

# A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

## An Inclusive City Growth Workshop

11<sup>th</sup> November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

### Social Integration and inclusion

#### Table 1 Session 1

**Facilitator in bold facilitator – comments in bold**

Respondents in regular text

*These notes are a summary of the conversation*

---

*Session 1, Table 1*

#### **Shanthi Gunsekera (Facilitator)**

Caroline Clipson, Alzheimer's UK

Fawad Bharti, London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Nicholas Plumb, The Challenge

Drew Stevenson, Paddington Development Trust

Fizza Qureshi, Migrant's Rights Network

Ade Fashade, London Voluntary Service Council

Gordon Deuchars, Age UK

Shane Britton, London Borough of Newham

Julia Park, Levitt Bernstein

Sarah Chapman, Hackney Council

---

**I think Matthew gave a clear steer around social integration, so this is about shared identities of ways of being a Londoner. There are really interesting complimentary tables. I shared some of the questions that you might want to talk about, but the key questions are around what successful social integration means to you. There's also this point around there being that one thing that would make a real difference, so where the GLA could add value. I suggest we have an open conversation for the next half an hour or so. Does anyone have any initial thoughts?**

You used the interesting phrase 'interconnecting lives', but what does that actually mean? How can that really work? It's very difficult to work in interconnecting lives when everyone comes from different backgrounds. What we need to look at more is what we need to live together. Perhaps we need to look at appreciating our differences more and being careful not to think that integration is all of us living together, which could be misconstrued as people from different people leaving their cultures behind to mix with everyone.

**This is a really new policy agenda. This isn't something that London has been doing in the past so it's open for discussion. Where Sadiq has come from has been about celebrating differences and London having a good history of accepting difference,**

**but there may be pockets of people living very different lives, which could lead to tension. So how can we help people lead connected lives but still have that difference? I think Caroline will have something interesting to say about how we can understand each other, like shopkeepers and their understanding of customers with Alzheimer's.**

At one level, it's the individual's choice about how they integrate and interact, but it's important to overcome the barriers. One practical thing that strikes me that the GLA can do is to do more to push digital inclusion. Older people, there are people who are still digitally excluded. If you're digitally excluded then you're more than excluded. There might be an area Facebook group or something, but if you're digitally excluded you'll never know about it.

### **What can the Mayor do?**

They're appointing a chief digital officer, so I assume there's a budget and team with an active work programme working to combat digital exclusion.

It might be relevant for me to come in now. I was saying before how people with dementia are often very excluded. Part of that is relating to stigma and fear around dementia. Some of the work we've been doing is trying to engage with the shopkeeper or the person who runs the library to get them to understand dementia so there's no stigma and fear around it. It's not just dementia; it might be other conditions that affect how people interact. Anything the Mayor could do would be great. On the digital thing, there are some people who won't be able to get their heads around digital stuff and there will be a point where it's not a priority for them, so I'd ask for flexibility around how people can engage. Being more understanding would be really appreciated by certain groups, and it would be valued by people who find that way of interacting very challenging.

It's quite a new policy agenda. Newham is the most diverse borough. Our largest single group is white British, which is 17%, so we've been thinking about the social agenda a lot. It's not about saying people are the same; it's about celebrating differences but making sure that it's something that everyone can come around. Community events are a great way for people to come together, so we do host things as a council, but we also have a bidding fund for people. You have to reach out and take practical steps. It's about celebrating those differences but overlaying that with a sense of place, which is where the active citizenship comes into play, where we bring people from different backgrounds together. It's about having that place identity to bring people together.

I work at The Challenge. We're a social integration charity. We had a nod to Newham's policy about funding community events. If that was adopted by other councils that would be a good step towards ensuring communities include all people. I agree with active citizenship. We do a lot of work with young people and volunteering. We see that as a way of creating contact between different groups. Contact is key, so any policy that has contact at the heart is important. The way we design our environment is important, so housing developments with possibilities for contact and the removal of poor doors. It's about inclusive design.

Building on Alan's point, I'm not sure I like 'integration', as it suggests you're pushing people into something they might not want to do. It's about understanding why people aren't integrating. Is it that people are doing their day job? We're in an age of austerity, so people are mainly thinking about how they're going to survive. It's helping people deal with their issues and austerity. Contact is really important, but I'm wary of thinking that mixed events are a

measure of that contact. You will possibly see the same faces, so how can you make sure those events are multicultural and cross the divides rather than just showing the face of it so it's truly connected?

Maybe a slightly bleak view: this is all very well meaning, but we have to take account of the fact that we're living under a government whose social policy is about driving inequality. In London, what we're seeing are certain communities being driven out of London because they can't afford to live here. Housing is key here. In Hackney, we have a fantastic regeneration programme with new properties for genuine social rent, but you're not seeing that in many other places in London. If you don't have communities with rich and poor living side by side, there's no chance of social integration. People are objecting to demolishing houses that aren't fit to live in, but that's because it will be the end of mixed communities. Language is the other thing. If people can't speak the same language, there's no hope for integration.

The policies are very well meaning, and we have to make sure the Mayor gets involved. It's about the whole concept of community. What we've been talking about is enabling, but you could argue that it's more about identity. In the digital age, the only way to see your neighbourhood's identity is online. Coming back to the sense of neighbourhood, in Paddington we've found the best thing is getting out there and talking to people. Only when you understand what matters to people can you say you can work with people. We've developed community champions. They're not paid, but they're given training on how to deal with things that affect people on a daily basis. Those volunteers can then get into paid work.

### **Are they part of the neighbourhood?**

Yes.

We need to eliminate discrimination. After that, we should expect tolerance and mutual respect. That should be an accepted baseline, but we're not there yet. Then we should facilitate interaction, not demand it, through design and the way entrances look so everyone feels as welcome as possible. There are parts of London where I don't feel welcome as a white, middle class, older woman. I'm not necessarily frightened, but places look like a private courtyard. Sometimes it's a public place but it's ambiguous. A lot of this is very basic. Picking up on poor doors, nearly all our clients expect us to provide different entrances for different tenants. There are different reasons, like giving wealthy purchasers everything they expect. There's a higher cost subsidy, but I'm not sure they're good enough to eliminate discrimination. We need to understand where the residents are happy with separate entrances if they're equally attractive and are all on nice parts of the site. We push incredibly hard for that. We won't have some cheap door tucked away for affordable rent.

If we're not in an equal place, how is anyone able to move across social mobility? Going back to your point, it does seem like London courts the wealthy. The housing industry is being pushed to attract wealthier clients, so poorer communities are being pushed out. How can you integrate when your neighbour is never there because it's their holiday home?

Addressing tenure imbalance is simple in policy terms. There's no point in a policy where less than half is routinely achieved. You need to aim higher and mean it. There are really good signs that that's the way Sadiq is going, which is fantastic. By and large, the cost comes out of land value. If developers know they can't negotiate below 40% of affordable rent, they won't bother.

Coming back to the question about the role of the GLA, the GLA is unique across London with the realities of what it can achieve. The Mayor of London has a hugely symbolic role, and he has made a lot of efforts to reach out, like to LGBT groups and the Jewish community. Now he's in position, it's about maintaining that. In Hammersmith and Fulham, I work with a cabinet member for social inclusion. That's hugely influential. In terms of opportunities for interaction, we've been here before with the Social Cohesion Agenda with millions thrown at it. Small things were achieved, but it's about how we incorporate this into the day-to-day running of our organisations. London has a transient community. I have very little time to interact with work colleagues where I live so, if I can't do that, what about the millions of other people from around the world?

The GLA is a facilitator for opportunities. For social integration to happen, people need to be incentivised so they can see how their lives can be better. It's just basically better housing, jobs, better quality education and spaces for children to play in. If you can, show that those opportunities are available with more joined-up working with other authorities. One area we're grappling with is the risk of reoffending. Young people come out of prison but there's no housing or jobs so they go back. We're asking them to be part of an inclusive London. That should make their lives better, but when they're excluded from that community there's a defensiveness. Housing is a big, complex issue. It's about focusing on what matters to people to incentivise them to be part of the inclusion agenda. Matthew Rider mentioned removing the barriers, so it's about how you facilitate that. There needs to be more awareness and understanding. The GLA is more of a facilitator, so as part of that they need more awareness about the local communities out there.

That's a good point. A really practical thing for the GLA is to have a clear and positive approach to working with communities and civil society. My experience of the GLA is lots of people want to do the right thing, but there are silos and things aren't consistent. There are parts of the GLA's work where civil society has to fight to be heard. Looking at housing, we're doing some work with older private renters, and one thing that's coming up is that if you're a social housing tenant you might have a difficult situation but you're relating to a public body, and there are lots of other people in the same situation as you. If you're in the private sector – which more will be in the future – you have an individual relationship between you and your landlord, so you often have problems that no one else has. That will be a challenge for integration.

We haven't answered the key question about what is London's identity and what we will bring people into. This is the key. London is divided on so many bases. It's a highly economised capital. How do you draw people into that same identity when it's so different for people in terms of what they can get out of London? We're hearing about libraries closing down, but they were a centre for me when growing up. It will be interesting to see if those centres can survive. Loads of community groups are disappearing because they don't have the funding or they're being pushed to fight for funding. How can the GLA ensure resources are available? I was very interested in what Gordon said. One thing that makes a community is having a common bond – it can sometimes be a common enemy. Some residents of Hackney regard Hackney as an enemy, but they have a common bond – they're all tenants and they have residents' groups. What we're seeing with the right to buy discount is people buying and then sub-letting their flats. We have got a population growing up who have a single landlord and not much else in common. This is an issue we have to be aware of. In Hackney, we put together a strategy for private renting, with key demands on what would make a good private landlord. That would be useful to take forward.

It's about what kind of London the Mayor and we want. There's quite a lot of that already coming through with what the Mayor wants. The next step is for the Mayor to say, "This is my

vision, and if you share my vision I want you, at your local level, to say how to make it a reality in your local area." It's making a division that celebrates diversity, but how to make a more integrated community that both celebrates diversity and also defends where they live? In terms of providing funding, there's still a lot of money out there. We're in a new situation. We're in austerity, public money has gone, but we have a bigger population, so the corporate sector needs to step in. It's either the most deprived areas or in the cross-cutting themes, like in-work poverty.

I think the London Finance Commission includes bodies to get them involved.

We're talking about social integration activity happening, but we need to remove the barriers. There are things that help, like libraries and English language courses. Those things are difficult to maintain if we don't have to, but we've kept our libraries open and tried to turn them into hubs. A GLA bidding fund that we can go to for specific projects is something that can sit under the social integration structure.

As long as it's from the ground up and all inclusive, because otherwise the same voices get the same funding. It's about finding what people really need.

Having events where they encourage interaction. A much broader sense of diversity, so ongoing interaction and activities are taking place that aren't just ticking off one or two groups. It's best to engage as many different groups as possible, doing what it can do.

It's like a street party or local people coming up with ideas where they need funding. It's stuff people do that you can wander along and do. It's about enjoyment and contact.

Public sector colleagues will know that you have to be careful when working closely with a cabinet member who makes bold decisions. We offer work experience. Traditionally, there was over-representation of white people from an ABC1 background, so they said that if you were on free school meals you would automatically get it. This gives people from a different socioeconomic group an insight into and interest in public sector work.

That's a really good practical example.

You can do your bit within your own organisation.

It's about incentivising.

**I'll summarise what I think the key points are. There has been a really interesting discussion with a good mix of questions about how we approach this and how it fits into a wider agenda. The key thing is to engage with Londoners, and it seems there are multiple layers. It's making sure we have an inclusive strategy to engage with Londoners. The second thing is about what it means to be a Londoner, and that's an inclusive identity that allows for different identities within it. Then there's something about reducing stigma and increasing understanding of different Londoners, so how the Mayor can reduce those stigmas. It's how we can give the message of connecting with other Londoners. Then there's something around the design of the city and the accommodation and tenures offered, how we make sure we're at the heart of what's designed so there are inclusive environments, and stopping forcing people out of the city. The third area is about funding and partnerships for inclusive working. Funding might be partnership with corporations and philanthropists. We need to look at how**

**funding is available in an inclusive way, so it's not always the same people getting funding. The final area is specific projects like digital inclusion, English language and bold decision making. Those are the key takeaways that I've picked up. Is there anything else?**

I'd be keen to hear more about the London Plan and the design of the city, and whether integration would be part of that so it's about contact between people.

It's a key component in the current plan and I think it will be even stronger in the next one.

The GLA needs better understanding as an agency. The community needs to bring that awareness to public authorities. There's too much top down; there needs to be more bottom up. Professional practitioners, it's about the language, it can be exclusive and can create barriers.

One other aspect that didn't come up is devolving power. Unless there is genuine devolution, people won't think the Mayor is serious and they won't engage.

**So devolution to communities.**

Everything we've been talking about comes into all the areas, like the economy and environment.

I have nothing to add.

The GLA needs to create a feedback group. I think there's a big reality gap. The GLA's energy policy is almost impossible to achieve, but the records say it's been achieved. There is no follow up. Nobody comes back to us. We all say everything is inclusive and its tenure mixed, but that could mean one affordable flat out of 499.

Nothing to add.

Thinking about ongoing interaction and how we want to keep that coming together on a sustained basis.

I'm recognising that London has a massive population and people will feel excluded if they don't feel like Londoners, so how do you make them feel included?

You can never have enough opportunities for interaction. London is super diverse, and you have to keep pushing for the platforms to bring people together.

**I have a short slot after the second table to summarise, so not everything we talked about will be part of that, but we've got the notes and what you've said will have been recorded.**

# Social Integration and inclusion

## Table 1 Session 2

---

*Session 2, Table 1*

### **Shanthi Gunsekera (Facilitator)**

Will Stinson, Family Mosaic  
Jeanelle de Gruchy, London Borough of Haringey  
Moussa Haddad, Child Poverty Action Group  
Muge Dindjer, City of Westminster  
Farah Elahi, Runnymede Trust  
Ben Robinson, Community Links  
Michael Ball, Waterloo Community Development Group  
Andy Gregg, Race on the Agenda  
Eileen Conn, Peckham Vision  
Andrew Hurst, One Dance UK  
Roland Chesters, Disability Rights UK

---

I'm part of the community group and it's about the area being zoned 40 years ago and the community was turfed out.

**Matthew gave quite a clear indication about social integration. This table is focused on bringing people together, connected lives and those aspects of social integration. I had a list of questions that we could use, but everyone took them away after the last session. The three key questions for me are about what social integration means in terms of how we might measure social integration. The second is the point around there being one key point where the GLA can add value. The third point is around mainstreaming as this agenda cuts across others. I'll open this up to the floor.**

I'm pleased that Matthew has a cohesive notion of social inclusion. The only thing that Matthew said is that he's interested in how to measure this stuff. With race and social inclusion, there are facile ways of measuring this. Some think tanks look at this and measure social inclusion when they mean ethnic inclusion. That makes it difficult for inclusion. They measure social integration with how many people of my pigmentation are in an area. The GLA could challenge how those metrics are done.

A lot of the metrics that look at social integration look at how often you go to someone else's house for tea, which isn't a good way of measuring it. It's looking at the role for central government bodies and the role of local groups. It's more about access to things like services and employment, and the ability to leave your house. They're more significant in allowing people to integrate.

I've never heard of it being used to describe racial integration until today, but I've been working in this for 15 years. We look at it from a vulnerable people point of view. Our tenants are often vulnerable, so it's about making those people engage with the things we put out there. The people who are hard to reach are the easiest to get included in society, as you can see what you need to do. They're the ones we always hit. The ones we don't tend to have any contact with are our standard people who are middle aged and probably go to work every day. We don't often hear from them. I'd like to look at the people we're not hearing from. We have 50,000

properties and we're talking to the hard-to-reach people, but it's the standard people who we're not hearing from. As a housing association, they're people we're overlooking, and I'd like to see how I can integrate those people and reach out to them. It's interesting to hear people label it up, because it's a different thing to me.

I've had a similar experience with the social housing sector, and your point raises the issue of people needing an issue to engage. Those who work are busy, so unless there's a need they won't make the time to engage with you on this. It's the whole, "What's in it for me?"

**So there's how services and the GLA engage with the communities they serve, and how we can make sure that's as representative as possible. Then it's how we facilitate Londoners to make contact with each other.**

That's what attracted me to this list of questions where it's about bringing people together. What we do is focus on mutual interests in things locally. The local thing we have is the town centre. That includes all kinds of people, which was deliberate. This educational activity helps people become engaged by understanding the obscure issues of planning and regeneration. We're deeply involved in involving everybody who has an interest in the same thing. It's how you help, in our diverse communities, to make things easier for individuals so you can get to know them quite well. In our town centre we have several parallel communities and economies that only interact superficially. We have a worm's eye view of some of the dynamics that go on. All kinds of richness in the neighbourhood are totally below the radar. The disconnect is between the understanding and experiences of that worm's eye view and the policy makers.

We talked a lot about housing and the private rental sector. That temporariness might attract some people, but we're seeing more families in the sector. If you're in that permanent sense of temporariness, it's hard to become integrated. In the other group, affordability was more the issue, but security makes you feel more rooted in a community. There needs to be increased security of tenure.

We do similar things to Eileen in Waterloo. We've done it around the town centre and the shopping street. It's what everybody uses. We've done many projects, like working with young people and getting people involved in planning, because that's our focus. We ask them what they want from the town centre, rather than asking the usual suspects, so you hear very different things. That brings identity to the area. People live in Waterloo and have the things that make them who they are. Part of that integration is creating identity. You have to say, "This is my identity, but I empathise with your identity." That's the approach to building an identity in Waterloo.

From a disability point of view, I saw it as accessibility for people with disabilities, not just physical but also cognitive. There's also the increase in disability hate crime, which also applies to other under-represented groups. The last thing is about employment. For disabled people, employment is a battle, so it's about making employment accessible for people with disabilities. It might be enabling employers so it's easier or giving those with disabilities more confidence to go for employment.

**We're running a community cohesion commission and I'm interested in developing the metrics to know how you've succeeded, so I'd be interested in thoughts about that. This is the start of the conversation. We haven't had someone for social integration yet, and there hasn't been much done at a city level, so this is a new area. We're starting this conversation to inform how we should approach it.**

**It will only succeed – and Sadiq doesn't have the policy leaders – if it's socially integrated, but that can't just be a thing on the side. It's not about mixed developments in housing – you can put people together and they live parallel lives. It's about a good housing policy.**

**Earlier we talked about mixed-tenure housing developments and the impact of housing policies. Your point is that it's not just enough to have mixed housing tenure.**

There is research that more affluent and poorer people are more disadvantaged in those mixed properties, because they're more aware of the inequalities. It's an ongoing requirement.

It's about what social inclusion is. People want to come to London because they're trying to escape homogenous communities and want to do some horizontal stuff. We have to be careful with what we mean by 'community'. People live cheek by jowl, but that doesn't mean they are or aren't integrated. The fastest growing cohort of young people is people of mixed heritage.

In Newham, we have a third moving in and out of the borough, so what can that mean in that context? 50% are in the rented sector. It's dealing with those complex issues.

In Lambeth, we have a development in Blackfriars. £15 million was going to go to the New Kent Road, which is 99% social housing. The metrics on the numbers for housing are so demanding that all the mixed stuff goes out the window. What we're creating is very imbalanced. You have to look across communities. Our street of shops, that's where everyone goes to shop, so that's where they can engage. You go there to find out what they're thinking and what they're doing. That's what gives them the identity. That space is so important; it's where we can all meet.

On the issue of metrics, inequality is quite a useful metric. It's how people feel about living in an area. That can be dependent on what they see around them. If equality is a metric, the thing about people living cheek by jowl, the basis of that, is that inequality is bad for everyone, not just in terms of how they feel but in terms of health and education. It's about understanding integration not just at a local level but London wide. Part of that is about age. For a younger demographic it's much easier to find spaces where they feel comfortable and integrated, but it's harder for older and much younger groups. For certain age groups or those with disabilities, horizontal integration is harder.

We're using 'community' in different ways, as it can be regional or age. London has a vast array of meet-up groups, so it's thinking about what we mean by communities. We've got a strategy on women and violence that has gone out, and it's about the concept of a benign community being problematic. Some women face violence within their community. With Brexit and people wanting control, there might be communities that have strong controls over what happens. It's also the concept of Londoners and how lots of Londoners have strong international connections. How can London play a role internationally in terms of social cohesion?

**Internet-based communities might be worth exploring as well.**

As individuals we have that communication, but they all need to be happening and working.

We have to address all the different interests that we've got. People have their own communities, like age and ethnicity. In my borough, there are people of mixed ethnicities who integrate as older people. I don't know if this is a GLA role, but I'm desperate to get

information. I want to know all the different characteristics that have been recorded in the census. I can't get it, so can we get access to it? Can that be made available?

I think Matthew is keen for us to use the GLA's data, but the census is always old and it doesn't allow for the granularity that we need within London. There's a level of granularity that we need in London that we don't get from the census, but we need the GLA to find it for us. We're not doing it like other policy constitutions

Your local authority has a duty to publish data on a lot of different metrics. They should be publishing that data regularly, and it should be readily accessible.

If you work in planning and regeneration you'll know how difficult it can be. We don't have the time.

As local authorities have had to cut budgets, some services have become much more self-service and things have been moved online, which might have impacted on inclusion and access to data. This will only continue and get more severe.

Now we've got the information, but it's just slightly out of reach.

As an observation, we've mentioned young people a few times, but I don't think there's anybody in the room under 25. I'm from London, and it was different 20 or 30 years ago, but I know it will never be like it used to be. When I started working I was the brain of the office, because I could use a computer. We've moved on in technology but we haven't moved on in how we take views. Young people communicate online but we've not moved on, so we're excluding them. They wouldn't come to a room like this because it would be too daunting for them. At Family Mosaic we're trying to introduce social media groups so they don't have to meet around a table, and that's blowing people's minds. Maybe get some young people involved in driving some of this forward. I'd hate to think that these policies are put in place by us when we're leaving out younger people. It's ironic that we're talking about inclusion when we're missing out that big group.

In terms of social media for people with disabilities, it's not always accessible for them.

Maybe not social media but technology. If you go to tech meetings, they'll say that 30% of the job market will be replaced. We have to look at how we get with that or we'll be left behind, because we'll be the people who can't use the sites in 30 years. We will be those people unless we work out technology to allow people to use those websites.

I manage to get young people because I went to their homework clubs and I went to the places they shared, so you go to them, you don't get them to come to you. The information is there, but people are filtering that information. Looking at disability employment, that's a huge issue. The government has announced cutting back on supporting disabled people in work. The issue of employment needs to be addressed. We had a local development that said there would be 200 new roles. They were told there were 50 local people. That wasn't quantified, as opposed to an office block that will bring people from miles away. It's easy to forget about the areas that aren't being developed and aren't changing. Integration and inclusion are easier when things are changing and there's development going on. I went to Hampstead last week, and it's exactly the same. In large parts of London, like Bexhill, the change isn't there so the integration and inclusion aren't there. We need to think about how we do that.

Hampstead would say that there has been change because people are buying properties from afar.

A lot of the communities that we work with don't have the power to shape it as they want. One of the success measures for integration could be these areas claiming this power to shape their areas. At the moment, with the generation we're seeing, the scale in Newham is out of this world and there's no way the local communities feel they can shape it.

What elements make up the common London identity and what makes a place where you can live well? Do we have an opinion of what that means in London? Peckham is changing every day and has been for the last 30 years. I only know about Peckham, which is seeing huge change. I think it's too much for us to cope with. The pace and quantity of change is being reflected in the election results because we're not able to cope with so much change. What can we identify as mutual? Those things are essential. If we're talking about neighbourhoods, we need to look at the things that are mutual and the things we have in common. I had an image of a new artificial medical thing you put in your body and the DNA cells create around that structure. Communities are living systems, so we have to do something to allow the system to grow.

Employment is important with this. What you find is that more and more people can't live in London for financial reasons. You might have had a community who work together, but you have less of that. In Newham and Tower Hamlets, they're looking at Canary Wharf. Every time we do a new build, a certain number of jobs have to be for apprentices, but our team is stressed trying to find people to fill those roles. Just because you want to give roles to local people doesn't necessarily mean that people want to do those jobs. Employment offers a real solution for people to integrate, because people from different social groups can meet and work together, which can change the course of people's lives. It doesn't have to be paid employment – a volunteering role can be what they want.

I agree that employment is an important metric for integration. You mentioned the pace of change and change being a sign of increased integration. Gentrification and the pace of change in areas have created big conversations in London. As there's more pressure on councils to attract money into the borough, they market the borough to attract a certain clientele, but that often leaves out groups already living there. It's about ensuring that they don't deprive people who want to move there. As fundraising powers devolve to boroughs, it will be about attracting people to the borough. In terms of valuing the communities and shifting the narrative, that should be thought about.

For refugees, employment is the level of integration, and it needs to be employment at the level they're trained for. The other distinction we need to make, some people make the distinction between the thick community that you have to invest in and the thin community you can get straight in. Our worry is that people are getting older and we're insisting that communities should be thick, but that's not the notion of community that we need in London, because it excludes those who want to be part of a thin community.

I propose that there are 40-odd opportunity areas. There are four I've been involved in and they're a disaster, because they're flying in development and smashing out what is already there. I want to turn that inside out. There was a policy in the old GLC called Communities First. I want to see that stuck at the centre of opportunity areas so they work with what is there. Old Kent Road has so much stuff going on there. Flying in all that stuff is what's got us in that

mess. We need to work with what's there and tell the developers to work with it. You can still produce the amount of housing you want, but you have to do it within the context.

In terms of community, it's not just residents; it's also people who run businesses and people who work there.

There's an important point about erasing an area's history. We saw that with the Olympics. People want to connect to an area. The council denied that the area they levelled had any housing on it, so we had to go back to the plan. We're seeing it again in Royal Docks: they're seeing an opportunity so it's easier for them to deny what exists. That relates back to homogenous areas. If you judge them on the measures you do at the moment, they look like successes because of the economics, but Sadiq could say that that is failure. We're working with business representative groups and they're saying we won't have a successful city if we continue with this process. We will get to the point where we realise what we've lost.

**I'll just summarise now. The first thing is around development, putting communities at the centre of those developments and looking at how we work with those communities. It's looking at the measures of those developments and including local employment. That would be reflected in the London Plan. Then there's the importance of employment as a facilitator of integration, and how employment needs to be appropriate and fulfilling. Maybe Sadiq could work to address stigma or preconceptions that are barriers to inclusive employment. There's looking at engaging with communities, whether that's social media or going out to communities. Looking at activities that have a common purpose, that might be similar to the things that we talked about earlier, and including local voices. The final thing is looking past mixed housing as the be all and end all, because it doesn't mean that we have integration. There's also sharing data so community organisations can use that in terms of being inclusive. I'll now go around the table so you can tell me if I've got anything wrong.**

Thinking about my area, there are social activities that bring people together. That's what I'm interested in. Our members do lots of things with that. You've touched on that with the common purpose, so there are social activities to bring people together.

The thing I find inefficient in the planning process is understanding the different aspects of life. This all needs to be acknowledged – a statement that talks about the elements for successful integration.

Nothing new to add. Two things I've heard, we're looking at a measure of success to get hard measures of integration into strategies. I've also heard that integration isn't about liking your neighbours but is around harder things like employment.

One thing that Eileen touched upon, it's about money and power. Local authorities are cash-strapped, so vanity projects or getting in bed with developers at the cost of local community. The community should come first.

The point around what we think of as success, taking into account what we value about London with the various diversities. It's not just looking at economic measures of success, there's also inclusion.

It's about embedding it in all services.

**The key thing is about communities being put first and looking at the measures around jobs that are developed to ensure they're available to existing communities. Employment was seen as a key enabler for social contact and overcoming barriers. The key part around making sure the measure of success isn't about wealth and bringing up the employment prospects of an area. Earlier there was a real discussion about engaging with Londoners and developing the approach. We have a conversation about what it means to be a Londoner and that should be a shared identity that allows for multiple identities. On engaging with Londoners, there is an opportunity for the Mayor to reduce stigma and increase understanding of communities, like giving shopkeepers a better understanding of dementia.**