‘Too poor to play’ An enquiry into contemporary segregation and desegregation within London’s play spaces.

by Eleanor Mack Briggs

Submission date: 03-Sep-2020 01:04PM (UTC+0100)
Submission ID: 133015369
File name: 693023_Eleanor_Mack_Briggs_Too_poor_to_play_An_enquiry_into_contemporary_segregation_and_desegregation_within_Londons_play_1972825095.pdf (15.94M)
Word count: 18582
Character count: 107073

UCL Bartlett School of Planning:

BPLN0008 Dissertation in City Planning / BPLN0039 Dissertation in Planning / BPLN0052 Major Research Project

To be completed by the student submitting the dissertation:

Candidate name:	Eleanor Mack Briggs
Programme name:	Spatial Planning
Time and date due in:	17:00, 8th September 2020
Supervisor name:	Callum Ward

To be completed by the School office:

Time and date actually submitted:	
Lateness penalty applied (if applicable)**:**	
Supervisor name:	
Second marker name:	
Third marker name (if applicable):	

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

FACULTY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

BARTLETT SCHOOL OF PLANNING

‘Too poor to play?’: An enquiry into contemporary segregation and desegregation within London’s play spaces.

Eleanor Mack Briggs (BA Hons)

Student Number: 19150791

Being a dissertation submitted to the faculty of The Built Environment as part of the requirement for the award of MSc Spatial Planning at University College London: I declare that this dissertation is entirely my own work and that ideas, data and images as well as direct quotations, drawn from elsewhere are identified and referenced.

Signature:  Date: 28/08/2020

Word Count: 10,971

Appendices: 3,907

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Callum Ward, for his guidance and feedback throughout the process of this research. A further thank you to the residents of the Lilian Baylis Estate who participated in interviews and gave their time so generously. Moreover, thank you to Dinah Bornat for her invaluable contribution.

ABSTRACT

The development of mixed communities is a planning topic which creates contentious policy and academic debates. While mixed communities are hailed by some as the solution for urban segregation the reality is complex with questions raised surrounding the impact of social mixing on inequality and community cohesion. Within the context of mixed communities, forms of segregation and demarcation by tenure are frequently evident, thus placing these issues within the context of urban inequality. The demarcation of play-spaces for affluent residents, excluding the less affluent is a manifestation of segregation, perpetuated through living within mixed communities. In an era of marketisation and social housing delivery through Section 106 agreements, the design and management of spaces needs careful consideration, with the needs of social housing tenants at times overlooked in a profitability-orientated agenda. It's within this context that this research seeks to examine the case of segregated play on the Lilian Baylis Estate to better understand the relationship between urban segregation and the communities it affects. Through semi-structured interviews and discourse analysis this research aims to critically examine the issue of play-space segregation – seeking to contribute towards an evidence base that examines urban segregation within mixed communities specifically through researching play-space segregation, a topic yet to receive academic attention. Three overarching themes were identified; the impact of (de)segregation for the Lilian Baylis community, accountability for the issue of segregation, and finally consideration of policy implications. These themes are discussed alongside relevant literature surrounding both urban segregation and tenure-mixing.

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Segregated play

The demarcation of play-space within London housing developments for affluent residents, excluding less affluent, has been described as 'segregation' and 'a form of social apartheid' (Voce, 2019). In March 2019 a 'media furore' (Voce, 2019) erupted over segregated play-spaces, uncovering a divisive practice within London developments. The issue draws on a complex understanding of contemporary inequality and class divisions in London, 'a city of contradictions' being both the richest and most unequal part of the UK (Guardian, 2015). Modern day segregation raises important questions about the role of planning and the agenda it pursues.

Segregated play-spaces can be found within London's mixed communities; developments incorporating, social, affordable and market-value housing. Evident from literature covering issues of tenure-mix, is a complex and problematic reality with questions raised surrounding the impact of social mixing on inequality and community cohesion. There are often marked differences between tenure within the context of mixed communities. Thus, cases of segregation align with debates surrounding urban inequality and socio-economic divisions.

Lilian Baylis became infamous as the first case of 'segregated' play-space to gain widespread media attention in March 2019. The estate, on the site of a former school, gained planning permission for redevelopment in 2013. The brutalist grade-II listed school is recognised for being of architectural interest (Lambeth, 2007, p.1). Today, Lilian Baylis is a 149-unit complex which includes 36 social-housing units located in the Wren Mews complex, with the Baylis Old School Estate comprising privately-owned homes as well as 36 shared-ownership homes (BBC, 2019). Developer, Henley Homes, marketed the development as 'an education in living well' (Henley Homes, 2018), incorporating high quality urban and landscape design (see figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1 – the redevelopment incorporated brutalist architecture with high quality public-realm.

Lilian Baylis is located in Kennington, a neighbourhood bordering Vauxhall and Elephant and Castle, within the South-London borough of Lambeth (see figures 1.2). Kennington is a diverse neighbourhood facing recent regeneration and gentrification, in part due to its proximity to central London. Kennington sits within a city-wide trend - as inner-city areas act as an 'incubator for gentrification' (Lees et al. 2008, p.133). House prices in the area have risen 135% between 2003 – 2019 (Steer, 2019). Like much of 'gentrified' inner-London inequality is prevalent. Lilian Baylis is located next to the Ethelred Estate, an area of concentrated social housing, sitting in direct contrast to the mostly private Lilian Baylis development.

Figure 1.2 - highlighting the London borough of Lambeth (London Councils, 2020).

Segregated play-spaces on this estate caused media, political and academic condemnation. Henley Homes initially advertised play areas as designed to 'maximise their inclusivity' (BBC, 2019). Original planning documents, approved by Lambeth Council showed gated access to the play area, allowing residents from both Wren Mews and Baylis Old School to access the play area. Yet, an amendment made in 2016 sought to change the gated access to a wall and hedge, preventing social tenants from using the main play-space (figure 1.3). The development has a history of conflict between residents over several play-related issues – this conflict peaked in March 2019 with the media campaign to 'desegregate' play-spaces. The developers have subsequently replaced the wall and hedge with a gate (figure 1.4), as outlined in the original plans, allowing residents of all tenures access to the play-space.

Figure 1.3 – a hedge and wall divided children from social and private housing (Grant, 2019 A).
Figure 1.4 – a key-coded gate was retrofitted to enable access.

1.2 Policy

The social mix agenda was national policy for the 1997 New Labour government. Under subsequent governments, policy has turned to advocate 'mixed communities' as the product of delivering social housing through Section 106 (S106) agreements. The Greater London Authority (GLA) recognise in their London Plan an aim of 'diversifying the tenure-mix of new homes' (GLA, 2019, p.36) while the National Planning Policy Framework sets out an objective of 'creating mixed and balanced communities' (Ministry of Housing, 2019, p.17). In Lambeth Council's 2007 development brief for Lilian Baylis, priority is given to promoting 'a mix of diversity' (Lambeth, 2007, p.11). Implied in council documentation is a presumption in favour of social mix for this site, in order to meet affordable housing targets.

London Mayor Sadiq Khan adamantly condemned segregation as 'morally unacceptable', recognising that policies in the Draft London Plan 'are absolutely clear that new developments should be inclusive to all' (Khan, 2019). Critically, the movement to end segregated play-spaces - a popular, political and media campaign - resulted in policy change for London and has, potentially, far reaching implications for the inclusivity of mixed communities.

1.3 Importance of this study

Researching the implications of segregation for mixed communities is vital for understanding the, at times, problematic nature of tenure-mix in practice. While focused on the issue of play-space, this research also speaks to broader issues of segregated space. By exploring how communities experience the sharing of urban space and relate to one another within communities of tenure-mix, this research has powerful implications for our understanding of inequality within the contemporary city.

Researching through the lens of segregated play-spaces provides analysis of the reality of social mixing in this specific case-study, as no similar studies exist, adding valuable analytic perspective on the issue.

1.4 Structure overview

After reviewing literature on urban segregation and tenure-mix (Chapter 2), and the methodological and ethical consideration of this research (Chapter 3), this dissertation presents findings in three chapters. Chapter 4 explores the experience of 'segregation' and 'desegregation' for the Lilian Baylis Estate as well as long-term implications. Chapter 5 assesses responsibility for 'segregation'. Chapter 6 works towards identifying the role policy change will have in preventing segregation. In conclusion, Chapter 7, considers how 'segregated' play impacts community relations within mixed communities.

1.5 Objectives

The research question for this study is:

How do segregated play-spaces impact relations between tenure within mixed communities?

With reference to the case-study, research objectives are:

- To explore experiences of segregation and subsequent desegregation of these spaces.
- To identify how cases of 'segregation' occur through the planning and delivery of developments of tenure-mix.
- To better understand how changes in policy can prevent segregation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Urban segregation

Issues of play-space access have been framed as 'segregation'. In the absence of literature surrounding play-space segregation, this review will frame this issue through urban segregation literature as segregated play constitutes a form of urban segregation. Anderson and Turner (2014, p.7) define segregation 'as the unequal representation of socio-economic, demographic, and ethnic categories across space'. Urban segregation is 'seen as a threat to social cohesion and stability' (Mustard et al. 2017, p.1062) with a seemingly obvious relationship between segregation and social inequality (Mustard, 2005; Reardon & Bischoff, 2011).

Segregation is frequently framed as a 'residential phenomenon' (Mustard, 2020, p.7) whereby homogenous groups dominate neighbourhoods. However, research has turned in recent years to consider urban segregation in other domains such as public space, the workplace and transport (Smith & Low, 2006; Blumen & Zamir, 2001; Strömgren et al., 2014; Wilson, 2011). Atkinson (2016, p.1305) recognises how literature has moved away from concepts of segregation which involve 'fixed ghettoization', instead giving greater recognition 'to the kinds of exchange, interaction and contact within and across social space in cities'. Mustard (2020, p.15) argues that in favouring homogeneity in residential environments, segregation as a trend is 'also increasingly expanding to middle-class households' and has 'produced homogeneous gated-communities'. Discussion surrounding gated-communities has argued that residents of these places are both 'metaphorically and in reality incarcerated by their fears' (Atkinson, 2016, p.1306; Low, 2003).

Tendencies for household segregation have been argued to be as a result of a range of demographic, socioeconomic and cultural differences (Schelling, 1971; McPherson et al., 2001; Mustard et al., 2016; van Gent et al., 2019). Urban segregation trends can be explained in relation to historical legacies and contexts (Mustard, 2020, p.2), explained partly through state involvement in housing provision and the redistribution of wealth (Mustard & Ostendorf, 1998), as 'welfare state arrangements and housing regimes are often strongly related' (Mustard et al. 2016, p.1067). Lee and Maurie (1999, p.638) argue that 'social divisions in British cities relate to tenure and the operation of the housing markets'. As current trends have assumed more market involvement in housing – a firmer relationship between social disparities and segregation develops, as Mustard et al., (2016, p.1067) suggest, 'higher levels of commodification of housing produce higher levels of segregation'. Atkinson (2016, p.1303) sees the 'unyielding programmes of austerity combined with the physical and social restructuring of major cities' as responsible for 'social fragmentation and injustice' adding to urban segregation.

Mustard (2020, p.13) argues that segregation has the potential to block opportunities and create negative neighbourhood effects, both expected to 'reduce social mobility and limit life chances'. Lloyd et al. (2015, p.7) highlight that at small-scales, negative cases of segregation 'may lead to social exclusion' and a loss of opportunities. Wilkinson and Pickett (2010) argue that social inequality, enhanced through social segregation, is deeply harmful for all of society. However, Mustard (2020) sees the blocking of life chances as an extreme form of segregation. Lloyd et al. (2015, p.8) highlight that local segregation can be beneficial as 'bonding social capital may lead to tightly knit mutually supportive social networks'. Anderson and Turner (2014, p.6) argue that segregation can be addressed 'both as a static distribution of social categories across space but also as a dynamic phenomenon whereby such socio-spatial distribution undergoes change over time'. Atkinson (2016, p.1303) considers how the city can 'enable encounter and mutual empathy' in order to neutralise wealth and income inequalities through design, so that the city is not structured for the affluent, thus reducing segregation. Politically, social mix and gentrification were seen as a means to tackle urban segregation, however in the last ten years social mix has gone from being a policy objective to a mechanism for delivering social housing. The following section will outline these agendas.

2.2 Social mix

Arthurson (2010, p.225) argues that 'social mix itself is an ambiguous concept'. Lee and Maurie (1999, p.635) suggest the term can imply 'some variation within communities and neighbourhoods'. The scale at which social mix occurs can vary with mix at the broader neighbourhood level as well as the finer-grained mixing of units within blocks of flats or along streets (Arthurson, 2010). Despite confusion surrounding the precise meaning of the concept, implicit is the idea that 'somehow the physical environment can influence social relationships' (Talen, 2002). New Labour orientated its policy towards a neoliberal social mix agenda (Cole and Goodchild, 2001; Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000). Social mixing became a 'means to tackle urban deprivation and reduce social inequalities' (Arbaci and Rae, 2012, p.451) as 'support for social mix is based on the premise that people are doubly disadvantaged through living in neighbourhoods of concentrated socio-economic disadvantage' (Arthurson, 2002, p.245).

Under New Labour, social mix moved to the forefront of the gentrification debate (Davidson, 2010, p.524; Butler and Robson, 2003; Cameron, 2003; Lees, 2008; Rose, 2004; Uitermark et al 2007; Walks and Maaranen, 2008). Critically many have argued that the mix-agenda was driven by economic transformation of cities, and 'state-led gentrification' (Allen, 2008; Porter and Shaw, 2009; Urban Studies, 2008; Arbaci and Rae, 2012), however 'policy language never uses the word 'gentrification''

(Lees, 2008, p.2452). This aligns with New Labour's objective of tackling the relationship between poverty and place (Cheshire, 2007; Hill 2007; Johnston, 2002). Some argue the 'social mix' rhetoric 'hides a gentrification strategy and in that a hidden social cleansing agenda' (Lees, 2008, p.2451; Cameron, 2003; Uitermark et al., 2007). Lees (2008) argues against social mixing in 'gentrified' neighbourhoods due to middle-class desire to self-segregate, questioning the premise and value of a social mix agenda. Lilian Baylis redevelopment plans were conceived during the New Labour years, however, the plans progressed alongside a policy shift away from the social mix agenda, as will be discussed below.

2.3 The contemporary agenda

Social mix terminology is no longer policy language; however, tenure-mix is still on the agenda as a by-product of delivering affordable housing through S106 agreements. Since 2010 social mix is less an implicit aim but rather a mechanism of S106 agreements and the delivery of affordable housing. S106 of the English 1990 Town and Country Planning Act provides local authorities (LAs) 'with powers to require developers to contribute towards affordable housing provision' (Morrison and Burgess, 2014, p.423). By the mid-2000s, affordable housing was delivered through S106 agreements in 90% of LAs (Christophers, 2014, p.84) 'alongside a sharp fall in the provision of traditional social housing' (Whitehead, 2007, p.34).

Ferm and Raco (2020, p.218) argue that the planning system has become increasingly market-led, with S106 agreements as a fundamental tool of 'viability-driven planning'. Close attention is now paid to 'viability (and profitability) of development proposals' as a result of government seeking to 'extract developer and/or landowner contributions to affordable housing' (Crosby et al. 2013, p.3). Ferm and Raco (2020, p.218) argue that viability-driven planning 'is further entrenching already existing spatial disparities and inequalities' within the context of a 'shift towards the marketisation of planning'. For Ferm and Raco (2020), the urgent need for LAs to meet housing targets creates reliance on private resources, with social value as aspirational.

S106 agreements deliver mixed communities 'as developers are required to make the provision of affordable homes within their market housing sites' (Morrison and Burgess, 2014, p.424). S106 agreements often require 'affordable housing to be pepper-dotted amongst market housing' (Burgess et al. 2011), encouraging a tenure-blind approach to developments. Lilian Baylis benefited from a S106 agreement for the creation of 36 social housing homes. Since 2012 a growing anti-viability politics has developed, with developers accused of exploiting planning authorities to avoid delivering on affordable housing targets (Pidd & Cocksedge, 2018). Grayston (2017) argues that since 2012 there has been a

dramatic reduction in affordable housing delivery and a failure to capture planning gains. This system has been criticised on the grounds of transparency (Burgess et al. 2011) with cases of housing not being delivered exactly as anticipated (Monk et al. 2006). This review will move to consider the ramifications of tenure-mix – whether that be explicitly through the 'social mix agenda' or implicitly through delivering affordable housing by S106 agreements.

2.4 Does tenure-mix enable social interaction?

Those in favour suggest mixed communities 'promote more stable, cohesive communities' (Bolt et al. 2010, p.130) as social interaction between owners and renters is facilitated (Casey et al. 2007, p.311). Key to this argument is the assumption that proximity will lead to relationship building across tenures with common spaces facilitating the 'spatial integration' of residents from different income levels – leading to the formation of relationships (Joseph et al. 2007, p.381). However, evidence for this is contentious. Cheshire et al. (2008, p.8) highlight that 'mixed community policy may reduce spatial disparities, i.e. the observable average differences between communities, even if it does nothing to change individual circumstances'.

Jackson and Butler (2015) identify the attraction of socially mixed communities for the middle-class, however, mix has not always translated into everyday social interaction. Social mixing is highlighted as a 'one-sided strategy that is seldom advocated in wealthier neighbourhoods' (Lees, 2008, p.2460, Blomely, 2004). Arthurson (2002, p.247) argues there is no evidence that 'social mix is a necessary condition for building inclusive communities', with studies showing a lack of social interaction between renters and homeowners. Cheshire et al. (2008, p.8) argue that mixed community policies 'may reduce spatial disparities, i.e. the observable average difference between communities', yet with no impetus to 'change individual circumstances'. Atkinson and Kintrea (2000, p.104) argue that there is 'little sign of benefits brought to renters through their contacts with owners'. Arthurson (2002, p.247) questions whether mixing 'creates tensions rather than social cohesion through raising awareness of class difference'. Arthurson's concerns are all the more pertinent when divisions are enforced through segregated spaces; while developments are mixed in theory, in practice barriers are present to separate residents.

Young's (1990) argument in defence of the 'politics of difference' is important within the criticism of mixed communities. Young (1990) argues neighbourhoods should allow group domination as long as the boundaries remain blurred. Lees (2008, p.2465) builds on this argument, expressing that people should be free to live with people like themselves rather than forcing mix, yet 'we should be keeping

the possibility for mixing open to them'. These authors contribute to an argument for allowing group domination within neighbourhoods, questioning the value of tenure-mix.

Urban design profoundly impacts social integration within mixed communities. Roberts (2007) argues that tenure-mix itself does not lead to successful neighbourhoods, rather the built and natural environment must be effectively planned and well designed. Casey et al. (2007, p.332) highlight the trend to position social housing on the periphery of a development, which 'helps to *create* 'difference'' rather than *mitigating* difference. Arguably if the 'distinction between tenures is aesthetically blurred' it would be possible to successfully integrate tenures (ibid 2007, p.332). Lees (2008, p.2465) argues that we need a 'refocus on urban design' which disallows 'fortress-style architecture'. If well managed and designed, some are supportive of tenure-mix, highlighting the potential for integration without tensions developing (Kleinhans, 2004, Jupp, 1999; Groves et al., 2003; Martin and Watkinson, 2003).

2.5 Research rationale

As a mechanism against urban segregation, mixed communities - delivered explicitly through the social mix agenda or as a mechanism of S106 agreements - prove problematic in practice. Evident is a tendency to avoid mixing across tenure despite the impetus of a scheme. Deep complexities exist especially when framed through Lees' (2008, p.2460) argument that this is a 'one sided strategy' rarely implemented in wealthier neighbourhoods. This study seeks to contribute towards this under-developed body of research surrounding issues of segregation, both self-segregation and enforced segregation within developments of tenure-mix, reflecting on arguments surrounding the middle-class and their attitudes to integration and the forming of social relations. Highlighting issues of segregation allows for critical analysis of problems associated with tenure-mix in practice, important when concerned with 'just' planning. This study adds a new angle to literature on this topic through investigating a case-study which is yet to receive academic analysis.

3. METHODOLOGY

A qualitative multi-methods approach was selected. Qualitative methods are employed to 'answer the *whys* and the *hows* of human behaviour, opinion and experience' (Guest et al. 2013, p.2) through 'analysing and estimating issues from an in-depth perspective' (Jamshed, 2014, p.87). A qualitative case-study approach will provide analysis of Lillian Baylis, examining 'phenomenon within its real-life context' (Guest et al. 2013, p.13). This case-study will be made up of semi-structured interviews and discourse analysis (DA) - analysis of written media. Reviewing social-media discourse as well as general reading of discussion, correspondence and documents exchanged between the residents and the property management company was important for understanding the case. Data which provides only background understanding highlights what aspects of the debate seem initially important before embarking on data collection. This multi-method approach reflects Walford's (2007) notion that interviews are unlikely to be productive when used in isolation. These methods will 'explore and describe the 'quality' and 'nature' of how people behave, experience and understand' (Alshengeeti, 2014, p.39).

3.1 Adapting to Covid-19

Measures have been taken to adapt this research within the context of Covid-19. Social-distancing guidelines made interviewing in person unviable. With remote interviews, 'the rapport and richness of the interaction may be lost' (Rowley, 2012, p.265). More participants may have been involved within this research had it been possible to attend neighbourhood events in order to build relationships with the community. Covid-19 has immense implications for all aspects of life, therefore, it was expected that invitations to participate in research would be less likely to receive a response. When contacting and relating to participants, the greatest level of sensitivity and care was adopted. Despite the limitations imposed upon fieldwork, this research has maintained academic rigour. With constraints imposed on interviewing, DA played an important role, thus the nature of the research has changed but not its quality and depth, protecting the validity of findings.

3.2 Case selection

Flyvberg (2006) highlights the importance of in-depth case-study research for understanding complex issues as 'case studies are likely to produce the best theory' (Walton, 1992, p.129). Flyvberg's (2006, p.34) model of 'information-orientated' case selection was adopted, by which 'cases are selected on the basis of expectations about their information content'. At a finer-grain, a 'typical case' selection approach was adopted (Flyvberg, 2006). Widdowson (2011, p.28) argues that with information-oriented

selection, cases are selected for their significance, with 'typical' cases, ‘generalisations can be drawn through logical deduction’. Lilian Baylis is appropriate as a ‘typical case’ - reflecting broader trends of play-space segregation common amongst other cases as well as the particularities of the individual case.

3.3 Semi-structured interviews

Online semi-structured interviews provide primary data for this study. Interviewing ‘is a valuable method for exploring the construction and negotiation of meaning’ (Cohen et al, 2007, p.29). An interview is ‘a conversation, whose purpose is to gather descriptions of the life/world of the interviewee’ (Kvale, 1996, p.174). Specifically, semi-structured interviews provide an open situation ‘through which a greater flexibility and freedom is offered to both sides’ (Gubrium and Holstein, 2002, p.35). Interviewing is an approach which should be ‘reflective and critical’ (Alshengeeti, 2014, p.41). When used within a case-study approach, ‘interviews explore the unique aspects of the case in great detail’ (Guest et al. 2013, p.13).

Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for greater accuracy than can be achieved through ‘on-the-spot’ notetaking (Hermanowicz, 2002) enabling the interviewer to produce a ‘verbatim transcript’ of the interview (Jamshed, 2014, p.87), which can be reviewed multiple times (Berg, 2007). Semi-structured interviews are based on an interview guide (see appendix D) ‘which is a schematic presentation of questions or topics’ used and expanded on by the interviewer (Jamshed, 2014, p.87). Semi-structured interviews allow for probing ‘into responses or observations as needed and obtain more detailed descriptions and explanations of experiences, behaviours and beliefs’ (Guest et al. 2013, p.23). Interviews are far from being ‘unproblematic’, responses will be, to an extent, shaped by how ‘questions are asked’ (Hammersley and Gomm, 2008, p.89, 100). To mitigate, interviewers should not ask leading questions (Alshenqeeti 2014) and should remain aware of context and the notion that answers can be ‘driven by a preoccupation with self-presentation’ (Hammersley and Gomm, 2008, p.89).

Five semi-structured interviews were conducted. Interview participants included Dinah Bornat - architect and child-friendly planning expert and advisor to bodies including the GLA - and four residents from the Lilian Baylis Estate (Louise, Daniel, Charlie and Paul). Snowballing was used to identify participants. Snowballing refers to ‘the process of “gathering” interviewees by asking initial contacts or interviewees to recommend other potential interviewees’ (Rowley, 2012, p.265). Only private housing residents participated in this research, as social housing tenants proved hard to contact and less willing to participate for numerous reasons. This research does not aim to represent the community holistically; instead it aims to understand the conflicts from the perspectives of those included in the sample. The perspectives of residents from social housing are drawn on through DA, as

media regularly quoted social housing residents; however, these views are selectively chosen by journalists, carrying implications for the meaning of the data gathered. This case adopts multiple sources; thus, interviewees give specific insights, but the research is not based solely on the information provided from these interviews.

3.4 Discourse Analysis

The term discourse 'is both complex and contested' (Ockwell and Rydin, 2010, p.168). Dryzek (1997, p.8) defines discourse as 'a shared way of apprehending the world', embedded in language, enabling us to 'interpret bits of information and put them into coherent stories or accounts'. The 'notion of discourse' also focuses on 'power and meaning of words' (Cole and Goodchild, 2001, p.352). Advocates of DA claim it is 'crucial to examine and explain how language is used' in order to 'reveal aspects of social and political processes that were previously obscured' (Ockwell and Rydin, 2010, p.169). Sonn (2010, p.1205) highlights the importance of revealing the 'discourse strategy behind discursive acts', drawing from understanding of social structures and the intent of the author. This is critically important as Ficher and Forester (1993) argue that language profoundly shapes our perception of the world. Thus, the process of DA needs to be squarely situated 'within the umbrella of social economic and political life' (Imrie et al. 1996, p.1258).

A DA method was employed to analyse the media coverage of segregated play on the Lilian Baylis Estate. This approach provided insight into the narratives constructed in relation to both *'segregation'* and *'desegregation'* as well as the impact of policy change. Newspaper database, Nexislexis, was used to identify articles. Search-criteria was comprised of two timeframes; search-criteria one focused on the timeframe 25th March 2019-10th April 2019 and searched for the phrase 'Lilian Baylis'. Search-criteria two selected articles from 12th July 2019-20th July 2019 – searching for the words 'policy' and 'play'. Timeframe one allowed for analysis of response to play-space segregation, while timeframe two corresponds to when policy changes were made. Timeframes were short to ensure only discourse focusing on the immediate reaction to segregation and policy change were identified. The words used were uncontentious in order to draw results from a wide range of media. Thirty-seven newspaper articles were selected from a broad selection of online and print-media, representing different perspectives.

Lilian Baylis residents had been developing their case against segregation before presenting it to The Guardian. As a result, Guardian articles are numerous and rich in detail including quotes from residents. These articles formed an important part of this research however they have been read critically with awareness that the over-representation of Guardian perspectives prevents a level of objectivity. DA 'allows us to describe in detail how speech and writing are used in the media' (Wodak and Chilton,

2005, p.12); analysis will highlight how this issue has been shaped through discourse. DA enables analysis of one topic from 'somewhat different vantage points' (Fairclough, 2013), in this case the vantage points include those of journalists and media-organisations as well as residents, academics, politicians and developers.

3.5 Thematic analysis

Analysis can be an 'overwhelming experience of being confronted with large quantities of material' (Crang, 2005, p.218). Thematic analysis, using coding software, Nvivo, has been used for both analysis of media discourse and interviews. The analysis sought to classify the predominant arguments and themes surrounding play-space segregation. Organisation and categorisation of interview material and DA is used to facilitate the identification of common themes. Coding data into classifications makes analysis more effective in uncovering trends to 'clarify the relationship between your codes and the materials with which you started' (Crang, 2005, p.224). Themes identified were relevant to my research question and objectives; these were (1) the impact of (de)segregation for the community, (2) accountability for the issue of segregation, and (3) policy implications. Sub-themes were subsequently identified within these overarching themes. These themes formed the basis of the structure used for presenting findings in Chapters 4-6.

3.6 Ethics

When dealing with 'human participants' research should 'rigorously follow ethical considerations' (Alshenqeeti, 2014, p.44). Ethical clearance was sought via UCL, ensuring research complied with UCL's Risks, Ethics and Data Protection requirements. It is important to ensure that 'people understand what it means to participate in a particular research study so they can decide in a conscious, deliberate way whether they want to participate' (Mack et al., 2005, p.9). Written, signed consent was sought from all participants. Prior to commencing, interviews participants were verbally reminded of the voluntary nature of their participation, they could withdraw at any stage. Cohen et al. (2007) acknowledge that ethical issues need to be considered at all stages of the interview process. Participants were given the opportunity for anonymity as confidentiality is important for protecting participants rights and in order to 'avoid causing them any harm' (Alshenqeeti, 2014, p.44). Two participants (referred to as Charlie and Daniel) requested anonymity; thus, their names have been changed. While this research concerns the provision of play-space for children (a vulnerable group), children will not be involved at any stage of the research.

4. THE CASE OF A 'SEGREGATED' LILIAN BAYLIS

The following chapters present discussion and analysis on the findings of this study. This chapter explores the narratives and discourse surrounding segregated play-space on the Lilian Baylis Estate. The impact of (de)segregation for the community effected will be examined and linked to broader theory surrounding urban segregation and tenure-mix.

4.1 Overview

Lilian Baylis was the first development to be platformed by the media for issues of segregated play. From the outset this development faced numerous issues in relation to play. Two key issues emerge; firstly, an issue of access with social housing tenants unable to access the main play area (referred to as segregation throughout this study), secondly, the issue of attitude towards children and families within the development, described as an 'anti-child atmosphere'. This research highlights that both issues are connected and often conflated. In response to these issues, a group of mothers, including participant Louise, framed the issues before engaging in discussion with the council, developers and estate-management companies. When these discussions proved unfruitful, they moved to contact academics, child-friendly planners and the press. In March 2019, Guardian Journalist Harriet Grant, reported on 'segregated play' – propelling Lilian Baylis' issues into the mainstream. Various additional cases of segregated play have since been revealed. Social housing tenants now have access to the play-space, with the hedge and wall replaced with a gate (see figure 1.3 and 1.4); however, contentious play-related issues continue.

4.11 A note on terminology

'Segregation' has become a word synonymous with Lilian Baylis. Architect and child-friendly city expert, Dinah Bornat, initially adopted the term, when asked by Grant "what's going on here" she responded, "well I think it's segregation". Louise agreed with Bornat; 'the policy was clear-cut segregation', which she argued to be 'morally wrong' (Mohdin and Grant, 2019). Through framing the issues as a form of 'social apartheid' (Voce, 2019), the strength of opposition to 'segregated' play-spaces is palpable. Lloyd et al. (2015, p.7) argue we should be concerned with segregation at small spatial scales as it may lead to 'social exclusion, an inability to access the full range of social and economic opportunities'. Thus, claims of segregation should be regarded with importance and concern.

It is recognised that 'segregation' is a loaded-term, thus this research explores this issue within the context of urban segregation literature, without arguing it is or is not segregation – rather the term segregation is used by Bornat, academics, politicians, some residents and the press. The developers did

not recognise the issue as segregation, instead they referred to the issue as one of access. Conclusions will be drawn as to whether segregation was an appropriate framing for the issues discussed.

4.2 How did 'segregation' impact communities?

4.21 'Anti-child' atmosphere

Discourses surrounding segregated play-space framed the issue within the narratives of residents – shown to overwhelmingly resent segregation. Voce (2019) speaks of the mothers as 'united in wanting all their children to be able to play together'. Private resident, Jane Bloomfield states; 'to have a physical manifestation of segregation was very difficult to take as a mum … My daughter said to me: 'But I don't understand, why can't they just come in and play?'' (Mohdin and Grant, 2019). Critically, these media reports selectively represent residents firmly opposed to segregated play. In doing so, these reports highlight conflict, as opposed to holistically representing the views of residents.

Bornat describes how her initial interest in the case came from stories Louise shared of "horrible contact and also an attitude that looked to me like the intention of the scheme in its submission hadn't been delivered". For Louise, the reality of play on the development conflicted with her expectations; "I bought the flat because all the advertisements were about families and children" (see figure 4.1). Louise referred to the play strategy for the development, which speaks of the importance of taking 'into account the needs of both adults and children' (Raycroft, 2012). However, once her children began playing on the development, she became aware of a pertinent "anti-child atmosphere" and she feared complaints from other residents regarding noise and how children were using the facilities. This anti-child atmosphere was confounded for Louise once aware that social tenants did not have access to the play area. Resident, Paul argues that a minority of residents adopted a pervasive view "that children should be seen and not heard" and with that "all facilities were sacrosanct". Thus, both Louise and Paul speak of an attitude from residents which discouraged play on the development.

Figure 4.1 - child-friendly marketing material was used by Henley Homes (Building construction design, 2014).

4.22 Is this about rich and poor?

Discourse surrounding ideas of 'rich' and 'poor' regularly accompanied this case. The Architects Journal described the case as a row over 'poor playgrounds' (Jessel, 2019) – a term adapted from the 2014 'poor-doors scandal'. Similarly, Observer journalist, Moore, referred to segregation as 'dividing rich and poor' (Moore, 2019) while Daily Mail authors referred to the divide between 'rich children' and 'poor children' (Duell and Leatham, 2019). However, Louise called for this not to be an issue of rich and poor, arguing that "it's about us mothers, who are friends, and our children are friends and want to play together". Louise notes, "it's just luck what side of the wall you fall on" – drawing on a view that residents are labelled as different but little divides them as neighbours. This is all the more pertinent for mothers, whose children provide commonality between families, helping to bridge socio-economic divides. This aligns with the argument that the neighbourhood plays a critical role in providing mutual support and neighbouring relations for households with children (Cheshire, 2007 and Kleit, 2005). Louise's remarks suggest a success of tenure-mix - implying that 'rich and poor' can and should live alongside one another without demarcation. However, Louise also speaks of a divisive issue surrounding a google-group where discussions were had "about whether social housing people should be allowed onto the google-group". Daniel endeavoured to separate himself from the narrative of a collective group of private residents opposed to mixing with social tenants; "I don't think of myself as someone who is rich, and I don't think of myself as someone who was trying to stop poor kids from playing". Highlighting issues such as this, questions how universal Louise and Daniel's attitudes towards her social housing neighbours were.

Bornat notes that "there's a kind of classism going on here, they're saying these sorts of people don't want to live together". The argument that classism is manifesting in this case can explain why media discourse became one of 'rich' and 'poor'. Chaskin and Joseph (2011, p.210) recognise the potential value of tenure-mix, as 'living among working-class and middle-class residents can benefit poorer

people'. Yet, in dividing by tenure within a development, some of the benefits discussed by Chaskin and Joseph (2011), amongst others, are inhibited. However, this notion is highly debated, with many sceptical of the benefits for working-class people living alongside middle-class, arguing that people should be free to live with those similar to themselves (Lees, 2008; Lee and Maurie, 1999; Arthurson, 2002). Evidence for Lees' (2008) argument that despite a desire for diversity, middle-class tend to self-segregate, is present within the narrative surrounding relations across tenure. Some residents 'opt for homogeneity in their residential environment' (Mustard, 2020, p.15), thus prohibiting relationships forming across tenure.

4.23 Narratives of 'desegregation'

While all residents, regardless of tenure, can now use the play-space, it appears that a mindset of division remains. Daniel argues the issue has "divided our community […] it deteriorated relationships between residents because we took sides – it was an us versus them thing". Bornat recognises that for many residents "it's not okay"; "I think it's really difficult because there's still a hardcore of residents who really hate it […] so the social housing tenants, they don't go there, they just feel like they shouldn't, they just don't feel 100% welcome". Louise suggests that the history of segregation resulted in a marked difference between social and private tenants, enforcing a sense of fear and unease; "they're so worried that their children will do something wrong and the wall gets put back up again and they're blamed". Louise reflected on the notion that those who had created the "anti-child atmosphere" had 'won' with families opting to use the park outside the development.

Evening Standard journalist, Bentham (2019), argues 'what happened here is symptomatic of a deeply regrettable trend for segregation in this city which has brought us seemingly ever more gated communities, "poor doors" in housing developments for social tenants'. While segregation at Lilian Baylis was temporary, this case exemplified Bentham's (2019) notion of 'a deeply regrettable trend' which leaves a lasting impact upon the community it effects. Evidently the removal of the wall was celebrated, yet the mentality and design of segregation within the development alongside an 'anti-child atmosphere' pervades.

4.3 United in opposition?

All participants spoke of animosity between residents as two camps formed between those in favour of 'desegregation' and those with reservations. Louise recognises that she and other mothers were subject to abuse from private residents. While the main triggers remain undetermined, Louise spoke of at least two families who had moved off the estate – potentially as a result of play-related issues and the

"nastiness" this had created. Daniel also referred to the hostile reaction he received to an email calling for the wall to come down, "it really infuriated a lot of my neighbours".

Paul reflected on the argument made by some residents that social housing tenants could use the playground across the road – thus, they should not require access to the development's playground. Paul argued this is missing the point "because if you overlook something, literally in touch with something, but you're not entitled to use it, it's very corrosive for a small community". Similarly, Louise used an analogy of the playground being like a sweetshop that social housing children were not allowed to access. This notion of entitlement was raised within discourse which regularly drew on the issue of service-charge. The Evening Standard argued social tenants were 'arrogantly dismissed' as 'not contributing via a monthly service-charge, and therefore attempted to justify such segregation' (Cavendish, 2019).

Unaware of the issues on his development, Daniel "approached this problem from the perspective of reading about this horrible institution and these horrible people". Paul highlights a feeling that the media reporting of segregation "lumbered the private residents of the development with the social exclusion of the residents who could not use the playground […] it was a bit upsetting for me to be singled out". Paul acknowledges that this was not unique, with issues of segregation evident across London, yet Lilian Baylis became the focus. The framing of segregation forms only an aspect of play-related issues for Lilian Baylis, however with the strength of public opposition to segregation, other opinions were omitted from public discourse. At times, the media's framing of segregation was not accurately representing the nuance of the debate amongst residents, more nuance may have enabled public debate as opposed to condemnation.

4.4 Summary

Mixed communities are advocated for their role in promoting 'more stable, cohesive communities' (Bolt et al. 2010), yet with the division and hostility created by segregation, Lilian Baylis is anything but a stable community. This lack of stability is exemplified by Louise's concern for the families who moved off the development, a decision she argues was influenced by the hostile atmosphere. The language used by the media in its framing of segregation proves critical in influencing both resident and public perception of issues. A dynamic conflict and segregation between residents, within and across tenure, continues, despite the removal of the wall.

5. ACCOUNTABILITY

This chapter will build on the case of Lilian Baylis, outlined in Chapter 4, to investigate the issue of accountability for the segregation of play-space. This chapter will also assess the scheme in relation to its execution of tenure-mix. It is hypothesised that the principle of tenure-mix lies at the heart of contentions regarding play-space for Lilian Baylis.

5.1 The developer and management companies

Discourses surrounding segregated play-space at Lilian Baylis regularly endeavoured to place blame, investigating how it came about and who was responsible. Consensus within these discourses focuses on the developer, Henley Homes, as primarily responsible. The initial Guardian article reported; 'Henley Homes has blocked social housing residents from using shared play-spaces' (Grant, 2019 B). Henley Homes were 'subject to widespread criticism' (Porter, 2019) when found to have changed designs only after planning permission had been granted.

In accordance with media discourse surrounding accountability, Louise primarily blames the developer for erecting the wall. Similarly, Charlie considered a financial motivation, arguing "it was the property developers maybe cutting costs but also changing what they promised". Paul cynically recognises the "commercial instinct" of the developers for both initially segregating and for their subsequent move to appear openminded.

Louise criticised Henley Homes' role from the outset in their marketing of the development, creating expectations which were not adhered to; she argues that the developers used "images of children to sell the property, wanting to make it child-friendly". Daniel draws on the role of developers in creating expectations for a development; "if you expect that this is a gated sanctuary in this tucked away place you will be disappointed but if you expect that this is the middle of London you expect to hear noise." Voce (2019), a child-friendly planning expert added to this discourse, recognising a running battle between residents expecting a child-friendly development and estate-management 'for whom children's play seems to have been largely conceived as a nuisance to be policed'.

The wide-ranging attitudes of residents meant that it was difficult for the management company's response to satisfy all. Instead their response led to further contention. Louise reflects that rather than supporting play on the development the management company "started sending these horrible letters, saying the water areas were ornamental and they started putting signs up saying it was too dangerous

to play". Louise argues the management company aligned with the "people with the biggest voices", highlighting how divisive the issue became.

5.2 Lambeth Council

Media discourse regularly quoted Lambeth Council's defence of their actions – with the LA arguing the scheme was given planning permission under the premise of equal access. However, Lambeth's role remains contentious, with debate surrounding their knowledge of segregation. Amendments to the planning proposals in 2016 show the developer's intention to move a wall and thus prevent play access for social tenants. Lambeth publicly argue they refused this, yet some participants suggested that they turned a blind eye. Whilst this is speculative, evidently the council was reluctant to address segregation until it became a very public political row. One former resident spent a year attempting to escalate the issue of access with the council, with no result.

Moore (2019) wrote in the Observer that changes to the development post planning approval did 'not appear to have happened by accident', bringing into question what motivations are at play. According to Paul, the genesis of the issue is the planning permission. Paul argued the council was motivated by profit rather than ideology; "they [councils] tend to be a bit of a pansy – they get pushed over by developers. In this age of entrepreneurialism with the public sector they were quite complacent". Paul draws upon a complex relationship between developers and LAs, by which developers hold great financial sway – thus implied is the notion that developers have a free hand. This complex relationship can be explained as the product of 'viability-driven planning' and a shift towards marketisation within planning (Ferm and Raco, 2020).

Louise found planning enforcement uninterested in the issues at Lilian Baylis, arguing this issue was the responsibility of the management company. Louise questioned the role of enforcement when "blatant" rule-breaking goes unchallenged. Similarly, Daniel found enforcement unresponsive despite the developer not abiding by planning permission. He notes that "as a resident of Lambeth you would think Lambeth would take developers to task for not following up on their promises" – asserting the notion that LAs have a responsibility to their residents to ensure developments comply with procedure.

5.3 A tenure-mix failure?

Criticism of segregation and the on-going issues faced by Lilian Baylis residents, naturally, calls into question the concept of tenure-mix and the consequences of not adopting a tenure-bind approach. Writing for the Guardian, Hinsliff (2019) refers to segregation at Lilian Baylis as 'a bad example of

social stratification' – arguably the direct opposite of what is intended through tenure-mix. With social stratification, social cohesion and stability within communities is threatened (Mustard et al. 2017, p.1062), exemplified by the contentious relations at Lilian Baylis. Discourse explicitly linked segregation to implications of tenure-mix, Hinsliff (2019) continues; 'given that the whole point of forcing developers to include affordable housing along with the posh bits was to encourage residents to mix naturally and break down social barriers. Here, literally the opposite has happened'.

Bornat argues that the stark reality of 'segregation' at Lilian Baylis shows that "the social element of the scheme was getting less space". Bornat argues this is not "segregation of equality" but rather social tenants were getting "starkly less". In social tenants occupying less space, inequality is perpetuated through design and the use of shared space. This reality reflects Casey et al.'s (2007) recognition of the trend to *create* difference between tenure as opposed to *mitigate* difference. When tenure is aesthetically blurred successful integration between tenure becomes possible (ibid). While Lees (2008, p.2465) questions the value of forced social mix, she argues 'we should be keeping the possibility for mixing open', yet with the physical segregation of play-space, the possibility of mixing is discouraged.

Participants related to social housing within the development in different ways. Paul had been unaware of where the social housing was positioned, suggesting effective mixing alongside private. He recognised "they are part of the development, they aren't fenced off or something", further highlighting continuity in building style. In conflict with Paul's impression of the social housing, Louise recognises that the social housing "is much more high density, it's all one block whereas the private housing is much more spread out with lots of low-level buildings" (see figures 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3). Daniel argues that "the development was never built as one development it was always built as two, with a public housing and private housing bit".

Figure 5.1 and 5.2 – private housing incorporates brutalist buildings from the old school alongside newly-built blocks.
Figure 5.3 – social housing complex, Wren Mews, is one, higher density block.

Louise implies a differentiation in attitude towards children from the private and social housing, reflecting attitudes towards their parents based on socio-economic status. Louise recognises "fear-mongering", with private residents thinking "if we let the social housing children in, they will trash the place and the flowers will be pulled up and the bushes pushed down". This emphasises that issues on the development extend further than the 'anti-child atmosphere'; rather, conflict is charged by issues of class and tenure. Discourse often framed the issue within the context of London, a city where 'people of different backgrounds both live close together and share spaces' (Moore, 2019). The notion that segregation goes against the values of London as a diverse city, emphases the unjust reality of segregation. This reflects Bornat's articulation that this is about "our attitude to shared space and how we live together".

Bornat argues that it is possible to create effectively tenure-blind developments whether this be through 'pepper-potting' tenures or separate tenure by block - as mixing can be at a neighbourhood scale or through the finer-grain mixing of units within blocks (Arthurson, 2010). Bornat is adamant that "you definitely should not be splitting it in the shared spaces", as was the case for Lilian Baylis. Bornat links this idea to gating, arguing against this for the negative impact on communities. Bornat reflects Lees' (2008, p.2465) notion that the design of socially mixed developments needs a 'refocus', disallowing

'fortress-style architecture'. Lilian Baylis is a real-life example of how damaging segregation within shared spaces can be.

5.4 Summary

Complacency is evident with the issue of segregation, with all involved in the development process sharing accountability. It is evident that Henley Homes bear responsibility for creating expectation for a development through marketing materials and their play strategy which was not delivered. Their building of the wall which prevented social tenants from accessing the play-space was a divisive move. The council share accountability for a passive attitude to enforcement prior to media attention. Alongside this, personal experience highlights the weaknesses of tenure-mix and the delivery of social housing within a mixed development, with differentiation between tenure present in the physicality as well as the attitudes of residents and arguably the developer. This case aligns with Atkinson and Kintrea's (2000, p.104) argument, that the fact 'owners and renters live in the same estates does not necessarily bring them together'. With physical division between tenure, 'casual contacts' (ibid, p.104) between neighbours across tenure is prevented and cohesive community relations are made less likely.

6. POLICY

This chapter will adopt a wider lens, considering broader issues related to the planning system. Firstly, the systematic implications of delivering affordable housing through the mechanism of S106 agreements will be considered before turning to analyse the impact Lilian Baylis has had on the policy landscape.

6.1 Section 106

Discourses focused on the role S106 agreements, adopted by most LAs, play in the creation of 'mixed communities' (Burgess et al. 2011), as has been the case for Lilian Baylis. Due to housing shortages, 'UK developments typically have to allot a certain portion of their projects to affordable housing' (Anderson 2019). As a result, the provision of affordable housing in London is dependent on the 'successful output of market housing as opposed to the historic model of social housing provided exclusively through 'government capital subsidies' (Morrison and Burgess, 2014, p.437)'. With this comes enhanced powers and freedoms for developers in how they implement tenure-mix; developers have the freedom to design difference between tenure, and with this, difference in access to shared spaces.

Moore (2019) writes critically about S106 agreements in his Observer piece describing it as an 'outcome of an ideology that, rather than levy taxes that LAs can then spend on the public good, prefers to make councils haggle with developers'. Moore's arguments reflect the notion of 'viability-driven planning' (Fern and Raco, 2020), a planning system centred on the concept of profitability. With this comes a growing 'anti-viability politics' whereby developers are criticised for exploiting LAs through avoiding the delivery of affordable housing (Pidd and Cocksedge, 2018). Daniel questions the attitude of developers towards their social housing obligations, recognising that "the developers are only going to make money from one part, so to be cost efficient they don't spend as much on the part they won't make money on". This draws on Ferm and Raco's (2020, p.218) notion that planning has been transformed 'into a vehicle for public revenue-generation and expedited private investment', conflating social housing with profit margins and investment. Mustard et al. (2017, p.1067) are sceptical of this model for its social impact, arguably with 'more market involvement and the financialization of rental housing' higher levels of segregation will develop.

Discourse often focused on the notion that 'councils have lost many of their powers over developers, and housing developments' (Dudman, 2019). In part due to a loss of financial powers in the absence of government subsidies for housing (Morrison and Burgess, 2014). A Guardian piece quoted Jon Healey,

the former shadow-housing sectary who brought the government's actions into the firing line arguing that 'over the last nine years, the government has given developers a free hand to build what they want' (Grant et al. 2019). Louise speculated about the complex relationship between developers and the council; questioning whether councils "are under-resourced or just in the pocket of the developer", both are key arguments made by those opposed to the current viability-driven system. Either way, Louise suggests developers have a degree of power over councils in schemes such as Lilian Baylis.

Bornat referred to the "private sector cross-subsidy model" and the implications this model has in the deal-making process; "the deal they have to strike with the housing associations is very simple, it's here's your land here's our land – you do what you need to on your bit and we'll do what we want on our bit of the land". As a result, mixed communities can embody difference. Discussion in the Guardian quoted Kate Henderson, executive of the National Housing Federation, who draws on the power that housing associations hold, in relation to Lilian Baylis, being 'incredibly well-placed to be guardians of those community spaces and to be creators of mixed communities' (Dudman, 2019). Henderson highlights how housing associations are brought into schemes too late, making it difficult to create properly integrated developments (ibid). As a result of delayed involvement, Bornat recognises that "quite often they hand over these shared spaces, but they don't know how to manage them properly". Thus, enabling a row over access and in the case of Lilian Baylis, complex disputed accountability for segregation.

S106 agreements, according to Moore (2019), encourages 'a box-ticking mentality whereby the open spaces of a development such as Baylis Old School become a choreography of enclosures' which 'puts the vital spaces of cities in the hands of people who would rather be thinking about something else'. Similarly, Bornat argues Lilian Baylis play-spaces met minimal requirements as "both the social and the private element were ticking the play-space requirement box", however she refers to the play-spaces allotted for social tenants as "mean". Both media discourse and interview responses highlight that more could be done to regulate and control developers to ensure that rather than box-ticking, developments meet the needs of all residents, providing inclusive and accessible high-quality spaces and facilities across tenure. A degree of consistency between housing development schemes and between developers is critical for ensuring housing is inclusive to all. The following section will reflect on the role policy plays in achieving this.

6.2 Policy change

Speaking to the Guardian, Bornat described how everyone she spoke to at the highest level 'has been absolutely horrified that our planning system is not robust enough to stop this happening' (Grant, 2019,

B). This response from politicians and senior planners sparked change. In July 2019, four months after the case of segregated play caused a 'media furore', Sadiq Khan announced policy change through the draft London Plan, preventing further cases of 'segregated' play. Under new policy for mixed communities, 'developers will no longer be allowed to build play areas that are accessible only to people in the most expensive properties' (Grant, 2019 C). Bornat referred to actions taken by the GLA in implementing policy change for London as "commendable".

Paul agreed that policy to prevent segregated play was needed as "it would have tied the council's hand" rather than being "pushed over by developers". The council's involvement with Lilian Baylis has proved complex, thus, as Paul argues decisive action to ensure councils prevent similar cases of segregation is important. Similarly, Daniel reflects that the council "should have enforced from day one", suggesting inaction from Lambeth's planning enforcers. Daniel also considers the implication policy would have on developers, arguing; "if you have rules that say you can't build developments like this with separate play areas that would force developers to think from the beginning about these sorts of things". This argument suggests that policy in this area could decisively prevent developers from segregating future play-spaces.

In raising the profile of issues on her development, Louise hoped to prevent the difficulties her community faced affecting others. In this aim, she was motivated in achieving some level of structural change. Louise references the Nine Elms development which also used child-friendly marketing material; "I just thought it's going to happen again but on an even bigger scale". Louise argued the attitudes on her own development were too entrenched to change however she wanted "developers to think twice before they think they can treat children like this on other developments". While policy change will play a role in preventing future cases of segregation, Louise expressed scepticism about the impact of policy and how it would be enforced. Louise highlights the role the media has played in addressing other cases of segregation; "whenever there is a segregated play area people release articles on it, to tell developers to back off". Without the high-profile condemnation of segregated play on the Lilian Baylis Estate, profiled through the media, other cases of segregated play-spaces may continue to go publicly unrecognised. Louise raises the notion that a change in attitude and the framing of what is acceptable planning could have a more profound impact than policy change, suggesting a change in culture is required.

Critically, there is no policy at a national level to prevent similar cases of segregated play-spaces from being developed. Bornat argues that commitments from national government "to make sure this doesn't happen again, is of course rubbish because there is no policy at a national level to stop this". Bornat also makes a broader connection to issues with the planning system. Divisions between policy, LAs and

the private sector prevent what Bornat describes as “dynamic policy”. She calls for less box-ticking and more concern for “people’s lives”; drawing on the need for cultural change within planning and housing delivery.

6.3 Summary

In placing this case-study within the context of a planning system reliant on S106 agreements for the delivery of affordable housing, the circumstances which allow for segregation by tenure can be understood. ‘Viability driven planning’ (Fern and Raco, 2020) gives developers considerable powers, and this is proving controversial. A complex relationship between councils and developers, as a result of this system brings into question the workings of these power dynamics as well as the effectiveness of the oversight and enforcement provided by councils. In identifying how this case-study has brought change to London Plan policy, it is evident that oversight delivered through policy may prevent future cases of ‘segregation’. However, pertinent is the idea that a change of culture is key in altering the relationship between councils and developers, ensuring planning regulations and policy are adhered to. Greater oversight of S106 delivery is fundamental in ensuring developments are inclusive and the needs of social housing tenants are protected.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has discussed the issues relating to play-space on the Lilian Baylis Estate as twofold; an anti-child atmosphere coupled with segregation. Evidently the issue of segregation has been intensified as a result of the anti-child atmosphere, with attitudes to children on the development compounded by notions of class and tenure. Research focused on the residents' experience of play-space segregation on the Lilian Baylis Estate, whilst framing this issue within the context of tenure-mix and the use of S106 agreements for the delivery of social housing. Research has highlighted the negative reality of living with segregation, creating entrenched divisions within the Lilian Baylis community, highlighting urban segregation as a 'threat to social cohesion and stability' (Mustard et al. 2017, p.1062). Critically, this study also highlighted deep-rooted tensions between residents within the private complex. This tension stems from differing expectations of what living at Lilian Baylis would be like, with some expecting a 'peaceful' environment whilst others envisioned a child-friendly environment where play would be encouraged. Thus, segregation became an issue heated by underlying conflict surrounding the attitude to children on the development, whilst also drawing on deep-rooted underlying structures of class, socio-economic status and community within a mixed tenure development.

This research presents a case example of segregated play within mixed communities, sharing both commonalities and differences with other cases. While the social mix agenda is outdated, the impact of S106 agreements forces planners to consider the impact of living within a community of tenure-mix. Interviews and media discourse highlight the profoundly damaging impact of living within developments where design creates or enforces difference. Participants spoke of discomfort caused by being made critically aware of their wealth and status in comparison to their neighbours, while the language of media also referred to the damaging impact upon families in social housing of differentiation between tenure. Evidently some residents align with Mustard's (2020, p.15) notion that segregation is increasingly a trend expanding to middle-class households as the middle-class seek 'homogeneity in their residential environment'. Yet Lees (2008, p.2465) highlights the necessity of keeping the possibility for mixing open'. This study highlights that rather than demarcating difference, shared spaces should be accessible to all, allowing for the possibility of mixing, promoting more harmonious, less contentious community relations for mixed communities.

The role of Henley Homes and their marketing of the development has proved highly significant in creating the grounds for contestation surrounding this development. In marketing the development as family friendly, expectations were created which were not upheld by the developers or the management company in both the delivery of the scheme and their response to the community's complaints. This suggests a role for greater oversight, with the aim of ensuring developers are accountable to both their

planning proposals and the creation of an environment promised to residents. The role created for developers in the delivery of social housing through S106 agreements raises concerns about the delivery of social housing under a 'viability driven planning system' (Ferm and Raco, 2020). Mustard et al. (2017, p.1067) express concern for urban segregation, assuming more market involvement in housing continues, a firmer relationship will develop 'between social disparities and segregation' as 'higher levels of commodification of housing produce higher levels of segregation'. This study highlights concerns that even with policy change, room for cases of segregation and social inequality remain present within the delivery of housing developments.

The language of the media's framing of this issue as segregation is highly significant for directing the trajectory of discourse on this issue. Preventing access to play-space for social housing tenants aligns with Anderson and Turner's (2014, p.7) definition that segregation simply is 'the unequal representation of socio-economic, demographic, and ethnic categories across space'. This case constitutes a nuanced form of urban segregation, aligning with Atkinson's (2016, p.1305) argument that urban segregation has adapted from pervious forms of 'fixed ghettoization', now concerning the 'kinds of exchange, interaction and conflict within and across social spaces in cities'. Segregation is appropriate terminology for this case as it opens up the possibilities for understanding underlying structural issues such as inequality and the use of shared urban space.

However, in the labelling of segregation, the issue was made more contentious and had a profound impact in dividing the community and augmenting tensions. The labelling of segregation dominates, potentially disguising equally damaging issues of an 'anti-child atmosphere' on the development, as discussed in Chapter 4, and the impact this has on communities, especially the social housing community where a greater proportion of residents have children. Further attention is needed to highlight how developments meet the needs of families and children within both private and social housing, rather than a planning which is driven by viability and investment (Ferm and Raco, 2020). This approach to housing highlights the significance of the local scale for households with young children, for whom the neighbourhood provides mutual support and information, encouraging neighbouring relations (Cheshire, 2007). The experience of Lilian Baylis demonstrates how complex issues of urban segregation are. Critically preventing access to play-space creates a contentious issue for a development, often engendering an emotive response. With Lilian Baylis, the issue exposed and platformed the complexities of mixed tenure living and community cohesion across tenure.

This study drew links between urban segregation and tenure-mix literature while highlighting the contemporary reality of 'viability-driven planning' (Ferm and Raco, 2020). As a solution to segregation, complexities exist within the practice of tenure-mix especially when framed through Lees' (2008,

p.2460) argument that this is a ‘one sided strategy’ rarely implemented in wealthier neighbourhoods. While mixed in theory, the reality of mix for Lilian Baylis is contentious. This research has added to the literature by investigating play-space segregation, which previously had not been studied. Further research with other case-studies which have experience play-space segregation, both within and outside London, addressing both planning and the implications for communities would add valuable insights into the themes discussed throughout this dissertation.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, C. (2008). *Housing market renewal and social class*. London: Routledge.

Alshenqeeti, H., (2014). Interviewing as a data collection method: A critical review. *English Linguistics Research,* 3(1), pp.39-45.

Anderson, J. (2019). A segregated playground is igniting outrage over inequality in Britain. *Quartz*. [Online]. Available from: https://qz.com/1581108/a-segregated-london-playground-is-igniting-outrage-over-inequality-in-the-uk/. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Anderson, R. and L.M. Turner. (2014). Segregation, gentrification and residualisation: from public housing to market-driven housing allocation inner city Stockholm. *International journal of housing policy,* 14(1), pp.3-29.

Arbaci, S. and Rae, I. (2012) Mixed-Tenure Neighbourhoods in London: Policy Myth or Effective Device to Alleviate Deprivation? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 37(2), pp.451-479.

Arthurson, K. (2010). Questioning the Rhetoric of Social Mix as a Tool for Planning Social Inclusion. *Urban Policy and Research*, 28, pp.225–231.

Arthurson, A. (2002). Creating Inclusive Communities through Balancing Social Mix: A Critical Relationship or Tenuous Link? *Urban Policy and Research*, 20(3), pp.245–261.

Atkinson, R. (2016). Limited exposure: social concealment, mobility and engagement with public space by the super-rich in London. *Environment and Planning*, 48(7), pp.1302-1317.

Atkinson, R. and K. Kintrea. (2000). Owner-occupation, social mix and neighbourhood impacts. *Policy & Politics*, 28 (1), pp.93–108.

BBC. (2019). Developers accused of 'segregating' children at London playground. *BBC News*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-47707838. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. London: Pearson.

Bentham, M. (2019). The Reader: Segregating play areas by class risks causing social unrest. *Evening Standard*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.standard.co.uk/comment/letters/the-reader-segregating-play-areas-by-class-risks-causing-social-unrest-a4104051.html. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Blomley, N. (2004). *Unsettling the City: Urban Land and the Politics of Property*. New York: Routledge.

Blumen, O. and I. Zamir. (2001) Two social environments in a working day: Occupation and spatial segregation in metropolitan Tel Aviv. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 33(10), pp.1765-1784.

Bolt, G., D. Phillips & R. Van Kempen. (2010). Housing Policy, (De)segregation and Social Mixing: An International Perspective. *Housing Studies*, 25(2), pp.129-135.

Building construction design. (2014). Lilian Baylis Old School. *Building construction design*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.buildingconstructiondesign.co.uk/projects/lilian-baylis-old-school-lambeth/. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Burgess, G., S. Monk, C. Whitehead. (2011). Delivering local infrastructure and affordable housing through the planning system: the future of planning obligations through Section 106. *People place and policy*, 5(1), pp.1-11.

Butler, T. with Robson, G. (2003). *London Calling. The Middle Classes and the Remaking of Inner London*. London: Berg.

Cameron, S. (2003). Gentrification, housing redifferentiation and urban regeneration: 'going for growth' in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 2367-2382.

Casey, R., S. Coward, C. Allen, and R. Powell, (2007). On the planned environment and neighbourhood life: Evidence from mixed-tenure housing developments twenty years on. *The Town Planning Review,* 78(3), pp.311–334.

Cavendish, K.J. (2019). The Reader: Segregating play areas by class risks causing social unrest. *Evening Standard*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.standard.co.uk/comment/letters/the-reader-segregating-play-areas-by-class-risks-causing-social-unrest-a4104051.html. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Chaskin, R.J. and M.L. Joseph. (2011). Social interaction in mixed-income developments: relational expectations and emerging reality. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 33(2), pp.209–237.

Cheshire, P. (2007). *Are mixed communities the answer to segregation and poverty?* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. [Online]. Available from: http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/are-mixed-communities-answer-segregation-and-poverty. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Cheshire, P., S. Gibbons and I. Gordon, I. (2008). *Policies for 'Mixed Communities': A Critical Evaluation*. London: UK Spatial Economics Research Centre. {Online]. Available from: http://cep.lse.ac.uk/textonly/SERC/publications/download/SERCPP002.pdf. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Christophers, B. (2014). Wild dragons in the city: Urban political economy, affordable housing development and the performative world-making of economic models. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(1), pp.79–97.

Cohen, L., L. Manion, & K. Morison. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. (6th ed.). London: Routledge.

Cole, I. and B. Goodchild. (2001). Social Mix and the 'Balanced Community' in British housing policy – a tale of two epochs. *GeoJournal*, 51, pp.351–360.

Crang, M. (2005). Analysing Qualitative Materials, in R. Flowerdew and D. Martin. (ed) *Methods in Human Geography: A Guide for Students doing a Research Project* (pp.218-232). New York: Routledge.

Crosby, N. P. McAllister and P.Wyatt. (2013). Fit for planning? An evaluation of the application of development viability appraisal models in the UK planning system. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 40(1), pp. 3-22.

Davidson, M. (2010). Love thy neighbour? Social mixing in London's gentrification frontiers. *Environment and Planning A,* 42, pp.524-544.

Dryzek, J.S. (1997). *The Politics of Earth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dudman, J. (2019). Kate Henderson: 'Something is wrong if we can't prevent social segregation. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/apr/09/kate-henderson-planning-system-wrong-cant-prevent-housing-segregation. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Duell, M. and X. Leatham. (2019). Housing developer U-turns on segregated playgrounds for rich and poor children after massive row over policy which divided the haves from the have-nots. *Mail Online*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-6855447/Children-social-housing-flats-banned-play-area-set-aside-rich-neighbours.html. [Accessed 26th August 2020].

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language (second ed.)*. New York: Routledge.

Ferm, J. and M. Raco. (2020). Viability planning, value capture and the geographies of market-led planning reform in England. *Planning theory and practice*, 21(2), pp.218-235.

Fischer, F. and Forester, J. (1993). *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*. London: Duke University Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), pp. 219-245.

Grant, H. (A). (2019). 'Don't make this rich v poor': the mothers who won the right for their kids to play together. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2019/mar/30/dont-make-this-rich-v-poor-the-women-who-won-the-right-for-their-kids-to-play-together-segregated-playground-baylis-old-school-development. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Grant, H. (B). (2019). Too poor to play: children in social housing blocked from communal playground. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2019/mar/25/too-poor-to-play-children-in-social-housing-blocked-from-communal-playground. Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Grant, H. (C). (2019). London officials ban segregated play areas in future housing developments. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2019/jul/19/london-officials-ban-segregated-play-areas-in-future-housing-developments. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Grant, H., A. Mohdin and C. Michael. (2019). 'Outrageous' and 'disgusting': segregated playground sparks fury. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2019/mar/26/outrageous-and-disgusting-segregated-playground-sparks-fury. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Grayston, R. (2017). *Slipping through the loophole: How viability assessments are reducing affordable housing supply in England*. Shelter. [Online]. Available from: https://england.shelter.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/1434439/2017.11.01_Slipping_through_the_loophole.pdf [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Greater London Authority. (2019). The London Plan (Intend to Publish). *Greater London Authority*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/intend_to_publish_-_clean.pdf. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Groves, R., A. Middleton, A. Murie and K. Broughton. (2003). *Neighbourhoods That Work: A Study of the Bournville Estate, Birmingham*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Gubrium, J. F. & J.A. Holstein. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guest, G. E. Namey and M.L. Mitchell. (2013). *Collecting qualitative data: a field manual for applied research*. London: Sage.

Hammersley, M. & Gomm, R. (2008). Assessing the radical critiques of interviews. In: M. Hammersley, (ed.). *Questioning Qualitative Inquiry: Critical Essays*. London: Sage. pp. 89-100.

Henley Homes. (2018). Baylis Old School. *Henley Homes*. [Online]. Available from: https://henley-homes.co.uk/archives/developments/baylis-old-school-se11. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Hermanowicz, J. C. (2002). The great interview: 25 strategies for studying people in bed. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(4), pp.479-49.

Hill, J. (2007). *Ends and Means: The future roles of social housing in England, report for Communities and Local Government*. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, CASE Report 34. London School of Economics.

Hinsliff, G. (2019). Playgrounds only for the rich kids? What grotesque social apartheid. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/mar/26/playgrounds-rich-kids-housing-social-apartheid. [Accessed 13rd August 2020].

Imrie R., S. Pinch, and M. Boyle. (1996). Identification, citizenship and power in the cities. *Urban Studies*, 33, pp.1255–1261.

Jackson, E and T. Butler. (2015). Revisiting 'social tectonics': The middle classes and social mix in gentrifying neighbourhoods. *Urban studies*, 52(13), pp.2349-2365.

Jamshed, S., (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *Journal of basic and clinical pharmacy,* 5(4), p.87.

Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *Journal of basic and clinical pharmacy,* 5(4), p.87.

Jessel, E. (2019). Conran + Partners criticises 'poor playground' segregation at its housing scheme. *Architects' Journal*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/conran-partners-criticises-poor-playground-segregation-at-its-housing-scheme. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Johnston, C. (2002), *Housing policy and social mix: an exploratory paper*. Shelter Brief 19. [Online]. Available from: http://www.shelternsw.infoxchange.net.au/docs/rpt02socialmix-sb.pdf. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Joseph, M.L., R.J. Chaskin, and H.S. Webber. (2007). The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty Through Mixed-Income Development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 42(3), pp.369–409.

Jupp, B. (1999). *Living Together. Community Life on Mixed Tenure Estates*. London: Demos.

Khan, S. (2019) *in*. Boyle, D. (2019). Politicians BAN playgrounds with segregated areas on all new housing developments after outrage over policy which divided rich and poor children at new London

flats. *Mail Online*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7265765/Politicians-BAN-playgrounds-segregated-areas-new-housing-developments.html. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Kleinhans, R. (2004). Social implications of housing diversification in urban renewal: A review of recent literature. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19, pp.367–390.

Kleit, R.G. (2005). HOPE VI new communities: neighbourhood relationships in mixed-income housing. *Environment and Planning A*, 37(8), pp.1413–1441.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lambeth Planning Service. (2007). Development Brief. *Lambeth Council*. [Online]. Available from: https://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s27487/07b%20App%20LilianBaylisDevelopmentBriefFinal1.pdf. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Lee, P. and A. Murie. (1999). 'Spatial and social divisions within British cities: beyond residualisation'. *Housing Studies*, 14(5), pp. 625-640.

Lees, L. (2008). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance?. *Urban Studies,* 45(12), pp.2449-70.

Lees, L. T. Slater and E. Wyly. (2008). *Gentrification*. New York: Routledge.

Lloyd, C. D., I.D. Shuttleworth, and D. Wong. eds. (2015). *Social-spatial segregation. Concepts, processes and outcomes*. Bristol: Policy Press.

London councils. (2020). *London Councils*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/30060?__cf_chl_jschl_tk__=b51f831d321a13834fd3be30314596e2dc3c4647-1598880385-0-AWush3WAsY2JgvCej2ZNEH7vLlG75CL-yeiXwdu9u2LBa1_qRQJTeVflmL1jVCIexv-1hxOYcvvTm_woSi3xb2zMPWfMchDw0MKcN8PEfVI8LdJmIEmWdRLOXFQsieZDiptwUMqdEpG6_c4hm-OBUwRoLG415x7E5ef_XyBkUwGEUpEjZaRyjHn-rYJXZwz096CN2Kq0bgKL2H-k5UoaOjNxgvKcnEl3aJjRWIswVkCyZfjBglJriPx4hWFeJxQ9o_mrAEwBUCR69la2Uqv1RsX-UoQsO9JdkT8ux9wJws0h. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Low, S. (2003). *Behind the Gates: Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*. New York: Routledge.

Mack, N., C. Woodson, K.M. MacQueen, G. Guest and E. Namey. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide*. North Carolina: Family Health International.

Martin, G. and J. Watkinson. (2003). *Rebalancing Communities: Introducing Mixed Incomes into Existing Rented Housing Estates*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

McPherson, M., L. Smith-Lovin, J.M. Cook. (2001) Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1), pp.415-444.

Ministry of Housing. (2019). National Planning Policy Framework. *Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government*. [Online]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf. [Accessed 23rd August 20200].

Mohdin, A. and H. Grant. (2019). 'Why can't they come and play?': housing segregation in London. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/mar/26/why-cant-they-come-and-play-housing-segregation-in-london. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Monk, S. T. Crook, D. Lister, R. Lovatt, A. Ni Luanaigh, S. Rowley and C. Whitehead. (2006). *Delivering affordable housing through Section 106: outputs and outcomes*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. [Online]. Available from: https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/delivering-affordable-housing-through-section-106-outputs-and-outcomes [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Moore, R. (2019). Dividing rich and poor is inevitable when developers run open spaces. *The Observer*. London: Guardian Newspapers Limited.

Morrison, N. and G. Burgess. (2014). Inclusionary housing policy in England: the impact of the downturn on the delivery of affordable housing through section 106. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 29, pp.423-438.

Mustard, S. and Ostendorf, W. eds. (1998). *Urban segregation and the Welfare State*. London: Routledge.

Musterd, S. (2005). Social and ethnic segregation in Europe: Levels, causes and effects. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 27(3), pp.331–348.

Mustard, S., W. Van Gent, M. Das, J. Latten. (2016). Adaptive behaviour in urban space: Residential mobility in response to social distance. *Urban Studies*, 53(2), pp.227-246.

Mustard, S. S. Marcińczak, M, Van Ham and T. Tammaru. (2017). Socioeconomic segregation in European capital cities. Increasing separation between poor and rich. *Urban Geography*, 38(7), pp. 1062-1083.

Mustard, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ockwell, D. and Y. Rydin. (2010). Analysing dominant policy perspectives – the role of discourse analysis, in J.C. Lovett and D. Ockwell. (eds) *A Handbook of Environmental Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pidd, H. , & Cocksedge, C. (2018). How Manchester developers dodge affordable housing. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/mar/06/the-0-city-how-manchester-developers-dodge-affordable-housing. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Porter, L. and K. Shaw. (2009). *Whose urban renaissance? An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies*. London: Routledge.

Porter, T. (2019). Property developer in Lambeth makes embarrassing climb down over segregated playground. *London News Online*. [Online]. Available from: https://londonnewsonline.co.uk/property-developer-in-lambeth-makes-embarrassing-climb-down-over-segregated-playground/. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Raycroft, S. (2012). *Play Strategy for Lilian Baylis Site*. Raycroft Associates.

Reardon, S. and Bischoff, K. (2011). Income inequality and income segregation. *American Journal of Sociology,* 116(4), pp.1092–1153.

Roberts, M. (2007). 'Sharing Space: Urban Design and Social Mixing in Mixed Income New Communities'. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 8(2), pp.183 – 204.

Rose, D. (2004). Discourses and experiences of social mix in gentrifying neighbourhoods: a Montreal case study. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 13(2), pp. 278-316.

Rowley, J. (2012). Conducting research interviews. *Management Research Review*, 35(3), pp.260-271.

Schelling, T.C. (1971). Dynamic models of segregation. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 1(2), pp.143-186.

Smith, N. and S. Low. Eds. 2006. *The Politics of Public Space*. London: Routledge.

Sonn, J.W. (2010). Contesting State Rescaling: An Analysis of the South Korean State's Discursive Strategy against Devolution. *Antipode,* 42(5), pp.1200-1224.

Steer, G. (2019). Kennington house prices slip after rapid growth. *The Financial Times*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.ft.com/content/b160df88-9da7-11e9-9c06-a4640c9feebb. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Strömgren, M. T, Tammaru, A.M. Danzer, M. Van Ham, S. Marcińczak, O. Stjernström and Lindgren U. (2014). Factors shaping workplace segregation between natives and immigrants. *Demography,* 51(2), pp.546-671.

Talen, E. (2002). The social goals of New Urbanism. *Housing Policy Debate*, 13(1), pp.165–188.

The Guardian. (2015). The Observer view on London's wealth gap. *The Guardian*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/mar/08/observer-view-on-london [Accessed 27th April 2020].

Uitermark, J., J. Duyvendak, and R. Kleinhans. (2007). Gentrification as a governmental strategy: social control and social cohesion in Hoogvliet, Rotterdam. *Environment and Planning A,* 39(1), pp.125-141.

Urban Studies. (2008). Special issue: Gentrification and public policy. *Urban Studies,* 45(12), pp.2379– 625.

Van Gent, W., M. Das and S. Mustard. (2019). Sociocultural economic and ethnic homogeneity in residential mobility and spatial sorting among couples. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 51(4), pp.891-912.

Voce, A. (2019). Segregated play space is an abuse of children's rights. *Policy for Play*. [Online]. Available from: https://policyforplay.com/2019/03/28/the-right-to-play-is-for-all-children-regardless-of-where-they-live/. [Accessed 23rd August 2020].

Walford, G. (2007). 'Classification and Framing of Interviews in Ethnographic Interviewing'. *Ethnography and Education*, 2(2), pp.145–57.

Walks, R.A. and R. Maaranen. (2008). Gentrification, social mix, and social polarization: testing the linkages in large Canadian cities. *Urban Geography*, 29(4), pp. 293-326.

Walton, J. (1992). Making the theoretical case. In C. C. Ragin & H. S. Becker (Eds.), *What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry* (pp. 121-137). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitehead, C.M.E. (2007). Planning policies and affordable housing: England as a successful case study? *Housing studies*, 22(1), pp.25-44.

Widdowson, M. (2011). Case Study Research Methodology. *International Journal of Transactional Analysis Research*, 2(1), pp. 25-34.

Wilkinson, R. and K. Pickett. (2010). *The Spirit Level: why equality is better for everyone*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.

Wilson, H.F. (2011). Passing propinquities in the multicultural city: The everyday encounters of bus passangering. *Environmental and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 43(3), pp.634-649.

Wodak, R. and P. Chilton. (2005). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

APPENDIX A: INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEWS

Participant Information Sheet

Title of Study:
An enquiry into contemporary segregation and desegregation within London's play spaces.

Department:
The Bartlett School of Planning, University College London.

Name and Contact Details of the Researcher:
Eleanor Mack Briggs
eleanor.briggs.19@ucl.ac.uk

You are being invited to take park in my MA research project. Before you decide to take part it is important for you to understand the aims of this research and what participation will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss with others if you wish. Your participation is voluntary, and you will be able to withdraw from the study at any time. Please feel free to discuss anything with me that is unclear. Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.

This research is to be undertaken between June - September 2020, it aims to understand how segregated play spaces impacts social relations within communities. The objectives of this project are as follows:

- To explore the discourses surrounding 'segregated' play spaces as well as the subsequent 'desegregation' of these spaces.
- To assess what impact segregation has on the affected communities.
- To identify how changes in policy will have the effect of preventing segregation.

You have been chosen to take part in this project if you fit into one of these two categories:

- Resident who has experienced segregation of play spaces.
- A professional who has commented on play space segregation or has had involvement with this case.

It is up to you to decide whether to take part. If you do decide to take part then please keep this information sheet. You will also be asked to sign a consent form. You can withdraw at any time without need for a reason to be given. Should you choose to withdraw you will be asked what you wish to happen to the data you have provided up to that point, should you wish, all data will be destroyed.

Should you choose to take part, participation will involve one interview which would typically last around 30-60 minutes. This interview will take place either over video calling software (such as Microsoft Teams) or by phone call. All interviews will be held remotely to maintain social distancing.

Interviews will be reordered using mobile phone audio recording. The audio recording will be used only for analysis. No other use will be made of them without your written permission, and no one other than myself will be allowed access to the original recordings.

Whilst there are no immediate benefits for those people participating in the project, it is hoped that this work will provide a voice for those involved in this case study and provide analysis of the case.

Should any issue arise during this study, you can contact my supervisor to discuss any concerns – callum.ward@ucl.ac.uk. However should you feel this complaint has not been handled to your satisfaction please contact the Chair of the UCL Research Ethics Committee – ethics@ucl.ac.uk.

Anonymity is optional for this research, you will be asked to select one of the following options regarding confidentiality.

(a) I agree for my real name and role/affiliation to be used in connection with any words I have said or information I have passed on.
(b) I request that my comments are presented anonymously but give permission to connect my role/affiliation with my comments (but not the title of my position).
(c) I request that my comments are presented anonymously with no mention of my role/affiliation.

If anonymity is selected all the information that I collect about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. You will not be able to be identified in any ensuing reports as no names or personal information will be included. Confidentiality will be respected subject to legal constraints and professional guidelines.

The finished research will be available for you to read from the 8th September 2020. This research may be stored by the Bartlett School of Planning library however it will not be published for public use. The data collected will not be used for additional or subsequent research.

Local Data Protection Privacy Notice

The controller for this project will be University College London (UCL). The UCL Data Protection Officer provides oversight of UCL activities involving the processing of personal data, and can be contacted at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk

This 'local' privacy notice sets out the information that applies to this particular study. Further information on how UCL uses participant information can be found in our 'general' privacy notice: click here.

The information that is required to be provided to participants under data protection legislation (GDPR and DPA 2018) is provided across both the 'local' and 'general' privacy notices.

The categories of personal data used will be as follows:

Name
Email address

Your personal data will be processed so long as it is required for the research project. All personal data will be anonymised in the report if requested, and I will endeavour to minimise the processing of personal data wherever possible.

If you are concerned about how your personal data is being processed, or if you would like to contact us about your rights, please contact UCL in the first instance at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk.

Thank you for reading this information sheet and for considering taking part in this research study.

CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH STUDIES

Please complete this form after you have read the Information Sheet and/or listened to an explanation about the research.

Title of Study: An enquiry into contemporary segregation and desegregation within London's play spaces.
Department: The Bartlett School of Planning
Name and Contact Details of the Researcher(s): Eleanor Mack Briggs – eleanor.briggs.19@ucl.ac.uk
Name and Contact Details of Supervisor: Callum Ward – callum.ward@ucl.ac.uk
This study has been approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee

Thank you for considering taking part in this research. The person organising the research must explain the project to you before you agree to take part. If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to join in. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

I confirm that I understand that by ticking/initialling each box below I am consenting to this element of the study. I understand that it will be assumed that unticked/initialled boxes means that I DO NOT consent to that part of the study. I understand that by not giving consent for any one element that I may be deemed ineligible for the study.

		Tick Box
1.	*I confirm that I have read and understood the Information Sheet for the above study. I have had an opportunity to consider the information and what will be expected of me. I have also had the opportunity to ask questions which have been answered to my satisfaction and would like to take part in **an individual interview.**	
2.	*I understand that I will be able to withdraw my data **up to 4 weeks after interview**.	
3.	*I consent to participate in the study. I understand that my personal information *(name and email address)* will be used for the purposes explained to me and anonymised in the final report. I understand that according to data protection legislation, 'public task' will be the lawful basis for processing.	
4.	**Use of the information for this project only** Anonymity is optional for this research. Please select from the following 3 options: (d) I agree for my real name and role/affiliation to be used in connection with any words I have said or information I have passed on. (e) I request that my comments are presented anonymously but give permission to connect my role/affiliation with my comments (but not the title of my position). (f) I request that my comments are presented anonymously with no mention of my role/affiliation.	

5.	*I understand that my information may be subject to review by responsible individuals from the University for monitoring and audit purposes.	
6.	*I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. I understand that if I decide to withdraw, any personal data I have provided up to that point will be deleted unless I agree otherwise.	
7.	No promise or guarantee of benefits have been made to encourage you to participate.	
8.	I understand that the data will not be made available to any commercial organisations but is solely the responsibility of the researcher(s) undertaking this study.	
9.	I understand that I will not benefit financially from this study or from any possible outcome it may result in in the future.	
10.	I understand that the information I have submitted will be written up within a report and I wish to receive a copy of it. Yes/No.	
11.	I consent to my interview being audio recorded and understand that the recordings will be destroyed immediately following transcription. To note: If you do not want your participation recorded you can still take part in the study.	
12.	I hereby confirm that I understand the inclusion criteria as detailed in the Information Sheet and explained to me by the researcher.	
13.	I have informed the researcher of any other research in which I am currently involved or have been involved in during the past 12 months.	
14.	I am aware of who I should contact if I wish to lodge a complaint.	
15.	I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.	

_____ _____ _____

Name of participant Date Signature

APPENDIX B: RISK ASSESSMENT FORM

RISK ASSESSMENT FORM
FIELD / LOCATION WORK

The Approved Code of Practice - Management of Fieldwork should be referred to when completing this form
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/estates/safetynet/guidance/fieldwork/acop.pdf

DEPARTMENT/SECTION BARTLETT SCHOOL OF PLANNING
LOCATION(S) HOME - LONDON
PERSONS COVERED BY THE RISK ASSESSMENT Eleanor Mack Briggs

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF FIELDWORK
Desk based research, methods including discourse analysis and semi structured interviews.

Consider, in turn, each hazard (white on black). If **NO** hazard exists select **NO** and move to next hazard section.
If a hazard does exist select **YES** and assess the risks that could arise from that hazard in the risk assessment box.
Where risks are identified that are not adequately controlled they must be brought to the attention of your Departmental Management who should put temporary control measures in place or stop the work. Detail such risks in the final section.

ENVIRONMENT	**The environment always represents a safety hazard. Use space below to identify and assess any risks associated with this hazard**
e.g. location, climate, terrain, neighbourhood, in outside organizations, pollution, animals.	As this research will be desk based, as a result of social distancing, the environment presents no safety hazard.

CONTROL MEASURES	**Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk**
	work abroad incorporates Foreign Office advice
	participants have been trained and given all necessary information
	only accredited centres are used for rural field work
	participants will wear appropriate clothing and footwear for the specified environment
	trained leaders accompany the trip
	refuge is available
	work in outside organisations is subject to their having satisfactory H&S procedures in place
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

EMERGENCIES	Where emergencies may arise use space below to identify and assess any risks
e.g. fire, accidents	All research conducted at home so only risk of emergency are standard domestic emergencies e.g. house fire.

	CONTROL MEASURES — Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk
	participants have registered with LOCATE at http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travel-and-living-abroad/
	fire fighting equipment is carried on the trip and participants know how to use it
Yes	contact numbers for emergency services are known to all participants
Yes	participants have means of contacting emergency services
	participants have been trained and given all necessary information
	a plan for rescue has been formulated, all parties understand the procedure
	the plan for rescue /emergency has a reciprocal element
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

EQUIPMENT	Is equipment used?	NO	If 'No' move to next hazard If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks
e.g. clothing, outboard motors.	Examples of risk: inappropriate, failure, insufficient training to use or repair, injury. Is the risk high / medium / low ?		

	CONTROL MEASURES — Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk
	the departmental written Arrangement for equipment is followed
	participants have been provided with any necessary equipment appropriate for the work
	all equipment has been inspected, before issue, by a competent person
	all users have been advised of correct use
	special equipment is only issued to persons trained in its use by a competent person
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

LONE WORKING	Is lone working a possibility?	NO	If 'No' move to next hazard If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks
e.g. alone or in isolation lone interviews.	All research will be carried out from home where I will be with family members at all times.		

CONTROL MEASURES	Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk
	the departmental written Arrangement for lone/out of hours working for field work is followed
	lone or isolated working is not allowed
	location, route and expected time of return of lone workers is logged daily before work commences
	all workers have the means of raising an alarm in the event of an emergency, e.g. phone, flare, whistle
	all workers are fully familiar with emergency procedures
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

ILL HEALTH	The possibility of ill health always represents a safety hazard. Use space below to identify and assess any risks associated with this Hazard.
e.g. accident, illness, personal attack, special personal considerations or vulnerabilities.	Currently, Covid 19 is of great risk to health. I will be social distancing and following government guidelines while this pandemic remains a risk. As fieldwork is desk based no other health concerns arise.

CONTROL MEASURES	Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk
	an appropriate number of trained first-aiders and first aid kits are present on the field trip
	all participants have had the necessary inoculations/ carry appropriate prophylactics
	participants have been advised of the physical demands of the trip and are deemed to be physically suited
	participants have been adequate advice on harmful plants, animals and substances they may encounter
	participants who require medication have advised the leader of this and carry sufficient medication for their needs
Yes	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented: Social distancing

TRANSPORT	Will transport be required	NO	NO	Move to next hazard
		YES		Use space below to identify and assess any risks
e.g. hired vehicles	Examples of risk: accidents arising from lack of maintenance, suitability or training Is the risk high / medium / low?			

CONTROL MEASURES	Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk
	only public transport will be used
	the vehicle will be hired from a reputable supplier
	transport must be properly maintained in compliance with relevant national regulations
	drivers comply with UCL Policy on Drivers http://www.ucl.ac.uk/hr/docs/college_drivers.php
	drivers have been trained and hold the appropriate licence
	there will be more than one driver to prevent driver/operator fatigue, and there will be adequate rest periods
	sufficient spare parts carried to meet foreseeable emergencies
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC	Will people be dealing with public	YES	If 'No' move to next hazard If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks
e.g. interviews, observing	No risk as I will be interacting with the public only through video calls and emails.		

	CONTROL MEASURES: Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk
	all participants are trained in interviewing techniques
	interviews are contracted out to a third party
	advice and support from local groups has been sought
	participants do not wear clothes that might cause offence or attract unwanted attention
	interviews are conducted at neutral locations or where neither party could be at risk
Yes	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented: Interviews conducted remotely.

WORKING ON OR NEAR WATER	Will people work on or near water?	NO	If 'No' move to next hazard If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks
e.g. rivers, marshland, sea.	Examples of risk: drowning, malaria, hepatitis A, parasites. Is the risk high / medium / low?		

	CONTROL MEASURES: Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk
	lone working on or near water will not be allowed
	coastguard information is understood; all work takes place outside those times when tides could prove a threat
	all participants are competent swimmers
	participants always wear adequate protective equipment, e.g. buoyancy aids, wellingtons
	boat is operated by a competent person

	all boats are equipped with an alternative means of propulsion e.g. oars
	participants have received any appropriate inoculations
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

MANUAL HANDLING (MH)	**Do MH activities take place?**	**NO**	**If 'No' move to next hazard** **If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks**
e.g. lifting, carrying, moving large or heavy equipment, physical unsuitability for the task.	Examples of risk: strain, cuts, broken bones. Is the risk high / medium / low?		

CONTROL MEASURES	**Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk**
	the departmental written Arrangement for MH is followed
	the supervisor has attended a MH risk assessment course
	all tasks are within reasonable limits, persons physically unsuited to the MH task are prohibited from such activities
	all persons performing MH tasks are adequately trained
	equipment components will be assembled on site
	any MH task outside the competence of staff will be done by contractors
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

SUBSTANCES	Will participants work with substances	NO	If 'No' move to next hazard If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks
e.g. plants, chemical, biohazard, waste	Examples of risk: ill health - poisoning, infection, illness, burns, cuts. Is the risk high / medium / low?		
CONTROL MEASURES	**Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk**		

	the departmental written Arrangements for dealing with hazardous substances and waste are followed
	all participants are given information, training and protective equipment for hazardous substances they may encounter
	participants who have allergies have advised the leader of this and carry sufficient medication for their needs
	waste is disposed of in a responsible manner
	suitable containers are provided for hazardous waste
	OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

OTHER HAZARDS	Have you identified any other hazards?	NO	If 'No' move to next section If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks
i.e. any other hazards must be noted and assessed here.	Hazard: Risk: is the risk		
CONTROL MEASURES	**Give details of control measures in place to control the identified risks**		

Have you identified any risks that are not adequately controlled?	**NO**	**NO**	**Move to Declaration**
	YES		**Use space below to identify the risk and what action was taken**

Is this project subject to the UCL requirements on the ethics of Non-NHS Human Research?

If yes, please state your Project ID Number

For more information, please refer to: http://ethics.grad.ucl.ac.uk/

DECLARATION	The work will be reassessed whenever there is a significant change and at least annually. Those participating in the work have read the assessment.

Select the appropriate statement:

☐ I the undersigned have assessed the activity and associated risks and declare that there is no significant residual risk

☐ I the undersigned have assessed the activity and associated risks and declare that the risk will be controlled by the method(s) listed above

NAME OF SUPERVISOR

APPENDIX C: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

29/06/2020 Dinah Bornat – Architect and child friendly planning expert.

05/07/2020 Louise – Resident, involved in 'campaign' to remove the wall segregating the play space.

08/07/2020 Daniel – Resident (name changed for anonymity).

16/07/2020 Charlie – Resident (name changed for anonymity).

16/07/2020 Paul – Resident.

APPENDIX D: LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Theme/Category	Question	Intention	Question asked to …
Background info	How long have you lived at Lilian Baylis?	To learn more about the interviewee's relationship to my case study.	All residents
Impact of (de)segregation	Why did you decide to campaign against 'segregated' play space on the Lilian Baylis Estate?	To gain an understanding of why the interviewee was interested in this issue.	Louise and Dinah
Impact of (de)segregation	What was the effect of living with 'segregated' play space?	To understand how the interviewee was impacted by segregation.	All residents
Impact of (de)segregation	Why did you decide to label this segregation?	To understand why a loaded term was used in this case.	All participants
Accountability	Who do you blame for this?	To gain understanding of the issue of accountability.	All participants
Accountability	What do you think was the motivation to segregate play spaces?	To gain understanding of the issue of accountability.	All participants
Impact of (de)segregation	What is your experience of the response to segregated play, both on your development and amongst others?	To gain understanding on the interviewee's perception of the broader response.	All participants
Impact of (de)segregation	Despite desegregation – has there been long term implications from segregation?	To gain understanding of the longer-term implications.	All participants
Impact of (de)segregation	Generally, do people within the social and private housing mix on your estate, are there friendships?	Taking a broader view of community relations on the development from the interviewee's perspective.	All residents
Impact of (de)segregation	Had there not been the wall separating play spaces – do you think private and social residents would have used play space equally?	To learn about the interviewee's view on how private and social residents use shared space.	All participants
Impact of (de)segregation	You are quoted saying in the guardian that this not being about rich and poor – for you why is this not about rich and poor?	To learn more about Louise's motivations.	Louise
Tenure-mix	On the Lilian Baylis Estate are there any other examples of how social housing and privately-owned homes are different or have different access to spaces?	To learn more about the delivery of tenure-mix on the development.	All participants
Impact of (de)segregation	What do you think the effect of living with segregated play spaces was for communities?	To understand the impact of segregation from an outsider to the development.	Dinah
Background info	How common do you think segregated play spaces, and other forms of segregated space are	To see the broader picture of a London-wide trend.	Dinah

	within socially mixed developments within London?		
Policy	Do you think policy change will do enough to prevent this from happening in the future?	To gain understanding on the impact of policy.	Dinah
Policy	Apart from policy are there other ways of preventing this from happing?	To gain understanding on the impact of policy.	Dinah
Tenure-mix	Do you think it is possible for socially mixed developments to be designed to be 'tenure blind'?	To gain insight from an architect's perspective of tenure-mix.	Dinah
Impact of (de)segregation	Do you support the argument that play is a powerful builder of community cohesion?	To understand why play is/ is not important for communities.	Dinah

‘Too poor to play’ An enquiry into contemporary segregation and desegregation within London’s play spaces.

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15

PAGE 16

PAGE 17

PAGE 18

PAGE 19

PAGE 20

PAGE 21

PAGE 22

PAGE 23

PAGE 24

PAGE 25

PAGE 26

PAGE 27

PAGE 28

PAGE 29

PAGE 30

PAGE 31

PAGE 32

PAGE 33

PAGE 34

PAGE 35

PAGE 36

PAGE 37

PAGE 38

PAGE 39

PAGE 40

PAGE 41

PAGE 42

PAGE 43

PAGE 44

PAGE 45

PAGE 46

PAGE 47

PAGE 48

PAGE 49

PAGE 50

PAGE 51

PAGE 52

PAGE 53

PAGE 54

PAGE 55

PAGE 56

PAGE 57

PAGE 58

PAGE 59

PAGE 60

PAGE 61

PAGE 62