



## **Exchange of Experience Report**

Theme I

“Contents, instruments and structural patterns of neighbourhood management policies”

Haringey/Stockholm, September 2004

# EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCE EVENT REPORT HARINGEY/STOCKHOLM, SEPTEMBER 2004.

## INDEX

<b>1. Theme of the Exchange of Experience Event</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. The Approach</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. The Key Issues</b>	<b>2</b>

### Appendices:

- i. Stockholm**
- ii. Vienna**
- iii. Amsterdam**
- iv. North Kent**
- v. Genoa**

---

## 1. Theme of the Exchange of Experience Event

This theme covers the wide range of topics dealt with by different local neighbourhood management policies such as the improvement of the quality of life in deprived neighbourhoods, the achievement of a better mix of populations or the achievement of a stronger social and ethnic inclusion in these areas etc. Of particular importance is also the organisational context of local neighbourhood management policies, i.e. the operational structures of existing neighbourhood management or of specific public facilities and supply networks.

## 2. The Approach

The third POSEIDON Exchange of Experience Event took place in Haringey, London, in June 2004. The theme of this event was “Contents, instruments and structural patterns of neighbourhood management policies”, and the event sought to address this topic in several different ways.

Zena Brabazon, Head of Neighbourhood Management in Haringey, began the event with a presentation about Neighbourhood Management policies in the UK. She outlined Central Government policies and how these were implemented at regional and local levels, giving examples of how policies had been translated into action in White Hart Lane and Seven

Sisters in Haringey. Our partners from Stockholm also gave presentations on the Swedish Neighbourhood Management Policy Framework and gave examples of local projects in Rinkeby and Skärholmen.

Following a tour of Haringey, in which delegates were shown the marked contrast between the relatively prosperous west of the borough and the more deprived east, we began to consider some questions which had been sent to partners before this EEE. The questions were prepared by members of the team from Haringey and shared with partners from Stockholm before being sent out. These questions were designed to tease out the more difficult, challenging issues we all face in our work in Neighbourhood Management:

1. Is there a broad, co-ordinated political initiative at national, regional or local level which sets the framework for the improvement of your neighbourhood?
2. Are all the relevant sectors involved? Is there a "full Orchestra" approach or are there many "single instruments"?
3. Does the (national // regional // local) organisation allow effective participation from local people? What issues emerge from this?
4. What is the relationship between these local neighbourhood structures/partnerships and wider and more established democratic structures?
5. Is there a project manager and a project team with the necessary power, money and influence to "bend mainstream services" to benefit the neighbourhood?
6. Is the organisation able to change focus and methods when required? Does it have a flexible approach?
7. Is there a local partnership (an effective co-ordination of all the local actors)? How are these organised and what are the different roles and responsibilities?

The purpose of the questions was to have an input about what the partners considered to be the key issues within Theme 1. All partner cities submitted papers with their answers to the questions and additional comments.

### **3. The Key Issues**

Drawing on the responses to the questions we had posed, we organised delegates into workshops to begin a more detailed discussion of issues concerning Neighbourhood Management policies. We chose the four questions that had generated the most interesting responses, and these were:

1. Are all the relevant sectors involved? Is there a "full orchestra" approach or are there many "single instruments"?
2. Does the (national/regional/local) organisation allow effective participation from local people?
3. Is there a project manager and a project team with the necessary power, money and influence to "bend mainstream services" to benefit the neighbourhood?
4. Is the organisation able to change focus and methods when required? Does it have a flexible approach?

We then put delegates from countries that did not have a problem with a particular question in a group with those whose country's policies were causing them some difficulty. The object of this exercise was for delegates not only to tell their stories, but also to find common ground and to learn from each other. We have chosen to examine in greater

detail the discussion on the two questions which seemed to fire people up most in the workshops.

The question that generated most discussion in both workshops was question 2 on the above list about policies to enable effective participation. Delegates from Amsterdam were put into both groups, as their city's structures for public participation appeared to be well thought out and very clear. The following points emerged:

- City of Amsterdam has a number of formal structures to facilitate participation. These include:
  - Bye-laws which make public consultation mandatory;
  - A Right of Initiative, where local residents can put issues on local government agendas, thereby encouraging interactive policy making;
  - Referendums
- City of Amsterdam also has an Active Civic Society which is underpinned by a partnership organisation between citizens and the city, with networks of self-organised residents feeding into this partnership.
- City of Amsterdam has different processes for participation – formal and informal. The formal processes are used for large schemes and the informal processes can include forums for government to listen to the needs of residents and to manage potential conflict at local level.
- These policies enable participation to be both bottom up and top down. The bigger planning projects may come from the top, BUT must involve all residents in the area in the discussion.

Delegates from partner countries, having listened to colleagues from Amsterdam, made the following points:

- Residents who have power can object, and those without power can't. The attitude of government organisations and their structures determines whether or not citizens' views are taken seriously. How do we change attitudes?
- How can we ensure that local citizens have influence?
- It is all very well having these formal structures which detail how you get residents to participate, but aren't they rather rigid? What about the "what ifs"?
- It is important for citizens to learn which political "buttons" to press; the American political rights movements of the 1960s provide examples we can learn from. They teach us about community organising which requires clear goals, manipulation and alliances.
- There is a problem with civic servants being able to engage in political activities.
- Local residents can see things differently to politicians and professionals.
- What powers do our communities/citizens really have to influence change?
- Local residents need education and training on structures and on public decision-making to help them get involved and to influence things.
- The job of local neighbourhood staff is to manage many interest groups and conflicts. It is as though we are conducting an orchestra – every day we go into the neighbourhood to "take the temperature" to see what the views and feelings are. It is always changing.
- Residents' networks do not necessarily reflect the "silent majority".
- Who wants participation? Who does it benefit?

- We need to understand the motivation for people to participate.
- What is the balance between helping groups and encouraging self-help?
- Amsterdam has sponsored residents' visits to Morocco to build an orphanage – reinforces cultural roots and strengthens civil participation.
- Sweden has developed a Somali childcare project to understand why Somali people don't use public childcare facilities. This included a trip to Somalia.
- Attitudes at the top relate to problems at the bottom.
- Are residents' networks just another form of bureaucracy?

The other question which generated a lively discussion was the one about organisational flexibility. For this question, delegates from Vienna, Stockholm, Amsterdam and Haringey came together, and the following points emerged:

- How do we encourage greater flexibility in mainstream services?
- Mainstream services are at their most inflexible when implementing laws – for example, schools and Social Services.
- Flexibility is a matter of good organisation, with power devolved to local districts
- Flexibility is a state of mind rather than rules and structures.
- Flexibility thrives where there are informal networks – finding the right people to make things happen with the right local people.
- Problems exist where there is a lack of clarity about where these local structures fit into formal structures.
- In Vienna, all neighbourhood offices are run by organisations outside the city structures who deal with maintenance/physical change/new projects – influence and change often depends on formal networks.
- Again in Vienna, the planning process was fairly closed and inflexible. Local campaigning has opened up discussion, especially around civic participation.
- The biggest land use projects are least influenced by residents, but can have the biggest impact on them.
- How can Neighbourhood Management influence middle managers? Some ideas:
  - Breakfast meetings for front line staff (Haringey);
  - Officer meetings – identifying service improvements to respond to residents' needs (Haringey);
  - Agreement made with Chief Executive and his management team about how they would engage across Directorates with Neighbourhood Management – ownership from the top (Stockholm);
  - Drew up Neighbourhood Plans which were incorporated into Directorate plans (Amsterdam)
  - Final Thought: local residents' resistance can create flexibility!

As you will see from the bullet points above, many additional questions were posed, ideas and information about successful projects was shared, and most delegates seemed to feel that the real discussion about Neighbourhood Management in the POSEIDON project had only just begun!

### 3.1. Conclusion

In Haringey we made a good start at identifying the Key issues for Theme 1. The question that generated most discussion was:

**Does the (national/regional/local) organisation allow effective participation from local people?**

Is this the one and only issue we should work with? Or should we add one or more of the four issues mentioned above? This will be a question to be discussed at the forthcoming Project Working Group in Stockholm in October 2004,

We hope that we have conveyed the essence of the Exchange of Experience event. Our thanks therefore go to all partners for engaging so enthusiastically in the Haringey EEE.

## **POSEIDON – Structural Patterns of Neighbourhood Management Policies, London Haringey EEE, 17-19 June 2004**

### **Input of the City of Stockholm**

#### **1. Is there a broad, co-ordinated political initiative at national, regional or local level which sets the framework for the improvement of your neighbourhood?**

It depends on the political majority. Labour and Conservatives in Sweden have different policies for the improvement of neighbourhoods. If there are different political majorities in the Government and the municipality, the implementation will be difficult.

We have had special initiatives from the Swedish Social Democratic Party and the Left Party and the Environmental Party, to develop neighbourhoods:

National: Governments Metropolitan Development Initiative.

Regional: 2 projects over the years 1995-2006 Outer city Project.

Local: Since 1996 Stockholm has been divided into district councils, which fall under the direct control of Stockholm City council. The district councils work within their own geographic areas and have the overall responsibility for their activities. The City introduced the district council reform for three reasons:

- To strengthen democracy by bringing the decision-making process – and the decision makers – closer to the inhabitants.
- To improve municipal services. Decisions that are made locally are easier to adapt to practical conditions. Furthermore, a district's own administration handles matters that were previously divided up among several different administrations.
- To utilise tax revenue more efficiently. The city district councils are better able to determine how best to use resources as they work closer with their own activities and understand conditions in the area.

Strengths:

- The political level has given concrete directives for the District Renewal Initiative (regional initiative)
- Local politicians decide where to invest the money
- There is a broad political approach for the improvement of the neighbourhood, regardless of which majority who has the power.

Weaknesses

- Regional politicians may think differently on the initiative depending on party
- Regional policies can take out local initiatives
- The initiative itself can marginalize the neighbourhood

Opportunities

- Political investments in the neighbourhood, both financially and emotionally

#### Threats

- To many rules about how to invest the money
- The process is too hard for citizens in common

### **2. Are all the relevant sectors involved? Is there a “full orchestra” approach or are there many “single instruments”?**

It depends on the type of project!

The planning processes for big areas, where the City is planning for infrastructure, housings, business etc, needs the “full orchestra” co-operation. In this processes the citizens are in a minority.

In smaller improvement project, all necessary actors is invited. But the will to participate can be poor.

#### Strengths

- Initiatives makes different sectors to work together

#### Weaknesses

- The projects gets isolated from ordinary mainstream services

#### Opportunities

- The District renewal initiative demand “full orchestra”, otherwise the founding will be left out

#### Threats

- After the money is gone, there will be back to business as usual, sectors-wise

### **3. Does the (national/regional/local) organisation allow effective participation from local people? What issues emerge from this?**

It depends on where the initiative comes from, if it is a initiative from the politicians or the citizens. If the project is initiated from the politicians there is a better chance that the project will be realised. The citizens participate within the project witch they are invited in, “movement from top to bottom”. The national/regional/local organisation allows effective participation from the local people in smaller project where citizens participation presumes.

If the initiative comes from the local people “from bottom to the top” the best way to succeed is to go by the political party. The processes for citizens to establish a project is much longer than for the politicians or the administration.

The politicians want to invite the local people, the administration hasn't found methods always for an effective dialog with the local people.

#### Strengths

- The rules of the District renewal initiative demands participation from local people

#### Weaknesses

- The methods to have a dialogue to people are not fully developed

#### Opportunities

- The initiative allows us to find methods in neighbourhood participation

#### Threats

- People can get even more disappointed, an chooses not to participate even less than before



#### **4. What is the relationship between these local neighbourhood structures/partnerships and wider and more established democratic structures?**

They are working beside each other, the local neighbourhood partnerships is not implemented in the established democratic structures. The local neighbourhood partners and the established democratic system dependent on each other. The political party's want's results and the neighbourhood workers want's funding. They both need good relationships. One difficulty is the long term planning. The election period is 4 years, and the different majorities have different ways to improve neighbourhoods.

Non-profit organisations can get contributions from the municipality, and their operations are independent from the municipality and often not co-ordinated with others.

#### **5. Is there a project manager and a project team with the necessary power, money and influence to "bend mainstream services" to benefit the neighbourhood?**

Yes! We have special projects to reinforce the local democratic process, the Outer City Initiative, with a project manager. The City districts are choosing themselves how to deal with the money, and how to make people participate, as long as the rules is followed. In Skärholmen, they are working with different groups, dependent of the project, and report directly to the direction of the Skärholmen district. The project manager can suggest to the direction different benefit to the neighbourhood. In Rinkeby, focus is on the citizens. An investigation has been done during the spring in 2004 where the citizens has been able to speak out there meaning about Rinkeby, regardless issues or rules. Information has also been given about the District renewal initiative, to avoid disappointments. Local goals has been formed from the investigation and people in Rinkeby can come up with project-ideas to match the goals. Rinkeby City District council will decide if the projects gets founding.

##### Strengths

- There is a project manager in each City District that participate in the District renewal initiative
- There is a big interest from politicians and directions in these questions
- There is a reasonable amount of money available

##### Weaknesses

- The project leader has no power towards the mainstream services. They has to "bend" themselves, when they "see the light"

##### Opportunities

- Money is power

##### Threats

- The mainstream services bend back as soon as the initiative is over

#### **6. Is the organisation able to change focus and methods when required? Does it have a flexible approach?**

We have a well-function structure and administration in the public organisations in Sweden, witch is difficult to change. In the small projects is it more possible to choose method dependent on the issue.

##### Strengths

- The organisation for the District renewal initiative is a project itself, this demands flexibility

#### Weaknesses

- The organisation is a project itself

#### Opportunities

- There are enough time to establish a good working organisation

#### Threats

- The organisation works for its own survival, not for the benefit of the neighbourhood.

### **7. Is there a local partnership (an effective co-ordination of all the local actors)? How are these organised and what are the different roles and responsibilities?**

In Skärholmen, they have constantly (8 times per year) meetings with all important actors about safety in Skärholmen, it´s called "citizen-meetings". The actors are citizens, Skärholmen District Administration, Police, non-profit-organisations and the County Council. They discuss and report important questions about safety. If there is something to develop every part takes it´s responsibility for that, and all actors can work together to make things better. A second effect is that network is formed.

In Rinkeby, they work within the system. There are different meetings with different actors, at different times. All regular, i.e. "crime-prevention board" with the politicians, housing-companies, shop-owners and direction from the Rinkeby City District administration and "Athorities in partnership" with the District administration, Unemployed-service, Sick-leave-services and helth-care-services. In all groups different actors in Rinkeby are working together for the benefit of the neighbourhood.

# **POSEIDON – Structural Patterns of Neighbourhood Management Policies, London Haringey EEE, 17-19 June 2004**

## **Input of the City of Vienna**

### **1. Is there a broad, co-ordinated political initiative at national, regional or local level which sets the framework for the improvement of your neighbourhood?**

In the late 90s, there has been a political initiative to widen the approach of the -since 30 years - existing area renewal offices. The aim of this initiative was to reach a more 'pre-active' and comprehensive approach of these renewal offices that is to reach a comprehensive area management approach. An evaluation and a broad assessment of the area renewal offices has led to the elaboration of a strategic paper for the implementation of area management programs. The two pilot-projects "Grätzelmanagement"<sup>1</sup> can be regarded as a result of this paper. The city of Vienna wants to learn from the experiences of the comprehensive project approach and wants to implement similar structures in the case of success in future.

### **2. Are all the relevant sectors involved? Is there a "full orchestra" approach or are there many "single instruments"?**

There various agencies and departments of the city administration which are more or less engaged in the field of urban renewal. These agencies try to bring forward the economic structure and economic development, the qualification of residents, the integration of immigrants, the improvement of housing conditions or the supply of youth care, etc. Several city departments are engaged in urban planning, social welfare, traffic, green space and so on. Therefore one might speak of an approach of many single instruments, at least in terms of funding and investments.

But one can speak of a "full orchestra" approach in terms of communication and co-ordination of these agencies and departments. If co-ordinated action is necessary for a specific area or a specific action, the existing network between these agencies and departments is strong enough to co-ordinate common and comprehensive action.

### **3. Does the (national/regional/local) organisation allow effective participation from local people? What issues emerge from this?**

The organisational structure of the pilot-projects "Grätzelmanagement" allows and fosters effective participation from local people and local sales- and craftsmen. Beside the accompaniment of working groups, participation and common decision making is reached through the advisory committee of the project. In this committee, the voting quorum of residents and businessmen is up to 50%. The committee decides about the concrete use of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "Grätzel" is an old Viennese notion for a relatively small area within a city district.

existing local disposal budget. So local people are not only consulted in terms of information activities or in terms of 'ask them for their opinions'. They can also decide upon specific sub-projects of the "Grätzelmanagement".

There emerges a number of issues from this. A full description is not possible in this paper but the following key words can be mentioned: different expectation in terms of time for implementation, questions of power, tensions between top-down and bottom-up, learning processes of all involved actors, mutual co-operation between actors, feeling of trust is reached, conflicts are regarded as productive, ...

#### **4. What is the relationships between these local neighbourhood structures/partnerships and wider and more established democratic structures?**

The direct democratic structure of the project is regarded as a complement to the established representative democratic system of the district level of the city.

There are several relationships that are worth to note:

- Up to now, the voting right in the representative system is restricted to the Austrian citizenship. Since the share of immigrants without the citizenship is rather high in the area, the opinions and interests of this population group are hardly represented by the representative system. Informal direct democratic structures foster social inclusion in terms of political participation and the ability to take influence on local decision making.
- The local mayor is a member of the advisory committee of the projects and constitutes a linkage between the informal direct democratic approach and the representative democratic system. The linkage between the residents and the administrative body is reached through the membership of actors of several city departments.
- The projects have elaborated "area development concepts" which will be hopefully agreed by the 'development committee of the district' and will have a legally binding character.

Although the mayor of the city signed the "Charta of Aalborg" (Local Agenda 21) in 1996, the Viennese city constitution does not include something like a "participation Charta". There exist cases (e.g. big planning procedures) where residents have the right to take a party but there is no "participation Charta" concerning community consultation within neighbourhood management projects in general.

#### **5. Is there a project manager and a project team with the necessary power, money and influence to "bend mainstream services" to benefit the neighbourhood?**

The power of the local project managers in the "Grätzelmanagement" is fairly restricted. They have no voting rights in the advisory committee and are therefore not able to influence the concrete spending of money. But the project team can 'influence' the project outcomes (sub-project of the Grätzelmanagement finances through the local disposal budget) in several ways:

- The sub-projects are developed in the working-groups of the project. The working groups are accompanied by the project team and there are no thematic restrictions for the working group set up by the project principals.
- The project team elaborate and pose the applications of sub-projects in the steering committee.
- The project itself was set up to deliver sub-projects and services beside the usual mainstream activities.
- The project team decide upon working methods concerning project management, accompaniment of working groups, communication structures, public relations and so on.

Project managers sometimes claim more power for being able to fulfil their roles within the project. They have a linkage position between residents and the political and administrative field and have to negotiate and bargain between sometimes conflicting interests. But bargaining and negotiation requires "degrees of freedom" for the project managers.

**6. Is the organisation able to change focus and methods when required? Does it have a flexible approach?**

One important advantage of the project is the operational flexibility. The degree of freedom concerning the working methods but also the approaches of sub-projects is very high. The existing guidelines have been set up by the advisory committee and can be changed if the necessary quorum is achieved (3/4 majority).

The thematic focus of the sub-projects is mainly restricted to the objective 2 criteria set up by the EU (budget of sub-projects is funded by the EU via objective 2) and the project application for the objective 2 committee which cannot be changed. The focus of the project application is rather broad and include fairly all thematic fields of a comprehensive area management approach.

**7. Is there a local partnership (an effective co-ordination of all the local actors)? How are these organised and what are the different roles and responsibilities?**

As already stated in the answer of question two, there exists local networks in terms of communication and co-ordination but not in terms of funding. But these co-ordination networks could be much more effective. Sometimes it is rather hard to overcome individual rationalities of institutions and to induce common or co-ordinated action. It would be much easier to induce common action of projects and institutions on the local level if the commitment for co-ordination between the existing agencies and city departments on the local level is reached on the strategic management level of these institutions. Without the commitment on the strategic level, the implementation of co-ordination is sometimes rather hard for actors in the local level.

The concrete configuration of these co-ordination networks on the local level are very different and strongly depend on the aim and the topic of an approach. Therefore the roles and responsibilities are specific to the topic of the network and change from time to time and from topic to topic. In general, these networks can be regarded as poly-centric with no main node with steering power.

## **POSEIDON – Structural Patterns of Neighbourhood Management Policies, London Haringey EEE, 17-19 June 2004**

### Input of the City of Amsterdam

#### **1. Is there a broad, co-ordinated political initiative at national, regional or local level which sets the framework for the improvement of your neighbourhood?**

Yes. On the national level the Great Cities Policy (Grote Steden Beleid) is the framework for all regional and local neighbourhood improvements. This policy aims at an integrated approach of problems and chances in cities and their deprived neighbourhoods in the sense that physical, social and economic sectors are involved (security is recently added as the fourth pillar of this policy). Within this policy there is (at least a proclaimed) need for participation of citizens.

All big cities in the Netherlands are entitled to extra financial support from the national government on the base of a 4-years programme. This programme has to take into account the integration of the sectorised policies in the city and name several output targets on several sub-themes. This framework and the output-themes are set on a national level in co-operation with the cities. Within each city of course the way to set the specific local output levels and the way it is put into policies and actions is done in close co-operation with relevant actors, in Amsterdam this is specifically the case with city districts.

Because of the similarity of the problems in terms of urban renewal and broader urban regeneration (the more integrated approach) in four city districts at the west of Amsterdam, Parkstad is erected. This is a co-operation of the four city districts and the central city of Amsterdam, together I close co-operation with housing associations.. The Parkstad co-operation forms the framework for the GeuzenveldZuid neighbourhood.

#### **2. Are all the relevant sectors involved? Is there a "full Orchestra" approach or are there many "single instruments"?**

Yes. To accomplish the neighbourhood achievement goals, you have to address four pillars of renewal: physical, economical, social and security. In order to attain the formulated goals on these four pillars two co-ordinating mechanisms have been developed in Geuzenveld-Slotermeer. The first one is directed at integrating policies from different parts of the organisation into one overall strategy for renewal of neighbourhoods. The second one is directed at the different neighbourhoods in which (physical) renewal is taking place. Planning teams have been formed in which all relevant actors are taking place, local government as well as the privatised housing associations.

#### **3. Does the (national/regional/local) organisation allow effective participation from local people? What issues emerge from this?**

Yes. Participation from local people is promoted and in most cases obligatory. The different steps in the planning process have to be discussed with local participants (inhabitants, business (wo)men and social partners). Issues that emerge from this consultation processes are:

- a gap between problem definition and the proposed solutions
- great concern about the concentration of different ethnic groups
- the reduced possibility to come back in the same neighbourhood because of reduced amount of 'cheap' houses

#### **4. What is the relationship between these local neighbourhood structures/partnerships and wider and more established democratic structures?**

Local government is working together with the privatised housing associations. Although the housing associations own most of the houses (private home ownership is rare in Geuzenveld-Slotermeer), every decision to renew complete neighbourhoods is brought to the local city district council. It is local government that has to issue a license to reconstruct houses.

From another point of view, you could argue that there is a second relationship. Policy issues that emerge from local neighbourhood structures influence thinking of policy makers on a higher lever and vice versa, policies from central government are being tested in the local neighbourhood structures.

#### **5. Is there a project manager and a project team with the necessary power, money and influence to "bend mainstream services" to benefit the neighbourhood?**

Yes, Geuzenveld-Slotermeer is trying to work 'neighbourhood' based. Currently, there are four neighbourhood managers (buurtmanager). The district manager is the linking pin between the local government organisation and the local people. They supervise local networks, consisting of police, youth work, housing associations etc. to gather information of what is needed to further develop the neighbourhood. By handing over management reports to local politics, they are able to influence decision making within the organisation.

#### **6. Is the organisation able to change focus and methods when required? Does it have a flexible approach?**

The organisation is not flexible right now, but is working towards a greater responsiveness in order to react quicker on local needs. The primary goals of 'neighbourhood based management (buurtmanagement)' are closing the gap between local politicians and their organisation and local people, to react quicker on inhabitants 'small' needs, to empower them and to be an efficient organisation.

Flexibility is of course also achieved by local elections that force the organisation to give greater interest to underlying problems.

#### **7. Is there a local partnership (an effective co-ordination of all the local actors)? How are these organised and what are the different roles and responsibilities?**

Considering the renewal of neighbourhoods, there is the before mentioned Bureau Parkstad, a local partnership consisting of four district councils. Bureau Parkstad is the combined effort of these four district councils to work effectively together with the privatised housing associations and to give a financial framework to the participants. Roughly speaking, the housing associations are responsible for the renewal of their possessions (houses) and local government is responsible for the social and security improvements in the public area. Further responsibilities are, as much as possible, shared between housing associations and local government, although every participant has its own

decision-making process.

looking at neighbourhood based management, there is a distinguishable partnership. Based on mutual respect for each others responsibilities, police, youth work, organisation for empowerment (opbouwwerk), housing associations and welfare organisations and local government are working together to tackle problems from an integrated perspective. It is the neighbourhood manager that fulfills the role of assembling all of the relevant parties when confronted with a problem or with devising a strategy.



## **POSEIDON – Structural Patterns of Neighbourhood Management Policies, London Haringey EEE, 17-19 June 2004**

### **Input of North Kent**

#### **1. Is there a broad, co-ordinated political initiative at national, regional or local level, which sets the framework for the improvement of your neighbourhood?**

1) Well there is a political initiative at a national level to deliver on the National NR Strategy. However, due to the issues of not receiving NRU funding within the North Kent NRI areas, there has been a desire by the sub regional partnership (ourselves, North Kent Gateway Partnership and other key partners like the Diocese/Church) to demonstrate back to government that these neighbourhoods are contributing to the delivery on the national agenda and agreed targets.

2) Also at a regional level the importance of NR work and support is being made from SEEDA (the RDA) through its Regional Economic Strategy and Regional Social Inclusion strategy and at a sub-region through the North Kent Area Investment Framework.

3) Neighbourhood Renewal is a key part of the local authority strategies within Medway (for All Saints and Twydall NRI) and Dartford (for Swanscombe). However, although delivery has been undertaken within these areas to date (some more so than others), the frameworks that are being established at a local level refer to development of 'locally agreed action plans' and implementation within each of the local NRI pilot areas.

#### **2. Are all the relevant sectors involved? Is there a "full Orchestra" approach or are there many "single instruments"?**

Using All Saints NRI as an example:

1) With regards to the NRI partnership structure, it is an informal partnership of local partners coming together to focus their activity and resources within the target area to improve the deprived neighbourhood. Partners involved include public, vol/com sector, with as yet no private sector representation as this started as a 'community led NRI pilot in N.Kent'.

2) Within the NRI partnership we have representation from nat, regional, and local partners. However, the main actors involved at project steering group meetings are the local partners whom are delivering the project in the NRI area.

3) We have not yet established thematic work groups on certain sector issues, which would then report back to the main NRI partnership. We have found that a focussed group of actors from a range of disciplines can co-ordinate local project activities and deliver real changes within the community.

### **3. Does the (national/regional/local) organisation allow effective participation from local people? What issues emerge from this?**

The Local NRI partnership in All Saints encourages participation through the following means:  
1) By undertaking 'community consultation exercises' to identify key priorities or issues within the local community which may have changed from delivery on previously agreed action plans. Furthermore, use specific target group exercises to effectively involve local people.

2) Through the delivery of locally agreed projects through funding support, this has involved local people from targeted groups within the community for example a) delivered a racism project; b) targeted excluded young people through a drugs programme; c) involved local volunteers in a community clean up event; d) involved young children in identifying and designing options for open green space e) Involved individuals and groups within the community through EU Interreg. projects which look to actively involve the citizen in developing and delivering local projects in their areas.

3) The results from the participation directly inform the delivery of the local community project and the wider NRI partnership. However, at present there is not a full diversity of local people involved on the main NRI partnership as for example 'Community Champions' expressing local needs in the NRI area.

### **4. What are the relationships between these local neighbourhood structures/ partnerships and wider and more established democratic structures?**

E.g All Saints NRI

This is a strange issue but very interesting in terms of the local NRI partnership and thus the NRI area due to the partners involved and the amount of match funding contributed within the area is far greater than that of the local Council (Medway). As such and previously raised in the Genoa EEE there is a greater distribution of power to the NRI partnership than the local political structure of the Council. However, in saying that Medway Council is a key partner in the future delivery of the NRI objectives in the area and are an integral partner at the NRI meetings.

E.g Swanscombe NRI

However, this couldn't be more distinct due to the very nature that the NRI pilot in Swanscombe has been strengthened by the overall political weighting/representation of Swanscombe council members in the local Dartford Borough council. The determination of the local council to develop the action and now deliver NR within the existing community of Swanscombe has been identified as a key priority.

### **5. Is there a project manager and a project team with the necessary power, money and influence to "bend mainstream services" to benefit the neighbourhood?**

1) Yes, at present this is contributed to by the establishment and effectiveness of the local informal NRI partnership meetings undertaken bi-monthly, which enables the co-ordination of resources from partner budgets.

2) The local All Saints community project (with a project manager and community development worker) steers a majority of the capacity building, community/social regeneration work in the area. However, the resources to achieve this are supplied by key partners in the NRI partnership such as the church and NKGp who also assist in a co-ordination and facilitation role for the local NRI work. Using the NRI partnership enables the local community group to 'access mainstream services' much easier than other com/vol groups would be able to as the area has been identified as a priority area for regeneration. The importance of open and strong communicational links between the local community project, the NKGp and church enable the ability to draw in and influence mainstream service provision within the area.

**6. Is the organisation able to change focus and methods when required? Does it have a flexible approach?**

Yes and No.

1) (Yes), The configuration of the local NRI partnership in itself is flexible to openly include other sector agencies within the partnership when required.

2) (Yes), The NRI partnership does have the ability to change its focus when responding to local people's desires and wants when expressed through local community consultation events or targeted group work whereby priorities may shift.

3) No, in terms of some approaches in the area due to the inability of the local faith group to be able to deliver change within the community against or contrary to its Christian values. This issue has arisen with regards to redevelopment of a site.

**7. Is there a local partnership (an effective co-ordination of all the local actors)? How are these organised and what are the different roles and responsibilities?**

I think I have been able to explain most of this above.

1 ) Local NRI partnership holds regular bi-monthly meetings.

2) Co-ordination of the NRI partnership is led by 3 main parties the NKGP, Church and the local community group (All Saints church). The NKGP leads as the Chair of the NRI Partnership and co-ordinates activity from other partners preparing action plans which incorporate sector partner's contributions in the area.

## **POSEIDON – Structural Patterns of Neighbourhood Management Policies, London Haringey EEE, 17-19 June 2004**

### **Input of the city of Genoa**

*“Vi é, dunque, una grande differenza tra periferizzazione e periferia. La periferizzazione non é un luogo geometrico sulla circonferenza di un cerchio e sui lati di un quadrato, ma é il luogo di ogni periferizzazione sociale anche in posizioni centrali o intermedia del "corpo urbano" complessivo quando avvengono fenomeni di esclusione e degrado”*

*Roberto Guiducci, da Lurbanistica dei cittadini*

*“Then, there is a great difference between suburbanisation and suburb. The suburbanisation isn't a geometrical place on the circumference of a circle or on the sides of a square, but is a place of every social marginalization also in central or middle contexts of 'urban bodies' when exclusion and urban blight attain.”*

*from Roberto Guiducci 'Town planning of inhabitants'*

### **1. Is there a broad, co-ordinated political initiative at national, regional or local level, which sets the framework for the improvement of your neighbourhood?**

If the purpose of the EEE in Haringey is sharing experiences on requirements and goals for programmes of improvement in disadvantaged areas, it is necessary to deepen ideas which are on the basis of different public bodies, laws and policies in our Countries.

In Italy since last 15 years a process of decentralisation has grown from the national government to delegated Local Authorities; Italian Regions have now greater power in making laws and gathering financial resources. All issues related to land planning and neighbourhood management (in a wide meaning) are now charged to Regions, Provinces and Municipalities.

From the national policy in the after second war period up to the end of 80-ies, Local Authorities have inherited few popular wards (in Italy public houses are less then the 10% of total housing), in peripheral zones of great cities, but any specific structures for neighbourhood management policy implementation.

In last years, and finally in the 2003 law on organisation of local government, Regions, Provinces and Municipalities have got a wider administration autonomy, but now they need to co-ordinate their policies in the relevant sectors such as health assistance, education, childcare, etc.

<b>National level, Italy</b>	<b>Law</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Beneficiary &amp; actors</b>	<b>Success</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Funds</b>
Contratti di quartiere (neighbourhood agreement)	L266/97	Neighbourhood management, renewal of public block	Local auth Local stakeholders	* * *	Participation integrated process		40% region 60% ministry of infrastructure and transports

Sportello unico per le imprese (single window for enterprises)	Dlgs 112/98 Dpr 447/98	Streamlining of bureaucracy for enterprises	Enterprises	***	Short times for administrative processes	Lack of services in the small municipalities	N
Urban rehabilitation programmes	2001	Urban renewal with building replacement		*** Old industrial areas * Urban and central areas	Urban renewal	Social substitution no participation, no specific funds = no strategic objective in UR	N (private)
Patti territoriali (Territorial agreement)	1995 - CIPE	Bottom-up approach	Enterprises, unions, local auth Co-ordinated by Chamber of Commerce and local auth	**	Bureaucracy streamlining, funding canalisation to selected probably successful projects	Disagreement among different local auth. Conditions only to receive funds, not whole strategy (control committee)	Y

Regional level, Liguria	Law	Topics	Beneficiary and actors	Success	Strengths	Weaknesses	Funds
PTR (Regional territorial plan)	LR 36/97	Integrated planning	Region	In course	Co-ordination of local level planning	?	?
POI (Organic programmes of intervention)	LR 25/97	Urban renewal by single little interventions	Municipalities Private owners Region	**	Strong private interest. Short times	Major focus for residents in not deprived areas	Y
CIV	LR 14/98 LR 2/03	Areas not in OB2 Historic center and peripheral renewal	Local auth. Public controlled company Region	***	Improvement of commerce Social improvement	Disagreement among retailers	Y

Local level Province of Genoa	Law	Topics	Beneficiary & actors	Success	Strengths	Weaknesses	Funds
Agenda 21	EU	Social sustainability Education system. Small municipalities participation	Municipalities Mountain communities Associations Local residents Schools	**	Integrated approach and participation	Too many actors and issues involved	N
PTC	LUR 36/97	Integrated planning	Province	***	Co-ordination of local level planning Focus on PQ (frame project)	Long times for implementing process. No funding	N
GELAP ENLACE ESSERE	Policies for employment ESF	Improvement of employment Training and information	Province Municipalities (With particular attention to small and inner ones) Citizens and Local auth.	** In course	Strong relationship with small municipalities and local enterprises	No funding	Y (ESF)
Programma di sviluppo	Local policy	Creation of services	Province Municipalities	Service	Strong relationship	Long times for implementation	N

di mandato (Task programme)		service nets Integrated planning Intersectoral co-ordination Promotion of citizens participation	municipali- ties(With particular attention to small and inner ones) Citizens and Local auth.	nets * * *  Integrated planning *	relationship with small municipalities and local action groups	implementation Possible sector overlapping	
-----------------------------------	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

## 2. Are all the relevant sectors involved? Is there a "full Orchestra" approach or are there many "single instruments"?

From the citizens' point of view, the described context implies a lack of information about all the services they need, because there isn't an integrated system (information net or information point) as neighbourhood management policy requires. Therefore our approach is more oriented to "single instruments" that arise frequently in a spontaneous way. Main actors are Municipalities, NGOS, Associations.

Provincia di Genova works, on one hand, as an institutional Authority, and creates planning instruments and social economic programmes, on the other hand promotes interventions and takes part to several local actions, that have been agreed by involved communities. We may highlight different kinds of approach - and of existing regulations too - for every different phase of transformation of a part of territory:

Phase 1 - Planning: single actors and single instruments often working on the same issues (problem of competence overlapping).

This kind of disorder is mainly generated by

- Different political line-up of public authorities
- Too many similar skilled departments not coordinated

Phase 2 - Decisions: in comparison with the uncoordinated planning frame, the decision frame is characterized both in national and local level by concerted process established by two recent regulations@L 241/90; L 267100).

Phase 3 - Projects: Deepening in real aspects of neighbourhood transformation it's easy to find out concrete exampies of full Orchestra approaches (e.q. below)

### **GAL appennino genovese** (*local action group*)

Topics: public & private society for improving of socio-economic conditions in Province of Genoa valley.

Actors: Municipalities, Province of Genoa, Mountain Community Chamber of commerce, Local commerce associations, Handicraft Union, Farmers Union, Bank, Local Transport society.

Projects: Baby parking (4 hs/day for 3 to 5 y.o) Promotion of bed & breakfast. Crafts: improving and restoring local handicraft as cultural heritage. Development of small commercial centre. Service nets for improving of life quality.

Funds: INTERREG (OQUALITY+, CRAFT) Leader+

### **Cultural planning Committee** Alta Val Polcevera - Alta Valle Scrivia

Topics: public authorities associated to establish rules to increase the value of cultural heritage

Actors: Municipalities, Province of Genoa, Mountain Community, Antola Park Authority.

Projects: "Terrestrial routes" exhibition about historical ways from the port of Genoa to the inner valleys. Traditional games and festival linked to the exhibition.

Funds: Genova **2004**.

### **Patto territoriale delle Valli del Genovesato** (*territorial aqreement of Valleys in Province of Genoa*)

Topics: Socio economic improvement of 32 municipalities in deprived areas included in OB 2 and OB 5b

Actors: Municipalities, Local Authorities, Province of Genoa, Filse

Projects: 20 public, 90 private

**www.vallescrivvia.info**

Topics: Portal for enterprises working in Scrivia Valley - information and websites

Actors: Enterprises Service

Projects: Services for enterprises located in Scrivia Valley

### 3. Does the (national/regional/local) organisation allow effective participation from local people? What issues emerge from this?

The focus of Italian approach is "representation" more than participation from people: Local Authorities are closer to local inhabitants, first of all in little communities like Valle Scrivia, but formal aspects are relevant in our culture as top down processes are preferred.

Last years, new procedures have been realized to accelerate decision processes in public administrations and to allow interested people to take part in them: therefore a more effective and transparent process "in concert" (procedure concertative) has been implemented.

Experiences in "bottom-up" approaches are twofold: on one side they arise from a new participation concept, and produce proactive actions to obtain something but, on another side, an important factor is struggling against something, too.

National level, Italy	Level of participation	Way of participation
Contratti di quartiere (Neighbourhood agreement)	Very high	Meeting, participation in making the strategic action plan
Sportello unico per le imprese (single window for enterprises)	Low for single citizens Very high for enterprises	Enterprises can apply a streamlined process
Urban rehabilitation programmes	None	
Patti Territoriali (Territorial Agreement)	High	Meeting for making the project that will be sent to be selected

Regional level	Level of participation	Way of participation
PTR (Regional territorial plan)	Low (in course)	
POI (Organic programmes of intervention)	Very high	Citizens discuss the whole project and apply for contributes
CIV	Very high	Detailers participate directly in the joint company

Local level	Level of participation	Way of participation
Agenda 21	Very high	Meeting (forum) and environmental education projects
PTC	Medium according to regulation	Meeting and presentation with municipalities and local actors, unions
GELAP, ENLACE, ESSERE	Medium	Citizens searching for a job can join an online forum
Programma di mandato (Task programme)	High	Creating a virtual community to involve different municipalities

### 4. What are the relationships between these local neighbourhood structures/partnerships and wider and more established democratic structures?

In general local partnership have occasional relationships with the structures of public Authorities. Never the less, we have to highlight some positive experiences of participation from volunteers associations and other similar bodies, whose activities have been recognized as a role of support in implementing social policies.

Here are given some examples of co-operation between local and wider organisation in Scrivia Valley

### **Antola Local Market Net**

Topics: Local produceres unions to create a local market net in order to favour the development of local production (OB 5B/98 by EU).

The "local products" are the agro alimentary products by small family business linked to the locations, to the place, and consequently to local resources through local traditional practices and knowledge. (Among the typical products: potatoes, vegetable marrows, cheese, berries, eggs, bread, vegetables, honey and derived products, chestnut wheat, syrups, juices and jam, apples, walnuts, wood, wood coal, roses charcuteries etc).

Actors: Antola Park Authority (co-ordinator), Farmers association, Local restaurants.

Goals:

- Recovering and making the most of the local production, practices and knowledge, realizing that they are an essential element on which it is nessecary to base production and consumption rythms
- Promoting the agricultural production activity in Valle Scrivia and in Val Trebbia
- Advertising the products through the development of inner relations

Funding: EU ob 5b

Co-ordinator: Antola Park Authority

Beneficiary & actors: Local Market Net

### **Ronco Scrivia Public Library**

Topics: Restoring an old industrial building preserving its aspect and converting function (OB 2 by EU). Old substation becomes cultural centre.

Actors: Municipality, volunteer associations

Projects: Mgt of Library, Exhibitions, Museum of historic photos, Conference, Meeting, Activities with children.

Funding: EU ob 2+ Local auth.

Co-ordinator: Municipality, Volunteer association

Beneficiary and actors: Citizens

**5. Is there a project manager and a project team with the necessary power, money and influence to "bend mainstream servicesyl to benefit the neighbourhood?"**

**6. Is the organisation able to change focus and methods when required? Does it have a flexible approach?**

In the context of Scrivia Valley before described, as of other little communities, the neighbourhood policies are charged to Municipalities, whose staff structures, available time and financial resources are in general inadequate to tackle all delegated tasks. Therefore they need a support from external consultants or from other public companies: in our land "GAL Appennino Genovese", "Promoprovincia" and "Sviluppo Genova" are organisations who aim to give a support to local communities and have a deep knowledge of their usual problems. These companies are participated by Provincia di Genova.

**7. Is there a local partnership (an effective co-ordination of all the local actors)? How are these organised and what are the different roles and responsibilities?**

In Scrivia Valley, since the beginning of the POSEIDON project, Provincia di Genova has



involved local Municipalities and other public bodies in a participation process. They signed a "Local Co-operation Agreement" to take part in the project, on the basis of the previous experience made in "PRUSST" programme jointly promoted with Provincia di Genova. In the document different roles and responsibilities are given at different competence levels. The agreement procedure has been established by the land-planning tool (PTC) for the implementation of area projects, and follows general policy outlines that Provincia di Genova Council stated for its commission period.

Annex

NEW STEPS TO JOIN THOSE WHO PLANS AND THOSE WHO KEEP THE POWER FOR ESTABLISHING PREARRANGED ORGANIZATIONS

Actors: Coordination of Local agenda 21

Projects: Progettazione Partecipata; School of "participate planning" and school of neighbourhood mgt has been open to different kind of person with the goal of training professionals and member of PA to help local authorities and local partnerships.