Haringey site was selected to be part of the Vacant Lot programme. With support from residents, the Mildura Court Residents Association and Groundwork London and implemented by the Vacant Lot team, £5,000 (€6,225) funding from Big Lottery and Homes for Haringey was used to create a garden that all residents could enjoy. The initiative was celebrated by the local councillor and cabinet member for housing for *'bringing residents together and encouraging children to get involved…'* with the hope being that the garden will *'develop food growing and gardening skills for tenants, help build community cohesion as well as improve and maintain the outdoor environment of the flats'* (Haringey Independent, 2012).

Perception and use of the concept of diversity
The concept of 'diversity' was not an integral feature of the project. However, given the demography of the city, the focus on deprived urban areas of London resulted in input and involvement at each site from residents from a wide range of ethno-cultural, socio-economic and demographic backgrounds including those from different BME[8] communities, tenants and homeowners and users from 6-70 years old. Project organisers typically noted a scarcity of gardens and open spaces in these areas and sought to address this by transforming various sites into community spaces in the form of allotment gardens in order to strengthen social cohesion. In doing so the urban environment becomes a focus for the construction of new forms of engagement encouraging a sense of ownership that transcends community differences.

Main factors influencing success or failure
The project would not have been possible without the agreement of the various site owners. The 'temporary' nature of the intervention was crucial to its success as, in order to ease landowners

---

[5] https://www.facebook.com/VACANT.LOT.friends?sk=info; http://www.vacant-lot.info/BACKGROUND.html

[6] Architecture practice based in Hackney focused on sustainable urban environments

[7] Environment regeneration charity

[8] Black and Minority Ethnic

fears that site users would seek to claim legal ownership of the land, assurances were given (via signed ownership agreements) that everything could be easily removed and the land redeveloped at any time if required. In parallel with these assurances it was equally important to achieve a degree of support from local residents by providing door-to-door information and holding exploratory meetings. Locals are also encouraged to act as volunteers in the construction of the sites and participate in green skills[9] workshops and the establishment of 'garden groups' to formalise their activities and enable them to apply for funding independently. Some sites were more successful than others in establishing garden groups as many users were hesitant to commit beyond their own use of the space due to time pressure. Others struggled to achieve full use of available plots due to lack of interest. Nevertheless, the importance of a finely balanced sense of 'ownership' of the space appears to have been an important factor in gaining local residents and site owners support. Having achieved this balance in most cases the project was very popular and attracted a lot of positive press which led to visits from local councillors and ultimately more funding and sustained support gained as a result.

Possibly the most interesting reflection on the value of community engagement for the success of the project related to the resourcefulness or 'capital' of the site users. One Vacant Lot organiser commented:

> *"The government's Big Society idea of 'everyone clubbing together' works in Hampstead where people are resourceful but it doesn't work in other areas where people are less resourceful... it isn't about being clever or not clever… you have a different outlook on what is possible … running these groups requires people who are confident and that needs a little bit of help, showing the ropes and encouragement".*

The need for groups to be supported, ideally by their housing association or local authority, was highlighted as a significant challenge to overcome, particularly as our respondents noted that this kind of support and facilitation is often not a typical function for these types of organisations. Ideally organisers believe each site needs a person or persons who *"likes gardening, is organised, works well with people and is good at paperwork"* in order to effectively sustain the activities of the site.

The involvement of a wide variety of different private, public, non-profit and grassroots organisations able to work together effectively and enthusiastically and offer their own particular specialisms to the project was another notable success factor. However working with this number of organisations also presented some challenges. For example, project organisers described their frustration at high staff turnover, internal politics of the organisations and the fact that two thirds of project funding went towards administrative costs, limiting how effective and site specific each intervention could be. The rigidity of expectations for delivery and funding requirements were also noted as frustrations yet the project would not have been funded in the way it was without the various organisations on board.

Conclusion
The greatest strength of this project is the way that it reclaims and redevelops land which had no purpose or use in order to strengthen cohesion for the local community. Surveys conducted by organisers after the completion of each site found that residents commented positively on the opportunity the gardens gave them to meet their neighbours, particularly those from different cultures. In the future What if: Projects Ltd are keen for housing associations to take more risks to develop vacant spaces in the most deprived areas. At present they believe there is a tendency

---

[9] For example training in horticulture, food growing, bio-diversity, bee-keeping, energy saving, smarter travelling.

among local authorities and housing associations to focus more on areas with fewer social problems where there is less risk that the initiative will be effective but also less to gain once it is. They are also considering expanding the Vacant Lot idea to disused community centres to challenge councils and housing associations to be more reflexive around the accessibility and management of their community facilities.

Streetlife.com

Strategy, focus and organisation
Streetlife describes itself as a *'British social network for local communities'* with the aim of helping people *'make the most of where they live by connecting with their neighbours and sharing practical information, advice and resources'* (Streetlife.com). New users sign up to the website using their postcode and email address and are automatically connected with others in their local area. Users are kept informed of discussions happening in their area and able to post messages, events, polls and pictures to which other local residents can respond. Streetlife likens itself to *'chatting with a neighbour over the garden fence, pinning posters on lampposts, speaking in the town square or putting cards up in the newsagents' windows but with the benefit of being accessible wherever you are, and at times to suit your routine'* (Streetlife.com). The site emphasises how, for example, a jogging club, library or neighbourhood watch group could engage with new people in the area. Our interviewee described how local authorities use the site to conduct consultations and share information about new developments in their area such as flood warnings, opening of a library or new recycling rules. Streetlife also emphasises the opportunity for local businesses to connect with customers by responding instantly to requests for help and advice.

There is no specific target audience as users come from a wide range of age, gender, socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, however Streetlife staff noted that users tend to be settled and embedded in their local neighbourhood and interested in local issues, such as professionals, families and retirees. The initiative is area-based given its focus on strengthening connections and networks within local communities and it was described during our interview as being between the early and advanced stages in terms of its progress. The website was first piloted in Battersea, South West London and is now available across the UK with a clustering of activity in London and the South East. According to Streetlife.com over 250,000 people in over 2,000 communities across Britain are using the site to *'discuss local news, crime, planning proposals and public services; find locals with common interests; organise and attend social groups and events; share skills and belongings with neighbours; recommend and discover local businesses and tradespeople; and promote, campaign and volunteer for community projects and local causes'* (Streetlife.com). It is run by 11 members of staff and structured as a privately funded company which is free for local residents, charities and non-profit organisations to use. At present it is driven primarily by private investment with our interviewee explaining the ultimate goal being to be self-sustainable by generating revenue from local businesses paying to have *"commercial conversations"* with local communities, this is already happening in areas with more established Streetlife communities.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity
Our Streetlife interviewee emphasised that *"a lot of what makes [Streetlife] work is the diversity of use"*, explaining that in his view the widest possible range of users with the largest possible range of experiences offered the site the most effective and comprehensive forms of mutual support and exchange. As he put it, *"having the diversity of people and targeting communities where you know you are looking at a lot of different people [makes] sure that everyone gets value from it, rather than just having the same people talking about the same things…"*. The impression offered by the interviewee was that Streetlife is *"…great for people who are, or feel, excluded from mainstream society in some way"* since the focus is on

bringing people together who have a common interest in a local area and that, as a result of the relative anonymity of site users[10], preconceived ideas users may have had about one another based on appearance or background are counteracted and new forms of interaction made possible. Although it does not request or hold detailed data (e.g. age, gender, ethnic origin, socio-economic status etc.) which would evidence the diversity of its users, Streetlife has conducted research using Acorn categories[11] based on the postcodes of its members which it says indicate that it broadly mirrors the demographics of the local areas in which it operates (from wealthy areas like Kensington in West London as well as more deprived areas such as Barking and Dagenham in East London). Anecdotal evidence suggests Streetlife is used in different ways across very different localities, e.g. transactional form in affluent areas and more conversational in others.

Main factors influencing success or failure
Given the focus on strengthening community spirit via online social networking one of the obvious factors affecting its success is that conversations actually take place. In order for this to happen it is crucial that the site have a critical mass of active users concentrated within a locality. Our interviewee pointed out that *"the site is only as useful as the people who use it"* and it is reliant on enough people joining in the same place, at the same time. Although it is already available to prospective users across the UK, staff at Streetlife marketing the site tend to focus their efforts on areas where usage is growing naturally (typically those neighbouring active Streetlife communities) by pushing direct and online marketing and liaising with local authorities in order to increase numbers. The Streetlife representative we spoke to described the site as *"almost the opposite of Facebook… as on Streetlife you don't know the people but you live near them, whereas Facebook is all about people you already know who could be all over the world"*, thus connecting people who don't already know each other is one of the biggest challenges facing Streetlife as it attempts to grow.

Maintaining active conversations and online communities is also argued to be impacted heavily by the sense of empowerment felt by users to affect change in their communities. Our interviewee emphasised the importance of the user-led and locally focused nature of topics, activities and campaigns in ensuring users felt a strong sense of ownership and were confident that once public opinion had been mobilised it would be possible to establish a plan and take action. During our interview many examples were given of local authorities and Members of Parliament using the site to communicate directly with users on a resident-to-resident basis, sharing information, seeking to dispel rumours and take-up local issues in direct response to concerns voiced on Streetlife.com. Our interviewee felt that the more the user feels that they can go beyond discussion and actually fulfil a community need (such as saving a local pub) or tackle a perceived social problem (such as potholes or litter) the more empowering and positive their experience of the site. Streetlife.com features numerous positive reviews from users to support its impact on social cohesion such as 'Eleanor B.' who states:

> *"Cities can be anonymous and lonely, but they're made up of communities of people who all share in common the place they live; imagine what other interests you might share. I set up a book club on Streetlife that meets monthly and it's been fantastic getting to know people who live nearby."*

---

[10] Users can customise their account to control the amount of information they receive, the type of information they are interested in and the information that they share about themselves.

[11] *'Acorn is a powerful consumer classification that segments the UK population. By analysing demographic data, social factors, population and consumer behaviour, it provides precise information and an understanding of different types of people'* (http://acorn.caci.co.uk/).

Finally, the structure of the site as a purely private initiative working towards a 'social good' while simultaneously aiming to be a profit making business is also a contributing factor towards its success as it is not reliant on already scarce and ultimately finite state or charitable funding, thus making the initiative more financially sustainable and challenging traditional approaches to funding community projects.

Conclusion
Streetlife emphasises the galvanising force that local (often small scale) issues have in encouraging people to communicate with their neighbours, mobilise around local issues and to demonstrate a willingness to seek local solutions. It emphasises the significance of the common bonds that people share around social interests and concerns and highlights the way that online social networking based around locality can overcome perceived barriers to interaction and generate new forms of neighbourliness and understanding.

Our Tottenham Network

Strategy, focus and organisation
Our Tottenham (hereafter referred to as the OT network) is a network of community organisations, residents associations and campaigns from the Tottenham area. This action network was set up to spread co-operation and solidarity throughout Tottenham's neighbourhoods and campaign for the interests of Tottenham residents with regard to urban planning and regeneration issues. The OT network currently includes 40 affiliate organisations or groups (OT, 2014), some of which represent established residents associations (e.g. Haringey Federation of Residents Associations), political parties (e.g. Haringey Green Party, Haringey Left Unity), issue-based campaigns (e.g. Defend Haringey Health Services), community centres used by a particular ethnic group (e.g. Lord Morrison Hall / Afro International), and charitable organisations (e.g. the Selby Trust, see case-study in section 2.3). The initiative contributes to the strengthening of social cohesion in the sense of seeking to achieve forms of cooperation between a wide ranging set of existing groups, organisations and campaigns. The *Our Tottenham Community Charter*, 'Planning and regeneration by and for the community' (OT, 2013), spells out the agenda and aims of the OT network:

> *'Tottenham is a great place with a rich social and architectural history, made up of vibrant, diverse and talented communities. We want to ensure this continues! The Council are promoting their 'Plan for Tottenham', backed by property developers, big business, and the Mayor of London. … Coupled with the Government's planning policies and attacks on vital public services and people's welfare, the major effect of all this will be to over-develop Tottenham, to threaten its positive community-scale character in many areas, to promote profiteering at the community's expense, and the forced displacement of thousands of local people who can no longer find or keep any affordable place to live. This is unacceptable. It doesn't have to be like this. Together we are very powerful. … We pledge to fight for OUR common interests, OUR neighbourhoods, OUR community facilities and for the needs of OUR communities throughout Tottenham.'*

The OT network was born out of the debates which followed the London riots of August 2011, which were sparked in Tottenham. The Mayor of London and the local council (Haringey) responded to the riots by producing two reports setting out their analysis of the problems and strategies for the regeneration of Tottenham (Mayor of London's Independent Panel on Tottenham, 2012; Haringey Council, 2012). Both reports advocated large-scale regeneration (£1billion / €1.2billion) of new developments and 10,000 extra homes) to bring new businesses, developments and higher income groups into the area and to diversify housing tenure, argued to be too dominated by social housing estates. The vision for the future of Tottenham outlined in these

documents has been the focus of strong opposition by some segments of the local population, which led to the creation of the OT network. It campaigns to defend community facilities; stand up for decent and affordable housing; support small businesses; promote quality design and respect for heritage; improve the street environment; support youth services and facilities; empower local communities; and develop local community plans (OT, 2013). The OT network does not have any professional staff nor legal status for the time being. It is led by a coordination group of volunteers who meet every two weeks, and is fed by small thematic working groups (e.g. on housing and planning policy) which monitor new policies, gather data and develop an agenda for local actions. The OT spokesperson is a local resident with a long standing experience of community activism and networking in the area. The network has received very little grant funding to date. Its activities have been assisted voluntarily by students and researchers. The network maintains an e-mailing list and web page to circulate news about local campaigns and relevant planning and urban regeneration policies. The common agenda of the network was produced during two 'community conferences' in April 2013 and February 2014, attended by approximately 100 participants.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity
The initiative explicitly addresses socio-economic diversity because its primary aim is to defend the right of the existing resident population and workers of Tottenham to 'stay put' in their neighbourhood in the face of the large-scale regeneration plans of the Council (supported by the London Mayor and large-scale developers) and of the associated threat of gentrification. The OT network is critical of the official urban regeneration rhetoric of Haringey Council, which advocates a diversification of the housing stock, of retail and business opportunities, and of the socio-economic profile of the residents of the area. For OT, this diversification agenda is a coded word for gentrification and the displacement of existing residents and businesses. The OT network therefore promotes the *existing* diversity of the area and opposes the planned 'diversification from above' embedded in the regeneration agenda of the Council. Three types of diversity are being promoted in the OT Community Charter. First, in terms of functional diversity, the network opposes the loss of independent shops and small-scale retailers; the closure or demolition of community facilities (e.g. youth centres) and community assets (e.g. pubs or post offices). Second, in terms of housing diversity, the network opposes the demolition of existing social housing and criticises the lack of sufficient provision of social and/or affordable housing units in new developments. Third, in terms of social diversity, the network campaigns for the right of the existing population – a large proportion of which is low income – to be able to remain in the area. Ethnic diversity is not explicitly mentioned as such, but it is positively valued and taken for granted in the meetings and activities of the network. Many of the activists come from ethnic minority groups settled in the area for decades, in particular the Black-Caribbean community. However some groups are under-represented in the network (e.g. the most recently arrived waves of migrants from Central and Eastern Europe or the Latin American community).

Main factors influencing success or failure
It is too early to assess the success of the network in influencing the Council to change its regeneration strategy and in generating alternative forms of community plans. So far, OT's actions have included awareness raising events, preparing formal responses to the Council during planning public consultations, and the dissemination of local good practices in terms of community planning and management of assets. The network is growing and gaining momentum. Its success will depend on its capacity to diversify and expand its base of volunteers in terms of age, socio-economic status and ethnic background; to find funding and expertise to support the professionalisation of its activities (in particular for the creation of community-led plans for particular sites, following past 'success stories' of community-led regeneration in Tottenham such as the £5million (€6.2million) makeover of Lordship Recreation Ground); and its willingness to engage

in collaboration with the Council (a contentious issue within the network, reflected for example in the lack of interest so far in engaging with the formal process of Neighbourhood Planning allowed by the 2011 UK Localism Act). Conversely, a very important external factor will be the willingness of the key officials and elected members of Haringey Council to take the network seriously as a valid and representative partner, and listen to and meet its demands. This may be helped by the fact that new councillors from BME backgrounds entered the Council following the May 2014 elections.

Conclusion

The innovative quality of the OT network is that it brings together a large number of existing community groups and campaigns which bridge across quite heterogeneous social and ethnic groups that may not have cooperated with each other previously, in order to defend the existing character and diversity of a particular area. Its agenda is not only to oppose the regeneration plans which it considers undesirable, but also to promote the development of alternative plans for community-led regeneration in Tottenham. This is a challenging task in the context of a city with a growing economy and population, where the power of corporate investors and high land values are serious constraints on the potential success of community-led regeneration initiatives.

Highgate Neighbourhood Forum

Strategy, focus and organisation

In 2011 the UK Conservative-Liberal Democrat government passed a new law, the Localism Act, which transformed the spatial planning system in England by dismantling many reforms introduced by the previous New Labour government and by creating a new tier of legally binding planning, called Neighbourhood Planning (see Raco et al., 2014: 19). The Localism Act gives the possibility to a group of at least 21 people to form a Neighbourhood Forum (NF) representing a geographically defined area. If recognised by the local council, the NF can prepare a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which will go through an independent examination and a local referendum. If successful the NP becomes binding and is used to assess planning applications for new developments in the area, in conjunction with the formal local plan (called Local Development Framework). The concept of NF is modelled on the way Parish and Town Councils have worked in rural parts of England. How it will work in complex, highly diverse urban areas is a challenge. In London, the intricate micro-geography of income, class, ethnic and tenure diversity means that the potential mobilisation of a coherent group of active citizens with a sense of place and common purpose for their 'neighbourhood' is not a self-evident process. The question of who gets involved in Neighbourhood Planning, where, why and with what agenda is therefore an important one to investigate in relation to the governance of diversity and to the pursuit of social cohesion in a particular area. Two aspects are key: first, whether the composition of NFs represents the socio-demographic diversity of their area and whether their agenda and proposals cater for the interests of a large section of the local population or, on the contrary, of a small segment; second, what position the NFs have with regard to the pressures for socio-demographic change and for new development (e.g. housing) in their area[12], i.e. a defensive or an open approach to existing and new forms of diversity.

As of March 2014, in London 35 areas had a formally designated NF and 14 more NFs had submitted their applications for designation. In Haringey, there is to date only one approved NF

---

[12] There is an estimated need for up to 1.25 million more homes to be built in London over the next 25 years. The Localism Act contains incentives to encourage local communities to accept new development (e.g. housing) in their area. Neighbourhood Forums with an approved plan can receive 25% of the Community Infrastructure Levy gained from new development in their area.

preparing a plan for Highgate, an area of 18,000 people which stretches across two Boroughs. The NF was recognised by Camden and Haringey Councils in December 2012. It is driven by a committee of core members (23 in May 2014) who are co-opted or elected. About half of the founders came from the Highgate Society, a conservation society created four decades ago by middle-class residents to protect the area's character. The NF cooperates with a number of affiliate organisations (e.g. residents associations, amenity societies, faith groups, community centre and schools). It provides a *'forum where people from across Highgate and from both Boroughs can come together to discuss issues which affect the area'* and … *'a democratic way for local residents to put together a Neighbourhood Plan – via the Forum and referendum – for the future development of the area'* (Highgate NF, 2014). The Forum organised various activities to ask local residents about the future of their neighbourhood (e.g. leaflets distributed to all households; Community Planning Workshops). Over 50 people have been working in subject groups to research and write policies for the NP, whose draft version will be published in the autumn of 2014. The plan will be open for consultation and checked by an independent examiner before going to a local referendum. The work of the NF was driven by volunteers' time, but also received in-kind support from an urban design charity (the Prince's Foundation) and expert and financial support (a £6800 (€8,500) grant to fund a professional plan writer) from *Locality*, the government-sponsored body which supports community groups engaging in neighbourhood planning.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

As argued above, from a diversity and social cohesion perspective it is crucial to assess the composition and agenda of the NF and its position vis-à-vis new development and the diversity of population, housing tenure and uses in the area. Highgate is a wealthy area, with less ethnic minority residents and a higher percentage of home owners compared to Tottenham. The Highgate NF is led by residents with a high degree of financial, cultural and social capital, mostly white and middle or upper-middle class professionals – many of them retired home owners who have been active in conservation societies in the area for several decades. There has been suspicion that NFs in wealthy neighbourhoods would be driven by a defensive NIMBY agenda seeking to protect property values and resist new development. In Highgate, however, there is evidence that the draft NP being prepared accommodates the need for new housing (in particular affordable) and community facilities, and pays attention to the needs of low income residents and to the maintenance of socio-economic diversity (e.g. as illustrated by the proposals for Archway Road, the main retail high street). This is explained in part by the relatively progressive attitude/'social conscience' of the members of the NF: in the local elections of May 2014, Highgate was the only ward in Haringey where the Liberal-Democrats won a majority, with Labour coming second. The influence of a younger generation of NF members with planning and architectural expertise is also traceable, who pushed for a positive agenda and vision for the area against a perhaps more defensive attitude to new developments which may exist among some older local residents.

Main factors influencing success or failure

It is too early to know whether the plan prepared by the NF will be approved by the independent examiner and by the local referendum. However the work done by the NF has already influenced, for example, some of the planning strategies of Haringey Council with regard to the future development of vacant sites in Highgate. The main factors which seem to have a potentially positive influence on the composition and agenda of the NF, from a diversity point of view, are the progressive political values of many NF members with regard to socio-economic, ethnic and housing diversity; the concentration of relevant skills, know-how and social networks among the NF members; the attempt by the core group of affluent white activists to mobilise residents and community groups from various segments of the population in the drafting and consultation of the NP. The main shortcoming of the Highgate NF (like other NFs across London), to date, is

that migrants and BME groups (which make up about 40% of the local population), teenagers and young people, isolated pensioners and social housing tenants are underrepresented. But gender balance is not an issue as many women have driven the NF.

Conclusion

The Highgate case-study confirms, to an extent, what we know from the existing literature on public participation in formal planning processes (in the UK and elsewhere): that engagement with such processes is often driven by an educated white middle-class (Holman and Rydin, 2013). It also shows that the neighbourhood planning process is mobilising a younger generation of socially-conscious activists who are willing to work on positive visions for the future of their neighbourhood which are not just 'reactive or reactionary but seek to embrace a more inclusive agenda. A major external constraining factor is the limited leeway available for the NP process within the framework of the Localism Act (NP have to abide by the rules set out in the formal local planning documents). There is often little opportunity for conflict to emerge in NPs as they tend to come to consensus perspectives and don't offer a lot of opportunities for disagreement.

2.2   Arrangements targeting social mobility

Haringey Young Advisors Integration Programme

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Young Advisors Integration Programme was set up across England by the Labour government in 2006. It was designed to promote local initiatives that would enhance the engagement of young people in the governance and management of urban regeneration programmes. Its aim was '*to show community leaders and decision makers how to engage with young people in community life, regeneration and renewal*' (DCLG, 2006: 10). Young Advisors would be recruited, selected and trained in local areas. They would act as 'skilled consultants' rather than community representatives. In the formal language of the programme they would be '*tasked with showing organisations, committees and projects how best to involve young people and how to attract and maintain the interest of young people in the planning, management and the reviewing of community services and activities*' (Ibid.: 10). They would, in turn, become the voice of young people in their areas and '*highlight to decision makers what young people believe their communities need as opposed to what local planners think is feasible*' (Ibid.: 10). By fostering the skills of individuals in this way, agencies would be able to increase youth participation in all areas of their work and enable them to become directly involved in '*planning, delivering and evaluating all aspects of* [urban] *policy*' (Ibid.: 12). In Haringey the programme has been particularly well developed. It is seen an important stepping stone in local attempts to build stronger relationships between young people and public authorities.

The project draws on 12 part-time staff is managed locally by the Community Youth Outreach Manager who initiated the scheme whilst working for the local Housing Association, Homes for Haringey, but who has since been seconded to Haringey Council. Austerity cuts have meant that there are fewer grants now available for non-governmental social projects and as a result the way the programme works has changed. The programme is largely managed by the young advisors themselves who have been empowered to make decisions on local social projects while bigger commissions are farmed out directly from the charity. The advisors consult and help shape local services supporting the police, local authority and most recently supported a workshop at the Institute for Government. Young Advisors have also been engaged with other local community and civil society groups, including local churches and social enterprises such as Groundwork London and have won eight national awards for community based projects.

As of 2012 there were 20 Young Advisors, aged between 15 and 21, working locally. The project's most visible impact has been the £3,000 (€3,735) transformation of a disused community

space into a community youth and IT centre known as 'Off Road'. This has been well used and has become a focal point for other community-building activities. A longer-term plan known as *Project 2020* (discussed below) is also based at 'Off Road' focusing on one of the most challenging local neighbourhoods (Northumberland Park). Its core priorities are to reduce anti-social behaviour and gang-related activities, boost training and education provision, and encourage more political participation from young people in the area. The latter point is seen as being particularly significant in light of major regeneration plans for the area.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity
The programme is clearly targeted at a specific group, namely young people. This group has traditionally been marginalised from formal policy-making processes and have also been disproportionately hard hit by the changes in the labour market. In Haringey most of those involved in the scheme are from BME communities, although the scheme does not target these communities formally. The emphasis is on creating new nodes of engagement in which trained young people will act as a conduit for the diverse views of groups viewed as 'hard-to-reach'. Perceptions of diversity are driven by understandings of inequality and a combination of poverty, marginalisation, and racial discrimination, all of which are seen to close down opportunities for social mobility and limit the regeneration potential of the area. Efforts should be made to bring about, what the Mayor of London terms, a convergence in opportunities for young people living in such areas when compared to those living in London 'best performing' districts.

The scheme therefore reflects wider changes in welfare provision in London (and the UK) in which the primary responsibility for enhanced social mobility, economic development, and social cohesion is devolved to individuals and their representatives. The emphasis instead is on the role of knowledge-sharing and changing subjectivities within local communities of young people. Change will come through their own efforts, supported by enabling local authorities and organisations.

Main factors influencing success or failure
The main success factors of the programme have been both physical and social. They include: (i) the creation of tangible infrastructure and community-owned assets that have been used as a springboard for community-building activities. The Off-Road Hub is a visible symbol that young people are important to regeneration agencies and have not been forgotten; (ii) implementing a programme of publicity which has highlighted the positive impacts on the participation of young people in community-related activities. This has helped to promote a sense of civic pride and for engaging young people in local planning decisions; (iii) the establishment of a vigorous training programme that supports selected young people to become skilled enablers of community action and engagement.; (iv) the establishment of a Young Advisors network to act as a new platform for local partnership building that connects young people to existing programmes, such as Haringey Jobs Fund in which local businesses seek to employ young people from the area. The local authority is also looking at its own procurement and contracting procedures under the government's *Social Value Act 2012* to reward companies that employ young people. The existence of the Young Advisors' programme provides a hub for local engagement and enables policy-makers to target their interventions in a more focussed way; (v) the absence of punitive, quantitative, targets. The initiative concentrates on building-up qualitative relationships between people and this has enabled local capacities and trust relationships to evolve.

The scheme also has limitations and there are concerns over its sustainability. Whilst its impacts have been wide-ranging, the project leader concedes that significant local problems remain and that the gains made thus far are vulnerable to set-backs. Support had been particularly effective in

helping those who were already looking to be helped. Building relationships with those suffering from multiple deprivation and discrimination has proved to be challenging. The project is also threatened by longer term funding cuts. The local authority will have to find savings of £70million (€87million) in the medium term. Central government funds for such programmes have also disappeared and there is a new ideological scepticism over the capacity of such projects to deliver tangible outcomes. The lack of sustainable funding is a major factor that could circumscribe the project in the longer term.

Conclusion

The Haringey Young Advisors scheme emerged in an earlier era of urban policy. It has survived because it is strongly supported by local organisations and the local authority. It undoubtedly plays a significant role in some of the most deprived neighbourhoods in Haringey. There have been some tangible successes, both in terms of providing physical assets and in building capacities within local communities. The scheme targets and supports young people, who in this area are made up predominantly of BAME groups. It reflects some of the wider approaches to diversity and urban policy across the city. The emphasis is on capacity-building and support for individuals and communities. It is about opportunity-building and an understanding of welfare that sees the role of the state as one of facilitating and enabling individual action.

Project 2020

Strategy, focus and organisation

Project 2020 was officially launched in January 2013 and is led by Homes for Haringey which is an Arm's Length Management Organisation (ALMO) set up in April 2006 to manage Haringey's council housing. It aims to reduce the number of young people in Haringey who are not in education, employment and training (NEET), initially targeting the over 1,700 young people living in the Northumberland Park ward of North Tottenham of whom 24% are NEET (ONS, 2011). Northumberland Park was named in 2010 as having one of the highest concentrations of unemployed people and NEET young people in the whole of London, and the second highest in the UK.

Project 2020 describes itself as unique because it *'pulls together the expertise of a range of partners and companies committed to dealing with youth unemployment'* and champions its greatest strength as *'the mentoring that each young person receives during their employment journey. It provides the necessary emotional support that is required to enable each young person to achieve their employment goals'* (Homes for Haringey, 2014). Having raised over £90k (€112,000) funding from the Department for Work and Pensions, Jobcentre Plus, Haringey Youth, Community and Participation, Community Funds and sponsorship, Project 2020 partners including Badenoch & Clark (recruitment services), Business in the Community (business-led charity), Haringey Council, Jobcentre Plus, Martin Arnold Associates (chartered surveyors and construction consultants), Northumberland Park School, Standard Chartered Bank, Lewis Silkin LLP (law firm) and Tottenham Hotspur Foundation offer support in a variety of ways.

Starting with 'light touch' community activities (often funded, led and or supported by partner organisations) aimed at building relationships and trust the teams are then able to conduct a one-to-one assessment focused on identifying the development needs of the young person and starting their achievement portfolio. Young people are then matched with professional/trade mentors to offer support throughout their journey. Skills training is offered to help young people become 'employment ready'. Partners provide young people with work placements, apprenticeships, volunteering and training. Finally achievement ceremonies are held to celebrate a cohort's completion of the programme including a presentation to each young person of their achievement port-

folio. The project also runs 'rewarding residents' events, coffee morning drop-in sessions for single parents and visits to local schools working with the Metropolitan Police. Its activities are delivered from 'Off Road' which is the site of Project 2020's office and youth hub in Northumberland Park. Previously a disused community space, it now hosts an IT suite and music studio as well as video games area and pool table with private spaces available to confidentially discuss career plans and ambitions with staff. The site is championed for providing '*a meeting place offering young people the opportunity to receive expert advice and support on accessing education, training and employment opportunities, as well as relax and make new friends'*. Speaking at the official opening of 'Off Road' Paul Bridge, former Chief Executive of Homes for Haringey, advocated for the importance of the work of Project 2020 by saying:

> *"With 40% unemployment among young people in the Tottenham area, some have few or no aspirations for the future. Project 2020 is about providing those young people with the opportunity to not only develop, but realise their aspirations, fulfilling their potential and contributing to their local community".*

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The Homes for Haringey Equality and Diversity Strategy states that as an organisation they '*…will work with our partners to provide services and opportunities in a fair and equitable way to meet the needs of diverse groups and will continue to address any imbalances that exist in relation to our operations to enhance the services we provide'* (Homes for Haringey, 2013: 3). Homes for Haringey have established a Single Equality Scheme and Action Plan which sets out how they addresses their responsibilities for promoting equality and diversity which includes collecting monitoring data from its clients on criteria including ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation and conducting equality impact assessments to '*mainstream equalities into [their] policies and practice, target resources more effectively and increase transparency in the way services are developed and delivered'* (Ibid, 2013: 4). It lists its six diversity objectives as to '*know our residents and their needs; deliver excellent and responsive services accessible to all; involve our residents in everything we do; work in partnership to deliver stronger, safer communities; ensure procurement is transparent and fair; and value diversity in our workforce and be an employer of choice'* (Ibid, 2013: 4).

Main factors influencing success or failure

One of the greatest strengths – and reasons for the success – of Project 2020, as identified by Homes for Haringey above, is the tailored and bespoke nature of the support available. This is achieved via mentoring programmes which are based around the specific background, needs and experiences of the young people involved, which inevitably vary greatly from person to person. The tailored nature of the support young people receive from Project 2020 would not be possible without the combination of two vital ingredients. The first is the approach to community engagement and the importance of positive relationships between the young people involved and Project 2020 staff. These positive relationships facilitated the conversations necessary to identify the various interests, skills and experience of the young people involved and the support and steps required to enable them to reach their goals. The second is the wide range of partnerships which the project has successfully developed with other organisations and businesses that help to open doors for young people seeking to gain employment via work experience placements, apprenticeships and paid job opportunities. Neither step would be effective without the other. It is the combination of these two that is a driving factor behind the success of Project 2020 in enhancing the social mobility of the local people of Haringey by offering support, training and the opportunity for work experience, apprenticeships and long-term employment. This is evidenced by the funding raised by the project and the various sources from which it was raised; the Future Workforce Award it received from Business in the Community's 'Race for Opportunity' campaign which celebrates outstanding practice in race/ethnicity, equality, diversity and inclusion in the workplace (BITC, 2013); the number of young local people receiving support and gaining

placements and further employment as well as the various fora at which Project 2020 young people have been consulted including the Institute of Government, Department for Work and Pensions, Haringey Council and the Mayor of London as part of work linked to regeneration in Tottenham.

Another major factor behind the success of the project's activities is the 'Off-Road Hub' where Project 2020 is based. Situated on the ground floor of one of a series of 16-floor council-owned tower blocks in the heart of Northumberland Park experiencing acute deprivation and unemployment it provides a visible – and conveniently located – presence for supporting local residents. The youth club facilities (including IT suite, games consoles, music studio and pool table) are undoubtedly a major attraction in an area where local community facilities are increasingly scarce as a result of austerity measures. By offering people a local space to socialise as well as seek support, advice and training the initiative is ensuring its services are welcoming and focused in the area most in need. If activities were based in Haringey Council offices over 20 minute bus-ride and 50 minute walk away it would certainly be less effective at engaging its target audience.

Conclusion
Project 2020 represents a good example of the way that locally-focused interventions involving effective partnership working across a variety of different bodies can have a positive impact upon levels of social mobility within areas of multiple deprivation.

Living Under One Sun

Strategy, focus and organisation
Living Under One Sun (LUOS) is a not-for-profit organisation with the aim of *'actively creating places for communities to meet, access services, share skills and ideas and shape their neighbourhoods'* as well as *'to inspire across generations and cultures taking responsibility to build, protect, share and celebrate a positive neighbourhood and environment both locally and globally'* (LUOS, 2014). Since it was created in 2005 by *'mothers of many cultures and ages to tell their stories through meet, cook and eat sessions in a corner of Tottenham'* the activities it undertakes have gradually expanded and evolved over time from its original focus on strengthening social cohesion to include a focus on enhancing the social mobility of residents through a wide range of events, projects, training programmes and courses (LUOS, 2014). The work of LUOS is community-led, combining participatory grassroots and strategic partnership approaches across public, private and third sectors to address 'issues of equality of access and opportunity' facing its local communities. The organisation is proud of its inclusive, intergenerational and intercultural approach and the fact that it involves, and indeed is led, by a range of local people who reflect the diversity of Haringey. Its work bringing together diversity positively to 'create community-led well-being and healthy connected neighbourhoods' has been recognised in a series of awards from University College London, Durham University, London School of Economics, ESRC Cities Research Group, London Borough of Haringey 40/20 Carbon Commission, The Fabian Society, and Capital Growth.

In its promotional material the activities undertaken by LUOS are grouped into six categories of: *'supporting community development'*; *'developing green skills'*; *'providing sports and outdoor activities'*; *'promoting healthy food'*; *'promoting better budgeting'*; and *'volunteering opportunities'*. Clearly this wide range of specific activities focuses its work on an equally wide range of different target audiences. Among the many project examples there are those which relate to anyone (such as *'Haringey Collective Switching'* which supports people to reduce their fuel bills and *'Blooming Beds and Bees'* which deals with horticulture, bee keeping and herbal medicine courses at the LUOS Community Allotment Project); those which target adults 50+ (such as *'Home from Hospital'* which supports those returning home from hospital and *'Neighbourhood Connectors Haringey'* which provides training, assistance and in-

formation about financial management, befriending schemes, volunteering and social capital building opportunities); and those which target children (such as *'Cook, Learn and Eat'* which runs training courses on healthy eating in local schools) (LUOS, 2014). Given the length of time that it has been operating, and the number of projects it has created, the organisation itself would be best described as at an advanced stage of development, although the status of each individual activity such as the examples given above would vary greatly in this regard.

Living Under One Sun lists its supporters, partners and funders from the community, public and private sectors as including Haringey Council (Smarter Travel; Public Health; Adult Social Care; Leisure; Parks; and Environmental Resources); The Big Lottery; Community Development Foundation; Film London; University College London; Newlon Fusion; Church of England; Lee Valley Estates; La Salle Investment Management; as well as several schools. It therefore represents an example of just how effective partnership working can be if well organised and developed by grounded and authoritative local bodies.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

It is clear from speaking to the organiser, from observing some of the projects in action and also from the demographics of the area in which it operates that the bulk of LUOS' activities are purposefully structured and operated in a manner which is intended to be welcoming and inclusive towards people from all backgrounds and walks of life. The organisation champions the notions of 'community' and 'neighbourhood' and, as such, the social interactions and skills training which they deliver benefits all within the diverse locality in which it operates.

Main factors influencing success or failure

The first, and arguably most significant factor affecting the success of LUOS as an organisation is the input from its particularly passionate and enthusiastic founder and coordinator who acts as the catalyst for much of the projects undertaken and the positive mentality that has led to the organisation expanding its activities so broadly and winning numerous awards. Our interviewee stressed the success of the community-led and neighbourhood focused nature of the work of LUOS and the importance of building on the sense of belonging which exists within local communities. They also emphasised that the work of LUOS, in engaging and involving such a diverse range of users and volunteers, had demonstrated that it was important to challenge the notion of BME groups as representing 'hard to reach communities' but rather emphasised the 'hard to reach nature of services'.

The second is the support that the organisation receives from (and the investment it makes in) its volunteers. LUOS provides *'training, support and pathways for community-based project ideas to flourish, and be managed by volunteers as routes to employment and further training…'* and offers *'a range of opportunities to share skills, ideas and aspirations and gain experience and certification'* (LUOS, 2014). The organisation regularly trains local people to become community leaders and excels at transforming service users into volunteers who, in turn, develop, implement and manage new project ideas for the organisation to lead. A good example of this strategy can be found in the way it operates a flexible policy towards the fees for some of its training courses (which include *'Developing Practical Gardening Skills'*, *'Beekeeping Course'*, *'Introduction to Practical Use of Herbal Medicine'*, *'Futureproof Money Connects'*) whereby those unemployed or on low incomes are able to attend for free in return for in-kind volunteering. In several cases having developed new interests after attending courses run by LUOS previously unemployed course attendees have gained qualifications and later volunteering and work experience as a result of the confidence gained through their involvement, many have gone on to lead the same courses themselves to the next cohort.

Although it may be an overstatement to describe it as a problem or a barrier to the success of the organisation it was clear from speaking to the organiser and from observing some of the projects in action that as a result of the volume of different activities in process there is very little time available for the organisation to raise funds to support the work it does.

Conclusion

The most interesting and innovative message to take from an assessment of LUOS is its focus on both the power of the individual and of people working together from diverse backgrounds to affect change within a diverse community, its reliance upon and support for its volunteers and its belief in the success of community-led and neighbourhood-focused initiatives. The work of LUOS is bigger than any one of the individual projects or initiatives which are run. What is unique and worth capturing rather is the collective approach and impact of the sum of the various aspects of the organisation's activities.

2.3   Arrangements targeting economic performance

Selby Trust / Selby Centre

Strategy, focus and organisation

The Selby Trust manages the Selby Centre (a former school premises in Tottenham) as a multi-purpose community and social enterprise centre and has three main aims: (i) *'to increase the capacity and sustainability of historically excluded groups in the diverse communities served'*; (ii) *'to promote and support, directly and through networking, a range of opportunities to enable all communities to achieve economic, social and cultural growth'*; (iii) *'to be a key place in community and economic development through partnership working at all levels – locally, London-wide, nationally and internationally'*. These aims are served by five inter-related core functions: (a) *Community Facilities Management* - Maintaining the centre as a community facility which reaches over 100 enterprises and attracts 1500 individuals on a regular basis; (b) *Community Development Centre* – Bringing grassroots partnerships and consortia together in a rich mix of cutting edge services that challenge poverty, injustice and inequality; (c) *Community Economic Development* – Achieving sustainability through social enterprise that promote growth in the local economy whilst serving social and environmental functions; (d) *Community Safety* – Encourage safer neighbourhoods with less violence, anti-social behaviour and better life chances for young people, women, offenders and ex-offenders; (e) *Community Environmental Development* – Greening the Selby Centre by creating a diverse, low carbon community as a model of good practice.

Based at the Selby Centre since 1992, with a 25 year lease from Haringey Council, the Selby Trust was registered as a Company Limited by guarantee in May 1993 and as a charity in May 1994. It is, therefore, one of the longest established organisations of its type in the area targeting economic performance and social mobility. The Trust was originally set up by local people passionate about the need for a facility led by the community and third sector organisations and constitutes a board of trustees, 21 members of paid staff and numerous volunteers. It is an explicitly area-based arrangement and sees itself as a platform from which new forms of social capital will emerge. Its activities are also designed to support local entrepreneurs by providing spaces for small businesses to expand and flourish with the goal of contributing to economic development in the area.

The Selby Centre site is 150,000 sq. ft. (13,935 square meters) containing offices, meeting rooms, training facilities, sports and events halls and a large car park. There are a wide range of organisations based at the centre including social enterprises, training centres, organisations to support vulnerable migrant groups, and infrastructure to support community activities (such as martial arts classes and cooking/gardening projects). The site is also used by a wide range of sports and

religious groups, runs its own café and restaurant, and regularly hosts community events of all sizes including weddings, funerals, and cultural ceremonies.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity

The centre is located in an area of high deprivation and brings together a diverse mix of individuals and organisations following the Selby Trust motto *'Many Cultures, One Community'* which plays a key role in shaping the work that it does for a local community which is one of the most diverse boroughs in London. Although it primarily serves Tottenham and the surrounding area, and its users are primarily from BME, refugee and other historically excluded communities, it is available for use by all people and organisations in Tottenham, Haringey and other areas of North London, as well as further afield. It produces charts every year outlining the demographics of its users who include those from Turkish, Somali, Romanian, Mauritian, Kurdish, Indian, Ghanaian, Greek-Cypriot, English, Caribbean and other backgrounds. As part of the Trust philosophy stated above it is committed to increasing the *'capacity and sustainability of historically excluded groups in* [its] *diverse communities'* and to promoting and supporting *'a range of opportunities to enable all communities to achieve economic, social and cultural growth'*[13].

Main factors influencing success or failure

The Selby Centre is locally recognised as a leading venue for community activities and one that possesses a relatively high degree of organisation, legitimacy, and stability. According to the Trust, the Centre attracts over 1500 people every day from Haringey's diverse communities and is used by over 100 community groups and local enterprises employing over 300 staff. The highly motivated Chief Executive and Board of Trustees play a key role in ensuring that the organisation is headed in the right direction and responsive to the needs of the local community. The operating arrangement of the Selby Centre as a community asset is a key success factor as it offers the Trust the significant advantage of being able to identify and pursuing its own independent goals and strategies. Another notable feature of the Selby Trust's activities is the strength and diversity of its funding sources. According to the representative we spoke to it is almost 80% self-sufficient, generating income through *"incubating and supporting social enterprises that hire out community facilities at the Selby Centre at affordable rates"* with the remainder supplemented by grants. The Global Garden, Global Kitchen project led by the Selby Trust and based at the centre is a good example of a new and innovative source of revenue explored recently where the website 'Spacehive' was used to solicit crowdfunding pledges from willing donors and managed to raise its goal of £11,104 (€13,822) to *'transform unused space into a new community food garden and kitchen where local people can learn to grow and cook a mix of produce that reflects Tottenham's diversity'*[14].

The most significant barrier facing the organisation, also related to funding and asset ownership, is the question of the lease for the Selby Centre itself. At the time of writing the 25 year lease granted by Haringey Council only has 8 years remaining and expires in January 2022. Without an extension of this lease the Trust believes it is unable to attract capital investment for the Centre and is left in a precarious position for the future.

Conclusion

The Selby Trust is an example of a dynamic organisation based in an economically deprived and ethnically diverse area of London led by community and third sector organisations which focuses on improving economic performance. It does so by maximising its community asset, the Selby

---

[13] http://www.selbytrust.co.uk/about-us
[14] http://spacehive.com/selbytrustglobalgarden

Centre, and creating innovative and sustainable sources of revenue to provide local entrepreneurs and community organisations with opportunities they would not otherwise have had to grow their businesses and tackle the deprivation and inequality which exists in the area.

Opening Doors Network

Strategy, focus and organisation

Opening Doors is described on its website as *'a new type of enterprise programme designed as an incubator for ideas and a connection hub'*.[15] It is still very much in its early stages having launched in January 2014 initially as a two-year pilot project funded by a £200k (€250,769) grant from Trust for London and the Department for Communities and Local Government. The target audience for the programme is young adults and its purpose is *'to create the next entrepreneurial generation irrespective of the chances people have had in life'*.

Following an initial suitability assessment the programme is delivered over six month's with expert workshops over either a full day or two shorter sessions at local centres and task-based learning. Ongoing information and support is available to participants for another six months who are also invited to future network events. The approach is structured around seven 'learning zones': the *'Ideas Zone'* where participants are urged to brainstorm potential business ideas; the *'Planning Zone'* where they are encouraged to develop a workable business model and plan for operationalising the idea; the *'Test Zone'* where the idea is tested out in some form of 'marketplace' and participants are introduced to effective approaches to selling, marketing and promotion; the *'Digital Zone'* where participants learn about how to maximise the potential benefits to their business from the internet and social media; the *'Launch Zone'* where participants develop leadership and self-management skills, find out about funding sources and learn to pitch their idea; the *'Network Zone'* where participants discover the value of social connections and meet potential funders, buyers and connectors; and the *'Momentum Zone'* where participants are given ongoing one-to-one personal support coinciding with self-driven action over the remaining course of the programme. Questionnaires are completed by participants before and after their participation in the programme in order to evaluate its effectiveness with the hope that business plans from successful and functioning businesses can also be used as evidence of the impact of the programme.

Opening Doors is currently operated in three areas of London (Brent, Haringey and Croydon), with four separate cohorts of approximately 15-17 participants in each area starting the programme in January 2014, April 2014, November 2014 and February 2015 respectively. Each area is led by a different local organisation and the project is coordinated by BTEG (Black Training and Enterprise Group) which is a national organisation that *'champions fairness and economic justice and pioneers innovative solutions through enterprise, employment and education'*.

In Haringey Opening Doors is led by Tottenham Hotspur Foundation which is the charitable arm of Tottenham Hotspur Football Club and a recognised training and development organisation based in Haringey. Some of the examples of businesses being launched in Haringey as a result of the programme include: a low sugar home-made Jamaican drink made from sorrel and ginger; naturally made beauty products, consultations and treatments; Photography services; and a business specialising in importing women's hair from Brazil for wigs and hair extensions. One member of Foundation staff is directly responsible for coordinating the project with support from colleagues (such as in-house PR specialists) where necessary. In addition to a wide range of recreational and elite sport related programmes Tottenham Hotspur Foundation is also involved

---

[15] http://www.openingdoorsnet.biz/content/about-us

in delivering a wide range of other programmes such as those aimed at mentoring 16-19 year olds either in or leaving care; apprenticeships for those not in education, employment or training (NEET); support for young disabled people to transition from school to further education, work or volunteering; and various health and well-being related projects among many other things.

Perception and use of the concept of diversity
Opening Doors is explicitly focused on addressing diversity, describing itself as being led by a *'partnership of highly experienced organisations and individuals passionate about enterprise, social mobility and the economic transformation of diverse communities'*. The three boroughs involved in the pilot phase were chosen as they were considered to be the most in need of this sort of programme following the riots of August 2011 which underscored high levels of deprivation and inequality in these areas. The Tottenham Hotspur Foundation representative interviewed was conscious that Haringey in general, and Tottenham in particular, is *"incredibly diverse"* so in promoting the programme to everyone in the local area they expected that there would be *"lots of BME groups and participants"*. In fact all of the participants in the programme in Haringey so far are of Black African or Black Caribbean ethnic origins. There was a sense from the interview that Tottenham Hotspur Foundation were proud of what they described as their *"very inclusive approach"* at the foundation and suspected that their *"track record of working with a wide range of diversities and demographics"* had factored into the decision by BTEG to involve them in the programme.

Main factors influencing success or failure
The greatest challenges facing the Opening Doors Network were described by one of our interviewees as the amount of time and effort it took before the project could be implemented, describing how it took a series of all-day meetings in central London over a period of several years. The fact that a project funded by central government with such a relatively small number of participants (approximately 70 in each of the 3 areas) was able to come to fruition was seen as particularly unique by one of our interviewees. The main practical challenges affecting the implementation of the project related to the nature of the project in seeking to work with the long-term unemployed who our interviewee found faced significant social problems such as eviction from their homes and phones being disconnected and often struggled with punctuality and attendance, which our interviewee described as *"the sorts of things that make it completely impossible to become an entrepreneur or trader"* which meant that many participants had to be chased to fulfil their obligations.

The main strength of the Tottenham Hotspur Foundation involvement in the Opening Doors Network was the way in which it utilised its brand recognition and existing networks to offer participants the most effective programme by involving its external partners in either recruitment or delivery of the programme including Barclays Bank, Sainsbury's, Haringey Council, local mentoring services and other external specialist companies.

Conclusion
The Opening Doors Network represents an interesting example of an initiative which both focuses on increasing economic performance among diverse communities and which is funded in part by central government, both of which are somewhat uncommon in the contemporary UK context. Funded initially as a pilot scheme it remains to be seen if the project will continue after its initial two-year funding cycle, although our interviewee noted that it may possibly be extended in a different form or in other boroughs in the future.

3   Synthesis and analysis of the results

Synthesis of the investigated governance arrangements

Table 1: Contribution of the governance arrangements towards the three main objectives

Governance arrangements	Social cohesion	Social mobility	Economic performance
Haringey Play Streets	***		
Vacant Lot	***	*	
Streetlife.com	***		
Our Tottenham Network	***	**	*
Highgate Neighbourhood Forum	***		*
Haringey Muslim Network	**	***	
Haringey Young Advisors Integration Programme	**	***	*
Project 2020	**	***	*
Living Under One Sun	***	***	***
Selby Trust / Selby Centre	*	**	***
Opening Doors Network		**	***

* = low contribution; ** = medium contribution; *** = high contribution

The initiatives discussed above give a powerful insight into the range and scope of contemporary urban policy initiatives in Haringey and London. They shed light on the often tangled relationships between conceptions of diversity and policy interventions and outcomes. We have demonstrated that resource-intensive initiatives that promote diverse forms of economic development are relatively thin on the ground and are becoming more so given the financial constraints of government bodies. This reflects what is happening not only in London but across England (see Raco et al., 2014; Tallon, 2012). Most projects, therefore, focus on different forms of social cohesion and, to a lesser extent, social mobility (as demonstrated by *Table 1* above). Despite reductions in funding for urban projects, there is still a large degree of area-based activity, particularly in relation to arrangements driven by local community groups and the activities of committed individuals. They are underpinned by the belief that *collective communicative interaction* forms the basis of successful urban community-building.

Most of the arrangements are implicitly or explicitly premised on the belief that opportunities for such interaction are becoming more limited in a context of growing hyper-diversity. As the city has become more cosmopolitan and economically dynamic there is a threat that social bonds and interactions are becoming more disconnected, transient, and 'liquid' in form (see Bauman, 2003; Hall, 2007; Savage et al., 2005). A number of schemes, therefore, use collective projects and shared endeavours as a means of building trust and interaction. Policies have evolved that seek to build on the existence of hyper-diversity and use it a positive asset. Social networks and interactions provide a particularly powerful basis for the mobilisation of projects in a context where a hyper-diversity of skills, experiences, and cross-boundary social networks are present.

Other community activities have emerged in response to the acute pressures generated by 'growth' agendas in London and the threats posed by globally-oriented and elite-driven urban projects. They are often concerned with maintaining and/or enhancing existing forms of hyper-

diversity and are opposed to gentrification projects that will benefit a relatively small number of investors and selective citizens. Collective political action to contest such projects is generating some intense forms of engagement between citizens and there is evidence that a vibrant local political culture is emerging based on the defence of public services, social housing, and community spaces from private incursions. Urban conflict can, therefore, act as a resource as different interests argue over the meaning of hyper-diversity and quality of life in urban neighbourhoods. Other attempts are being made to reclaim public space for social interaction by, for example, making streets safer for children and families. Alongside these efforts to use physical space to build social cohesion, there are also efforts to boost virtual interactions and to establish place-focussed virtual communities. Moreover, projects that are seen to be achieving tangible outcomes have been amongst the most successful in terms of garnering wider support and building on their stated objectives. The physical environment is treated as a resource for such projects and used to build a sense of place in a context of hyper-diversity.

In more concrete terms, projects to promote social mobility mainly focus on the softer skills and characteristics of individuals rather than the direct creation of jobs or work placements/apprenticeships. Enhanced social mobility, it is claimed, will result from measures that reduce anti-social behaviour and encourage young citizens to develop their individual skills and employability. This is a reflection of broader neo-liberal shifts in thinking about welfare in which responsibility for policy outcomes has been transferred from state bodies to individuals and communities, albeit with some support from enabling local governments (see Crouch, 2011; Rose, 2006).

Some community-led efforts are also being made to create spaces for entrepreneurialism which will help to boost the number of jobs and employment opportunities in the area and, it is hoped, boost local skill levels, economic activity, and social mobility. The long term threat of property-led regeneration in the area is being, in part, mitigated by the existence of these incubator spaces for small businesses but their longer-term survival is far from assured. As the report has shown, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a diversity of opportunities and economic activities in the area. This will have serious longer-term social implications if it is not tackled.

Conceptualisations of diversity

Most of the projects discussed in this report celebrate, promote, and/or defend a pluralist conception of diversity. They aim, in their different ways, to encourage greater use of public spaces by different groups and celebrate the existence of hyper-diversity. They are opposed to privatisation or marketization in ways that impact on the use of public spaces and the basic requirements of urban living; such as affordable local housing and access to employment opportunities. Many projects are underpinned by a strong belief in the value of diverse encounters in the city and broader conceptions of what Pilch (2006) terms 'neighbourliness', or urban living that reconciles the '*prospect of perpetual coexistence* [with] *the art of peaceful and humane cohabitation*' (Latour, 1998: 79; see also Purcell, 2013). In Fincher and Iveson's (2008) terms groups seek to use projects to attain enhanced *recognition* of their needs and, in some cases, their very existence. If they are able to do this effectively then projects could act as '*a crucial means to challenge injustice by de-naturalising assumptions about proper forms of urban conduct and urban forms which underpin planning and governance, making them open to debate and to political determination by diverse publics*' (Fincher and Iveson, 2008: 120).

Few of the arrangements explicitly target 'diversity' in framing their objectives and proposed outcomes. The emphasis instead has been on a combination of area-based initiatives to improve local environments and community-based arrangements in which efforts are made to establish greater social cohesion and new cultures of engagement. Some projects *de facto* target specific social groups, particularly the young. But most present themselves as pluralist, open, and available

to all. They are place-focussed and embrace the fact that local populations are diverse in social, economic, and cultural ways. They promote a form of soft integration built on mutual recognition and collective place-focussed endeavours. These are not designed to eliminate diversity but to support community-building in the wake of major, globally-driven economic and social changes taking place in London.

We are also seeing, what Massey (2005) terms, a more progressive sense of place emerging in which local actors see their initiatives as the basis for providing positive examples of policy practice that can be used to promote wider benefits to communities outside of their immediate areas. This, once again, reflects the hyper-diversity of those living in the area and their relational networks with those living beyond its boundaries. By re-claiming existing spaces and using these to foster greater social contacts between different groups, it is hoped and expected that new alliances, identities, and ways of working can be established. Some of the organisations discussed above have become part of broader networks with groups across London and elsewhere. Haringey has attracted widespread national attention as a place of conflict in which the London riots of 2011 were initiated (see Mayor of London, 2012). Local groups are determined to forge a different narrative of place, in which the hyper-diversity of local communities is seen as an asset. There has been a conscious effort to break down the negative stigma given to the area by outsiders and to associate Haringey and areas such as Tottenham with progressive examples of contemporary urban policy success.

Main factors influencing the success and failure of projects

Project *funding and finances* are key factors in influencing the successes and limitations of the initiatives studied in this report. It is not only the scale of financing that matters, but also: its sustainability; the security/insecurity it generates for local actors; the extent to which it is conditional on meeting the quantitative targets and objectives set by funding agencies; and the flexibility in its use. Austerity cut-backs to local authority budgets have put greater onus on alternative forms of funding. Projects that rely on state funding have (and will be) particularly vulnerable to change. Therefore a *diversity* of funding sources is a success factor as is the ability of agencies to establish strong forms of partnership working. Charitable Trust models of financing are particularly innovative and successful. The case of the Selby Centre has proved to be a particularly resilient source of finance. As a charity and company limited by guarantee it has a security and flexibility in its funding streams that enables the Board of Trustees to allocate resources in ways that meet locally articulated demands. It is also supported directly, and in kind, by the local authority and this type of partnership working has enabled the Trust to expand its range of innovative and successful activities. There is little evidence in our cases that quantitative targets improve the quality and success of projects. In some cases their absence opens up opportunities for greater local innovation and entrepreneurialism.

Alongside funding one of the most significant issues facing local actors is that of *asset ownership*. Where assets are owned and/or managed by local actors, there are enhanced opportunities to promote initiatives that draw on and develop positive aspects of hyper-diversity. This can take various forms. In some cases they are being delivered through local authority support in which assets are held in trust or on-loan. In other instances they have emerged through innovative forms of local public-private partnership in which private landowners have been happy to use their assets in the pursuit of a wider public good. The difficulty with such schemes is that there is much uncertainty over the use of assets in the longer term. Development pressures and funding cuts mean that assets can be commodified at any time, making it difficult to plan and to invest. Policy interventions that cater for and support hyper-diversity can only be successful if the issue of asset ownership is targeted.

Other more qualitative factors have influenced success and failure. Projects that rely on community resources have been remarkably successful in Haringey, often as a consequence of *local leadership and traditions of community engagement*. The existence of a vibrant local political culture helps to develop this engagement and policy should seek to build on and support these more qualitative aspects of urban policy. The reliance on voluntary action is, however, also a potential vulnerability. As projects expand and become more complex so the need for more voluntary engagement increases. The limited capacities of individuals to undertake such work in the longer term can become a major obstacle to the effectiveness of initiatives. The presence of a hyper-diversity of citizens can help to ameliorate this as it provides a deep pool of skills and expertise from which to draw.

4   Conclusions

Hyper-diversity is often presented in the policy and academic literature as a significant new policy challenge that threatens to make existing territorially-based modes of governance ineffective, outdated, and irrelevant (see Tasan-Kok et al., 2013). As outlooks change, it is claimed, so the importance of the 'local' is diminished and urban policy has had to adapt to the new realities. However, in this report we have shown that local action still matters and has co-evolved with the growing hyper-diversity of cities. Far from being a barrier to effective action, hyper-diversity acts as a platform from which initiatives and purposeful actions can emerge. As other EU research has found, it is at the local level in which the day-to-day realities of hyper-diversity are experienced that some of the most innovative, positive, and effective forms of urban policy are to be found (European Commission, 2010). The (co)presence of different outlooks, skills, networks, and ways of viewing urban problems becomes an asset, rather than a problem for policy-making processes. Hyper-diversity does not mean that place-based issues and problems become less relevant. In many instances it encourages citizens and policy-makers to think more creatively about what their urban areas are becoming and how they can be improved for the good of those residing in them. Moreover, the more hyper-diverse a place the more likely it is that local projects will be able to tap into relational knowledge networks and understandings from a variety of places. New ways of thinking and progressive modes of working might also be transferred to other places more easily.

5   References

Legal documents and policy programmes

DCLG (2011) Localism Act (in particular Part 5: Community empowerment; Part 6: Planning (chapter 3 neighbourhood planning); Part 8: London)
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted.

Reviewed documents and sources of the selected governance arrangements

Haringey Play Streets
- Rose, Amy and Ferguson, Alice (2012) *Playing Out: A Step-by-Step Manual for Organisers* (v.6), 148 North St, Bedminster, Bristol, BS3 1HA, http://www.playingout.net.
- Haringey Council (2013) *Play Streets Cabinet Report*, December 2013, online http://www.haringey.gov.uk/playstreets_report_for_cabinet_on_17.12.13.pdf, accessed 29/05/2014.
- Haringey People Magazine, *Rolling out Haringey Play Streets*, February – March 2014 Issue, Haringey Council, http://www.haringey.gov.uk, Page 23.
- Haringey Play Streets Facebook Page (2014), online http://www.facebook.com/groups/553352248089532/.
- Haringey Play Streets (2014), online http://www.haringey.gov.uk/index/environment_and_transport/roadsandstreets/playstreets.htm, accessed 29/05/2014.
- Haringey Play Streets (2014) *Play Streets Information and Application Pack*, online http://www.haringey.gov.uk/playstreet_info_pack.doc, accessed 29/05/2014.
- Haringey Play Streets (2014) *Play Streets Appendix 1 – conditions of application*, online http://www.haringey.gov.uk/appendix_1_play_streets_condition_of_application_.pdf.
- Haringey Play Streets (2014) *Play Streets Appendix 2 – unsuitable streets*, online http://www.haringey.gov.uk/appendix_2_play_streets_.pdf.

Vacant Lot
- Vacant Lot (2014), online http://www.what-if.info/Vacant_Lot_allotment_programme.html.
- Vacant Lot Facebook Page (2014), online https://www.facebook.com/VACANT.LOT.friends.
- Wright, Hermione (2012), Vegetable plots for all in Hornsey Mildura Court flats, Haringey Independent, 2nd July 2012, online http://www.haringeyindependent.co.uk/news/9792599.Vegetable_plots_for_all_in_Hornsey_flats/.

Streetlife.com
- Streetlife.com (2014), *About*, online http://www.streetlife.com/about/.
- Streetlife.com (2014), *Research*, online http://www.streetlife.com/research/.
- Streetlife.com (2014), *How social networking can strengthen community spirit*, YouGov survey commissioned by streetlife.com, online https://www.streetlife.com/s/press/Streetlife_YouGov_Survey_-_Community_Spirit.pdf.
- Streetlife.com (2014), *How councils can use social media to strengthen community spirit*, YouGov survey commissioned by streetlife.com, online https://www-static.streetlife.com/s/press/Streetlife_Community_Survey_-_Council.pdf.
- Streetlife.com (2014), *How the police can use social media to strengthen community spirit*, YouGov survey commissioned by streetlife.com, online https://www-static.streetlife.com/s/press/Streetlife_Community_Survey_-_Police.pdf.

Our Tottenham Network
- Our Tottenham (2013) *Our Tottenham – A community charter. Planning & Regeneration by and for the Community. As agreed and launched by the Our Tottenham conference on Saturday April 6th 2013*, online http://ourtottenham.org.uk/?page_id=13.

- Our Tottenham (2014), *Affiliates to the Our Tottenham Network*, online http://ourtottenham.org.uk/?page_id=31.

Highgate Neighbourhood Forum
- Highgate Neighbourhood Forum (2014) *About us*, online http://www.highgateneighbourhoodforum.org.uk/about.

Young Advisors Integration Programme
- Young Advisors (2014) *Haringey – Helping homeless people in their community*, online http://www.youngadvisors.org.uk/case-studies/community-cohesion/haringey.
- Young Advisors (2014) *What are Young Advisors?*, online http://www.youngadvisors.org.uk/case-studies/community-cohesion/haringey.

Project 2020
- Homes for Haringey (2013), *Equality and Diversity Strategy 2011-2013*, online http://www.homesforharingey.org/equalities_and_diversity_strategy_2011-2013.pdf/.
- Homes for Haringey (2014), *Project 2020*, online http://www.homesforharingey.org/almo/project2020.htm.
- Homes for Haringey (2014) *About Project 2020*, online http://www.homesforharingey.org/almo/project2020/about_project_2020.htm.
- Homes for Haringey (2014) 'Off Road' is officially declared open, Thursday 31st January 2013, online http://www.homesforharingey.org/off_road_is_officially_declared_open.htm.
- Project 2020 Update Winter 2014, online http://www.homesforharingey.org/project_2020_update_feb_2014_final.pdf.
- Business in the Community (2013) *Race for Opportunity Awards 2013 – Homes for Haringey – Future Workforce Award (Public Sector)*, online http://raceforopportunity.bitc.org.uk/tools-case-studies/case-studies/awards-2013-homes-haringey-future-workforce-award-public-sector.
- Andalo, D. (2014), The social housing organisation trying new ways to help people find jobs. The Guardian. Accessed: http://www.theguardian.com/public-leaders-network/2014/may/31/project-2020-homes-for-haringey-employment, 1 June 2014.
- Fearn, H. (2013), Homes for Haringey: grassroots runner-up. *The Guardian*. Accessed: http://www.theguardian.com/public-leaders-network/2013/nov/13/home-for-haringey-public-services-awards, 1 June 2014.
- Dandelion Project (2013) No longer NEET: Young, gifted – and finally working. Accessed: http://dandelionproject.org/pub/no-longer-neet.

Living Under One Sun
- Living Under One Sun (2014), *About*, online http://www.livingunderonesun.co.uk.

Selby Trust / Selby Centre
- The Selby Trust (2014), *About Us*, online http://www.selbytrust.co.uk/about-us.
- The Selby Trust (2014), *On Site Organisations*, online http://www.selbytrust.co.uk/about/on-site-organisations.
- The Selby Trust (2014), *Raising awareness and involvement on energy efficient campaigns*, online http://www.selbytrust.co.uk/green-hub.
- The Selby Trust (2011), *'Amazing model' of Big Society in action faces uncertain future*, 25 February 2011, online http://www.selbytrust.co.uk/articles/%E2%80%98amazing-model%E2%80%99-big-society-action-faces-uncertain-future.
- The Selby Trust, *Current Update on Selby Trust*, online http://www.haringey.gov.uk/selby_centre_current_update-2.pdf.
- Global Garden, Global Kitchen (2014), online http://spacehive.com/selbytrustglobalgarden.

Opening Doors Network
- Opening Doors Network (2014) *How does it work?*, online
  http://www.openingdoorsnet.biz/content/how-does-it-work.
- BTEG (2014) *Opening Doors Network: The Enterprise Programme*, online
  http://www.bteg.co.uk/content/opening-doors-network-enterprise-programme.

Bibliography

Bauman, Z. (2003), *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Crouch, C. (2011), *The Strange Non-death of Neo-liberalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

European Commission (2010), *World and European Sustainable Cities – Insights from EU Research*. European Commission, Brussels.

Fincher, R. and K. Iveson (2008), *Planning and Diversity in the City: Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haringey Council (2012,) A *Plan for Tottenham. London: London Borough of Haringey* http://www.haringey.gov.uk/a_plan_for_tottenham.pdf.

Hall, P. (2007), *London Voices, London Lives*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Holman, N. and Y. Rydin (2013), What can social capital tell us about planning under localism? *Local Government Studies*, 39(1), 71-88.

Kooiman, J. (2000), 'Societal Governance: Levels, Modes, and Orders of Social-Political Interaction', in: Pierre, Jon (Ed.). Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy. Oxford: University Press: 138-164.

Latour, B. (1998), 'Ein Ding ist ein Thing', *Concepts and Transformations* 1–2: 97–111.

Massey, D. (2005), *For Space*. London: Sage.

Mayor of London's Independent Panel on Tottenham (2012), *It took another riot. Final Report*. London: GLA. http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/It%20Took%20Another%20Riot.pdf.

ONS Office for National Statistics (2014a), Area: Haringey (Local Authority). Key Figures for 2011 Census: Key Statistics. http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadPage.do?pageId=1004&tc=1403005497331&a=7&b=6275119&c=Haringey&d=13&e=62&g=6326901&i=1001x1003x1032x1004x1011&m=0&r=1&s=1403005497331&enc=1.

ONS Office for National Statistics (2014b), Area: Haringey (Local Authority). Ethnic Group, 2011 (KS201EW). http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275119&c=Haringey&d=13&e=62&g=6326901&i=1001x1003x1032x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1403003140586&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2477.

ONS Office for National Statistics (2014c), Area: Haringey (Local Authority). Ethnic Group, 2011. Households by Deprivation Dimensions, 2011 (QS119EW). http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275119&c=Haringey&d=13&e=61&g=6326901&i=1001x1003x1032x1004&o=362&m=0&r=1&s=1403003687461&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2520.

Pilch, T. ed. (2006), *Neighbourliness*. London: Smith Institute.

Purcell, M. (2013), *The Down-Deep Delight of Democracy*. London: Wiley & Sons.

Raco, M., Kesten, J. and Colomb, C. (2014), *Report 2f: Assessment of Urban Policies in London, UK*. Brussels: European Commission.

Savage, M., Bagnall, G. and Longhurst, B. (2005), *Globalisation and Belonging*. London: Sage.

Tallon, A. (2012), *Urban Regeneration in the UK*. London: Routledge.

Tasan-Kok, T.; van Kempen, R.; Raco, M. and G. Bolt (2013), *Report 1a Towards Hyper-Diversified European Cities: A Critical Literature Review*. Brussels: European Commission.

6   Appendix

List of the interviewed persons

- Haringey Play Streets (25/03/14):
    - Representative – Haringey Council
- VACANT LOT (28/03/14):
    - Representative – What if: Projects Ltd
    - Representative – What if: Projects Ltd
- Streetlife.com (28/03/14):
    - Representative – Streetlife.com
- Our Tottenham Network (January – May 2014):
    - Participant observation at various public meetings of the Our Tottenham Coordination Group
- Highgate Neighbourhood Forum (10/06/2014):
    - Representative – Highgate Neighbourhood Forum Committee
- Young Advisors Integration Programme (12/05/14):
    - Representative – Haringey Council
- Project 2020 (08/04/14):
    - Representative – Homes for Haringey
    - Representative – Homes for Haringey
- Living Under One Sun (20/05/14):
    - Representative – Living Under One Sun
- Selby Trust / Selby Centre (25/04/14):
    - Representative – Selby Trust
- Opening Doors Network (12/06/14):
    - Representative – Tottenham Hotspur Foundation
    - Representative – Tottenham Hotspur Foundation

List of the participants of the round-table talk

Date: June 26, 2014

Place: Selby Centre, Selby Road, Tottenham, London, N17 8JL

- Representative – Selby Trust
- Trustee – Selby Trust
- Representative – What if: Projects Ltd (Vacant Lot)
- Representative – Homes for Haringey (Project 2020)
- Representative – Haringey Council (Haringey Young Advisors Integration Programme)
- Young Advisor – Haringey Young Advisors Integration Programme
- Representative – Living Under One Sun
- Representative – Tottenham Hotspurs Foundation (Opening Doors Network)
- Representative – Finsbury Park Trust