



# Project Working Group Report

## Guidelines & Recommendations

Contents, instruments and structural patterns of neighbourhood management policies

Inter-regional Project Working Group meetings  
Stockholm, October 2004 and London Haringey, March 2005

Stockholm – London Haringey, July 2005

**Content:**

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 1   | Theme-specific guidelines to help improve neighbourhood management policies ..... | 2 |
| 1.1 | Policy recommendations made by research on urban development initiatives .....    | 2 |
| 1.2 | Proposing a model for elaborating and testing development policies.....           | 3 |

## **Theme-specific guidelines to help improve neighbourhood management policies**

The agreement between lead partners within the POSEIDON project stipulates that the inter-regional partnership during phase 2 will further explore theme-specific neighbourhood management policy issues that have actual transfer potentials and elaborate problem solutions, guidelines or minimum quality standards for commonly shared problems that can help to practically improve local neighbourhood management policies (operational manual, page 7).

As stated on several occasions throughout this report, the first of the three POSEIDON themes deals with contents, instruments and structural patterns of neighbourhood management policies. This means that we are dealing with the *making* of policies. Policies are seldom or never produced and decided upon at the same level where they later are to be implemented. In addition, policies are produced and decided upon by different levels of public authorities in different European countries. For example, the local project manager in London Haringey has very limited opportunities to influence the content of a new development strategy since the decisions on those issues are being made by the British government (concerning the number of new dwellings to be constructed in each London borough, or district). On the other hand, the local project manager in Stockholm has a rather good possibility of influencing a new policy document since those issues, at least in part, are decided upon at city level.

Ultimately, we are all more or less detached from the policy making level of the authorities of our respective cities/countries. This fact needs to be taken into account when we proceed with the elaboration of policy recommendations and guidelines (for instance, we need to be realistic about our chances to make a difference when it comes to strengthening policies on overall development issues). In addition, if there is to be a POSEIDON II, the lead partners may want to consider involving the actual policy makers in the future process, in order to ensure a more direct possibility to influence policy making.

### **1.1 Policy recommendations made by research on urban development initiatives**

The following recommendations on urban development policies and programmes have been formulated by researchers throughout Europe. Some of the suggestions have been made in a manual on successful local development work published by EU in 2003.

- Area-based projects should be developed and implemented in connection to other projects and to regular public services. Without this important connection there will be no sustainable change in the area.
- The local organisation that is established in order to plan and implement the project(s) and the overall development policy need to be at the same time visualising the development work being done and maintaining a strong link with the regular public organisation that is in need of improvement. Projects and policies that are too much separated from regular services will not be able to influence the daily work. Too close connection to regular services, on

the other hand, may threaten the project or initiative to get lost within the old structures rather than influencing them.

- The present situation – existing and potential need – must be clearly defined and analysed, as a foundation for the development process. The analyses need to be performed by experts as well as local actors and residents.
- Development work based on knowledge is preferable to temporary projects without any connection or overall plan. The work need to find a balance between the day to day wishes and needs of residents and local actors and the solid knowledge of which types of initiatives will have a more lasting effect on the area.
- A local development programme needs to be elaborated. The programme should not only be a list of projects but should describe a cohesive plan regarding the area's further development (i.e. the overall goal of the separate projects and activities).
- The local decision-making level should be most influential with regards to the funding available within the initiative. The funding needs to be long term. If the local level is forced to spend a lot of time looking for uncertain funding from different sources this will have a negative influence on the stability and the sustainability of the local development work.
- A powerful support from the head of the city district administration as well as the local councillors is important if the development initiative is to have an overall effect throughout the organisation. In addition, the initiative must be strongly supported by councillors or politicians at the central level of the city.
- Co-operation between local actors, the municipality, national authorities, trade and industry, leisure organisations and NGOs must be supported and developed on a long term basis.
- The work must be done in close co-operation between different levels in the overall administration, where the responsibility of every single level is clearly stated. This vertical co-operation needs to be combined with an equally visible horizontal co-operation between different local actors. All parties must be equally responsible for the overall development initiative.
- Segregation cannot be successfully combated by initiatives that focus solely on certain limited areas that are defined as deprived. In order to get to the core of the problems the focus must be on the relation between the deprived areas and the surrounding society. The local city districts can not be made responsible for turning the downward spiral themselves, because they lack the capacity, the means and the mandate to change the overall structure of the area (i.e. influence, for example, the number of industrial and commercial establishments, the quality of the public transportation to and from the area, the establishment of centres of higher education and the quality of these centres).

## **1.2 Proposing a model for elaborating and testing development policies**

The following list of characteristics or criteria has been elaborated by the responsible lead partners with regards to the recommendations made above. It may serve as a functional model for approaching issues regarding contents, instruments and structural patterns; being applicable in the development of a new (or the reconsidering of a present) neighbourhood management policy. If

(most of) the listed criteria are met, the possibility of having a successful policy should increase.

Please note that the list has been further elaborated compared to the draft template for describing pilot projects, previously presented at the platform. This has been done in order to ensure that it will be useful both in relation to policies and to the separate projects and activities being performed within the framework of a policy. (Most criteria are applicable to overall policies as well as to specific projects. If applied to projects, the word „policy“ is simply substituted for the word „project“.)

This model should be tested on pilot projects within POSEIDON and, if found satisfactory and useful, further developed during the upcoming assessment missions when all pilot projects are evaluated in relation to the three POSEIDON themes.

❑ **Analysis**

Does the policy ensure that specific measures within its framework are based on facts and analysis? If so, describe how.

❑ **Cohesive long term planning**

Is the elaboration of a cohesive and long term development plan a purpose or component of the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Horizontal co-operation**

Is development of horizontal co-operation a purpose or component of the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Vertical co-operation**

Is development of vertical co-operation a purpose or component of the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Equal responsibility**

Is equal responsibility among involved parties for the overall objectives of the policy ensured? If so, describe how.

❑ **Decentralisation**

Is decentralisation of influence and decision-making a purpose or component of the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Participation**

Is participation of residents and local actors a purpose or component of the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Development of partnerships**

Is the formation of partnerships (type and character) and the balance between partners a purpose or component of the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Limited intervention or influence on overall structures**

Is the possibility to address and influence overall structures and the surrounding society's relation to the target area(s) supported by the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Sustainability**

Are sustainable results a purpose of the policy? If so, describe how.

❑ **Funding**

Is long term funding of the implementation of the policy ensured? If so, describe how.

When used in relation to specific projects, the initial issue on the list of criteria may be the following.

❑ **Type and character of project**

Describe how the pilot project relates to an overall policy and plan for improvement of the neighbourhood.