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| Executive Summary Spatial planning decisions can have significant impacts on social cohesion and integration within an area. If we are to optimise outcomes, the scope for delivering positive long-term outcomes for social cohesion must be recognised and specific policies adopted to achieve this.  This paper has gathered evidence on the most effective planning policies for promoting social cohesion, in particular those best suited to the specific environment and characteristics of the East of the Borough. Drawing upon this evidence base and discussions with colleagues across the Council, we have set out recommendations of policies to be incorporated into the Area Action Plan that are aimed at promoting social cohesion.  We recommend including policies that support the:   * Delivery of shared public spaces, both in the form of community hubs and open spaces. * Provision of low-traffic neighbourhoods and play streets. * Delivery of inter-generational public spaces and homes. * Varied use of existing and newly provided recreational spaces by the community e.g. schools opening their grounds to the community after hours and on weekends. * Provision of meanwhile spaces that allow for the activation and use of abandoned or derelict spaces by the community. |
| Introduction This document has been prepared to support the development of the East of the Borough Area Action Plan (AAP). Its purpose is to consider how the Council’s commitment to improving social cohesion and integration within the borough can be delivered through the planning system.  The paper will outline the challenges, opportunities and importance of embedding cohesion in Tower Hamlets; the particular importance of considering cohesion in planning for the East of the Borough; the Cohesion policy context and a summary of relevant research on planning and cohesion. Finally, the paper will outline a number of recommended policy interventions for use in developing the AAP.  This paper will draw on the objectives, research and outcomes of key existing Council workstreams, including:   * The Draft Cohesion Plan (waiting to go to Cabinet) * [The Community Cohesion Pilot Programme](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/The_cohesion_programme.aspx) * [The Communities Driving Change Programme](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/health__social_care/public_health/Communities_Driving_Change.aspx) * [The High Density Living Supplementary Planning Document](https://talk.towerhamlets.gov.uk/highdensity/widgets/11180/faqs) * [The Social Integration Design Lab](https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/all-us-mayors-strategy-social-integration/social-integration-design-lab) (GLA-led project) |
| Cohesion challenges, opportunities and importance What do we mean by Cohesion?  Tower Hamlets has adopted the definition of Community Cohesion linked to the Cantle and Denham reports[[1]](#footnote-1). This definition is widely accepted and is embedded in both national and regional approaches to social integration.  It states that *a cohesive society is one in which:*   * *there is a common vision and sense of belonging by all communities;* * *the diversity of people’s backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and valued;* * *similar life opportunities are available to all; and* * *Strong and positive relationships exist and continue to be developed in the workplace, in schools and in the wider community.*   Why Cohesion?   * Without community cohesion diversity can become a source of division as has been seen during race riots in places like Bradford in 2001. * Effective community cohesion means people can develop connections and shared identities which incorporate their differences and ensure diversity remains a strength. * High levels of inequality and reduced public spending on those most in need present genuine challenges for cohesion. * Stronger, more diverse social networks are vital in helping people from all backgrounds access opportunities. * Increased trust and belonging can help improve health and wellbeing, reduce loneliness and isolation, reduce crime, and increase support for equal rights. This can create a healthier, safer and fairer society   Annual Resident’s Survey Results  The council’s Annual Residents' Survey results covers data from the whole Borough. We know through our residents’ survey (2019)[[2]](#footnote-2) that 78 percent of residents feel thattheir local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together. This compares favourably against the London average of 75 per cent[[3]](#footnote-3).  Whilst residents’ views remain positive, there has been a significant shift between 2018 and 2019. Satisfaction for the local area saw an 8 percentage point dip. Equally there was a significant shift in the number of residents who agreed that people from different backgrounds get on well together (a fall of 8 per cent).[[4]](#footnote-4)  The ARS 2019 also shows that 77% of people feel that public services treat all types of people fairly and seven in ten people (70 per cent) are satisfied with their area as a place to live. Just over half of all respondents (52 per cent) felt they could influence decisions affecting their area.[[5]](#footnote-5)  86 per cent of residents feel safe during the day as opposed to only 58 per cent feeling safe after dark. In comparison, and at a national level, 94 per cent of residents feel safe during the day and 76 per cent of residents feel safe after dark (LGA Inform, February 2019).[[6]](#footnote-6)  Demographics  The AAP area predominantly sits within the Lansbury and Bromley South wards; hence we have used demographic indicators for these wards as proxies for the whole AAP area where smaller scale geographical data was not available.  The following LSOAs sit within the AAP core area: 008D, 018A, 018B, 018C, 018D, 020A, 020C, 028G. We have not included 012C and 008E in the data because only a small proportion of the LSOA sits within the AAP Area.  Inequality / poverty:   * Tower Hamlets is the 27th most deprived local authority in England, in terms of its average deprivation score[[7]](#footnote-7). This is an improvement on its 2015 ranking of 6th most deprived borough in England. The average IMD 2019 rank for the AAP area is 6,418, where 1 is the most deprived and 32,844 is the least deprived. This means that the area is within the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods in England. However, within the AAP area there are pockets of significantly greater deprivation; the LSOAs vary between sitting within the 8% most deprived LSOAs and the 50% most deprived LSOAs. * Tower Hamlets has the second highest rate of pensioner poverty in England: the Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI)[[8]](#footnote-8) showed it to be the second most deprived borough in 2019. These levels of deprivation are present in the AAP area with all but two LSOAs in the area falling within the 10% most deprived according to the IDAOPI. * The Borough also has the highest rate of child poverty in the UK, with 39% of children living in income deprived households. Child poverty is even more acute in Lansbury ward, where 46% of children live in income deprived households, and Bromley South where 41% of children live in income deprived households[[9]](#footnote-9). * It is estimated that around four in ten households in Tower Hamlets are living below the poverty line, after housing costs are taken into account. This is the highest poverty rate across all local authorities in England and Wales, and almost double the national average (39 vs. 21 per cent).   Religious and ethnic diversity:  Our 2018 Borough profile shows that the borough is ranked as the 16th most ethnically diverse local authority in England in terms of the mix of different ethnic group populations. More than two thirds of our residents belong to minority ethnic groups. Tower Hamlets is home to the largest Bangladeshi population in the country, making up 32 per cent of our population. More than four in ten residents (43 per cent) were born outside the UK. Residents born in Bangladesh are the single biggest migrant group, but the most significant population growth in recent years was among EU nationals.  Lansbury and Bromley South are particularly ethnically diverse. At the time of the 2011 census, 64% of residents in Lansbury and 70% in Bromley South were BME; this compares to 54% of residents in LBTH and 40% in London. The largest ethnic group in both Lansbury and Bromley South is Bangladeshi (39% and 42% respectively) This ethnic group is more heavily represented in these wards than for the borough as a whole, where 32% of people described their ethnicity as Bangladeshi.  The same census showed that for both Lansbury and Bromley South a lower proportion of residents had English as their first language and a higher proportion did not speak English well or at all, as compared to LBTH as a whole. English was the main language of 64% of residents aged 3 and above in Lansbury, with 10% of residents not speaking English well or at all. In Bromley South, English was the main language of 61% and 11% of residents did not speak English well or at all. Across the borough, English was the main language of 66% of residents, and 9% of residents could not speak English well or at all.  38 per cent of our residents are Muslim – the highest proportion in the UK. In both Lansbury and Bromley South, the percentage of residents who identified themselves as Muslim was higher than the borough average, at 42.9% and 47.6%.  Age:  Tower Hamlets has the 4th youngest population in the UK. Almost half of our residents (46 per cent) are aged 20-39 (Borough Profile 2018).  Lansbury ward has the highest proportion of residents aged 0-15 years old in the borough at 28%, with Bromley South close behind at 27%[[10]](#footnote-10).  Health/loneliness and isolation:  The councils 2019 Annual Resident Survey reported that 1% felt lonely often/always, 8% some of the time and 18% occasionally. This is roughly in line with London-wide findings. The national figure in 2017 was 6% who frequently feel lonely but another 15% said they sometimes feel lonely. The national Community Survey data suggests that loneliness is higher (8%) in urban areas and higher in deprived areas.  Age UK publish a heat map of loneliness for older people based on factors such as living alone, widow or widower and health condition status and this highlights areas across the borough as high risk for loneliness amongst older people including Samuda Estate, East India and Lansbury, Shadwell, Whitechapel and Stepney, Weaver and Bow East. However, in Bromley South the percentage of pensioners living alone is significantly lower than the borough average, which could mean lower levels of loneliness for older people within this ward[[11]](#footnote-11).  Growth figures:  According to the Tower Hamlets Borough profile 2018[[12]](#footnote-12), Tower Hamlets is the fastest growing local authority in the UK in terms of population and the second most densely populated local authority in the UK, next to Islington.  Since 1986, the population in Tower Hamlets has more than doubled. As of June 2017 the Borough had a resident population of 308,000. Our population is projected to reach 365,200 by 2027 and 400,000 by 2041.  Over 54,000 new homes are expected to be built in the borough by 2030/31.  Both East India and Lansbury[[13]](#footnote-13) (now Lansbury ward), and Bromley-by-Bow[[14]](#footnote-14) (now Bromley South ward) are projected to see their population rise by more than the borough average of 29% between 2015 and 2030. |
| AAP area and the importance of cohesion Map of AAP Area  Overview of the geography of the AAP Area:  The AAP core area, outlined on the map in pink, is the area which the new planning policies will apply to. The wider reference area, outlined on the map in orange, is being used to inform the evidence base which will support the plan development. This wider reference area has been developed to reflect the fact that facilities in the wider area are used by residents within the AAP Core Area and vice versa and that growth in the wider area will also impact on residents in the AAP Core Area.  The AAP Core Area encompasses a number of different neighbourhoods and character areas. This includes existing residential neighbourhoods, in particular three large post war housing estates: the Brownfield Estate, which has been recently regenerated, the Aberfeldy estate, where regeneration is ongoing and the Teviot Estate where regeneration is anticipated. The area, particularly the land directly adjacent to the river Lea has historically been a focus for industrial activity. In recent years, many of the larger industrial uses in the area have left and many of these sites are becoming residential developments. This includes City Island and Goodluck Hope at the south of the site as well as the Leven Road Gasworks development. The core area encompasses areas of industrial and cultural workspaces, including the borough’s only Strategic Industrial Location at Empson Street, the unique creative enclave at Trinity Buoy Wharf and the Blackwall Trading Estate. Some new development is seeking to deliver both industrial and residential uses on the same site, including at Gillender Street and the Poplar Works infill scheme.  The Area boundary is formed by, and encompasses, a number of natural barriers which divide the core Area into these district character areas. These include the River Lea to the east, the DLR tracks to the west, the A12 running parallel to the River Lea, the canal to the north and the A13 and river Thames to the south.  The AAP area has been identified as an opportunity area in both the current and emerging London Plans. Opportunity Areas are considered to be London’s main opportunities for accommodating large-scale new development to provide substantial numbers of new employment and housing, due to transport connectivity, land availability and deliverability. Reflecting this area’s status as an Opportunity Area, it is expected that a considerable number of new homes could be delivered in this area, as well as significant amounts of workspace and retail space.  The area’s geography, land use changes and growth focus create unique challenges and opportunities for embedding community cohesion, which the AAP should seek to consider and address. These are outlined below.  Spatial Severance  As outlined above the geography of the AAP Area has resulted in relatively isolated neighbourhoods, requiring long, convoluted and unpleasant journeys to reach community facilities or even adjacent neighbourhoods. For example, the TFL London Street Family study identified the A12 as ‘severing development land in Tower Hamlets from the rest of the borough’[[15]](#footnote-15).  The design of some of the residential estates, in seeking to reduce the impact of the surrounding roads, has created enclosed neighbourhoods which discourage people from taking routes through. This reduces the opportunities for residents and workers from different parts of the area to meet and use shared facilities. It has also created a number of areas where low footfall has led to safety concerns, further reducing the use of those spaces.  Rate of Growth  The scale and pace of change in the area is expected to be significant, reducing the time and space available for existing communities to incorporate and become accustomed to new developments. Both East India and Lansbury[[16]](#footnote-16), and Bromley-by-Bow[[17]](#footnote-17) are projected to see their population rise by more than the borough average of 29% between 2015 and 2030. This rapid rate of change may cause residents to feel excluded or estranged from their changing neighbourhood. Additionally, this may place short term pressure on local services, also causing cohesion challenges.  Conversely some of the larger new developments may take up to twenty years to be built out, potentially creating incomplete neighbourhoods and causing long term disruption from construction. This does also provide opportunities for meanwhile uses to bring residents together and into new developments and for residents to be involved in designing and/or creating aspects of new developments.  In additional to the predicted scale of change and the influx of new residents, this area is already affected by high rates of population churn. For all but one LSOA within the core area, the percentage of households to have changed occupier from 2012 to 2016 was between 40% and 70%[[18]](#footnote-18). This could make it harder for residents to form lasting relationships with other people living in the community.  New Communities  In parts of the AAP area, in particular those adjacent to the river Lea, residential developments are being built for the first time. There are therefore limited established community facilities and organisations[[19]](#footnote-19) which may otherwise be new residents’ first port of call to meet neighbours or get to know more about their neighbourhood and activities taking place.  In some of the established residential neighbourhoods in the AAP area, regeneration and new housing development has resulted in significant changes to the residential population. The proximity to Canary Wharf and good transport links into the City, has attracted younger more mobile professionals for whom the local area may be of less importance than the connections to other areas. Evidence from the [Aberfeldy Listening Campaign](file://Thpnas01/shared/Development%20%26%20Renewal/P%26BC/STRAT%20PLANNING/PLAN%20MAKING/STP%20PROJECTS/East%20of%20the%20Borough%20AAP/3.%20Evidence/Social%20Cohesion/Evidence%20and%20Ideas/Aberfeldy%20Listening%20Campaign%20report%20Dec%202016(3).pdf) suggests that these change may have already impacted the sense of community in the AAP area: 46 responses commented on there being a ‘lack of community’, with a number of these commenting that the sense of community had been eroded through demographic change.  The design of new buildings and facilities, as well as the landscaping around them can also challenge community cohesion if residents are not made to feel, through explicit and/or implicit messages, that these spaces are shared and for all to use. |
| National and Local Policy Context National  *Equalities Act:*  Community cohesion is underpinned by the Equality Act 2010, which states that public authorities must have due regard to the need to:   * Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act. * Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. * **Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.**   The Council is required to set and publish one or more equality objectives that are specific and measurable which we should achieve to meet all or part of our duty. We do this by embedding equality objectives within our Strategic Plan, ensuring that community cohesion, as a vital component of the Act, is explicitly featured.  Community Cohesion has become more of a priority nationally and regionally in recent years, with an independent review into opportunity and integration conducted by Dame Louise Casey in 2016[[20]](#footnote-20).    *Integrated Communities Strategy (Govt)*  The Government published its ‘Integrated Communities Strategy’ Green Paper in March 2018[[21]](#footnote-21), and in response to the consultation, an Action Plan was launched in February 2019[[22]](#footnote-22). The national strategy identified the need to have measures for social integration and encompassed eight focus areas:   * Strengthening leadership * Supporting new migrants and local residents * Education and young people * Boosting English language * Place and communities * Increasing economic opportunity * Rights and freedoms * Measuring success   Regional  Also, in March 2018, the Greater London Authority (GLA) published a social integration strategy for London entitled ‘All *of Us – The Mayor’s strategy for social integration.* It takes a four-part approach:   * Promoting shared experiences * Supporting Londoners to be active citizens * Tackling barriers and inequalities * Improving London’s evidence base   In working towards a more unified approach to cohesion nationally, in June 2019 the Home Office launched its ‘Indicators of Integration Framework’[[23]](#footnote-23). The Greater London Authority has also produced headline measures for social integration[[24]](#footnote-24).  Tower Hamlets Strategic Objectives  *Tower Hamlets Plan:*  The Tower Hamlets Plan 2018-23 sets out the Tower Hamlets Partnership’s five-year vision of tackling inequality by building a strong, inclusive and fair borough. The Partnership recognises that strong and resilient communities are happier and healthier communities and that people benefit in terms of their health and wellbeing, from their connections with people around them and when people look out for each other. The Plan sees cohesion as acting like a glue that bonds society together and helps create strong and resilient communities. The Tower Hamlets Plan has committed to creating stronger, more resilient and safer communities by ensuring people:   * Feel safe and live in a cohesive community * Are proud of and want to live, work, study and stay in the borough * Live in a friendly and welcoming borough with strong community spirits   *Strategic Plan:*  The Council contributes towards realising these commitments mainly through its focus on two outcomes within its strategic plan:   * Inequality is reduced and people feel that they fairly share the benefits from growth (Outcome 4) * People feel they are part of a cohesive and vibrant community (Outcome 8)   *Tower Hamlets Homes Community Investment Strategy*  As Tower Hamlets Homes is also a key part of our plan, we will work closely with their Community Investment Strategy and particularly the “building resilient and cohesive communities” priority within that. |
| Planning policy context The principal of promoting social interaction and community cohesion though planning policy and new development is well established within planning policy at all levels.  National  *NPPF 2018*  The NPPF 2018, requires planning policies and decisions to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other….and which are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion (paragraph 91).  It also requires planning policies and decisions to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, recognising the value of such spaces for the sustainability of communities (paragraph 92).  Regional  *The London Plan 2016:*  The London Plan (2016) requires boroughs to develop planning policies which promote the effective management of places that are safe, accessible and encourage social cohesion (policy 3.2). It also requires developments to enable people to live healthy, active lives; should maximize the opportunity for community diversity, inclusion and cohesion; and should contribute to people’s sense of place, safety and security, creating safe, secure and appropriately accessible environments (policies 7.1 and 7.3).  *The emerging London Plan 2019:*  Underpinning the emerging London Plan is the concept of good growth. Policy GG1 states that good growth is inclusive growth and that those involved in planning and development must provide access to good quality community spaces, services, amenities and infrastructure that accommodate, encourage and strengthen communities, increasing active participation and social integration, and addressing social isolation.  Supporting this overarching principal is the requirement to deliver inclusive design (policy D5). The Plan also highlights the particular cohesion challenges around specific planning uses and the lack of provision of some community facilities and for some communities. It also highlights the benefits that providing community facilities, including social infrastructure and community food growing, can provide for cohesion.  **Local**  *The Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031:*  The Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031, Key Objective 2: Sharing the benefits of growth, states that a key principle for growth in the borough is that it must promote community cohesion, ensuring the accessibility of space, places and facilities. The Plan highlights that this objective will be implemented through:   * reducing existing spatial inequalities and barriers and preventing the future polarisation of areas or communities, through optimising regeneration opportunities, in particular in the Lower Lea Valley, Isle of Dogs and South Poplar; * ensuring housing development contributes to the creation of socially balanced and inclusive communities and offers housing choice, reflecting our priorities for genuinely affordable and family homes; and * creating buildings, streets, spaces and places which promote social interaction and inclusion, which are accessible to all and which people value, enjoy and feel safe and comfortable in;   A number of the policies in the Plan seek to implement these principles and objectives in all developments and in delivering specific schemes where there are greater challenges or opportunities to improve cohesion. These include:   * Policy S.SG2 Delivering sustainable growth in Tower Hamlets, which requires developments to increase opportunities for social interaction and deliver social and transport infrastructure and public realm improvements which are inclusive and accessible to all. * Policy D.H6 Tall buildings, which includes a specific requirement to provide shared facilities at the ground floor to encourage social cohesion in tall buildings and that shared amenity space should also encourage cohesion. * Policy D.CF3 new and enhance community facilities, requires developments to ensure that where community facilities are provided they should be easily accessible to people who live and work outside the host development.   The existing planning policy framework provides a strong basis from which to further consider how planning can support improving community cohesion.  *High Density Living SPD*  This SPD, which is currently out for consultation, provides guidance to shape high density development such that it supports a good quality of life for Tower Hamlets’ residents. In line with the Local Plan, this SPD aims to contribute towards a borough where people feel they are part of a cohesive and vibrant community.  The SPD focuses on how mixed and balanced communities can be facilitated in high density living environments. Recommendations include:   * The design of the public realm should promote inclusivity, providing opportunities for residents of new developments to meet and interact. * High density developments should provide spaces for people to meet. These should include formal spaces and spaces in and around the building to foster informal interactions. * The home should be a place of retreat, rest and privacy, while communal areas are available to foster social integration and interactions. |
| Planning and Cohesion There is a body of academic work evidencing the influence of planning policy on the promotion of social interaction and community cohesion. In addition, various reports have been published on the topic of social cohesion in a planning context, providing examples and practical guidance, published by public bodies such as the GLA and NGOs such as the Social Integration Commission.  This section summarises a selection of relevant reports and academic studies, rather than evaluations of individual projects or case studies.  Guidance for local authorities on how to mainstream community cohesion into other services – Communities and Local Government (2009)[[25]](#footnote-25)  This paper provides guidance about how cohesion can be built during the course of planning and neighbourhood renewal projects that are not specifically aimed at cohesion. Planning is important in promoting social cohesion:   1. Through the preservation and support of places where people can mix with those different to them, such as street markets, parks, cafes and arts centres. 2. By providing the opportunity to break down physical divides / barriers that isolate certain communities from the wider area.   The paper provides the example of the upgrading of Swalwell Park, Gateshead as a planning project that promoted social cohesion. This project involved consulting with the local community to rejuvenate a neglected state park. Discussions involving local residents led to an agreed set of actions, including upgrading the ball court, establishing an adventure area and creating a play area for younger people. These proposed changes are thought to contribute towards cohesion by creating a space that meets the needs of different generation of residents living in the local area.  Design for Social Sustainability – Woodcraft et al (2011)[[26]](#footnote-26)  This paper sets out recommendations for built environment professionals on designing socially sustainable neighbourhoods. These recommendations are based on an international review of new towns and communities into why some fail while others flourish.  Social sustainability is defined here as “A process for creating sustainable, successful places that promote wellbeing, by understanding what people need from the places they live and work. Social sustainability combines design of the physical realm with design of the social world – infrastructure to support social and cultural life, social amenities, systems for citizen engagement and space for people and places to evolve.”  The paper identifies four elements that are deemed essential to build new communities that will be successful and sustainable in the long term:   1. Amenities and social infrastructure – amenities and support services in place early in the life of the new community. 2. Social and cultural life – shared spaces, collective activities, and social architecture to foster local networks, belonging and community identity. 3. Voice and influence – governance structure to represent future residents and engage new ones in shaping local decision making and stewardship. 4. Space to grow – flexible planning, housing and infrastructure services that can adapt over time, meanwhile use of buildings and public spaces.   Places, spaces, people and wellbeing – What Works Wellbeing (2018)[[27]](#footnote-27)  This review looks at the global evidence base for improving people’s wellbeing through changes to community infrastructure. The review covered the following interventions: community hubs, events, neighbourhood design, blue and green space, place-making, alternative use of space and urban regeneration.  Neighbourhood design was found to improve individuals’ social relations in three qualitative papers:   * Installing a cycle lane provided more opportunities for people to interact. * Making streets more walkable, including inserting more pedestrian crossings, allowed pedestrians to walk more safely to a location, and allowed for more social interactions than driving. * Within master planned neighbourhoods, neighbourhood design changes could be made to meet the specific needs of local residents, such as more parks in areas with younger demographics, and this supported social interactions.   Neighbourhood social conduits and resident social cohesion – Wickes et al (2018)[[28]](#footnote-28)  This paper is comprised of a literature review on the impact of land use policies on social cohesion, as well as an examination of the association between types of social and non-social spaces on social cohesion using data from over 4000 residents in Brisbane, Australia.  The literature review sets out evidence that the presence of certain features, such as parks and high streets, combined with neighbourhood walkability, positively influences resident’s perceptions of social cohesion by increasing opportunities for local interaction. Conversely, land use features that impede mobility, such as rivers, motorways or industrial areas, reduce perceptions of social cohesion.  The primary research contained in this report found the following:   * The presence of anchoring conduits (places that support routine interactions between regular users, such as schools, libraries and health clubs) was linked to increased frequency in neighbour networking, higher reports of social cohesion and place attachment. * Places that encourage chance interactions amongst local people did not significantly increase social cohesion. * Land use diversity, in the form of co-located residential and commercial uses, positively influences all forms of social cohesion. * Social holes[[29]](#footnote-29) and undeveloped land have no effect on any indicators of social cohesion.   The degree to which neighbourhoods are fragmented by streets with speeds over 60km/hour, waterways and train lines was consequential for neighbourhood networks. Fragmentation appeared to limit opportunities for social interaction, but it did not influence the perceived quality of the neighbourhood among residents or the perceived social cohesion. |
| Developing Policy In this section we have set out the evidence as to how each of the three TH Cohesion Strategy priorities contribute to a more cohesive environment.   * Priority 1 – Connected People: People have strong and positive relationships with others from the same and different backgrounds * Priority 2 – Involved and Empowered Community: People have a common vision and a greater sense of belonging in the community * Priority 3 – Bridging the equalities gap: Similar life opportunities are available to all   We have then provided examples of planning related projects that help to achieve each priority.  The next step is to work out how these priorities, and specific projects, can be achieved through planning policies in the AAP. |
| Priority 1 – Connected People: People have strong and positive relationships with others from the same and different backgrounds Evidence:  Research shows that positive relationships and better understanding between local residents are likely to reduce community tensions and hate crime, to increase community resilience and to promote cohesion.[[30]](#footnote-30) Having diverse groups of friends can stimulate creativity, encourage greater open-mindedness, and help develop tolerance and more positive attitudes towards other groups. [[31]](#footnote-31)  Community Research conducted in 2019, in order to develop the Borough cohesion plan, shows that people in Tower Hamlets like the diversity in the Borough and are keen to connect with other residents. They want more opportunities to connect, especially with those they wouldn’t ordinarily mix with.  The spring 2019 School Census shows that around 30% of Tower Hamlets schools had 80% or more students from one ethnic background. This means fewer opportunities for pupils and their families to mix with people of different backgrounds. The oldest and youngest age groups have little close interaction with each other- nationally, less than 10% of the closest contacts of those aged 55+ are under the age of 18. [[32]](#footnote-32)  Having positive interaction with neighbours is fundamental to developing cohesive neighbourhoods. Evidence from the Survey of Londoners suggests that those who interact with their neighbours are more likely to have positive views of social cohesion. 45% of Londoners borrow things and exchange favours with their Neighbours. 85% of those who borrow things and exchange favours with their neighbours agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together. This falls to 69% among those who do not borrow things or exchange favours[[33]](#footnote-33)  Community research completed for the Cohesion Plan in Tower Hamlets also shows that people do not always have the confidence to take the first step to interact with a neighbour or someone from a different background. They feel safer to stay within the boundaries of what they know and are used to; this results in parallel living.[[34]](#footnote-34)  A lack of strong social connections can lead to social isolation and loneliness, with consequences for an individual’s mental and physical health.[[35]](#footnote-35) Lacking social connections is as damaging to our health as smoking 15 cigarettes a day.[[36]](#footnote-36) Social networks and friendships not only have an impact on reducing the risk of mortality or developing certain diseases, but they also help individuals to recover when they do fall ill.[[37]](#footnote-37) Research suggests that those who have little trust of others in their local area and those who feel that they belong less strongly to their neighbourhood reported feeling lonely more often.[[38]](#footnote-38) Moreover, rates of chronic loneliness are higher in deprived inner city boroughs[[39]](#footnote-39).  With the Borough becoming denser because of population growth and the increase in new development, it has become more important for people to have shared spaces to socialise and mix in order for relationships to flourish. We know that shared spaces and shared activities also help to create a sense of belonging and pride in living in the local area.[[40]](#footnote-40)  Community research showed that residents often feel that the constant population change affects the organic development of communities. As a result, at a neighbourhood level, social bonds may not be as strong. The research highlighted the prevalence of new developments, high rental costs and transient nature of rental markets being large contributory factors here for the constant population change.[[41]](#footnote-41)  The 2019 community research also showed how the built environment, transport and social spaces can be a catalyst or a barrier to people coming together. Having vibrant community buildings, local markets and public spaces were highlighted as factors that help people feel more connected.  “*Using the facilities makes me part of the community. The transport is good and the shopping centres are good and food here is diverse.*”[[42]](#footnote-42)  However, lack of public spaces where people can congregate easily and lack of communal spaces in housing complexes were also highlighted as a barriers to developing relationships and communities.  “*I lived in Tower Hamlets for twelve years. I lived in three different housing associations. The first two places I lived in had no community spaces to hang out with neighbours. My third place is comparatively better to have a community space.”[[43]](#footnote-43)*  Examples of planning related projects to connect people  **Accessible shared spaces -** **Community hubs[[44]](#footnote-44)**  A community hub is defined as a multi-purpose centre or building that is made accessible to residents of the area that it occupies. In order to promote social cohesion, it is important that these hubs are accessible to the wider community, not just a specific block of flats or housing estate.  MPC Fruit n Veg Together food cooperative is an example of an accessible community hub. It provides organic fruit and veg bags to around 15 families via two pick-up sessions a week. The pick-up location is a local church hall in the centre of Southend. This location can be easily accessed by residents from across Southend and provides an opportunity for people to congregate, without the barriers associated with entering what can feel like the more private environment of a housing estate. In addition, the pick-up slots are coordinated with the Parent and Toddler Group and After School Club held in the church hall, increasing opportunities for people to interact.  **Spaces and facilities for families and young children -** **Play streets[[45]](#footnote-45)**  A Play Street is an event where a road is closed off to traffic for a few hours on a regular basis, so that children can play freely. In Lambeth, the council has supported Play Streets by:   * Deciding if a road can be closed safely * Publishing the formal legal notices necessary to close a road.   In terms of social cohesion, Play Streets are thought to provide opportunities for local people to interact in an open space.  The Play Streets pilot in Hounslow in 2014 provided local people the chance to create street party celebrations supported by a full time London Play playworker. These play streets gave children a space to meet with their neighbours and play, and as a result parents/carers also started to mix. These play streets involved closing the street to traffic and facilitating outdoor play. Another important element was community involvement in the planning and organisation process. The events were classified as a success - 90% of residents consulted on the Oriel Estate after the street party asked for more such events in future.  **Activating abandoned or derelict spaces for community use[[46]](#footnote-46)**  The City of West Palm Beach set up an Office of Public Life (OPL), which was dedicated to approaching public spaces and public life from a people-first perspective. This body facilitates the re-development of an abandoned park on corner plot to form a new public space that included a small, free library container, a food service container, a portable big screen a modular screen, umbrellas, seating and game equipment.  The space has been utilised for a variety of events, such as regular movie nights, Jazz events and Sunday Night Football Broadcasts. It also had positive impacts for community cohesion; the OPL heard residents tell stories of meeting their neighbours for the first time and the space bringing the community together.  The local community has actively participated in the regeneration project in multiple different ways:   * Community members helped build and maintain park infrastructure. * Residents and local community groups have started to organise their own events on site. * A micro-grant programme was set up for community led events. These grants were mostly given to organisations that were deeply rooted in the community but were small and lacked resources.   This has helped the community to accept the site and overcome the preconceived notion that any facilities would be vandalised or stolen.  **Creating intergenerational spaces[[47]](#footnote-47)**  Evidence has shown that older people have a preference for ‘aging in place’, meaning staying in the community as they grow older. Therefore, that there needs to be infrastructure to support older generations, who remain in the community, as well as new younger residents that move into the area. One such form of infrastructure is multi-generational parks, which are designed to attract users of all ages by providing not only traditional children’s play areas but also activities for adults and older users.  Dam Head Park in Manchester is an example of a successful multi-generational park. In this park, the local residents campaigned for an exercise area consisting of six pieces of equipment designed for gentle exercises, as an addition to the existing children’s playground. This area was placed next to the children’s playground with the aim to:   * Provide accessible and affordable exercise to older people in the area. * Increase opportunities for older people to socialise. * Strengthen links between older generations. * Allow older people to oversee children they were responsible for while exercising.   Residents of the Dam Head estate and surrounding private residences have said they have enjoyed the opportunity to socialise and exercise alongside local children. This scheme has since been replicated in Hyde Park and Eastbourne, with others planned.  **Range of spaces for different uses[[48]](#footnote-48)**  This report looks at the potential of different public spaces to enable social contact between different ethnic groups, drawing on qualitative research in London Borough of Newham. The research found that different forms of public spaces enabled different opportunities for people to mix:   * Neighbourhood and semi-domestic spaces such as shared forecourts and residential streets. These most commonly provided the first point of contact between neighbours of different ethnic groups and regular use of these areas helped residents to develop good relations. * A neighbourhood park adjacent to a primary school brought together groups of people. Meetings by parents in the school lobby led to greater shared use between this group and younger people that tended to use the space for sports and informal games. The proximity of the school and park was seen to bring different communities closer. * A market attracting locals and strangers encouraged casual encounters between different ethnic groups who would likely not have otherwise come into contact.   This suggests that social cohesion is better supported by a range of different public spaces, as this provides the opportunity for different forms of mixing and fosters inter-ethnic understanding through a number of different social interactions.  **Varied uses of existing and well used spaces[[49]](#footnote-49)**  Community facilities, such as schools, churches and council buildings, can be repurposed for other uses when they are not serving their primary function. For example, school facilities can be used on weekends for community events and sports.  As part of the Big Lottery PE and Sports in Schools Programme, St Mary’s School and Stewartstown School were granted a new multi-purpose sports hall. The sports hall is used during school hours as a space for PE, assemblies and drama. It has also been made available to the local community for evening activities, such as Zumba, weekend events, such as the cross community Christmas Craft Fair, and as a youth club venue. Previously, the local area had no provision for community activities. This venue has had a positive impact on the whole community with local children, young people and adults having a space to meet and interact. |
| Priority 2 – Involved and Empowered Community: People have a common vision and a greater sense of belonging in the community Evidence  We want to build a common vision and greater sense of belonging for everyone that is living in the area – this includes the established communities, and the more transient ones and those who are new to the area. We need to support people to play an active part in their communities and the decisions that affect them. We know that society grows and is more unified through political interaction and active citizenship – which includes social action, political participation, volunteering and shaping local services.  A sense of belonging to London and the local area is associated with higher personal well-being. 85% of Londoners with high personal well-being say they belong to London, against 75% of those with medium or low well-being. 78% of Londoners with high well-being report belonging to their local area, versus 65% of those with medium or low well-being.[[50]](#footnote-50)  The Tower Hamlets Annual Residents Survey 2019 shows that 16% of residents are volunteering in the Borough. The power of volunteering is not only in developing the individual but also in developing communities. Volunteering has been shown to bring about a greater awareness in people of the issues faced by their community or society more generally, and to develop a greater sense of belonging.  Volunteers report that volunteering enriches their sense of purpose in life, and helps them learn valuable things about the world and about themselves. It can also help organisations appreciate the local community who they are working with. We also know that volunteering improves mental health including having favourable effects on depression, life satisfaction and wellbeing.’[[51]](#footnote-51)  Evidence suggests that when young people from different backgrounds get opportunities to mix and build positive relationships then they are more likely to volunteer locally and also were more likely to vote. It was found that 72% of young people participating in the National Citizens Service (NCS) said that they were more likely to help out locally; and there was a 7 percentage point increase in the number of participants who said they were absolutely certain to vote. [[52]](#footnote-52)    Celebrating diversity can also be a means to bring people together and help instil a sense of belonging in the community. A diverse community often attracts people from different backgrounds to join that community, especially when they feel their particular background is respected; therefore, celebrating diversity can have effects which are self-perpetuating. Our community research suggests that people feel that more localised events can help bring people together and build positive connections.  Community research conducted for the S106 funded cohesion programme in 2016 and community research conducted in 2019 for the development of the cohesion plan both found amongst the key common barriers to developing a sense of belonging was drug dealing and drug use. This not only has residents feeling unsafe, but also less satisfied with life in the respective areas. It was interesting to note that they saw this not only as an issue but as a barrier to community cohesion and the bringing together of people from different backgrounds. Often people steer clear from areas that drug dealing is taking place or is likely to take place, hence feeling less comfortable and more detached from their local area, with parks being the hot spots.  The 2019 community research also highlighted that regeneration of local areas has had many benefits but on occasions has also had negative social, cultural and economic impacts on communities, and highlighted how inequalities can be exacerbated. One example provided in the community research was that often local businesses are becoming outpriced therefore either leaving or closing down.  Examples of planning related projects designed to involve and empower the community  **Engaging the community - designing with children[[53]](#footnote-53)**  One means of empowering people in the local community is to involve them in the design process of community projects and/or facilities. Spotlight Youth Centre, based in Langdon Park, engaged young people in the development and design process of their centre. Young people’s views on the development of the Spotlight creative arts space were fed into the development process on at least a fortnightly basis. They were involved in the development of the project brief and the wider consultation process, amongst other things. According to the youth engagement report, key aspects of the building design and centre services have been shaped through engagement with young people. This process is reported to have engendered a sense of ownership by the young people involved.  **Supporting residents to activate and use spaces[[54]](#footnote-54)**  In Mapesbury Dell, Brent, the local residents’ association wanted to renovate the Dell. In order to do so, they formed a partnership with Brent Council’s parks services. A local resident created a design for the space and Brent’s parks service wrote a tender specification for construction. The community service chose the contractor and the parks service managed them on site. This close collaboration throughout the development process resulted in a revived public space. Approximately 20% of resources came from time and skills that were donated for free. Once the restoration was complete, an agreement was drawn up specifying that the parks service would provide basic maintenance of the site and the community would provide more detailed care.  **Cohesion training** **for social housing organisations and employees[[55]](#footnote-55)**  Many social landlords have programmes of training in equality and diversity, but it is less common for training to focus on the role staff can play in facilitating social cohesion. Notting Hill Housing Trust tried to incorporate a better understanding of the community and cohesion issues through an internal cultural and faith awareness programme delivered by a cross-section of staff. The programme was aimed at raising individual awareness, and in turn improving front-line services. Examples of action include a poster campaign focusing on the different religious and cultural beliefs of each of the main communities housed by the trust. |
| Priority 3 – Bridging the equalities gap: Similar life opportunities are available to all Evidence:  The Greater London Authority Survey of Londoners found that 35% of Londoners felt they had been treated unfairly by others in the last 12 months because of one or several protected characteristics[[56]](#footnote-56) or because of their social class. This emphasises the need to continue to work on supporting people from different equality groups including people from different socio-economic backgrounds.  Tower Hamlets has the second lowest levels of English language proficiency in England.[[57]](#footnote-57) Lack of English proficiency is likely to impact on people’s ability to mix with people of different backgrounds; develop networks; limit people’s job opportunities and contribution to community life. It also can be a driver for loneliness and prevent people from seeking help.  Louise Casey in her *review into opportunity and integration[[58]](#footnote-58)* highlighted inequalities in economic activity amongst different groups. BME employment is lower in comparison to white residents in Tower Hamlets. In common with most areas women have lower employment rates than men however the size of the gender gap in employment is a bit wider in Tower Hamlets than in London.[[59]](#footnote-59) Whilst the picture is complex in terms of the drivers of this, our approach is to support women into employment while respecting their free choice not to do so, for example where they have caring or other responsibilities.  Examples of planning related projects designed to bridge the equalities gap  **Ensuring facilities and spaces are accessible e.g. via older people’s advocacy in the built environment[[60]](#footnote-60)**  One means of ensuring the accessibility of facilities and spaces is to work with local people to understand their needs, especially the needs of disadvantages or minority groups that may have otherwise been overlooked.  The Newcastle Elders Council undertook a large consultation to assess the ‘older people friendliness’ of Newcastle City Centre 2003-4. The study commissioned older people to survey the city’s streets, buildings and amenities using a designated survey format. The group liaised with the council to promote awareness of the concerns raised by the study. Several outcomes were agreed upon, such as longer crossing times at pelican crossings and updated maps showing local amenities.  **Employment opportunities -** **Community facilities providing employment[[61]](#footnote-61)**  NANA was a social enterprise café in Clapton. The café recruited older women from the local area, who cooked and served their food. Each ‘nana’ worked a set shift each week and after three months they took a small share of the profits. Nanas who had worked at the café said that enterprise had helped them to ‘reconnect with people of all ages’.  The café’s destination was found when the local preservation trust, the Clapton Improvement Society, began work to save a derelict Victorian pubic toilet. The social enterprise founder and the trust forged a partnership, and the café was housed in the public toilet. |
| Internal Roundtable We conducted an internal roundtable to discuss the possible policy interventions outlined above. This roundtable was attended by colleagues from the development management team, infrastructure planning team, the public health department and the strategy and policy team.  In the roundtable each of the three priorities were discussed and we assessed the merits of different policies in terms of their likely impact, how easily they could be operationalised and any potential negative side-effects. Appendix 1 provides a copy of notes from the meeting.  The key recommendations from the roundtable were to:   * Integrate play streets into Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. * Provide open spaces that are not over landscaped, so that visitors can use the space for informal sports. * Focus on providing community spaces, rather than over-analysing their exact location. In general, the participants thought that if a community space was provided people would come, given the high demand for such spaces. * Encourage different models of ownership of open space. This could promote greater engagement of local people and a sense of belonging. |
| Recommended policy interventions We combined the evidence coming out of the desk-based review of current Tower Hamlets cohesion policy, planning policy and case studies of successful cohesion projects with the suggests coming out of the roundtable. This allowed us to prioritise certain policy interventions over others. Hence, we recommend that the following policies are implemented in the AAP:   * The delivery of shared public spaces, both in the form of community hubs and open spaces. * Support for the provision of low-traffic neighbourhoods and play streets. * The delivery of inter-generational public spaces and homes. * Support for the varied use of existing and newly provided recreational spaces by the community e.g. schools opening their grounds to the community after hours and on weekends. * Meanwhile space policies to allow for the activation and use of abandoned or derelict spaces by the community. |
| Appendix 1 – notes from roundtable discussion 04/08/2020 **Priority one**    Community centres - currently most of the facilities are in Poplar. New facilities are needed in northern and eastern areas of the AAP.    Play streets - could be integrated into low traffic neighbourhoods. Also worth looking at issues / success in implementing liveable streets in Bow.  Play streets are very important in the current climate and people are becoming more used to temporary road interventions since lockdown.    Open spaces - need to ensure they are not over landscaped, so there is still space for kids to kick around a ball.    Where to place community spaces? Little evidence on ideal location. Evidence seems to suggest if you build them people will come. Can facilitate cohesion by providing a space, but it also needs to be accessible and affordable.    Activating derelict spaces - look at the Bankside Open Space Trust.    Varied use of existing spaces - look into community stewardship CDC.    **Priority two**    Empowering communities - role of public health assessments. The Healthy Environments Team in public health have already down a lot of work on this.    Open space - could ownership of open spaces lead to greater engagement.    **Priority three**    Employment opportunities - more information on this is set out in the new planning obligations SPD.  There is scope to gather more specific information for this area and to try and tailor policies accordingly. The current scope for employment agreements centres around:   1. Apprenticeships 2. Employing local people 3. Target for using local people for tender and outsourcing   The local plan policies at present are quite general.  Poor doors - this is already covered in local plan. |
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