



Hackney Cohesion Review

Full report July 2010

Foreword

By Mayor Jules Pipe



Hackney's richly diverse community – where people from different backgrounds are confident and respectful of one another – is one of the borough's greatest strengths. That's why Hackney's Sustainable Community Strategy put strong and cohesive communities at the centre of our shared vision for a sustainable Hackney in 2018.

This review drew on a range of research and data, as well as discussions with residents and local organisations, to explore what makes community life and cohesion so strong in Hackney. By building on what brings people together and unites them, we hope that Hackney will remain a special place for residents – somewhere where diversity is a source of strength and creativity, and where existing communities and residents can share in the benefits and opportunities of London's dynamic economy.

There are challenging times ahead. Now, more than ever, excellent services, delivered fairly and equitably in a way which meets the needs and aspirations of local people are crucial for cohesion. The Council and its partners will be looking closely at the review's recommendations and setting out how we will work together to address the issues, making Hackney a better place to live and work.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jules Pipe". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line that ends in an arrowhead pointing to the right.

Mayor Jules Pipe

Hackney Cohesion Review 2010

	page
Summary	3
Main Report	
Chapter One Background to the Hackney Cohesion Review	5
Chapter Two Cohesion in Hackney	9
Chapter Three Gap Analysis	20
Chapter Four Future Directions	26

Foreword

By Mayor Jules Pipe

Hackney's richly diverse community – where people from different backgrounds are confident and respectful of one another – is one of the borough's greatest strengths. That's why Hackney's Sustainable Community Strategy put strong and cohesive communities at the centre of our shared vision for a sustainable Hackney in 2018.

This review drew on a range of research and data, as well as discussions with residents and local organisations, to explore what makes community life and cohesion so strong in Hackney. By building on what brings people together and unites them, we hope that Hackney will remain a special place for residents – somewhere where diversity is a source of strength and creativity, and where existing communities and residents can share in the benefits and opportunities of London's dynamic economy.

There are challenging times ahead. Now, more than ever, excellent services, delivered fairly and equitably in a way which meets the needs and aspirations of local people are crucial for cohesion. The Council and its partners will be looking closely at the review's recommendations and setting out how we will work together to address the issues, making Hackney a better place to live and work.

Mayor Jules Pipe

The Hackney Cohesion Review: Summary

About the review

“A green, cosmopolitan part of London with safe, cohesive communities and a shared sense of fairness, citizenship and social responsibility”

Hackney Sustainable Community Strategy – the vision

During 2009, the Hackney Cohesion Review asked local organisations and people what contributes to a good community life. We looked at some of the challenges facing Hackney’s communities and considered what different organisations could do to support strong, cohesive communities where people are happy to live.

We looked at whether communities in Hackney are *cohesive*

where people from different backgrounds live and work comfortably alongside their neighbours

and whether they are *resilient*

where people and communities are able to cope with changes in their lives and communities without blame or undue tension.

Our findings

On the whole, residents feel Hackney is cohesive; somewhere where they feel they belong, and where people from different backgrounds get on well.

There are many reasons for this. Neighbourhoods in Hackney are very diverse, giving people the opportunity to meet and mix with people from different ethnic or religious backgrounds on a daily basis. Many people have personal or family experience of migration, and are generally positive about new arrivals. Hackney has a long tradition of progressive local community organisations and local politics. Residents struggling to make ends meet and improve their living conditions see that their neighbours face similar challenges, whatever their background.

Although Hackney is a cohesive place, the review did find that there are strains on community life. We believe that meeting these challenges will help communities in Hackney become more cohesive and resilient.

- Younger and older residents don’t always see eye-to-eye, and this can lead to mistrust and isolation
- Some people face a range of issues which make it difficult for them to get involved in community life. Poverty, limited English language skills, mental health problems, physical barriers and discrimination or prejudice are some of the things which limit people’s opportunities. Some parts of the community - such as refugees and migrants, Gypsies and Travellers, disabled adults and families with disabled

children – can face many barriers at once.

- Hackney can be a busy, noisy, and sometimes difficult place to live: tackling noise, crime and anti-social behaviour is an important element of cohesion. Many people told us that moving around safely and comfortably in Hackney and making full use of public spaces can be difficult or stressful. This is particularly true for young people affected by ‘postcode’ rivalry, but also for others, including the disabled and lesbian and gay residents we consulted during the review. People want welcoming places and events where they can get together.
- Although residents generally get on well with people from different backgrounds, many people wanted more chances for people to get to know their neighbours and make friends with people from different backgrounds.
- There are sometimes difficult decisions to be made about how local services and priorities can serve all communities whilst making sure specific needs are addressed. Women-only swimming sessions are a classic example of how local services work to meet the needs of all communities. More could be done to build a shared understanding across the borough of why such decisions are made.

Moving forward

The review suggests some of the ways we think Hackney Council and partners could help communities in Hackney stay cohesive and resilient. Our recommendations include

- Staying focused on the cornerstones of cohesive communities: tackling poverty, reducing crime, and providing excellent services to all residents.
- Communications which celebrate diversity and showcase residents’ contributions to their community and to cohesion
- Ensuring that our approach to regeneration, housing and green space continues to prioritise supporting people to live in and enjoy mixed local neighbourhoods
- Providing opportunities for residents to come together, through cultural, sporting and community-led activities
- Tackling the barriers which stop people from getting involved in community life – whether these are English language skills, information about services, reducing harassment and hate crime, or worklessness.
- Staying up to date with the changing profile of Hackney’s residents and rethinking how the voices of new and existing communities are heard
- Considering the impact on cohesion and equality of all policies, programmes, and spending decisions
- Working with community organisations and frontline staff to stay up to date with local community issues, adjusting our approach if necessary.

Chapter One: Background to the Hackney Cohesion Review

The review

- 1.1 Between June 2009 and January 2010, Hackney Council worked with other organisations to learn more about
- what makes communities cohesive and resilient in Hackney
 - what issues might lead to tensions between people from different backgrounds
 - what the council or other organisations should do to support people from different backgrounds to live together comfortably, and without destructive conflict
- 1.2 This report sets out our practical proposals for enhancing cohesion at a local level. They are based on evidence provided during the review, including discussions we had with people who live and work with Hackney, and those providing public services or working in voluntary organisations.

Cohesive and resilient communities: what do we mean?

- 1.3 We looked at whether communities in Hackney were **cohesive**
- where people from different backgrounds live and work comfortably alongside their neighbours*
- and whether they were **resilient**
- where people and communities are able to cope with changes in their lives and communities without blame or undue tension.*
- 1.4 Cohesion is not about creating a conflict-free society where everybody agrees with each other. One of the things that many residents like about Hackney is its history of debate and dissent. People from every background and walk of life are welcome in Hackney: it is a place where people can be themselves, hold their own views, and take pride in their own background and cultural heritage. The review chose to focus on all different aspects of identity: ethnic background, beliefs, and income levels, but also age, gender, disability and sexual orientation, and where people live in Hackney. Our starting point was that it is people who are central to cohesion, and that people are Hackney's greatest asset: diverse, creative and resilient.

- 1.5 The review also drew on the national government definition of cohesion.

National definition of community cohesion: Communities and Local Government

Community Cohesion is what must happen in all communities to enable different groups of people to get on well together. A key contributor to community cohesion is integration which is what must happen to enable new residents and existing residents to adjust to one another.

Our vision of an integrated and cohesive community is based on **three foundations**:

- People from different backgrounds having similar life opportunities
- People knowing their rights and responsibilities
- People trusting one another and trusting local institutions to act fairly

And **three key ways of living together**:

- A shared future vision and sense of belonging
- A focus on what new and existing communities have in common, alongside a recognition of the value of diversity
- Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds.

- 1.6 This review was the first major piece of work by the council looking at cohesion in Hackney. Before 2009, the council had actively engaged with cohesion issues locally. As a member of the Commission on Cohesion and Integration¹, one of Hackney's elected members also played a key role in shaping the national debate on cohesion.
- 1.7 Hackney's Sustainable Community Strategy (2008 – 18) is the shared vision for the council, local public services and partners from business, community and voluntary sector. Cohesion is central to the vision for Hackney and the priorities set out in the strategy. However, the strategy recognised that
- “The greatest risk to community cohesion in Hackney is economic polarisation. Closing the gap between our wealthy residents and our most deprived remains the strategic focus for the borough.”*
- 1.8 We therefore began with a look at the future, and in particular, how best to address the possible impact of economic polarisation on cohesion in Hackney, and “ensure that our existing communities and residents can share in the benefits of a growing local economy.”
- 1.9 The review recognises that people are not just Hackney residents: they are also Londoners, citizens or visitors to the UK. Many people have important links and contacts with other parts of the world. Equally, there are many different factors which affect cohesion; the economy, politics, national policies, international events, and the media are all

significant influences. This review tries to recognise the wider picture, while focusing on the practical things that partners in Hackney can do.

- 1.10 The timing of the review also coincided with a period of economic downturn. This was important to the review for two reasons. Firstly, economic hardship often creates very real strains and tensions for families and communities and can put pressure on cohesion. Secondly public spending is likely to come under pressure in the next few years, and so realistic recommendations must focus on reprioritisation or more efficient use of resources rather than assuming new funding streams are likely.

How we did the review

- 1.11 The review was led by a small steering group which met four times to guide the review and agree the report and recommendations.

Hackney Cohesion Review : Steering Group	
Councillor Nargis Khan Review chair	Cabinet Member for Community Services, London Borough of Hackney
Alan Wood	Chief Executive, The Learning Trust
Martin Davis	Citizen Focus and Partnership Inspector, Metropolitan Police
Mary Cannon	Chair, Community Empowerment Network
Professor Michael Keith	Director, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, Oxford University
Nicola Baker	Assistant Director, Culture, London Borough of Hackney
Steve Douglas	Interim Corporate Director, Neighbourhoods and Regeneration, London Borough of Hackney

- 1.12 The work began with a literature review and interviews with council officers, officers from other public sector organisations and the voluntary sector.
- 1.13 Further research is currently underway with three small studies which are looking at key services which we feel can make a difference to cohesion.
- A cohesion impact assessment of the proposed Hackney Housing Strategy 2010 – 15, which will include a review of borough-wide data with more detailed analyses of two contrasting wards – Dalston and Springfield
 - An analysis of the potential of culture and the cultural Olympiad to support cohesion, drawing on lessons from the 2009 Hackney One Carnival
 - A short review conducted in partnership with The Learning Trust looking at how Hackney schools have implemented their statutory duty on cohesion, including the collection of short good practice examples

from a range of schools, as well as detailed case studies in two primary schools carried out by Coram.

- 1.14 Our approach was tailored to the issue we were exploring. Because cohesion is about how people feel about other people, themselves and their place in the community, qualitative methods were used to try and understand cohesion at a local level. Because the evidence points to relatively good cohesion in Hackney, the review took a proportionate and economical approach, using existing information and people's knowledge wherever possible, rather than commissioning new surveys. The findings of the review represent our best understanding of cohesion at the current time, but there are many different perspectives on cohesion, and the picture is likely to change over the coming years.
- 1.15 The review has not dealt specifically with the Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) agenda as this is covered by a separate workstream. This includes an in-depth mapping exercise with Muslim communities in Hackney, which reports in April.
- 1.16 The review benefited from a consultation exercise organised by Hackney's Community Empowerment Network in July 2009, which helped to set the agenda for the review and the issues it would explore. Following this event, a number of further discussions were held with individual voluntary and community organisations, including a stakeholder workshop in January 2010, where participants commented on emerging findings.
- 1.17 We also carried out small consultation exercises with some residents whose perspective was under-represented in available research or established organisations. A focus group discussion was held with members of Hackney's lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) communities. A survey with disabled residents was conducted in partnership with the user-led forum Disability Backup.
- 1.18 Finally, we drew on a survey of elected members, a discussion at the Overview and Scrutiny Board, and the input of Team Hackney's Active Vibrant Communities sub-group (part of the Thriving Healthy Communities partnership group).
- 1.19 A separate Appendices document to be published later in 2010 includes more detail about these pieces of work and the people the review spoke to.

Chapter Two: Cohesion in Hackney

Hackney: a diverse and cohesive borough

- 2.1 Available data tells us that, on the whole, people feel Hackney is a cohesive place.
- 2.2 Almost four in five Hackney residents (78%) agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together in the area². This figure is in line with other inner London boroughs, and compares well with neighbouring areas. But this positive picture is particularly striking given the challenges that Hackney faces: deprivation, relatively high levels of migration, and historically high rates of crime and anti-social behaviour³. Other qualitative and quantitative research⁴ and interviews conducted as part of the review paint a similar picture, with a consensus that Hackney is a tolerant place, where people from different ethnic backgrounds and beliefs are accepted.
- 2.3 Nearly three in five residents say they feel they belong either fairly or very strongly to their local neighbourhood (57%). This compares well to the London average of 52%. Interviews conducted for the review also suggested that people had a strong identification with local neighbourhoods. Many people feel they 'belong' in many different ways – to a small local area or estate, to one of Hackney's distinctive sub-localities (Shoreditch, Stoke Newington, Wick), to London more generally, to a community defined by a shared ethnic/faith background, and/or to a homeland beyond Hackney and the UK – and are able to reconcile these different kinds of belonging comfortably. Some iconic places, such as the Hackney Empire, and Ridley Road market were frequently mentioned as bringing different people together.
- 2.4 Data on a third common measure of cohesion – the percentage of people who have meaningful interactions with people from different backgrounds – is not available locally. We know from the National Citizenship survey that 75 % of Londoners say they have friends from a different ethnic background to themselves, compared to an England average of 52 %. The survey also tells us that people from black and minority ethnic (BME) groups and younger people – both of whom are well represented in Hackney - are more likely to have friends from different ethnic groups.

Explaining cohesion in Hackney

- 2.5 The review identified four main explanations for this strong sense of community and comfort with diversity in Hackney.
 - People from different backgrounds live alongside each other
 - Hackney residents are comfortable with migration
 - Local community organisations and local politics support diversity
 - Adversity leads to solidarity

Different people live alongside each other

- 2.6 Hackney's diverse mix of people from different backgrounds gives it the third greatest degree of ethnic diversity, and the fifth greatest degree of religious diversity amongst local authorities in England and Wales⁵. Hackney's local diversity means that it is one of the places in the country where your neighbour is most likely to be of a different background to you⁶.
- 2.7 In 2001, segregation was generally low in Hackney – ethnic and religious groups are widely dispersed across the borough. Ethnic diversity tends to be greatest in eastern and central wards, while religious diversity is highest in northern and eastern ones. The one exception to this is the Orthodox Jewish/ Charedi community, which is noticeably more concentrated than other groups. There is a wide mix of people from different socio-economic groups, and this mix is reasonably well distributed throughout the borough. In contrast to some other boroughs, social housing tenants are also generally diverse, although they do not reflect the population of the borough overall⁷. We anticipate that the 2011 census will show that Hackney's population has continued to change, and some local areas may experience a significant shift in their profile. However, recent data, for example on children in schools,⁸ suggests that the population in most local areas remains relatively mixed.
- 2.8 Geographically, then, the majority of people in Hackney live in mixed communities, with day to day contact with people from other backgrounds. This has important implications for services - for example, maintained schools are generally mixed, and health services serve a diverse population – and for day to day life. Hackney's sheer diversity makes it hard for people to make assumptions about other people's background, limiting the extent to which stereotypes about different groups can build up. The review encountered a number of examples of local disputes or tensions: in many cases, people on different sides of the dispute had different identities, but issues tend to die away rather than snowball into bigger conflicts. The review heard a number of times that Hackney people are accepting and tolerant of people from different backgrounds, and that racist language and reported race hate crimes are relatively unusual⁹.

Migration is a fact of life in Hackney

- 2.9 Hackney has become accustomed to high rates of migration – from other parts of the UK and beyond – from the mid-1850's when the area's significant population growth began, serving local manufacturing. In the 1950's and 1960's, labour shortages in the reviving post-war economy drew in migrants from the Caribbean, Cyprus and South Asia. At different points, Hackney has also provided a haven for refugees fleeing political persecution.

- 2.10 It appears that migration and cohesion are closely linked in Hackney: those coming to Hackney from the UK and beyond report they were drawn to Hackney as a result of its reputation for diversity and tolerance¹⁰, and we know from national data that people who are not born in the UK are more likely to feel that their local area is cohesive¹¹.
- 2.11 It is possible that successive waves of migration into Hackney did not generate significant conflict because a decline in the borough's population (which reached a low point in 1991) reduced competition for scarce resources. For example, members of the Vietnamese community recall settling in run-down empty council properties; and Turkish and Kurdish businesses thrived on Kingsland Road, an area which had become very depressed.
- 2.12 This comfort with migration is combined with declining international migration into Hackney¹². For example, figures suggest international migration to Hackney declined slowly from 4,600 in 2004/5 to 3,200 in 2007/8¹³. It is possible that this decline will continue as the cost of living continues to rise in Hackney, and new arrivals to London seek cheaper accommodation.
- 2.13 Hackney's mobility rate is currently around 17%¹⁴. Mobility is complex, with students and young professionals most mobile, while families with children are also more likely than average to move out of the borough. Those most likely to stay are social renters, the over-45s, the unemployed and economically inactive, those from minority ethnic backgrounds, and households headed by somebody who is long-term unemployed or has never worked. There are some local neighbourhoods in Hackney characterised both by deprivation and low population turnover¹⁵. Rapid recent improvements in transport, changes in the housing market, and educational standards may shift the dynamics of mobility in Hackney.

Local community organisations and local politics support diversity

- 2.14 The review found a strong political commitment to diversity and tolerance in Hackney, from political stakeholders, to people in leadership positions in public services, and voluntary organisations. For example –
- Hackney has not always been free of extremist racist political views¹⁶, but since the 1980's there has been little popular support for far-right parties.
 - Hackney's councillors, including those in leadership positions, are amongst the most diverse in the country: currently, more than a third are from minority ethnic backgrounds; more than a third are women; and of these a third are from minority ethnic backgrounds.
 - In the past, an openness by local public bodies in Hackney to working with and supporting community organisations has contributed to the growth of a new generation of community leaders amongst the

voluntary sector. Some have become involved in party politics; others have remained as community leaders and activists.

- There is a strong tradition of community engagement and support for diversity and cohesion amongst faith and other organisations: examples include Stamford Hill's Muslim-Jewish Forum and the Hackney Winter Night Shelter run by an ecumenical coalition of 19 churches across Hackney.

Adversity leads to solidarity?

2.15 Some stakeholders argued that adversity and poverty have fostered a strong sense of community and mutual support. Examples given to the review included:

- Poor transport links mean that many people stayed in Hackney at the weekend;
- Residents come together to improve the local environment;
- Visible poverty on estates mean that people can see that their neighbours from different backgrounds are in as difficult a position as they are;
- Faith organisations have developed a strong tradition of support – to members of their religious community and to refugees and destitute people from other backgrounds;
- Some groups of people come together to lobby on service improvements, or to challenge regeneration or other development plans;
- Many residents pointed to a strong sense of belonging to a place – particularly to one Hackney's distinctive sub-localities (for example, Shoreditch, Stoke Newington, Wick) – partly forged through a negative response to the merger of the three very different metropolitan boroughs of Shoreditch, Stoke Newington and Hackney to make the London Borough of Hackney in 1965.
- Orthodox Jewish/ Charedi and Muslim communities are drawn together through shared interests in culturally-appropriate services: for example, women-only swimming sessions.

The Place Survey: who does not find their local area cohesive?

2.16 The review considered whether there were groups of residents who were less likely to say that people got on in their local area, or whose views might not well be represented in the biannual Place Survey. In general, women and men, and people from different ethnic groups in Hackney appear equally likely to say that people from different backgrounds get on well together. This is a very positive finding.

2.17 The data from the Place Survey suggests there some people in Hackney who are less likely to believe that their local area is somewhere where people from different backgrounds got on well:

- 86% of people over the age of 65 were positive about cohesion, while those between 18 and 64 were less positive.
- 83% of people in private rented accommodation were positive about cohesion, while 78% of social renters, and 75% of owner occupiers were positive about cohesion. This data suggests there is not a straightforward relationship between socio-economic background and feelings about cohesion.
- There seems to be some variation in how people living in particular parts of the borough view cohesion. The survey figures are not statistically robust at ward level, but some of the areas where people were less likely to think that people get on well appear to be near parks, borders with other local authorities, and near major road intersections, suggesting a link between cohesion, local boundaries and the public realm which deserves further exploration.
- Disabled people or people with long term health problems¹⁷ were less likely to feel that people got on well together.

2.18 Other research and discussions held during the review suggest that:

- The overall finding that minority ethnic and White respondents are equally positive about cohesion may mask issues faced by specific sub-groups.
- The views of young people under the age of 18 years may be different to those of adults, but are not captured by the Place survey. Interviews during the review and the Metropolitan Police's Youth Survey suggest young people have particular concerns about safety and mobility around the borough.¹⁸
- The views of people who do not speak English or prefer not to answer surveys are likely to be underrepresented. This is likely to include – for example – a proportion of Hackney's Turkish/Kurdish and Orthodox Jewish/Charedi residents, and some people working in the informal economy.
- New migrants may have quite specific views on cohesion. For example, research with East European migrants in 2007 showed that although both new immigrants and long term residents surveyed in Hackney agreed that people from different backgrounds got on, only 35% of migrants felt they belonged 'very strongly' or 'fairly strongly' to their neighbourhood, compared to 72% of long-term residents interviewed.¹⁹
- Local areas may have their own particular dynamics. For example, a survey for the Shoreditch Trust New Deal for Communities Area²⁰ identified that retired people were less likely than others to say people from different backgrounds got on well together. By contrast, older residents in the rest of the borough are more likely to be positive about cohesion.
- Discussions as part of the review suggested that gender plays an important part in shaping the opportunities that residents have to mix with different people. Public services such as schools and children's centres, clinics and libraries provide opportunities for people to meet, but often these are disproportionately used by women. Work provides

important opportunities for tackling disadvantage, and for getting to know people from different backgrounds. However, Hackney's high rates of worklessness mean these opportunities are not open to all: particularly for young Black males and White men over fifty, who are over represented amongst workless people compared to their proportion of the population.²¹

Hackney in 2010: current cohesion issues

- 2.19 Despite a broadly positive picture, the review identifies five challenges. We believe addressing these challenges will help to support cohesive and resilient communities in Hackney.

Young and old

- 2.20 Friction between younger residents and adults and older people emerges as an important theme which is often described through the lens of crime and anti-social behaviour²². This issue was evident across many different areas of the borough, and it is not unique to Hackney. There are particular groups of younger people – for example, young Black British men – who face a range of disadvantages in relation to education, employment and the criminal justice system – whose combined impact presents risks for their life chances, but also for cohesion. The issue of stop and search – although carefully managed and monitored in Hackney – was raised a number of times during the review by young people and organisations working with young people. Youth violence and 'postcode barriers' were also highlighted repeatedly as a genuine issue for some young people.
- 2.21 Although older people tend to be quite positive about community life, loneliness, poverty and age discrimination can undermine older people's well-being and prevent them playing a full and active role in community life. There is good evidence that intergenerational contact and mixing with others in meaningful activity plays an important role in promoting well-being for older residents.²³

Social exclusion and inequality

- 2.22 We accept the principle that people from different backgrounds having similar life opportunities is one of the three foundations of an integrated and cohesive society²⁴. The extent of structural inequality in Hackney is a major challenge for cohesion. Some residents face a range of barriers which make it difficult for them to play an active part in economic, social and cultural life of Hackney and London. They include
- Refugees and asylum seekers: who face legal, financial and often language barriers to getting work or becoming involved in community life. These can be compounded by poor physical or mental health related to previous experiences, or the stress of living as an asylum

seeker in the UK. These experiences can have a lasting impact – the example of the Kurdish community was given several times during the review.

- Disabled adults – who often face a range of physical, income and other barriers to participation in work and community life – and families with disabled children.
- New arrivals whose English language skills and/or previous experience with government can leave them poorly equipped or unconfident in navigating their way through information about public services, their rights or responsibilities.
- Specific, smaller, groups of people who face a combination of prejudice and economic and social disadvantage – including trans people and Gypsies and Travellers, D/deaf people, and looked after children.

Public spaces, liveability and transport

2.23 Hackney is densely populated, with an estimated number of people per square kilometre 2.3 times greater than the London average.²⁵ It may be doing well on cohesion, but day to day life can be hard – with issues such as noise, dogs, the use of public space, prostitution, and drug/alcohol use all frequently mentioned as putting a strain on community life, particularly in areas affected by the night-time economy. This can disproportionately affect residents who do not have spare income to spend on leisure, trips, services or shopping²⁶ and are therefore the most reliant on high quality shared spaces. 48% of Hackney's residents believe that there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration in their local area – a worse score than the inner London average of 38%, although a rapid improvement on previous scores. In some areas – tensions between residents and local businesses (notably those involved in the night time economy) was reported to be one of the most significant cohesion issues.

2.24 For some residents, safety is a major concern. Transport (buses in particular) feels unsafe for some of those we have consulted including lesbian, gay and bisexual residents, and homophobic attacks in the E2 area have highlighted and intensified safety concerns for some LGB residents. For many young men, and some young women, gang activity, territoriality or 'postcode' barriers emerge as a real problem²⁷, which is sometimes amplified by parents and others in a way which limits young people's access to educational and job opportunities and other services. Fear of crime is high amongst the Orthodox Jewish/Charedi community²⁸, and there have been sporadic outbreaks of anti-semitic harassment and crime²⁹ as well as verbal abuse, particularly of men and boys³⁰.

Neighbourliness

2.25 A number of interviewees reported that people from different backgrounds do not always mix socially, or help each other out, even

though they live side-by-side. We heard several times that people ‘live in pockets’ or ‘on separate tracks’, and that politeness at the school gates or in the local shop did not necessarily mean that people had friendships with people from different backgrounds. Some people thought, “It’s a shame if tolerance is all we can hope for”, while others felt the ‘live and let live’ approach was the root of Hackney’s good record on cohesion³¹.

- 2.26 This finding – which have begun to explore through Hackney’s e-panel ‘Hackney Matters’ is consistent with research³² which shows that economically disadvantaged communities tend to have fewer social capital networks. Our preliminary questions through the ‘Hackney matters’ online panel suggests that better-off, and older residents feel more comfortable asking their neighbours for help (for example, with collect a prescription if they are ill). There is no suggestion that it is unusual for a large city like London.
- 2.27 Friendships and relationships between neighbours are not the only way in which Hackney residents come together. A number of interviewees spoke about local economic relationships which bring different groups together, helping to build or undermine understanding³³. Other research³⁴ and evidence from the review points to the importance of other ways that people get together - for example, at English classes or adult education classes, school coffee mornings – in a regular way which enables them to get to know each other.

Rights and Responsibilities – when equality rights collide

- 2.28 The review discussed some of the practical challenges for local authorities in valuing diversity while balancing rights and responsibilities.

“Respecting and valuing diversity is an essential part of building a successful, integrated society. But respect for diversity must take place within a framework of rights and responsibilities that are recognised by and apply to all – to abide by the law, to reject [violent] extremism and intolerance and make a positive contribution to UK society. Different ways of living our lives, different cultures or beliefs all coexist within this shared framework of rights and responsibilities.”³⁵

- 2.29 In Hackney there is a strong commitment to delivering excellent and appropriate services and employing a workforce that reflects the communities we serve. However, Hackney’s local superdiversity, means that it can be difficult to balance the wishes of specific communities e.g. around single sex or single faith swimming pool sessions, with the need to maintain a good, accessible service for all residents.
- 2.30 There is significant national discourse on how best these concepts can be developed. For Hackney we are recommending that a more

corporate and consistent approach to community engagement, community development, consultation and community intelligence would help at a local level.

Hackney in the future: looking to 2018

- 2.31 There are many opportunities for promoting cohesion ahead – through improved service delivery, reducing worklessness and inequality, and the opportunities offered by the Olympics. However, the review has also looked at possible challenges to cohesion over the medium term. This section describes some of these challenges.
- 2.32 **Pressures on services and housing:** A combination of population growth and the economic downturn is likely to increase demand for public services. Intense pressure on resources can create perceptions of unfairness if not carefully handled. It will be critical that services and decision-making are seen to be fair and transparent. The example of housing was cited most often: there are usually between 12,000 and 15,000 households on the waiting list at any time, many of whom are unlikely to ever be allocated a letting. Access to school places is another sensitive issue.
- 2.33 **The quality of life:** Population growth and the penetration of the night-time economy northwards (with non-residents visiting the borough at night) may place strains on community life, as well as providing economic, cultural and entertainment opportunities. We anticipate that improvements to transport are likely to have far-reaching and complex impacts. Regeneration will mean different things to different parts of the borough. Although all areas should benefit, with major developments in both the west and east of the borough, there is potential for some areas to see fewer opportunities than others over the short to medium term.
- 2.34 **Economic and educational polarisation:** Hackney's new borough profile³⁶ suggests a recent, rapid process of socio-economic change. Recent data on qualifications and housing is indicative of some of the changes underway. Between 2006 and 2008, there was a substantial decline in the percentage of Hackney's working age population with no qualifications at all (from 24% to 15%), and a significant increase (from 33% to 46%) in the percentage of working adults qualified to Level 4 or above. Hackney has a higher proportion of both unqualified and highly qualified working adults than London or England. The period 2003 to 2008 also saw a rapid increase in households in the private rented sector – the majority highly mobile, with higher than average incomes. As part of the Local Economic Assessment in 2010, we will be exploring different approaches to measuring economic inequality in the borough.
- 2.35 Modelling of national Citizenship Survey data shows that poor cohesion is strongly linked to individual and community disadvantage. It is not

clear from the data whether economic inequality locally has an impact on cohesion in its own right. Recent research suggests that economic inequality at a national level has a damaging impact on health and social outcomes, including trust and the quality of social relations. However, it finds little evidence to show that equality/inequality in small areas has a significant impact on social outcomes, concluding that “what matters most is the scale of social differentiation across the whole society.”³⁷

- 2.36 The review did not identify widespread resentment or ‘active’ tension between Hackney’s less well-off residents and newer, better-off residents as a major risk to cohesion³⁸. However, as part of our online panel ‘Hackney Matters’, we asked about understanding between different groups in Hackney. Whilst many panellists felt that understanding between different ethnic groups and disabled and non-disabled people was good, the highest percentage of people felt there was ‘a little’ or ‘no understanding at all’ between people from different social classes. In local discussions and interviews, long-standing residents we spoke to did voice some resentment of newcomers. A number of elected members who responded to our survey commented on the arrival of ‘professional, mainly white’ people in their ward, generally suggesting they had settled in without problems, but sometimes without mixing much with other residents. Some members and other people interviewed also commented on the need to build bridges between established residents (often estates) and people coming to live in private new build developments. Others said there was little evidence that poorer Hackney residents benefited from newer shops, pubs or other facilities.
- 2.37 People involved in service delivery talked about the consequences of socio-economic change on – for example - the make-up of user groups, and on the kinds of demands made on services. Some saw this as a trend with the power to erode community resilience and solidarity, or to diminish the focus on the most pressing social and economic challenges faced by the borough. Others saw opportunities – for example, if better-off residents generate economic opportunities, or make demands in a way which improves schools or other services for everybody’s benefit.
- 2.38 Service providers and voluntary sector representatives argued that it was important to take a disaggregated approach to monitoring social and economic outcomes: making sure we know whether overall improvements have benefited the least well-off residents. This is also true of the way that cohesion is monitored: if Hackney’s cohesion scores improve, is this a result of better-off people moving into the area, or do less well-off people also believe that people from different backgrounds get on better in their local area?
- 2.39 **Less mixed local neighbourhoods:** Since we believe that Hackney’s local diversity is key to cohesion, wider processes of population or

socio-economic change, which reduce this diversity and potential for day to day contact between residents from different backgrounds could undermine cohesion. The Sustainable Community Strategy and supporting policies aim to support Hackney's mixed communities by provision of social infrastructure and public and private services which are inclusive, meeting the needs of diverse residents.

- 2.40 **Changes in national policy:** Any future policy changes at the national level in areas such as public spending, immigration, benefits and criminal justice policy are likely to have a significant impact on Hackney residents. These changes are uncertain, and the impact on cohesion hard to predict.
- 2.41 **International events:** Global issues sometimes have a local impact in Hackney, although this is mitigated through strong community leadership. Conflict in the Middle East, terrorist attacks, and political or environmental emergencies which lead to refugee flows, are among the circumstances which may require a sensitive local response.

Chapter Three: Gap Analysis

Introduction

- 3.1 This chapter provides headlines from an analysis of the council's approach to cohesion conducted in July/August 2009. It draws on the recommendations from 'Our Shared Future', and on a draft diagnostic framework for cohesion developed by the Improvement and Development Agency (I&DeA).

Building trust through effective leadership

- 3.2 Interviewees across the Team Hackney strategic partnership understood the importance of cohesion for the Sustainable Community Strategy. There was consensus on the importance of ensuring fair and equitable outcomes during a process of ongoing change and regeneration in Hackney. Hackney's target of achieving 'Excellence' by May 2011 in the new Equality Framework for Local Government, which includes cohesion, provides an ideal opportunity to embed cohesion within the council's equality work.
- 3.3 Hackney has adopted a 'neutral' approach to some symbolic issues. Some other local authorities sometimes, for example, do more to celebrate different national days. However, the review believes that the Hackney approach is sensible, given the sheer diversity of backgrounds and outlooks in Hackney's population. However, this approach, and the reasons underlying it, are not always explained as effectively as they could be, potentially leaving some people feeling undervalued.
- 3.4 There is widespread respect for diversity. This respect makes both officers and members careful when dealing with sensitive issues – particularly those concerning race or faith. Some interviewees felt that this meant that the council's leadership role was not used to maximum effect; that some difficult issues were not dealt with as openly, robustly or consistently as they might be. Others suggested that some equality issues – particularly sexual orientation, but also age and the position of older people - do not receive the same profile in Hackney and recognition as race and faith.
- 3.5 Hackney council has made progress on the diversity of its own workforce, including the introduction of family friendly and 'new ways of working' policies, adoption of the Two Ticks disability equality scheme, and the Phoenix programme to support disabled staff and staff from minority ethnic backgrounds to develop management skills. Hackney was top of the English league for councils for the percentage of the top 5% of earners employed from ethnic minority backgrounds. There are some significant gaps however: for example, people from a Turkish/Kurdish background are under-represented on the council's staff, and there are almost no staff from Orthodox Jewish/Charedi

backgrounds.

- 3.6 There is still work to do to close gaps in trust: for example, between the 76% of white residents and the 68% of minority ethnic residents who agree that *“local public services treat all people fairly”*, and the 67% of white residents and 53% of minority ethnic residents who agree that they were *‘treated with respect and consideration and your local public services’*.³⁹ It is important to note that, minority ethnic residents generally report higher levels of overall satisfaction with council and other services (including the police and GPs) than white residents. These gaps around trust and respect, reflect some anecdotal evidence from community organisations about some residents’ experience using services. They are important in their own right, and because responses on fairness in the Place Survey are positively associated with cohesion
- 3.7 Members play an important role in engaging with residents in their ward, and sometimes with particular communities of interest. Through their surgeries and local activism, many have developed a deep understanding of local community dynamics, and are able to identify emerging issues or new communities such as migrants from A10 countries. Arguably, the council is at times too reliant on individual members to initiate and sustain dialogue with ‘their’ community. In the long term, there is some is a risk of this engagement obscuring the voices and interests of residents who are from other minority ethnic or faith backgrounds. The ‘Twenty First Century Councillor’ project is designed to strengthen councillors’ role through better induction and support processes.

Effective community interaction and empowerment

- 3.8 Hackney has made significant investments in building and mapping statistical data about its communities, understanding population growth since the 2001 census and the real size of its diverse population. Additional work to understand Hackney’s ethnic diversity is planned for 2010. Tracking new communities of migrants or refugees presents significant methodological challenges. Nevertheless, there is scope for improvement in the way that ‘new’ communities are identified, and the issues they face explored.
- 3.9 The Consultation Team has done valuable work through the ‘Connecting with our communities’ programme which helped build understanding, a more consistent approach and also to broker practical relationships between some parts of the council and with community organisations. Front-line staff interviewed during the review showed a generally good understanding of local community issues and dynamics, but this was less obvious amongst non-front line colleagues. Arguably, high staff turnover and Hackney’s complexity has tended to limit the development of institutional knowledge around community issues.

- 3.10 Despite very many examples of good practice in particular service areas – from culture, to 2012, to provision of youth services for different young people, and well beyond - the review believes there is room for improvement in order to ‘level up’ understanding and engagement with Hackney’s diverse residents across different parts of the council. This needs to include strong leadership of the community engagement agenda, an easily accessible ‘snapshot’ of Hackney’s different communities, an induction process which introduces some of the key community dynamics in the borough, and a consistent approach to equality training which focuses on developing the skills and confidence to communicate effectively with people from different backgrounds. This work should extend to a consistent and shared approach to strategic engagement with different groups of residents: for example, senior officers in the Council would welcome guidance and principles for responding fairly to requests for culturally-specific services or facilities from the Orthodox Jewish/ Charedi community.
- 3.11 We were struck by how segmented many of the forums used for engaging with communities on important issues are. Community Action Panels, neighbourhood forums, and tenants and residents associations, and forums for young people’s participation, for example, are generally somewhat mixed, but far from representative of Hackney residents. There are a number of well-respected, community-led forums, where open, tolerant and informed debates take place, but the review found few examples of the council playing an active role bringing different community members together on the most challenging issues. In some case, it was the council’s regulatory role (for example, planning or licensing), which brought different local interests and perspectives to the table, but sometimes on different sides and not always constructively.
- 3.12 Hackney has a strong tradition of grassroots activity and support to communities led by community and faith organisations. There is much to learn from this, and the council should consider how best it can enable this kind of activity (without leading or necessarily funding it). In some cases, community-led work has its origins in historically poor service provision, or communities challenging council actions. For this reason, building relationships between the council and community activists will not always be straightforward.
- 3.13 There are a number of specific interventions focused on the lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) communities in Hackney, but little sign of overarching engagement with, or clear recognition of LGBT contributions to the life and economy of the borough. This was underscored by the LGB focus group held as part of the review, where residents talked about what they regarded as a lack of recognition of the contribution of Hackney’s LGBT residents, or of the historical importance of Hackney for London’s LGBT community.

- 3.14 There appears to be little Hackney-specific council information available for new refugees, asylum seekers and migrants setting out services available, and the rights and responsibilities of new arrivals.
- 3.15 Two pieces of work focused on specific communities are underway – a refreshed focus on Gypsies and Travellers, and a Strategy on Migrants (which will cover Refugees and Asylum seekers). Both have potential to address cohesion.
- 3.16 Hackney does not have a specific ‘mythbusting’ strategy for cohesion purposes, and it is not immediately clear that one is required. Despite the pressures on services and housing, the review was unable to identify widely held beliefs that decisions were unfair or based on ethnic origin.
- 3.17 Hackney Council has taken significant steps towards making services available on the phone and online, and recently launched the site www.younghackney.org, but to date has little presence through social media. Social media and technologies such as mobile phones have a potential role in enabling isolated people to stay in touch with friends and family, promoting cohesion and spreading information about community activities and council services to residents who might not normally use them. Social media can also be used to fuel tensions and misinformation. We suggest some of these opportunities and risks are explored further.

Service design and delivery to support and build cohesion

- 3.18 A number of Hackney’s 21 Corporate Priority Programmes – particularly the Olympics and Paralympics; the Regeneration Delivery Framework; Woodberry Down Estate; Estate Renewal; and Parks and Open Spaces – include a focus on supporting cohesive communities. Elsewhere, officers in most directorates can identify which of their service areas are most relevant to cohesion. There are many terrific examples of programmes which bring different people together, and build a strong sense of place. However, in some cases, there is less clarity about how specific programmes can contribute more to cohesion, or where there are risks to cohesion which need to be reduced or mitigated.
- 3.19 The current administration is committed to maintaining current levels of service delivery. However, the economic downturn is already having an impact, for example, in areas where private sector financing is involved. The timeframe for some estate renewals has had to be extended in some cases as negotiations with developers continue, although large regeneration schemes remain on track.
- 3.20 Personalised services for adults through the Transforming Adult Social Care agenda provide a big opportunity to support disabled and older adults to play an active part in community life, provided the right kind of

support is available. Further work is needed to make the links between individual inclusion and support and the wider cohesion agenda. A new Prevention and Wellbeing Strategy – “Making Hackney a great place to grow old” provides an opportunity to work with wider groups of older people.

- 3.21 The council, and the Local Strategic Partnership – Team Hackney – take a tight, outcome-focused approach underpinned by evidence of the greatest priorities for the borough. Provided it is communicated clearly, this kind of approach generally supports cohesion by demonstrating that decisions about resources are made fairly and transparently. However, enabling isolated individuals and fragmented communities to come together, or encouraging different community members to mix may be a legitimate use of resources even if it does not demonstrate ‘hard’ outcomes straight away.
- 3.22 The neighbourhood is a good starting point for cohesion in Hackney, because most neighbourhoods are so diverse. The language of planners focuses on ‘mixed, sustainable communities’. More work is needed to understand whether this means ‘cohesive communities’ in every case, and to understand how people in Hackney see their local area or neighbourhood.
- 3.23 All interviewees agreed that good spaces and social infrastructure (shops, meeting places, playgrounds, schools and so on) are key for cohesion. Woodberry Down provides an example of where this has been built in to regeneration plans, with a new community centre, health centre, an Academy school, a children’s centre, a training centre, and landscape and leisure areas planned. However, some people argued that – in general - social sustainability has been overshadowed in a drive to improve Hackney’s physical infrastructure. There is scope for more concerted programming to make sure that Hackney’s poorer residents can make use of newly regenerated areas. This needs to be balanced with activities and community events in parts of the borough where the regeneration effort has been less intensive. It is not always easy for local residents to organise community events or groups. There are opportunities to make much better use of residents’ creativity and energy by ensuring they can find out about places they can meet, who can help them in the council, and providing basic guidance on events, health and safety issues, and so on.
- 3.24 Hackney has a needs-based approach to translation, with very little routine translation of documents. Providing opportunities for people to learn English as a Second Language remains an important issue for cohesion, equality and access to work. Work is underway to address this through the Skills for Employment Strategy and the successful Migration Impacts Fund bid. At the very least, there is a strong case for better use and coordination of existing resources, a stronger push to fill geographical gaps in provision through more effective use of children’s

centres, and a strategy to meet the English language needs of those with no recourse to public funds.

- 3.25 All interviewees highlighted the importance of tackling inequality and exclusion as a foundation for cohesion. There has been very significant progress in a number of areas which provide the ‘foundations’ of cohesion, including
- successes tackling crime and anti-social behaviour
 - building trust in local institutions through initiatives such as the Public Service Promise and letting residents know about improved services
 - providing people with more consistent and accessible information about their rights and responsibilities through communications, and the Advice Sector Strategy. However, there is little specialist advice on equality law available locally for people who experience discrimination in employment or accessing services.
- 3.26 The review felt that more could be done to provide a strategic direction for work on hate crime and harassment, ensuring wider opportunities for reporting for victims, and ensuring the information about hate crime and harassment informs partners’ understanding of local cohesion and tensions.

Effective performance and resource management

- 3.27 The review heard about a number of mechanisms for sharing information about the issues facing communities: although there is no local authority led ‘tension monitoring’ mechanism. This is an area where there is potential to do more, however, most interviewees suggested that operational collaboration and communication between different organisations generally worked well. Mechanisms for responding to civil emergencies are well established, involve religious leaders, and were used in the weeks following the London bombings. There are also ongoing meetings as part of the Preventing Violent Extremism programme, convened by the Council’s Community Safety Team, and police-led Community Action Panels and the borough-wide Community Engagement Board.
- 3.28 The review was surprised at the limited evaluations of major programmes, and the reliance on out-turn data and complaints as a way of measuring success. These are unlikely to capture cohesion impacts. Although there are real challenges tracking cohesion impacts of complex programmes over long time-frames, there is potential to do more to explore the impact of interventions on cohesion. One way this could be taken forward is by incorporating cohesion into the preparation and monitoring of equality impact assessments, and to address issues of community, belonging and equity within evaluations.

Chapter Four: Future Directions

The following broad recommendations are intended to contribute to the Sustainable Community Strategy vision of a “safe cohesive communities and a shared sense of fairness, citizenship and social responsibility”.

The recommendations have been made because they:

- Address the issues identified in Chapter 2, by supporting what works well, or addressing challenges identified
- Fall within the council’s role as a community leader, a regulator, and a provider of statutory or discretionary services – or can be addressed through collaborative work across the Team Hackney partnership
- Are reasonably specific and achievable, particularly given limited funding is likely to be available for additional work.

The recommendations are underpinned by three principles:

1. Equality and social justice are fundamental to Hackney’s approach to cohesion.
2. Residents, community and faith leaders, and their organisations are at the forefront of cohesive and resilient communities.
3. Change is a fact of life in Hackney: our knowledge and actions must keep pace with change.

OVERALL OBJECTIVE

Objective	How we will measure achievement	Justification
People in Hackney are able to live and work comfortably with one another, coping with change without blame.	<p>NI1: Proportion of residents who agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area rises from 78% (2008/9) to 80.3% (2010/11), remaining at 80% thereafter, despite impact of economic downturn.</p> <p>NI2: Proportion of residents saying they feel they belong either fairly or very strongly to their local neighbourhood.</p> <p>No significant rise in hate crime following economic stress or any civil emergency affecting Hackney.</p>	<p>Our understanding of cohesive and resilient communities in Hackney is broad.</p> <p>However, NI1 is a reasonable starting point, which we will supplement with additional qualitative and other information as appropriate. Particular attention will be given to understanding the perceptions of different groups of residents.</p>

A. Short term objectives

Objective	How we will measure achievement	Justification
<p>1. Communications and cultural activities in 2010 reinforce and promote residents' own attachment to place and diversity.</p> <p>(i) Council communications demonstrate diversity in action, reinforce sense of place and belonging.</p> <p>(ii) Cultural and sporting events have strong focus on diversity and Hackney the place.</p>	Achievement of 80.3% target for NI1 in 2010/11. (2010 Place Survey)	In the short term, communications and community events have the greatest potential to promote positive perceptions of cohesion.

B. Medium term objectives

Objective	How we will measure achievement	Justification
<p>1. Policies and services support people to stay in mixed local neighbourhoods</p> <p>(i) Regeneration and housing policies designed to sustain diverse local neighbourhoods, reflecting needs of existing and new residents.</p> <p>(ii) Public realm is safe, accessible to all, promotes mobility, shared social spaces & infrastructure.</p> <p>(iii) Range of residents and visitors, and younger and older residents, involved in addressing anti-social behaviour and improving the quality of life.</p>	<p>Monitoring ethnic and religious diversity at ward level, and mix of age and socio-economic groups. (2011 Census)</p> <p>Reasons for moves out of Hackney (2013 housing needs assessment).</p> <p>% of residents who feel there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration declines below 48% (2010 Place Survey).</p>	<p>Local diversity is an important foundation for cohesive communities in Hackney.</p> <p>The council's role is not to determine where people live, but instead ensure the best possible mix of housing, services, shops and public spaces to enable people to live comfortably alongside one another at different stages of their lives.</p>
<p>2. Hackney residents have more opportunities to come together</p> <p>(i) Cultural, sporting, 2012 programmes bring residents together and encourage residents and visitors to think differently about Hackney.</p> <p>(ii) Volunteering strategy implemented and monitored for cohesion impacts.</p> <p>(iii) Cohesion applications to Hackney Grants Programme demonstrate better analysis of local cohesion issues and how they can be addressed.</p> <p>(iv) More community-led initiatives resulting from reduced barriers to community activity.</p> <p>(v) Opportunities for engaging social media and community online networks explored.</p> <p>(vi) Further exploration of neighbourliness issues.</p>	<p>Increased use of sporting/leisure, library, museum, park, and theatre/concert hall facilities – disaggregated (2010 Place Survey)</p>	<p>This objective focuses on making the most of the potential offered through existing/planned work to provide inclusive events, and to build on residents' creativity and energy.</p>

<p>3. Fewer barriers to participation in Hackney life</p> <p>(i) Improved access for new arrivals to information about services, rights and responsibilities, informed by Migration Impact Fund strategy work.</p> <p>(ii) A well-coordinated programme of relevant and high quality English as a Second Language classes, with adequate childcare support, effectively publicised to all potential learners, particularly those previously excluded or newer arrivals, with a strategy for addressing geographical gaps, and for meeting the needs of residents without recourse to public funds.</p> <p>(iii) A clearer strategic direction and monitoring for hate crime work in Hackney, including for reporting and casework through effective third party reporting arrangements, including looking at the best ways to address harassment on transport.</p> <p>(iv) More consistently effective approaches to bullying across Hackney's schools.</p> <p>(v) Joined up approach to addressing the impact of unemployment, educational disadvantage and disproportionate involvement in criminal justice system for particular groups of young people.</p> <p>(vi) Gypsy and Traveller strategic approach agreed and implemented.</p>	<p>Specific outcomes related to interventions.</p>	<p>Tackling social exclusion and the barriers that prevent people playing a full part in community life is a priority. However, a very wide range of initiatives is underway – many more than can be encompassed within a cohesion action plan.</p> <p>These issues all identified as priority areas within the review.</p>
---	--	---

C. Getting the fundamentals right

Objective	How we will measure achievement	Justification
<p>1. Reduced poverty, crime and fear of crime.</p>	<p>Progress against Sustainable Community Strategy - Outcome 3 (improve the earnings of people in Hackney to lift them out of poverty) and outcome 13 (make the borough safer, and make sure people living in, working in, studying in and visiting Hackney can feel safe in our borough) to be assessed as part of Sustainable Community Strategy review in 2011.</p>	<p>Socio-economic disadvantage and crime in an area/community are key negative predictors of low cohesion.</p>
<p>2. Increased trust in local institutions:</p> <p>(i) Service first and public service programmes successfully implemented with equality monitoring and action to ensure all groups of residents receive excellent service.</p> <p>(ii) Improved transparency in how decisions are made and scarce resources are allocated.</p> <p>(iii) Hackney grants programme for VCS incorporates focus on building links between communities, supported by clear guidance and engagement with CEN and HCVS on outcomes of cohesion review.</p> <p>(iv) Improved access for Hackney residents to advice on their rights under equality law.</p>	<p>Increase in percentage of residents who believe that local public services treat all types of people fairly from 42%, and reduced gap between white and minority ethnic residents (Place Survey).</p>	<p>The review found no evidence of need for a major public information campaign about the way decisions on resources are made. However, it is important that all services, particularly those likely to come under pressure in an economic downturn, are very clear about their criteria, how decisions are made, and who benefits.</p>

D. Knowledge, monitoring and oversight

Objective	How we will measure achievement	Justification
<p>1. Effective oversight of cohesion-related work</p> <p>(i) Cohesion and equality work integrated with a clear focus on tackling unequal outcomes through an integrated planning and review process overseen by a Corporate Equality and Cohesion Board with responsibility for cohesion.</p> <p>(ii) Active, Vibrant Communities group reviews progress on cohesion recommendations across Team Hackney partnerships, reporting annually to Performance, Intelligence and Equalities group.</p> <p>(iii) Governance of cohesion and Prevent work programmes ensures consistent and credible engagement with Hackney's different residents.</p> <p>(iv) Annual review of cohesion and resilience with key stakeholders and staff in community engagement roles to supplement existing mechanisms for tension monitoring and emergency preparedness.</p>	<p>Excellence under new Equality Framework for Local Government achieved by May 2011.</p> <p>All major corporate programmes include practical steps to promote cohesion where relevant.</p> <p>'Do no harm' tips for smaller interventions, linked to Equality Impact Assessments.</p>	<p>Cohesion and equality are closely related, cross-cutting issues which are linked within the new Equality Framework for Local government. Linking them in this way will enable cross-learning across directorates. We know that economic disadvantage has a negative impact on cohesion, and on social networks, and this integrated approach will enable us to track the links between poverty and group-based inequality more effectively, and to ensure that all of Hackney's communities share in the benefits of growth. It will also help to ensure that the gender and age dimensions of cohesion are addressed as part of new programming.</p> <p>The review proposes a light-touch approach to cohesion issues within smaller programmes and projects.</p>

<p>2. Effective engagement with new and existing communities</p> <p>(i) Clearer strategic direction is agreed for engaging with communities of interest in Hackney – and particularly the most excluded communities. A structured forward plan for dialogue with specific communities around equality and cohesion outcomes and rights and responsibilities is agreed. This should include tracking the effectiveness of community-led engagement and conflict-reduction mechanisms, with additional support as necessary.</p> <p>(ii) Following completion of ethnic mapping of Hackney in 2010, short follow-up study of issues faced by Hackney’s ‘new’ communities commissioned.</p> <p>(iii) Council staff and those providing commissioned services are equipped with practical knowledge and confidence to work with different residents through improved induction, equality training and access to intranet information on Hackney’s communities.</p>	<p>Increase in staff who believe that Hackney Council has strong links with the community from 75%. (Staff survey)</p>	<p>This recommendation would address the fragmented nature of engagement with different communities identified in the review, building up trust and agreement on priorities as well as exploration of difficult or contentious issues through broad-based dialogue and (where necessary) research – and discussions of rights and responsibilities. During the review, this was suggested as a priority for LGBT, Orthodox Jewish/Charedi and Turkish/Kurdish residents. Further work is needed to understand other community issues.</p>
---	--	---

Endnotes

- 1 The Commission on Integration and Cohesion was announced on 28 June 2006, by then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Ruth Kelly. The Commission, a fixed term advisory body, was set up to consider how local areas can make the most of the benefits delivered by increasing diversity - and also to consider how they can respond to the tensions it can sometimes cause. It was tasked with developing practical approaches to building communities' own capacity to prevent and manage tensions. Its members included Cllr Nargis Khan, and two other members of the Hackney Cohesion Review Steering Group – Steve Douglas and Professor Michael Keith. The Commission's final report - "Our Shared Future" - was published on 14 June 2007. www.integrationandcohesion.org.uk
- 2 These and other figures are from the Place Survey, a biannual survey of residents' views about their local area and services. www.teamhackney.org/hackneyfacts
- 3 IPSOS Mori (2010), "Mind the Gap: Frontiers of Performance in Local Government V: Analyses based on the findings of the 2008/09 Place Surveys", www.ipsospublicaffairs.co.uk
Using their 'Area Challenge Index', MORI estimates that Hackney's NI1 score is six percentage points higher than might have been expected given the challenges it faces across a range of domains.
- 4 Markova, E., Black, R., "East European immigration and community cohesion." York. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2007. www.jrf.org.uk
- 5 Using Simpson's Index, based on the number of groups in an area and the evenness with which individuals are distributed.
- 6 Wood, P., Landry, C. and Bloomfield, J. (2006) "Cultural Diversity in Britain, A Toolkit for Cross-cultural Co-operation." York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. www.jrf.org.uk. Hackney (and three other London boroughs) has the lowest 'isolation' ratio.
- 7 Hackney Homes, 2009, Ethnic breakdown of tenants
- 8 See www.measuringdiversity.org.uk, and the forthcoming small study on schools and cohesion in Hackney
- 9 Some of the relatively low reporting of hate crime and harassment may be the consequence of limited third party reporting arrangements.
- 10 See Hackney's Sustainable Community Strategy, 2008 – 2018, www.teamhackney.org
- 11 Cohesion Delivery Framework 2010, Communities and Local Government. www.communities.gov.uk

-
- 12 Increasing A8 in-migration, and increasing non-white in-migration in an area are both associated with lower NI1 scores (Laurence and Heath; 2008, quoted in Cohesion Delivery Framework 2010, op.cit).
 - 13 ONS, Local Area Migration Indicators. www.statistics.gov.uk Rates of international inflow are lower than the average for Greater London. International migration into Hackney remains much smaller than internal migration from other parts of the UK.
 - 14 Population Mobility in Hackney, internal Research Briefing, 2007, Strategic Policy and Research Unit, LBH
 - 15 Unpublished data from Communities Analysis Division, Communities and Local Government
 - 16 For example, in Hackney South, the National Front took 19% of the vote in the 1977 GLC elections.
 - 17 This finding reflects national figures. Cohesion Delivery Framework, op.cit.
 - 18 Metropolitan Police Youth Survey cms.met.police.uk/met/boroughs/hackney/03working_with_the_community/youth_survey. Place survey figures also show that fear of crime is greatest amongst younger residents: 17% of younger residents say they feel very unsafe after dark.
 - 19 East European immigration and community cohesion, op cit.
 - 20 National Evaluation of New Deal for Communities, Household Survey 2008, Hackney NDC [43], IPSOS Mori, December 2008
 - 21 Hackney Worklessness Review, 2010 [forthcoming], www.hackney.gov.uk/cross-cutting-policy-reviews
 - 22 Noted for example in Renaisi's 2008, 'Community Cohesion study: Woodberry Down' www.renaisi.com, and in Shoreditch - National Evaluation of New Deal for Communities, op. cit
 - 23 "Making Hackney a great place to grow old: transforming prevention and wellbeing services for older adults", draft strategy, 2009
 - 24 Our Shared Future, op cit.
 - 25 Mayhew Associates, 2008, "Estimating and profiling the population of Hackney", report for London Borough of Hackney. www.teamhackney.org/hackneyfacts

-
- 26 Duffy, C., Chan, D.L. (2009), “People, Perceptions and Place”, www.ipsos-mori.com finds that that the perception that people do not treat each other with respect in the local area is by far the biggest driver of cohesion.
- 27 Interviews with community safety and youth service staff, borough police, unpublished peer research by the North East Hackney Youth Forum. Nearly twice as many children and young people in Hackney report that crime is a main worry for them compared to the national average, according to the TellUs3 survey in 2008. See also peer research in Fellowes Court, described in “Hackney Evidence Pack 2009”, prepared by the Strategic Policy and Research Team, London Borough of Hackney. www.teamhackney.org/hackneyfacts
- 28 Holman, C., & Holman, N. (2002) “Torah, worship and acts of loving kindness: baseline indicators for the charedi community in Stamford Hill”, London Borough of Hackney Household Survey, 2004
- 29 For example a number of incidents were reported during the Gaza crisis in 2008/9. This is reflected elsewhere in the UK: the Community Safety Trust recorded 924 antisemitic incidents nationally in 2009, the highest annual total since it began recording anti-Semitic incidents in 1984. www.thecst.org.uk
- 30 Holman, C., & Holman, N. (2002) op cit
- 31 Vertovec S., (2007) “New Complexities of Cohesion in Britain: super-diversity, transnationalism and civil-integration”, argues that ‘most urban encounters are fleeting or momentary’ – for established communities as well as migrants. www.compas.ox.ac.uk
- 32 Letki’s (2008) study quoted in ‘Good Relations: A Conceptual Analysis’, EHRC Research report 42 by Nick Johnson and John Tatam of the Institute of Community Cohesion. www.equalityhumanrights.com
- 33 Positive examples given during the review included the Orthodox Jewish community’s use of local minicab firms (largely Muslim-run) and employment opportunities for Polish workers in construction and cleaning for Jewish households. Examples given where economic relationships were reported to be less positive included resentment of perceived ‘control’ of retail and small business opportunities on the Hackney – Tower Hamlets border, and Sarah Keeler’s finding on the discomfort reported by Kurdish men about customer behaviour (and particular women’s behaviour) in kebab shops. Keeler, S., “No job for a Grown Man’: Transformations in Labour and Masculinity among Kurdish Migrants in London”, in Ryan, R., Webster, W. (2008) “Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in post-war Britain”, Ashgate.

-
- 34 Susanne Wessendorf, (forthcoming 2010), Corner-shop Cosmopolitanism: Social Interactions in a Super-diverse Context, Working Paper of the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity
www.mmg.mpg.de/english/Publications/workingpapers
- 35 Home Office, (2004), Strength in Diversity Towards a Community Cohesion and Race Equality Strategy, www.homeoffice.gov.uk
- 36 Hackney Borough Profile (forthcoming) www.hackney.gov.uk
- 37 Wilkinson, R., Pickett, K. (2009) “The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better”, Penguin, London, also www.equalitytrust.org.uk
- 38 This process is not new – see for example Butler, T. “People like us”: the Gentrification of Hackney in the 1980’s’, in Butler, T., Rustin, M. (1996) ‘Rising in the east? The Regeneration of East London’, Lawrence & Wishart Ltd.
Butler’s more recent work suggested that middle class families in London Fields were less likely to get involved in controlling local institutions (such as the park or school) than in other inner London locations studied – ‘Social Capital and the Formation of London’s Middle Classes’, in Blokland, T. & Savage, M. (2008) ‘Networked Urbanism: Social Capital in the City’, Ashgate.
‘In Living in the Bubble: Gentrification and its ‘Others’ in North London’, Urban Studies, Vol. 40, No. 12, (2003) , Butler argues that recent gentrifiers of Islington, “unlike the pioneers of the 1960s and 1970s, are unwilling to invest social capital in the area and that their relationships are almost entirely with ‘people like us’”.
- 39 “People, Perceptions and Place”, IPSOS – Mori, 2009, op cit.