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Executive Summary

This report seeks to develop a better understanding of how research collaborations between universities and cities—supported by digital, artistic and creative practice—can re-make life in cities to better meet communities needs. It is based on a series of presentations from the ‘Co-creating Cities and Communities’ event which took place in Bristol on 12–13 July 2017. Organised by the Arts and Humanities Research Council Connected Communities Programme with support from the Urban Living Partnership and the University of Bristol, the event brought together over 200 participants and over 40 collaborative projects to discuss how creative, collaborative, urban research can make a positive difference to cities and communities.

Our aim here is to draw together the insights from these projects, to showcase their practices and methods, and to identify common themes that underpin a set of key recommendations for others wishing to support university-community collaboration as a tool for developing flourishing cities.

Project Summaries

This report showcases 15 case studies of co-produced research between universities and communities, local authorities, artists and digital designers. These projects include:

- Somali Kitchen, #refugeeswelcome in parks, Here comes everybody, Life Chances, Imagine, Banlieue Network, Co-Creation Network, Choreographing the City, Sensory Cities, Living Archive Milton Keynes, Sensory Exploration of Smithfield Market, Smart Cities in the Making: Learning from Milton Keynes, Bristol Urban ID, Urban Living Birmingham, and Newcastle City Futures.

These projects have sought to address a series of urban challenges by:

- co-creating inclusive neighbourhoods to improve community cohesion and wellbeing
- imagining new approaches to tackling poverty and exclusion in regeneration areas
- enhancing city infrastructure and urban experiences with the help of arts and digital technologies
There are three key recommendations for Research Councils seeking to support research in this area:

06 Funding for partnership building and networking alongside longer-term project-based funding is required to enable the development of sustainable and transformative research collaborations.

07 Investment in engineering and technology research in the urban environment needs to be matched by equivalent research into social factors, as well as into unintended and social consequences of urban development.

08 Research is urgently needed into the national and international urban experimentation initiatives that are already taking place in civil society, local government and trans-national organisations. Significant innovation in urban living is currently under-researched.

Recommendations

The 'Co-Creating Cities and Communities' event and our wider review of current practice makes it clear that many projects aimed at improving urban living are unaware of related projects working in the same local areas. Our overarching recommendation therefore is that local actors need to actively seek out opportunities to network projects in local areas; to share existing knowledge and resources; and to move beyond silos and short-term projects to achieve more sustainable long-term change.

There are a number of recommendations for universities working at a city-scale:

01 Research findings related to the city need to be made more easily, accessibly and widely available to local communities and stakeholders perhaps through publicly accessible city-focused research events as well as online.

02 There is a key role for universities in developing community and civic research skills; this could be developed as part of widening participation agendas.

03 Flexible, responsive and trusting partnerships with partner organisations requires long-term commitments beyond the project funding model; universities need to identify how they might support and sustain partnerships at an institutional level for the longer term.

04 Arts-based and creative practice can play a critical role in building partnerships, reframing research questions and generating novel research data.

05 There is a need for universities to work with local government and civil society to create opportunities to actively promote and share the research that is already happening in a local area.
In this landscape, we encourage civil society and community organisations to:

09 Have greater confidence in their own expertise and local knowledge. This means being confident to ask for sufficient resourcing to cover their involvement in projects and ensuring that partners are aware of the expertise involved in developing long-term community relationships.

10 Develop a more proactive approach to contesting passive forms of citizen consultation, with the aim of challenging top-down policies and becoming active co-creators of urban services.

11 Work with universities and local government to create opportunities to actively promote and share the research that is already happening in a local area.

There are two clear recommendations for academic researchers involved in collaborative projects:

12 Communicate research findings using clear and simple messages, making them easier to understand by different stakeholders involved in the project research and partners working in different disciplines.

13 With more arts-related methods being used in the projects, academics need to be confident in allowing artists and community partners to take a leading role at particular points in the project; this can help generate more trust with research participants and improve the quality of findings by fostering a more creative and supportive environment.

For local government and city authorities we advise that they:

14 Consider using more creative and arts-based methods to diversify and expand the range of participation in consultation at all stages of public policy development.

15 Defend accessible and inclusive public spaces as important resources for the development of citizen voice, democracy and informal public engagement/consultation.

16 Work with universities and civil society to create opportunities to actively promote and share the research that is already happening in a local area.

With artists playing a key role in mediating collaborative activities, we recommend that they:

17 Develop a better understanding of local power relations and existing settings to avoid creating an impression of ‘parachuting’ into a project, or a particular community.

18 Be more aware of their influence not only in visualising or vocalising embodied experiences, emotions and challenges of urban communities, but also of their value in generating new research questions and resolving tensions which can arise from the research process.
Introduction

In July 2017, an interdisciplinary event entitled ‘Co-creating Cities and Communities’ took place in Bristol. The event focused on the changing role of universities as partners of local communities and local governments, working together to invent new approaches to designing, living in and running cities.

The need for universities to play a stronger role in establishing a dialogue with local communities, local government and businesses to encourage wider societal changes is well acknowledged. There are also examples of long-standing, system-wide initiatives aimed at achieving these goals. For example, the ‘Mistra Urban Futures’ programme focuses on co-creating cities which are ‘accessible, green and fair.’ The European Network of Living Labs encourages collective urban governance to drive positive change and citizen engagement. The ESRC-funded, ‘Urban Politics and Governance of Social Innovation in Austerity’ examines implications of austerity for urban politics through a comparative study of city governance practices in Athens, Berlin and Newcastle.

The key focus of this event in Bristol, however, was to understand the potential of arts-based, social sciences-informed and co-produced modes of research in this area. The event brought together urban researchers, practitioners, artists and community partners from the AHRC/RCUK-funded Connected Communities programme, the RCUK/Innovate UK Urban Living Partnership and a number of related projects. It created conversations between academics, artists, designers and partners about best practices and innovative methodologies, with the aim of establishing a new agenda for collaborative research in future cities.
Many of these projects were concerned to address the growing democratic deficit in urban governance: from developing bottom-up smart city innovation and citizen engagement to co-designing service provision with end-users. For example, some projects have developed innovative approaches to envisioning urban spaces without poverty or stigmatisation by encouraging resident involvement using films and participatory arts. Other projects explored how to improve urban diversity and inclusion to create socially-cohesive places with a shared sense of belonging. Heritage-based initiatives described how they sought to build bridges between past, present and future urban experiences. The key urban challenge of producing health and wellbeing was addressed through a series of projects that brought together arts and digital tools to develop public services and community action. Others explored new ways of creating environmentally friendly places with clean air, calling on city authorities to share responsibility over urban resources and encouraging them to decarbonise and use energy more efficiently.

This report showcases 15 of the projects from this event in order to illustrate the ways in which co-produced research between universities and urban communities can disrupt and re-imagine existing urban practices and lead to new knowledge about cities. In particular, it asks:

- How can universities work better with partners to empower civil society and create people-centred urban services?
- What is the role of heritage and collective memory in regeneration and city futures?
- How can collaborative research create environmentally sustainable cities to promote health and wellbeing?
- What work still needs to be done together with citizens and city authorities to address the democratic deficit in urban governance and innovation?

Heritage-based initiatives described how they sought to build bridges between past, present and future urban experiences.

The diverse projects discussed in this report have in common an interest in developing and co-producing bottom-up responses to urban governance and austerity, citizen engagement and smart technologies. In so doing, they adopt a wide variety of different approaches to collaboration: some focus on developing community-based skills or use participatory arts to unsettle established practices. Others embrace open innovation and user-centred approaches to co-designing new services or correcting existing policies to overcome discrimination and prejudice. In some, academic researchers have actively challenged policies to make sure the voices of disadvantaged communities were being heard. While in others, the university was conceived as a neutral broker – facilitating engagement between citizens, local authorities and businesses. Elsewhere we have summarised different collaborative practices under different categories, including ‘mutual learning’, ‘crowd and open’, ‘design and innovation’ and ‘correcting the record’. These four broad framings are visible across the case studies featured in this report. Different methodologies have also highlighted more general issues associated with participatory spaces, power dynamics and the learning processes which occur in the course of the collaborative research with communities.

In this report, the case studies are grouped around four distinct themes related to university-community co-production. The first group of projects focuses on creating inclusive neighbourhoods and new spaces where every member of local community is welcome. The second set of examples addresses how co-produced research between academics, communities and artists helps re-imagine new approaches to tackling poverty and exclusion. The third theme deals with how digital technology, sensory mapping and performative arts can help re-invent urban engineering and curate urban experiences. The final group of case studies presented in this report examines partnerships between universities and cities designed to improve urban infrastructure with the help of engaged citizens and smart technologies. We conclude with a set of recommendations drawing on this event and on our prior research into university-community collaborations that address both the difficulties and the opportunities offered by this sort of research.
How can universities, community organisations and artists improve local neighbourhoods, contest urban policies and create more friendly spaces where members of all communities feel welcome? The following three case studies illustrate different ways in which this has been addressed through collaborative projects: the ‘Somali Kitchen’ initiative focuses on community-based approaches to promoting healthy food provisions in Bristol; ‘#refugeeswelcome in parks’ examines ways of improving public parks and urban spaces in Sheffield, London and Berlin to support refugee wellbeing; ‘Here comes everybody’ provides an example of how an artist-researcher can engage in practice-led research to help a local neighbourhood regain its lost sense of community.
The initiative was designed to transcend some of the linguistic and cultural barriers by bringing together different communities and making everyone feel welcome. The ‘Shed on Wheels’ was placed in a busy public area which was a community space where people could interact with each other, learn about Somali culture, take part in a henna activity and even be taught how to make spices.

Moreover, the event was designed to coincide with the time children and parents would walk past after school as a way to attract the audience but also to test whether young people would eat the traditional Somali food, rather than go to one of the many nearby fast food outlets. At the heart of the project was a collaborative attempt to disrupt and regain a sense of community by re-creating communal spaces where even the smells of spices would work to disrupt the smell of takeaways.

The project’s methodology consisted of a participatory approach and mixed methods, taking into account the emerging findings from the partner organisations together with their own experiences and expertise. For example, participants took part in a peer research training based on participatory mapping and peer interviewing, with activities being shaped by participants’ own commitments and interests. An interesting element of the project was that community participants had no previous involvement in a research project and were particularly interested in gaining new knowledge and transferable skills to improving language proficiency and organisational and practical skills.
The Somali Kitchen project: ‘Shed on Wheels’

The project’s findings revealed that while the issue of fast food and healthy eating was a clear concern, there was a wider problem of the lack of alternative meeting spaces for the community and particularly for Somali women and children. By creatively designing a shared space, the project explored a series of conditions under which ‘thriving community spaces based on sharing food could be recreated, enabling interaction and building communities.’

The collaborative work is an example of how university-community partnerships can help implement tangible local changes and set in motion further ways to make them more durable and meaningful to particular communities. The project achieved a series of impacts and follow-up activities, including establishing future collaborations with the Coexist Community Kitchen. Following the success of the Somali Kitchen event, participants received numerous invitations to cater for events and run cultural activities at events and workshops.

The research highlighted the ‘importance of environments and spatial regulation in the over determination of individual choices,’ and called for proactive engagement with the planning process in local authorities ‘to ensure that the food retail environment offer healthy, affordable choices.’ Members of SPAN have continued to meet as a group and are putting together plans to register as an unincorporated association and apply for funding for future events and activities. The group are also taking further action with other organisations to ask the Council to make Stapleton Road a cumulative impact area in order to have more say about the kind of local food premises they would like to see in their area in the future.

---

18 ibid, p.15.
19 ibid, p.31.
20 ibid, p.41.
21 A successful application to become a Cumulative Impact Area means that licenses for any new premises, club certificates or variations relating to ‘on trade’ premises situated within this area, will be refused if relevant representations are received.
Refugees arriving in new places experience a wide range of issues, including difficulties finding jobs, poor living conditions, mental health problems and limited opportunities to form social connections. Rather than representing refugees as victims the project is seeking to recognise their agency, seeing new arrivals not as a set of problems but as people seeking respite from their situation and in need of new social connections and skills. It explores wider themes of belonging, social networks and wellbeing by raising awareness of public parks being safe and inclusive spaces, which can encourage social interaction and provide ‘mentally restorative interludes.’

The research has also identified a series of challenges and vulnerabilities in supporting refugees and using public resources. Refugees can often feel uncertain about local norms, unwelcome and vulnerable to hate crime. There can also be anxious responses from local residents, some of whom feel unsettled by changing patterns of use to ‘their’ parks, but also can include more hostile incidences of harassment or hate speech.

The project team conducted qualitative interviews with refugees and different national and local stakeholders from refugee support, social wellbeing and greenspace sectors in Britain. Interviews with stakeholder organisations and refugees also took place in Berlin, and this was compared and contrasted with experiences in Sheffield and London. The data is being used to select relevant case studies and share best practice between the two countries and their approaches to refugees.

The collaborative aspect of the work in the British context involved examining the current state of policy and practice relating to refugees and the use of urban public open spaces. Working with different stakeholders from urban greenspace management and refugee support, local authorities and mental health organisations, the project examined how diverse voices can shape a mutual understanding of inclusive public spaces, focusing on the requirements for better provision, access and awareness to create a higher quality of life for refugees in urban areas.

The project’s preliminary findings revealed a wide range of refugees’ engagement with, and perceptions of, public parks. For example, some refugees experienced a sense of loneliness and isolation. One of the project participants remarked that ‘when it is difficult to go alone in a city you don’t know, you feel safer to stay indoors and not

#refugeeswelcome in parks

Funded by the AHRC Connected Communities programme, ‘#refugeeswelcome in parks’ is a new project which follows from ‘The Bench Project’ (2015) which sits within the same programme. Led by Clare Rishbeth from the University of Sheffield, it runs from February to November 2017. The project partners include the University of Manchester, The Young Foundation (London) and Minor (Berlin). Building on the earlier research about the benefits of sitting in public places, the project explores the ways in which spending time outside in urban public spaces can have positive outcomes for the wellbeing and inclusion of refugees. In the context of increasing new arrivals of refugees, this project argues that parks have the potential to improve wellbeing and help establish social connections in urban settings. In particular, it examines the ways of improving integration in the context of three different locations: Berlin, East London and Sheffield.

The project uses refugees as a term to include both refugees and asylum seekers.
to interact with other people. Others have commented on suburban parks being predominantly white middle-class spaces where they do not see themselves as fitting in. There were also interesting differences in refugee attitudes to green spaces shaped by their previous life experiences and countries of residence. Some Iranian participants who remembered outdoor spaces as lively, community places, have found parks in Sheffield were very quiet by comparison, creating a sense of uncertainty of how they were expected to behave. However, alongside these issues there were many interviewee accounts of pleasure and peace found in parks, and many did take some steps to find new places to go, especially those with young children.

These findings are being used to write recommendations of how to improve refugee access and inclusion in parks and other greenspaces. These can be summarised in six words: find, chat, join in, feel better – and these lead to specific ideas, considerations and actions with specific partnerships developed in the earlier stages of the project.

Partnership arrangements between the university and external organisations included linking up with stakeholders who are in some ways already connected with refugees, such as the Red Cross, and those in the greenspace sector, such as the Sheffield Council parks department, supporting new connections and working relationships between these. Greenspace sector organisations generally want to be inclusive, but may not understand or know how to address accessibility barriers for refugee users. The project team is also working together with food-growing networks, such as ‘Incredible Edible’ and the emerging ‘Gardens of Sanctuary’ initiative, in particular addressing challenges of including less well networked refugees.

Further actions involve building on established research on the positive impact of visiting greenspace as a means of improving mental health, but also raising awareness among GPs to consider the need for social contexts to support this for refugees. Parks need to be curated to encourage people to get involved and feel welcome. Activities can include organised events, walking groups, picnics or gardening projects. All these collaborative initiatives can work towards bringing people together and improving refugee wellbeing.

The project team includes three academics (a landscape architect, a migration geographer and a visual sociologist) and although this work is funded to focus on impact, there are findings which can be developed to support academic reflection and thinking about the experience of public space as ‘welcome’ to counter broader politics of hostility.
Here comes everybody

The work on this project led by Nela Milic began in 2012, with ‘Fourthland’ commissioning her to establish a connection between the artist and the architecture through practice-led research in one of the local neighbourhoods in Elephant and Castle. Motivated by the need to challenge the property developers’ announcement that there was ‘no community’ in the area, it aimed at exploring the changing realities of communities who often felt abandoned and ostracised in the aftermath of the regeneration projects. Highlighting the importance of shared communal spaces, it explored how art and community engagement can help re-create a sense of inclusion and belonging.

Nela Milic, working as an artist and an academic in media and arts, took a 10-day residency in a Victorian house in the local area in August 2012. This was an abandoned space obtained through the Westminster Cooperative and, for the time being, was given to artists, with East Street market on the one side and the Aylesbury Estate where most of the local participants were from on the other.

The house has become a project space which welcomed local residents through the window on the ground floor of a Victorian house – ‘similar to the ways in which people invite people into their houses’.

The aim of the project was to enable the artist-researcher to better understand how her ‘co-producers live locally and what happens when the communal space is missing.’ With the growing pressures of gentrification and redevelopment, residents tended to move away from each other and lose an earlier spirit of being together, with the Aylesbury Estate being no exception. The artist role in this participatory project was about helping to bring together these communities and encourage citizens ‘to have agency in negotiating about their habitat.’

The project involved building trust with residents by opening a window into the street to invite people in and encouraging them to participate in a range of activities with the artist in the newly created space. These ranged from a photo-booth, a beauty parlour to film screening with popcorn. The residents started bringing gifts or leaving their pets to look after while they would do their local rounds. All these activities and interactions took place through the window. The artist started participating in sharing their stories and passing them on. People would also come and sit outside on the bench and just have a chat between themselves often even forgetting that the artist was there. Eventually residents started inviting the artist to their houses, talking about their daily routines and sharing histories.

The project’s methodology included engaging with people, listening to their stories, collecting visual records and blogging. The artist-researcher felt the need to come up with something that the community would need in their everyday lives and succeeded in people actively participating in these communal activities. One of the outcomes of this work was an exhibition of all the pictures taken by Milic of residents throughout the project, with some of the younger residents experiencing a photography exhibition for the first time. As Milic explains, ‘people would come, see the exhibition and take down their own pictures to bring them home.’
These collaborative projects show the benefits of working more closely with residents, artists and local authorities to improve local wellbeing. They reveal how local public spaces can be curated to promote integration and cultural diversity. While being largely focused on addressing everyday issues, such as isolation or lack of friendly communal spaces, they have succeeded in developing a series of long-term legacies, such as setting up community-based associations and developing new approaches to local planning (e.g. in Easton) or encouraging different types of city services to provide more information for newcomers (e.g. in Sheffield).

However, these projects also highlight some of the more uncomfortable tensions around who has the power to decide what should or should not happen in the local neighbourhood and whose voices are being heard and why. Are they those of established residents or new arrivals? Concerned mothers and community workers or young people? Local residents or property developers? They consequently bring to light the extent to which community-based research is affected by complicated patterns of urban governance and local contestation.

Title

‘Here comes everybody’
Commissioned by ‘Fourthland’

Dates
August 2012

Contact
Nela Milic, London College of Communication,
University of the Arts London
n.milic@lcc.arts.ac.uk

Website
www.fourthland.co.uk/nela-milicmotion2

Selected blogs, reports and publications

Summary

These collaborative projects show the benefits of working more closely with residents, artists and local authorities to improve local wellbeing. They reveal how local public spaces can be curated to promote integration and cultural diversity. While being largely focused on addressing everyday issues, such as isolation or lack of friendly communal spaces, they have succeeded in developing a series of long-term legacies, such as setting up community-based associations and developing new approaches to local planning (e.g. in Easton) or encouraging different types of city services to provide more information for newcomers (e.g. in Sheffield).

However, these projects also highlight some of the more uncomfortable tensions around who has the power to decide what should or should not happen in the local neighbourhood and whose voices are being heard and why. Are they those of established residents or new arrivals? Concerned mothers and community workers or young people? Local residents or property developers? They consequently bring to light the extent to which community-based research is affected by complicated patterns of urban governance and local contestation.
Co-creating urban living to address marginalisation and exclusion

The three projects in this section demonstrate how universities and their partners are seeking to address urban poverty and stigmatisation. They examine the ways in which collaborative research between academics, residents and artists can lead to a deeper understanding of urban challenges and the ways in which arts-based practices can be used to visualise and address local concerns. In particular, each project seeks to co-create an alternative vision of the welfare system and community life. ‘Imagine’ discusses the ways in which arts and communal spirit can help re-examine past, present and future challenges of urban regeneration. The ‘Co-Creation Network’ brings together artists, residents and researchers to gain a better understanding of life in the stigmatised inner-city areas. The ‘Life Chances’ project focuses on re-imagining fairer society in which the interests of low-income families are being incorporated into welfare policies.
Imagine North East: focus on North Shields

The first case study focuses on the Durham-led Imagine North East project, which involved revisiting the Community Development Projects (CDPs) of the 1970’s in North Shields and Benwell (Newcastle-upon-Tyne). While starting with the past, the project also explored life in the present and possibilities for the future of those areas. Imagine North East was a partnership between Durham University and 12 community organisations on Tyneside. The project examined the lessons and legacies of the CDPs which were a Home Office-funded national anti-poverty experiment in 12 ‘deprived’ areas. It also involved the 12 community-based organisations in developing their own projects to examine the past, present and future of the areas. These projects were generally arts-based, ranging from an inter-generational graffiti art project in North Shields to a series of pictures in felt in Benwell. One of the key themes of Imagine North East was changes in the last 40 years and the issues of austerity and welfare cuts facing communities on Tyneside today. At the ‘Co-Creating Cities and Communities’ event, the focus was on North Shields and the presentation was enhanced by films made by Hugh Kelly (Swingbridge Media) in the 1990s and 2000s, which explored the experience of the residents of the Meadow Well estate and in North Tyneside more widely.

One of the Imagine North East projects was facilitated by the Cedarwood Trust, which is based on the Meadow Well Estate in North Shields. The project, called ‘Imagining Community at Cedarwood’ explored the history of the community on the estate through a family history approach, using oral history, drama, creative writing, family history research and other methods. As Yvonne Hall, a community researcher working on the project explained, the collaborative work aimed at gaining a better understanding of what happened and how, exploring a variety of issues from the stigmatisation of the neighbourhood, especially following riots in 1991, to residents coming together in celebration events. In particular, community workers, filmmakers and academics examined community life through family research, looking at how ‘civil disturbances and the stigma that was still attached to them’ have been experienced for generations.
The team found different ways in which local residents have addressed these issues: from rejecting the stigma, or simply choosing to leave, to becoming community activists and ‘building blocks within the community that younger people (could) trust.’

An important finding of this research was that revitalisation of the area did not simply involve central and local government-initiated regeneration and community development projects, but is an ongoing process of overcoming everyday injustices and inequality. Moreover, the participatory methodology of filmmaking, photography, interviews and oral histories revealed that the residents who took part in the project were full of resilience and community spirit. They helped each other in developing confidence and taking care of each other through sharing of laughter, food and joint activities – ultimately challenging the negative perceptions associated with the estate. As Yvonne Hall noted:

While the world view of Meadow Well is hard to challenge, the lived view implies that it is still a very hopeful community. People face unimaginable difficulties on the estate but still care about one another because there is hope things will be different. As a result of the ‘Imagine’ project some people were able to develop new skills and engage in community activism in various forms either for the first time or with more confidence. These conversations brought alive the remembrance of the residents who were the community activists of the past who left a legacy of inspiring hopeful change. Those community activists all those years ago did imagine a better future and worked hard for it and their legacy encouraged others to do the same.

In the panel, the team also engaged with a series of previously developed films by Swingbridge Media. Works by Hugh Kelly, including ‘An English Estate’ (Channel 4, 1992), ‘Good News to the Poor – Church Action on Poverty 1991’ and ‘Poverty – It’s a Crime – Cedarwood Project 2001’ included earlier conversations with many residents living on the estates and their neighbourhoods. Aimed at providing a reflection of people’s everyday lives and their social history, these films brought together a number of community organisations working with the residents on the estate. For example, ‘Poverty – It’s a Crime’ (2001) was commissioned by Cedarwood Trust and was about three young people investigating the effects of poverty on young people and its relationship to crime. Today, the Cedarwood Trust continues to challenge the negative perceptions of the Meadow Well Estate, ‘particularly relating to income deprivation and poverty’ by also celebrating ‘all that is good within the Meadow Well Estate.’

Imagine in Sheffield: focus on the Park Hill Estate

The Sheffield part of the ‘Imagine’ project focused on the relationship between culture and civic engagement. Collaborative work between the University of Sheffield, its academic partners, community researchers and Museums Sheffield focused on the housing regeneration projects in the Park Hill Estate, an iconic social housing built in the 1960s.

The work in Park Hill involved conducting interviews with the residents, including those who saw the estate being built and then redeveloped into modern flats. Residents talked about their sense of history and shared their memories and ideas about the ideals on which the estate had been built, as well as their hopes and expectations for the future. Community researchers spent time with the residents, collecting life histories which were then recorded and archived. Talking about their current lived experiences on the estate, some participants noted a loss of that communal spirit which existed in the 1960s. For example, the research found that following the regeneration work, the buildings were no longer seen as ‘conducive to meeting people, with communal facilities not being there.’

Despite these fears, residents expressed confidence that the community could develop with time.
The research and resident engagement were not without their challenges, considering how many times the Park Hill residents had already been approached by various researchers in the past. Some of these centred on getting access to people and overcoming interview fatigue. As was noted by Hugh Kelly, a filmmaker from Swingbridge Media, in some of the earlier efforts, it was not always easy to persuade people to appear in the films in the first place. This was a time-consuming process but the filmmakers succeeded in putting across the views of local residents by seeing the issues through their eyes as if ‘moving with them through the estate.’

These projects brought to light many challenges and difficulties faced by the residents. However, they also revealed fresh hopes among community members that the search for ways in which to bring social justice and develop community action to regeneration projects would influence policies and result in real benefits for the residents – provided their voices continue to be heard. A film especially commissioned by Museums Sheffield will be permanently displayed in the City of Sheffield’s flagship museum, Weston Park Museum.

Celebrating hope in Park Hill Estate
The Co-Creation Network and the Banlieue Network

The ‘Co-Creation’ project (2017-2020), funded by the EU Commission Horizon 2020, is led by Juliet Carpenter, urban geographer at Oxford Brookes University in partnership with Christina Horvath (PoLiS, University of Bath). It brings together researchers from 5 other organisations across the EU and in Latin America, as well as policymakers, residents and artists to address urban disadvantage and territorial stigmatization. In particular, it seeks to co-create a deeper understanding about different urban neighbourhoods and what can be done to address challenges of disadvantage and community marginalisation.

The research builds on the earlier findings from the ‘Banlieue Network’, an international research network (banlieuenetwork.org) which was funded by the AHRC (2012-2014) with the aim of designing a series of interdisciplinary events ‘to address the representation, theory and practice of suburban space.’ This was a collaborative pilot project for researchers, residents, policymakers and urban practitioners to develop comparative approaches to study poverty, stigmatisation and discrimination in the Parisian suburbs. The project’s key objective was to ‘contribute to new thinking about future ethical, cultural and social landscapes and future directions for society.’ It examined the ways in which residents developed alternative identities in response to mainstream discourses to better understand the shortcomings of previous urban policies and improve the effectiveness of future strategic planning.

Over the 24 months of the project, the network grew to include over 120 members from various disciplines ranging from architecture and sociology to film, literature and linguistics. It organised a series of events, including a summer school in Greater Paris in 2014 for researchers, artists and residents. Urban walks, activities with artists and discussions helped develop new collaborative synergies between artists and researchers. The resulting edited publication ‘Regards croisés sur la banlieue’ (2015) brought together the project’s interdisciplinary approaches to exploring living in the banlieue. The project’s key recommendations emphasised the need for an earlier engagement with the key stakeholders and stronger connections with a wider range of local residents and community leaders in more neutral spaces rather than the city council.

The H2020 ‘Co-Creation’ project is seeking to build on the earlier lessons and methods piloted in the course of the ‘Banlieue Network’ project, with the aim of rolling out these activities more extensively in 7 cities over the next 4 years. The project conceptualises co-creation as ‘a method which chooses art to involve communities, artists and researchers in collaborative work.’ A variety of participatory techniques, consultations with stakeholders and engagement with local residents and community artists are intended to be used from the initial design to the final dissemination of the findings.

The project’s collaborative methodology includes integrating inputs from researchers, local practitioners and artists to co-create knowledge about neighbourhoods and explore new visions for building sustainable places for the future. The theoretical framework draws on the current debates about participatory democracy, art-based, creative research methods, participatory action research, place-making practices and community engagement to develop a collective understanding of the city. In particular, it examines ‘what the neighbourhood means and what the future holds’, delving deeper into the value of ‘creative, bottom-up expression about neighbourhood identity.’
The project’s outputs include an international conference in Bath in September 2017, workshops with stakeholders, summer schools in Rio and Paris in 2018, followed by further knowledge exchange events, including four other international conferences. The project will also develop a series of policy recommendations in relation to the seven case study cities to suggest the ways in which the ‘co-creation’ method can help address stigmatisation, create empowerment and improve wellbeing in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.
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Arts and Humanities Research Council
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2012-2014

**Contact**
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Oxford Brookes University, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, Maison de Science de l’Homme Paris Nord, French Institute, London, La Capsule, La Ville de Bondy, La Ville de Drancy, La Ville de Saint-Denis, Maison de Science de l’Homme Paris Nord
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www.banlieuenetwork.org
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This was a collaborative pilot project for researchers, residents, policymakers and urban practitioners to develop comparative approaches to study poverty, stigmatisation and discrimination.
Life Chances: Low-income Families in Modern Urban Settings

Life Chances is part of the ‘Productive Margins: Regulating for Engagement’ research programme. It was a co-authored, participatory piece of research which explored life of low income families in Bristol and Cardiff from March to June 2016.

Co-produced between community organisations (the Single Parent Action Network in Bristol and South Riverside Community Development Centre in Cardiff), the Universities of Bristol and Cardiff and the artist collective ‘Close and Remote’, the project examined the ways in which regulatory services affect opportunities for low-income families with children. It constructed alternative scenarios for engagement between policies, services and community members to challenge the government approach to ‘Life Chances’, which has traditionally implied that responsibility should rest with individuals and society rather than the state.

The work explored what would happen if the welfare system put families and children first, ‘re-imagining what the welfare state might be like if children and families were at the centre of decisions rather than bureaucratic categories.’ As Debbie Watson from the University of Bristol explains, it was not just about ‘capturing voices of the poor’ but enabling the participants to be in the project space, working together with people in their everyday situations.

The re-imagining process focused on addressing the regulatory impacts of housing, benefits, immigration and child protection on people’s lives by fictionalisation and creative exploration through arts, crafts and performance. A series of workshops between volunteers, community partners, researchers and artists led to the creation of a co-authored fictional novel and jewellery. The experimental novel followed a fictional journalist as she tried to learn more about the life chances of people in Bristol and Cardiff, the challenging context of austerity and the elites controlling the system from the top. As the novel developed, she gradually discovered the ‘power emerging in real people that can be nurtured if given a life chance.’

55 ‘Life chances; low-income families in modern urban settings’, Available at: www.productivemargins.ac.uk/projects/low-income-families

Life Chances Novel
The collaborative nature of the project brought to light the centrality of the artists in developing trust between researchers and community members. It also revealed some of the more challenging aspects of co-produced research for academic researchers, particularly in relation to 'letting things go and allowing the creative process to create a supportive environment in which ideas can be developed and exchanged'.

Commenting on the value of the project to academic research, Debbie Watson noted that collaborative activities allowed her to 'genuinely experience co-producing a project with a number of stakeholders (community volunteers, artists, other academic colleagues) in a way that was meaningful and brought an interdisciplinary gaze to producing new knowledge with communities.'

The project also questioned the role of the university as being a driving force behind any co-produced research, indicating universities and communities should exercise greater flexibility in their collaborative work. Morag McDermont, the Principal Investigator on the Productive Margins programme, suggested that this should be 'a more porous space', in which 'people can come in and universities need to be able to go out.'

 Whilst this creates a sense of fluidity which collaborative work entails, it also reveals the ways in which multiple methods of working and researching can re-enforce each other. This sentiment was echoed by Nathan Evans, the project's partner from South Riverside Community Development Association, as he referred to a collaborative process as a 'meeting in the middle, turning universities and communities inside out.'

The project's findings highlighted important implications for reducing poverty. Some of the policy recommendations included actively listening to communities at the early stages of policy formulation, developing clearer policies on parent rights in their engagement with social services, and 'ensuring childcare, language support, education and paid travel costs' are being offered to families on low income to encourage their input in policy development.
These three projects bring to light the role of the artists and filmmakers in helping academics to imagine new city futures together with communities. In the process of collecting data, there is a risk of communities being disengaged or even critical of researchers intruding in their everyday lives. Artists working on collaborative projects help address some of these challenges by mediating between researchers and communities. Whilst these relations are not without problems, artists can contribute to collaborative research by capturing or creating fictional accounts or alternative scenarios of what life in the local neighbourhood could be like, relating some of the resident hopes and aspirations with the help of creative activities and open conversations.

Such collaborative initiatives can also present a series of obstacles, including a difficulty of getting access to participants or establishing that ‘middle ground’ between academics, communities and artists in which shared approaches to co-creating urban living can be not only imagined but also realised.

**Summary**

These three projects bring to light the role of the artists and filmmakers in helping academics to imagine new city futures together with communities. In the process of collecting data, there is a risk of communities being disengaged or even critical of researchers intruding in their everyday lives. Artists working on collaborative projects help address some of these challenges by mediating between researchers and communities. Whilst these relations are not without problems, artists can contribute to collaborative research by capturing or creating fictional accounts or alternative scenarios of what life in the local neighbourhood could be like, relating some of the resident hopes and aspirations with the help of creative activities and open conversations.

Such collaborative initiatives can also present a series of obstacles, including a difficulty of getting access to participants or establishing that ‘middle ground’ between academics, communities and artists in which shared approaches to co-creating urban living can be not only imagined but also realised.
A re ‘smart’ cities to be defined by digital technologies or are they to be social places, mindful of collective embodied memories and built by engaged citizens? The projects in this section reveal that these positions do not need to be mutually exclusive. They offer innovative methodologies to explore past, present and future cities with the help of digital technologies, sensory mapping and dance. They also highlight the importance of art-based approaches in mediating urban experiences.

The ‘Choreographing the City’ project explores how the tools and techniques of dance making can be used to enhance urban design. The ‘Sensory Cities Network’ examines the ways in which researchers, museum curators, community members and architects have developed a toolkit for understanding and curating sensory urban experiences. This work is complemented by other pieces of research, including the creation of an App with Living Archive to curate past and present experiences in Wolverton, using mixed methods to examine the social and urban history of the West Smithfield in London and evaluating some of the opportunities and constraints of using smart technologies in urban development in Milton Keynes.
Choreographing the City

Choreographing the City’ is a project undertaken by Ellie Cosgrave and John Bingham-Hall at the UCL Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy (STEaPP). It is part of the wider EPSRC-funded research ‘Liveable Cities’ programme which looks at radical and innovative engineering solutions for low carbon, resource-secure UK cities and human wellbeing.

The key aim of the project is to examine the ways in which the tools of dance-making can be adopted by the engineering profession and how this would change the outcomes of large engineering projects. With the ethos of co-creation at the centre of the work by UCL STEaPP, the current exploratory phase of the project brings together leading choreographers in a series of conversations with engineers in the realm of transport and mobility to scope out the potential for future practice-led research on live projects.

Whilst policy-makers are still looking to engineers to deliver solutions to the great challenges of creating sustainable cities, traditional engineering approaches struggle to provide the desired level of change. With rapidly expanding globalisation and urbanisation, city infrastructures experience significant challenges in ‘fulfilling social and cultural experiences, a sense of community, connection and wellbeing’.66 This project seeks to promote greater innovation and change by using experiences of choreographers to challenge and reform engineering design methodologies. As Ellie Cosgrave explains, ‘if we keep using the tools of engineering to critique engineering we are not going to get anywhere progressive’.67 In particular, the project explores the impact of creative approaches to curating and designing sustainable urban environments and how this challenges the way our cities function.

What makes this innovative fusion of different disciplines and methodologies possible is a shared understanding that a successful collaboration entails not only establishing common ground between choreography and engineering design processes but also a clear understanding of their differences. As Cosgrave explains: both are creative processes that are taught formally and developed through practice and experience; both have known outputs, physical and economic constraints and desired social outcomes.68 Most importantly, both deal with ‘curating space, form, flow and personal experience’.69

However, choreographers and engineers have developed different approaches to using tools, methodologies and training, or conceptualising the role of failure.70 The project does not expect dance to provide all the answers but it expects it to help reconceptualise and enrich particular engineering approaches and urban design. It examines the ways in which dancing and engineering use movements and space, drawing analogies between movements on stage and how people using their bodies to move and negotiate the urban environment. Dance movement, therefore, offers exciting insights and perspectives into the use of space, mobility and constraints which can be applied to better understand sustainability, equality and function of streets in the city.

Dr Cosgrave with Scatter, The Place’s adult dance company
Through a series of conversations combining conceptual and practical exploration of challenging movement spaces (such as major intersections and stations) in London, the project is examining what choreographers can teach engineers and urban planners about curating and designing sustainable urban environments to influence the ways our cities function. For example, by actively engaging with choreographers, the researchers wish to find out whether techniques such as improvisation can be applied to the engineering design practices. These initial findings will be explored in a larger follow-up project focused on live design challenges.

As John Bingham-Hall suggests, learning practices from dance can be applied to facilitate the development of transport networks to understand how bodies and vehicles relate to each other in a particular physical environment where movement is being constrained. For example, some of the activities envisage a choreographer and a traffic engineer working collaboratively to plan a route trajectory together around the city. Further collaborative work involves working with the three-dimensional movement and beam scanning to compare the ways in which people move around and to apply this knowledge to the transport modelling exercises. The project has also brought in a sculptor to explore how ‘physical thinking can be built into it through using bodies to better understand the spatial solutions.’

The project’s value lies in adding a methodological enrichment to understanding engineering processes by using improvisation, movement and testing spatial solutions within the choreographic practices that do not require any additional materials to visualise and experience future cities. The use of imaginary spaces and physical movement can help ‘test out a broader range of possibilities that might emerge through a discursive model.’

Some of the activities envisage a choreographer and a traffic engineer working collaboratively to plan a route trajectory together around the city.
Sensory cities and collaborative dialogues in digital urbanism

The international research network ‘Sensory Cities: researching, representing and curating sensory-emotional landscapes of urban environments’ (2015–2017) creates a platform for dialogue between interdisciplinary scholars, museum curators and urban professionals to explore how to mediate sensory experiences of the city. The network is led by Monica Degen and Astrid Swenson from the University of Brunel, in partnership with international academics in Barcelona and Cologne, and museum partners in three European cities: Museum of London, Köln Stadtmuseum, and Centro de Cultura Contemporanea de Barcelona. The aim is to develop interdisciplinary and cross-professional approaches to mediating sensory experiences from the city, including the ways in which different participants can learn from each other by working together.

With cities being crucial entities for providing a sense of place in a globalising world, the project seeks to examine the role of the senses in place-making and attachments. As urban areas are being redeveloped with the help of digital technologies and mobile apps, less attention is given to understanding the relationship between smart technologies and embodied experiences, history and memory of places in shaping modern experiences of urban life. To address this gap, the project examines the sensory experiences and ‘the relationship between history, personal experiences and feelings of attachments in a multicultural European context.’

A series of international workshops were organised in London, Cologne and Barcelona between 2016 and 2017, with participants sharing different methodological insights and approaches to understanding the sensory aspects of urban development. The London workshop took place first and brought together inter-disciplinary, cross-professional groups to address a range of urban challenges using different sensory methodologies, from social media and sketching in the street to observation, evocative interviews and sensory mapping. Whilst different groups identified specific issues, a common theme was the importance of urban development not only as a physical restructuring of the city, but rather as a process that ‘radically transforms the somatic and experiential landscape of places affecting individual’s place attachments.’

The second workshop took place in Cologne. Whilst maintaining ‘a strong emphasis on architecture, planning, curation and artistic visions’, more attention was paid to the role of sound and music, as well as political questions of the senses play in framing social inequality in the city which had emerged from the London workshop. An important methodological point that emerged from these discussions was the need to develop interdisciplinary research when examining urban experiences or sensory dimensions in the city. The third workshop in Barcelona explored some of the limits of the senses in displaying historical information about the urban past and discussed how the political aspects of ‘who has the power to frame the senses’, particularly in relation to analysing urban homelessness or the benefits of tourism. The methodological dimension of the Barcelona workshop focused on developing ways of making sensory relationships ‘tangible for different audiences.’

76 Sensory Cities Website. Available at: www.sensorycities.com/about-2
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Using creative methodologies and sensory approaches to tackle urban challenges

These workshops were particularly important for connecting scholars with policy makers, professionals from the arts and community groups and developing different aspects of sensory methods. For example, if the London workshop ‘focused on multi-modal sensing’ and the Cologne fieldwork ‘developed attention to the sensory regimes created by one particular sense’, the Barcelona workshop worked towards bringing together individual findings and thinking how to best represent them.82

Based on the discussions and the data collected by the multi-disciplinary teams of academics, artists, policy makers, community activists and urbanists in the course of two days in each city, in particular areas/streets – the project developed a range of questions and interactive mapping techniques which were used to create the online ‘Sensory THINK Kit’.83 The digital resource has allowed to explore the findings by professions, cities and themes.84 As Monica Degen, the Principal Investigator, explains, ‘the THINK Kit enables communities and curators ‘to pay attention to the embodied engagement with world’, being aware of how different sensory perceptions help appreciate the quality of space.85 An important feature of this THINK Kit is its accessibility as a digital device for both professionals and the general public, providing everyone with an equal opportunity to create their own sensory experiences around the city.

However, the research also revealed a series of challenges in relation to mediating such fluid embodied experiences through the digital devices and technologies. What happens when emotions get mediated through the smart technologies or places become essentialised through particular digital interactions? What are the frictions that emerge? Other questions related to the challenges of the interdisciplinary approach. To what extent does training in a particular discipline condition the way academics sense places and how does this affect the ways in which other people frame their experiences? What does this reveal about inclusion and exclusion of certain communities from the interactive maps? The final set of questions addressed the temporal dimension of the place and how to best capture them the past and present realities with the help of digital technology?86
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The Living Archive Milton Keynes and Sensory Explorations of Smithfield Market

The questions raised by the Sensory City projects formed the basis for another ‘collaborative dialogue’ which took place at the ‘Co-creating Cities and Communities’ Event (July 2017), bringing together experts from other projects to discuss their shared interests and findings in sensory urbanism. Contributions included presentation of the work about the Living Archive in Milton Keynes and observations from a new research project that has evolved from the Sensory Cities network about Smithfield Market which is being shared with the Museum of London. Emphasising the embeddedness of everyday experiences in particular places, academics, community groups and museum curators discussed how a sensation of place, memory and community can be mediated through mobile Apps and distributed through digital networks.

The Living Archive has been collecting oral histories from the population of Milton Keynes since the mid-1970s. Darren Umney from the Open University, in a collaborative project between Wolverton and Newport Council and Living Archive, drew on this data to develop a heritage guide to Wolverton, a historic railway town within the new city. The guide, funded by a Section 106 planning grant, took the form of a phone App which identified individual sites and buildings around the town, places of interest which signified important historic changes in the urban and cultural landscape of the town. Each place of interest was accompanied by a sound clip, adding voices and associated stories from the archive. In an interview with Celebrate: MK, Darren Umney mentioned the three trails also included in the App – ‘one guides you around early Wolverton, another follows in the footsteps of the railway workers and one recycles some of the existing pavement trail markers.’

For example, see ‘All Change’ which is a collection of oral history audio recordings, still images and research process documents, which relate to the new arrivals and the creation of the railway towns of Wolverton and New Bradwell in Buckinghamshire, during the years 1832-1865. Available at: www.livingarchive.org.uk/content/catalogue_item/all-change


‘Wolverton gets smart with new app’, Celebrate: MK, 1 December 2016. Available at: celebratemk.co.uk/2016/12/01/wolverton-gets-smart-with-new-app

The App brought together old photographs and sounds to establish a spatial and generational connection between different people, places and urban stories, ‘like a walk down memory lane, past places of interest, iconic places, all triggered by the phone’s GPS.’ The work on the project has also contributed to the ongoing debate about the accessibility of urban experiences and the question of exclusion. A key implication of the project was the role of smart technologies in deciding who gets involved in the production and consumption of such digitally-generated experiences and memories, and who gets excluded. In this case, it was about people who would not be able afford a smart phone or would not know how to use it. The project added an interesting temporal dimension to sensory experience of urban places by allowing participants to access and compare memories of others whilst remaining in the present.
Another important project about urban regeneration and sensory mapping involved collaborative research between the University of Brunel and the Museum of London. The project has focused on examining and curating the sensory experience of the Smithfield Market in London, with the aim of developing a digital map to capture the findings. As Camila Lewis, Research Fellow at the University of Brunel explains, the aim of the pilot project was to ‘map the sensory landscape of current market sight in relation to its future regeneration.’

The work involved investigating the social and urban history of the West Smithfield part of the market to understand how the past can be reworked into the future of the area, considering the regeneration work around the market which includes the Museum of London moving to one of its derelict parts in 2022. The project seeks to address the sensory and temporal dimensions of the urban regeneration process. Its methodology involved a combination of mixed methods, from ‘walk-along interviews, making sound recordings in the market’ to ‘collecting oral histories.’ Further work focused on ethnographic research and mapping the ways in which public space and sensory landscapes were being used by different groups of people visiting or working at the market and its surrounding area.

The research to date highlighted contrasting landscapes and different social uses of the market, including different flows of people, goods and ideas. The project’s emphasis on the importance of temporality highlighted a complex relationship between the sensory and temporal aspects of the everyday experiences of the place, depending on time of day/night or the day of the week. The next stage of the research involves documenting the urban regeneration process by ‘creating a multi-sensory, participatory experience for their visitors.’ The map will be shared with the Museum of London and may lead to the development of a digital resource which explores how different groups visiting the area experience its smells and sounds. The Museum of London are particularly interested in how they can incorporate sensory understandings of place in their future curation practices in order to better serve their visitors and the local community. As in the case of the digital data from the Living Archive in Wolverton and the work by the Sensory Cities Network, some of the anticipated challenges include the issue of making the fluent and varied nature of experience accessible to researchers and visitors.
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Smart Cities in the Making, Learning from Milton Keynes

The implications of sensory approaches to urban regeneration were aptly summarised and reflected upon by Gillian Rose from the Open University in her ESRC-funded collaborative project ‘Smart Cities in the Making: Learning from Milton Keynes.’ The project examines a series of opportunities and challenges surrounding smart city activities and suggests a better understanding of how ‘smart policies and technologies actually engage city residents and workers.’

On the one hand, smart cities gather digital data to ‘make the city more efficient, democratic and sustainable.’ On the other hand, corporate visions of smart living tend to focus on the purely infrastructural side of urban development, with people being turned into data points without ‘any sense of collective agency.’ Her work highlights the need to move away from this by examining the ways in which projects become embedded in particular city environments – to recover some of that lost sense of memory, history or a sensory feel of the city.

Whilst the project reveals the importance of focusing on collective memories, it also notes their contested nature and the importance of understanding digital and human frictions that shape and influence urban environments.

The project examines a series of opportunities and challenges surrounding smart city activities and suggests a better understanding of how smart policies and technologies actually engage city residents and workers.
These diverse experiments in sensory urbanism help to better understand how urban spaces can be re-created not only with the help of digital technologies and sensory tools, but also with a greater sensitivity to the spatial and temporary needs of urban communities and determination to identify, explore and preserve collective memories and heritage. A closer evaluation of these projects helps establish further connections between urban places, their past and present inhabitants and the ways in which they are being represented, reconfigured and consumed by different audiences – including scholars from architecture, urban sociology, engineering and arts, curators and local community organisations.

Taken together with the case study on collaborative work between dancers and urban engineers, these examples of co-produced research provide different innovative methodologies to explore the changing nature of urban communities and technologies to deliver change. Not only do they share their passion for sensory urbanism, but also demonstrate how cities can be redeveloped by establishing a dialogue between academic fields, smart technologies and urban community interests.
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**Summary**

These diverse experiments in sensory urbanism help to better understand how urban spaces can be re-created not only with the help of digital technologies and sensory tools, but also with a greater sensitivity to the spatial and temporary needs of urban communities and determination to identify, explore and preserve collective memories and heritage. A closer evaluation of these projects helps establish further connections between urban places, their past and present inhabitants and the ways in which they are being represented, reconfigured and consumed by different audiences – including scholars from architecture, urban sociology, engineering and arts, curators and local community organisations.

Taken together with the case study on collaborative work between dancers and urban engineers, these examples of co-produced research provide different innovative methodologies to explore the changing nature of urban communities and technologies to deliver change. Not only do they share their passion for sensory urbanism, but also demonstrate how cities can be redeveloped by establishing a dialogue between academic fields, smart technologies and urban community interests.
Developing city partnerships with local councils and engaged citizens

The ‘Urban Living Partnership’ is a programme funded by the Research Councils and Innovate UK to promote integrated research and innovation in urban areas. Aimed at helping cities ‘realise their visions for future urban living’, it brings together researchers, business leaders, civic authorities and citizens to address challenges affecting life in contemporary cities through collaborative research.

In 2016, five cities – Bristol, Newcastle, Birmingham, Leeds and York – were chosen to encourage an exchange of approaches and future urban visions with other urban centres. The programme focused on developing diagnostic pilot studies to empower citizens to co-design cities and develop new mutually beneficial ways to improve health, wellbeing and prosperity. These collaborative pilots, running between June 2016 and December 2017, have been supported by expertise in engineering, computer science, planning, psychology, management, arts and humanities, creative industries and health sciences.

A key element of this initiative involved working with local authorities not only to improve urban infrastructures but also to make cities more citizen-centric. The following three case studies provide a snapshot of some of the challenges and findings which have come out of this work to date.
Bristol Urban ID (Integrated Diagnostics) began in June 2017. It brings together partners and stakeholders in the City of Bristol and neighbouring South Gloucestershire urban area. The project is backed by the two local authorities, plus Bristol Green Capital Partnership and Bristol Health Partners, the local business community, and diverse citizen groups and community organisations. The project’s core mission is to seek novel ways of diagnosing the constraints of ‘business as usual’ urban planning and management and to identify the barriers faced in delivering the local authority visions of a more resilient, healthy, prosperous and sustainable city.  

Envisaged as a partnership between academics from the University of Bristol, the University of the West of England, practitioners and local communities from across the City of Bristol and South Gloucestershire, the project is developing and piloting a new transdisciplinary framework for the diagnosis of urban challenges. It is tackling these challenges together with citizens in order to identify where transformative changes in city-wide systems and their governance are needed. The framework is being applied to diagnose a series of complex problems across a number of themes, including ‘Mobility and Accessibility’, ‘Health and Happiness’, ‘Equality and Inclusion’ and ‘Carbon Neutrality’. 

In particular, it focuses on examining a series of disparities which the city needs to address in these areas. From the very outset, the work encouraged early partner involvement: this started with the project proposal which was co-produced with partner organisations to set up a series of questions to explore the particular barriers stopping Bristol from bridging the gap between our current situation and the desired future as encapsulated by the City’s various visions and aspirations.
The diagnosis of urban living challenges for these case studies has been conducted during a period of financial austerity, and the associated reductions in resources have been particularly acute for local authorities. The Bristol Urban ID case studies have highlighted a series of important themes and research questions arising out this austerity context, including how communities should interact with restructured local authority teams. For example, the importance of deciding who should be ‘involved in the stewardship of community assets’ and what new models of shared or delegated/devolved governance are possible; how can ‘citizen-led initiative start-ups, self-sustain and replicate without external support; and on what basis should the value of urban assets be identified and included in decision-making, especially given the multiple-benefits such shared and interdependent assets bring to local communities?’

By bringing together ‘system thinking, co-production, learning journey and resilient agency approaches’, the Urban ID team has integrated research and learning from across the academic and practitioner communities to delve beneath the prima facie problems of urban living and expose ‘root cause’ challenges.
Urban Living Birmingham

This pilot study funded by the Urban Living Partnership (RCUK), commenced on 1 June 2016 with the aim of identifying improvements for urban services in Birmingham and delivering better outcomes by catalysing change in city governance. In particular, the work involved developing strategies to transform citizen and citizen groups into ‘co-creators and co-innovators of urban services’ and turning the City Council into services facilitator, rather than provider. By encouraging city-wide solutions to cut across policy silos, the project’s objective was to re-design ‘the city into a prosperous, healthy and vibrant living place’.

The Kerslake Report (2014) strongly criticised Birmingham Council for failing to provide a positive vision for the city by ‘sweeping problems under the carpet or blaming them on others rather than tackling them head on.’ In view of these comments, Birmingham City Council (BCC) entered into a ‘listening mode’ and the Urban Living Birmingham (ULB) project team engaged with them to explore how ‘better outcomes can be produced for individuals and families living across the city.’

The Urban Living Birmingham Consortium brought together the expertise of four universities (University of Birmingham with Birmingham City University, Aston University and the University of Warwick) and many local, regional and national organisations. There were three stages to this project. First, the Consortium initially focused on developing an urban diagnostic methodology. A mixed methods approach was developed, incorporating quantitative and a qualitative data and information analyses. The quantitative analysis comprised a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) that drew upon 248 numeric datasets. The qualitative studies draw upon 388 information sources analysed using network analysis, hot/cold spot analysis, geographical analysis and thematic analysis. In addition to contributing to the identification of Birmingham’s critical challenges, the evidence analysis also identified a disconnect between academic studies and the evidence base used to support policy development across the city. Collectively, the quantitative and qualitative analyses were able to identify Birmingham’s critical challenges as they relate to city services. The PCA analysis identified that ‘Health & Wellbeing’ is related in Birmingham to ‘Energy’, ‘Connectivity’ and ‘Economy’ in an apparent ‘Birmingham plexus’.

In stage two, the researchers identified that there was ‘very little end-user innovation in public services, emphasising the need to transform citizens from the ‘passive consumers’ of public services into ‘active innovators’.’ The project found that whereas end-user innovation had been widely adopted in the private sector, ranging from customers using DIY to improve mountain bike design or car suspension to developing creative solutions for the gaming industry, it was virtually absent from the mainstream public sector. Interviews with stakeholders from Birmingham’s providers of public services revealed that such initiatives as ‘Be heard’ or ‘Intelligent Mobility’ were driven by local authorities, rather than being end-user innovation in which citizens act as ‘agents of change’ – ultimately resulting in passive consultations with citizens and lacking in citizen empowerment. Examples of end-user innovation were identified and, in particular, the need to develop Apps that would support the interface between citizens and public service providers.
In stage three, on-going research is focusing on the role end-user innovation can make to providing better outcomes for citizens across Birmingham. This includes three processes. First, is to further the development of the urban diagnostics process with a focus on 'place based characterisation', using all the datasets for the city and working directly with citizens. This includes identifying key variables by working with policy-makers and citizens through the development of a board game. Second, to explore end-user innovation in Birmingham as it relates to the natural environment, connectivity, the integrated nature of the city’s systems, deprivation and governance. Third, is to engage with citizens and collective through working with community artists to identify opportunities for creating better outcomes for people, communities and places. This art-enabled methodology will encourage citizens from across the city to rethink places and processes.

Using citizens’ ideas in the process was seen as a positive development as it increased chances of breaking cycles of passive policies and securing a greater buy in from the public. However, the researchers also highlighted a range of obstacles involved in the end-user engagement, including citizen frustration with often complex systems of governance or the lack of technical expertise and funding.

The research suggested that some of these barriers to end-user innovation in service provision could be overcome by showing the impact of citizen proposals, securing small micro-grants to overcome financial constraints or using social media. Open data platforms were found to be crucial for encouraging the creation of Apps (e.g. Fix My Street, Good Gym) to engage with citizens in a more direct way.

The project’s initial focus on the development of a robust and rigorous approach to urban diagnostics has led to the development of a methodological tool that can be applied to support policy formulation, development and appraisal. This is an important development. In addition, the on-going research on end-user innovation, including the application of an arts-based methodology, is transforming the ways in which policy-makers engage with citizens. As part of this, the project has identified that end-user innovation as it is applied to public services also includes end-user innovation that is undertaken by groups of citizens.
Newcastle City Futures

Newcastle City Futures (NCF) is one of the larger urban living pilots funded by the Research Councils UK Innovate which aims to address the future needs of Newcastle and Gateshead through collaborative projects across the city region. Led by Newcastle University in partnership with Northumbria University, NCF includes 22 core partners covering public, private and third sectors in the city. The project began in July 2016. Building on some of the previous future-oriented research at the University of Newcastle, it seeks to establish ways in which universities can help citizens and businesses in cities and regions to ‘diagnose the complex and interdependent challenges’ to think about change and imagine future. A focus of the NCF consortium is the development of a shared long-term vision for Newcastle and Gateshead as an Age Friendly Sustainable urban area.

The research is underpinned by a series of interconnected questions, including: How can the long-term future of the region be tackled together? How can older industrial regions be more ambitious and positive about change and how to harness the assets and skills of the place? What is the role of the university in the region and how can universities research link up with leadership?

The Report on ‘City Futures and the Civic University’ (2016) found that the cities need to do more for their citizens, particularly as the latter become increasingly ‘interested in the future of their places’, from ‘delivery or loss of public services, the cost of housing, the reliability of transport’ to ‘the availability of jobs’ and ‘the extent of green spaces and clean air’.

To address some of these urban challenges, particularly relating to the priority themes of sustainability, aging and social inclusion, NCF is helping to develop a variety of initiatives. Working together with local authorities and the public sector, businesses, communities, and universities, they are generating new visible projects across the city using participatory engagement, digital technologies and photography.

Some of the more recent citizen-focused projects identified by partner organisations and facilitated by the Newcastle City Futures include ‘Metro Futures’ and ‘transforming northumberland Street’. The first project sought to encourage residents and businesses to get involved in designing the next fleet of Metro trains to develop inclusive mobility. The second project is about creating opportunities to ‘redesign and green’ the high street in Newcastle city centre, using digital retailing that links customers to businesses. Other initiatives focused on intergenerational work and included creating digitally enabled sustainable homes for an ageing society (Future Homes) or encouraging children to design their own future city (Big Draw).

One of the most important features of the pilot has been the continuous development of the innovative engagement model. Reporting to the multi-partner City Futures Development Group convened by Newcastle City Council, NCF sees itself as a neutral broker, or a bridge between different academic fields and industry sectors,
Developing city partnerships with local councils and engaged citizens

Policy and organisations. Operating ‘at arm’s length’ from both the University and City Council, they can turn the research process on its head – finding potential areas of impact first, then developing activities to influence policies which results in empirical data and further research.\textsuperscript{119} Whilst allowing a greater methodological flexibility, this also enables the researchers to bridge some of the cracks between disciplines and subjects by using a quadruple helix approach. This meant extending a traditional triple model of collaboration between government, university and business to include working together with civil society for social as well as business innovation.\textsuperscript{120} Using a wide range of methodologies and systems analysis to visualise scenarios, combined with expertise in computing, mapping, spatial analysis and urban planning, this approach allows a stronger understanding of the interdependent challenges confronting citizens, the city and the region.

The project’s methodological findings to date have included a better understanding of some of the key benefits and challenges of the brokerage model for collaborative research in relation to cities, citizens and local authorities. The collaborative model also highlighted some of the challenges of different stakeholders involved in the collaborative process, including the difficulties experienced by the community and voluntary sector with open ended nature of the project facilitation process (e.g. mashups). Whilst local authorities can find it challenging when the overall control and leadership over the project is shared between different groups, changes in leadership at the university can also have significant implications for the project. The research also emphasised that one approach does not fit all and the ways in which the model of collaborative urban governance can work in one city context may not be as effective in the other. Within the ‘fragmented governance landscape’, the university’s civic contribution to collaborative research lies in its ability to work as an incubator of new ideas, whilst still playing ‘a brokerage role in their development.’\textsuperscript{121}

The ongoing NCF Urban Living Partnership pilot project builds on and extends two existing strands of academic research by core team members (Mark Tewdwr-Jones, Louise Kempton, and Paul Vallance). First, work on urban futures conducted as part of national Foresight programmes.\textsuperscript{122} Second, work developing the concept of a contemporary ‘Civic University’.\textsuperscript{123}

Metro Futures sought to encourage residents and businesses to get involved in designing the next fleet of Metro trains to develop inclusive mobility.

---


\textsuperscript{120} Goddard J. and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2016). ‘City Futures and the Civic University’, Report, p.11. Available at: www.ncl.ac.uk/media/wwwnclacuk/socialrenewal/files/City%20Futures%20and%20The%20Civic%20University%20(1MB).pdf

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.


This brief presentation of the three of the five Urban Living Pilots demonstrated how their work has contributed to a better understanding of the ways in which different interdependent systems (e.g. transport, health and power) interact with each other and the results which can be achieved by developing stronger engagement and co-production with citizens. With different stages of these and other pilots now completed, key findings were showcased at the ‘Festival of the Future City’ in October 2017 in Bristol, as well as via project websites.

Summary

Newcastle City Futures: Digital jigsaw model
Recommendations

The 'Co-Creating Cities and Communities' event and our wider review of current practice makes it clear that many projects aimed at improving urban living are unaware of related projects working in the same local areas. Our overarching recommendation therefore is that local actors need to actively seek out opportunities to network projects in local areas; to share existing knowledge and resources; and to move beyond silos and short-term projects to achieve more sustainable long-term change.

There are a number of recommendations for universities working at a city-scale:

01 Research findings related to the city need to be made more easily, accessibly and widely available to local communities and stakeholders perhaps through publicly accessible city-focused research events as well as online.

02 There is a key role for universities in developing community and civic research skills; this could be developed as part of widening participation agendas.

03 Flexible, responsive and trusting partnerships with partner organisations requires long-term commitments beyond the project funding model; universities need to identify how they might support and sustain partnerships at an institutional level for the longer term.

04 Arts-based and creative practice can play a critical role in building partnerships, reframing research questions and generating novel research data.

05 There is a need for universities to work with local government and civil society to create opportunities to actively promote and share the research that is already happening in a local area.

There are three key recommendations for Research Councils seeking to support research in this area:

06 Funding for partnership building and networking alongside longer-term project-based funding is required to enable the development of sustainable and transformative research collaborations.

07 Investment in engineering and technology research in the urban environment needs to be matched by equivalent research into social factors, as well as into unintended and social consequences of urban development.

08 Research is urgently needed into the national and international urban experimentation initiatives that are already taking place in civil society, local government and trans-national organisations. Significant innovation in urban living is currently under-researched.

In this landscape, we encourage civil society and community organisations to:

09 Have greater confidence in their own expertise and local knowledge. This means being confident to ask for sufficient resourcing to cover their involvement in projects and ensuring that partners are aware of the expertise involved in developing long-term community relationships.

10 Develop a more proactive approach to contesting passive forms of citizen consultation, with the aim of challenging top-down policies and becoming active co-creators of urban services.

11 Work with universities and local government to create opportunities to actively promote and share the research that is already happening in a local area.
There are two clear recommendations for academic researchers involved in collaborative projects:

12 Communicate research findings using clear and simple messages, making them easier to understand by different stakeholders involved in the project research and partners working in different disciplines.

13 With more arts-related methods being used in the projects, academics need to be confident in allowing artists and community partners to take a leading role at particular points in the project; this can help generate more trust with research participants and improve the quality of findings by fostering a more creative and supportive environment.

For local government and city authorities we advise that they:

14 Consider using more creative and arts-based methods to diversify and expand the range of participation in consultation at all stages of public policy development.

15 Defend accessible and inclusive public spaces as important resources for the development of citizen voice, democracy and informal public engagement/consultation.

16 Work with universities and civil society to create opportunities to actively promote and share the research that is already happening in a local area.

With artists playing a key role in mediating collaborative activities, we recommend that they:

17 Develop a better understanding of local power relations and existing settings to avoid creating an impression of ‘parachuting’ into a project, or a particular community.

18 Be more aware of their influence not only in visualising or vocalising embodied experiences, emotions and challenges of urban communities, but also of their value in generating new research questions and resolving tensions which can arise from the research process.


Appendix 01

A full list of sessions from the ‘Co-Creating Cities and Communities’ Summer Event, 12-13 July 2017 Watershed Bristol

Roundtable Discussions

- Diane Carr (UCL), Esther Fox (Accentuate), Martin Levinson (Bath Spa University) and Allan Sutherland (writer and performer), ‘Best laid plans: connection, visibility and loss on the D4D project’

- Andrew Miles (University of Manchester), Lisanne Gibson (University of Leicester), Abigail Gilmore (University of Manchester) and Esme Ward (Manchester Museum), ‘Everyday participation, community assets and public spaces: methods and practices for locating cultural value’

- Bradon Smith (Open University), Bexie Bush (animator), Tim Mitchell (photographer), David Llewellyn (University of South Wales) and Hamish Fyfe (University of South Wales), ‘Demanding times, future works and everyday lives’

- Morag McDermont, Helen Thomas-Hughes, Angela Piccini, Sue Cohen, Debbie Watson, Helen Manchester (University of Bristol), Nathan Evans (South Riverside Community Development Association) and other community team members, ‘Generating diverse models of social enterprise to contribute to the future of flourishing cities: how do we turn the university inside-out and outside-in?’

- Kate Pahl (University of Sheffield), Sarah Banks (Durham University), Hugh Kelly, Alan Silvester (film makers), Louise Ritchie and Yvonne Hall (community researchers), ‘Revisiting the past to re-imagine the future: regeneration projects in North Tyneside and Park Hill’
• Monica Degen (Brunel University London), Gillian Rose (Open University), Camilla Lewis (Brunel University London), Darren Umney (Open University and Living Archive), ‘Mediated memories: the digital construction and reconstruction of urban experiences and identities’

• Colin Taylor, Ges Rosenberg and David Relph (University of Bristol), Louise Kempton and Paul Vallance (Newcastle City Futures), John Bryson (University of Birmingham), ‘Urban development and change in the age of austerity’

Pecha Kucha Presentations
• Corra Boushel (University of West England), ‘ClairCity: What’s the problem with air pollution?’
• Lorena Axinte (Cardiff University), ‘Co-creating Cardiff Capital Region’
• Marcus Willcocks (UAL) and Mark Clack (Community arts facilitator), ‘Visual voices: empowering communities through new approaches to graffiti, street art and more’
• Rachel Matthews (Coventry University), ‘Friend or foe? Provincial newspapers and communities’
• Van Pham (XHutches), ‘Xhutches: adaptive reuse of former religious spaces for culture and communities’

Talks
• Tim Dixon (University of Reading), ‘Towards a Smart and Sustainable Reading 2050’
• Christina Horvath (University of Bath) and Juliet Carpenter (Oxford Brookes University), ‘Co-creation: conceptualising a methodology addressing urban stigmatisation’
• Steve Cinderby (University of York), ‘York city environment observatory’
• Katharine Willis (Plymouth University), ‘Whose rights to the (smart) city?’
• Sara Pepper (Cardiff University) and Ruth Cayford (Cardiff City Council), ‘Leadership and connectivity in the creative economy in Cardiff and the region’
• Elie Cosgrave and John Bingham-Hall (UCL), ‘Choreographing the city’

• Sara Heitlinger (Newcastle University) and Mhairi Weir (Spitalfields City Farm), Co-designing digital and networked technologies with urban agricultural communities

• Clare Rishbeth and Dominika Blachnicka-Ciacek (University of Sheffield), ‘refugeeswelcome in parks’

• Josie McLellan, Nate Eisenstadt (University of Bristol), Andrew Foyle, Mark Small (OutStories), Mapping LGBT+ Bristol

• Roaa Ali, Researcher in Minority and Diversity, ‘Intercultural Street Art: the City’s Inclusion of an Othered Britishness’

• Nela Milic, London College of Communication, UAL, ‘Here comes everybody’

• David Webb (Newcastle University) and Laurence Bonner (WEA Greening Wingrove), ‘Advocacy through environment change’

Interactive Sessions
• Lisa Procter (Manchester Metropolitan University), Jen Slater (Sheffield Hallam University), Charlotte Jones (Sheffield Hallam University), Kirsty Liddiard (University of Sheffield), ‘How can a Queer/Crip New Materialism Energise Thinking about “Cities”?’

• Darien Simon (University of Leeds), Tajinder Virdee (Leeds City Council), ‘Co-creating challenge: bridging gaps between experts and communities’

• Darien Simon (University of Leeds) and Tajinder Virdee (Leeds City Council), ‘Co-designing the TRUE tool for urban resources and future city ecosystems’

• Owain Jones (Bath Spa University), Michael Buser (University of West England), Helen Adshead and Luci Gorell Barnes (artist facilitators), ‘Towards Hydrocitizenship’

• Susan Moffat and Rachel Reddihough (New Vic Theatre), Esther Fox (Accentuate), ‘The presence of absence (resisting perfection)’

• David Webb (Newcastle University), Pollyanna Ruiz (University of Sussex), Tim Snelson (UEA), Rebecca Madgin (University of Glasgow), Paul Richards (Brazenbunch) Winstan Whitter, ‘Engaging youth in cultural heritage’
Workshops

- David Wyatt (Cardiff University), Kimberley Jones (CAER Heritage Project) and Dave Horton (Action in Caerau and Ely), ‘History is our future: designing a vision for asset-based heritage regeneration’

- Katharine Willis (Plymouth University) and Jen Stein (University of West England), ‘Open City: co-creation and design toolkits for smart cities’

- Kate Pahl, Katy Goldstraw (University of Sheffield), Patrick Meleady (Pitsmoor Adventure Playground), Mubarak Hassan and Mike Fitter (Sheffield City Social Cohesion Advisory Group), ‘Taking yourselves seriously: creative approaches to social cohesion in communities’

- Marie Harder, Firooz Firoozmand, Ammu Sanyal and Pauline Rutter (University of Brighton and Fudan University), Emma Crossland (MindOut), ‘Starting from values: an experiential approach’

- Sophia de Sousa and Louise Dredge (The Glass-House Community Led Design), Katerina Alexiou and Theodore Zamenopoulos (Open University), ‘Sparking connections: how cities co-design their future’

- Samuel McKay (University of Leeds) and Fran Woodcock (community musician), ‘Migration and settlement: extending the welcome’

- Nick Gant, Joe Palmer and Kelly Duggan (University of Brighton and Community 21), ‘Digi-tools for engaging young people in envisioning the future city’

For more information about the event and individual podcasts and sessions, please visit: https://connected-communities.org/index.php/about/co-creating-cities-and-communities-conference
How can cities engage with their citizens to address longstanding issues and open up new possibilities? This report, bringing together projects from the Connected Communities Programme and Urban Living Partnership, addresses this question. It provides case studies and recommendations for building partnerships across universities, local government, civil society and communities and demonstrates the value of Arts and Humanities practice and research in setting new agendas.