

UCL Institute for Global Prosperity

Towards Sustainable Prosperity: Making Greater London a National Park City

ACTION BRIEF

Konrad Miciukiewicz, Henrietta L. Moore and Hannah Sender

in collaboration with the IGP team

Introduction

Green, blue and open spaces occupy over 60% of the UK capital. Greater London is home to 8.5 million people, who speak over 300 languages, and 13,000 species of wildlife. Its forests, parks, allotments, farms, private gardens, warehouse rooftops, railway lines and many other sites are key locales for human and non-human prosperity. To harness the metropolitan space for the benefit of all requires attention, imaginative thinking and creative transformation. Research conducted at the UCL Institute for Global Prosperity (IGP) has shown that transforming the capital into a novel, innovative and democratic Greater London National Park City would enhance well-being, sustainability and prosperity in the metropolitan environment.

This action brief enquires into the transformative potential of the Greater London National Park City Partnership and lays out recommendations for policies and practices that the partnership could take forward in its endeavour to turn London into a more livable, workable and sustainable city. It draws upon the GLNPC *Green Paper* (Raven-Ellison, 2015), the conclusions of the "Reimagining London" event held on 24 February at the Southbank Centre attended by 600 delegates from private, policy and community sectors, and the follow-up public consultation process. We tested the vision for the GLNPC as set out in the *Green Paper* against the key concerns and challenges discussed by the stakeholders. On this basis we formulated five key imperatives for the GLNPC: (i) to capitalise and strengthen rather than compete with existing organisations and initiatives on the ground; (ii) to secure new funds rather than divert existing resources for ecosystem services and environmental initiatives; (iii) to balance environmental

stewardship with socio-economic inclusion concerns; (iv) to influence and co-shape existing governance networks without compromising the grassroots nature of the GLNPC; and (v) to build synergies between creating demand and stimulating supply of green and healthy environments.

We tested the vision and the imperatives described above for action against the IGP's prosperity framework, determined the key opportunities the GLNPC presents for turning London in a sustainable prosperous city, and elaborated pathways for putting these opportunities into motion. In doing so, we identified five dimensions of sustainable prosperity within which the GLNPC can bring socio-environmental benefits. These include: (i) urban environmental sustainability, (ii) health, (iii) connected diversity, (iv) socio-economic-inclusion and (v) political empowerment and transformative creativity.

This Action Brief brings together the discussion of these benefits. Section 1 explains how the GLNPC can contribute to the five key dimensions of sustainable prosperity; Section 2 offers six key transversal recommendations; and Section 3 outlines further considerations relating to specific dimensions of prosperity.

1. The Dimensions of the GLNPC

We argue that the GLNPC can capitalise on London's natural capital and on passion and creativity of its communities to deliver significant contributions to sustainable prosperity and to the ways in which Londoners think about and interact with the environment. These contributions fall into five key dimensions of prosperity.

1.1. Urban environmental sustainability

The GLNPC offers a potential locale for peaceful co-existence and interaction between people with fauna, flora and other forms of life in a dynamic non-equilibrium urban ecosystem. The partnership between policy and practice communities can enable both conservation of existing natural heritage and proactive approaches to biodiversity that will mobilise the creation of new intensive built/natural systems of metropolitan nature (see: Gandy 2003, Swyngedouw 1996 and 2006). While its grassroots provenance predisposes the GLNPC to shape nature-oriented daily forms of social practice, its support among policy makers will make it capable of influencing infrastructure provision. Potential synergies between the demand-side and supply-side interventions will embrace not only an increasing need for and delivery of 'green' and 'blue' recreational

environments, but also sustainable forms of mobility and transportation, and energy- and resource-efficient forms of consumer goods production and circulation (Shove 2014, Shove and Walker 2014). This, in turn, will be a crucial contribution of the GLNPC to the delivery of London's ambitious decarbonisation targets. The GLNPC can be understood here as a bottom-linked platform (see: Garcia et al 2009, Swyngedouw and Moulaert 2010, Andersson et al 2013) for mutual learning and co-production of sustainable urban landscapes where novel ways of exploring and knowing shape behavioural change and infrastructure provision.

1.2. Health

The changes that the GLNPC could potentially bring about to demand-side and supply-side interventions will include the provision and increased use of new green infrastructures, promotion of active forms of travel and reduced exposure of Londoners to air, water and soil pollutants, and climate change impacts. While clinical evidence suggests that the assessment of impacts of both use of green spaces and sustainable lifestyles require complex multi-variable analyses where direct relations are difficult to measure, numerous studies imply health benefits of physical activity on both physical and mental health (see: Lovell et al 2014, White et al 2013, Lee and Maheswaran 2010, Takano et al 2002, Coombes et al 2010, Bell et al 2008). Hence, it is expected that initiatives pursued and supported by the GLNPC – if undertaken in conjunction with NHS interventions – can help in addressing obesity, cardiovascular disease, diabetes and mental health impacts of social isolation, amongst others.

1.3. Connected diversity

The GLNPC has great potential for connecting individuals, groups, communities and organisations through co-production of space, affirmative action and cross-cultural learning. The GLNPC's connected diversity agenda involves bringing different people, species and places together in new, meaningful ways. While public parks where different forms of co-presence and casual interaction take place are signatures of peaceful multicultural societies (see: Low et al 2005, Wolch 2007, Sadler et al 2010, Kaźmierczak 2013, Van den Broeck et al 2013), everyday encounter between strangers in public space rarely results in forms of meaningful contact and connection (Valentine 2008, Amin 2002). The GLNPC gives a chance to take the agenda of connected diversity forward by supporting people from different walks of life to collectively design, materially produce, manage and own new forms of metropolitan nature. In a time when increasing cultural

heterogeneity is often construed as a problem and met with hegemonic discourses of controlled multiculturalism (Dukes and Musterd 2012, Miciukiewicz et al 2012), new green 'contact zones' (Askins and Pain 2011) and 'spaces of inter-dependence' (Amin 2002), such as urban farms or community gardens, provide a unique opportunity for rethinking and redoing togetherness from below. On the one hand, the public desire for green and healthy environments constitutes one of the enclaves of unproblematically shared values. On the other, multi-vocal horticultural knowledges and skills evade established professional hierarchies that characterise the domain of capitalist production (i.e. intensive farming). The GLNPC can champion spaces where differences between class and ethnic cultures are not only visible and celebrated but also horizontally integrated into new circuits of economic production. As such the GLNPC has a potential not only for bringing about higher levels of bonding and bridging capital in a place, but also for rethinking the ways in which social cohesion is conceptualised and actioned upon.

1.4. Socio-economic inclusion

The GLNPC will support and scale up creative and productive micro-practices that contribute to turning London into a more sustainable and prosperous city. For the GLNPC to succeed, symbolic ownership of place(s) among different communities needs to be matched with variegated forms of economic ownership. This means creation of a plural economy that can address challenges of socio-spatial deprivation and environmental (in)justice through: (i) democratisation of access to land, knowledge, skills, employment, affordable goods and services and (ii) enabling economic activity across socio-economic strata and urban territory. The GLNPC gives a chance to transform London into a Continuous Productive Urban Landscape (CPUL) (Bohn and Viljoen 2005) where networks of multi-functional urban infrastructures connect the modern urban capitalist economy to novel economic formations, such as ecosystem service economy, shared economy and circular economy. Operational objectives of the GLNPC will include, for example, supporting local affordable food produce, distributing this food to local schools, and bringing local agricultural production and distribution chains together with training and employment schemes for young people (see: Tornaghi 2014). However, the GLNPC's socio-economic inclusion agenda needs to go beyond securing equal access to 'new green economies' for different groups in the socio-economic strata. Paradoxically, in real estate capital-driven cities like London in particular, attending to environmental justice problems of deprived neighbourhoods may lead to environmental gentrification,

whereby populations that were meant to benefit from green space improvements face displacement and further exclusion (Byrne 2012, Checker 2011, Dooling 2009, Heynen and Perkis 2005, Wolch et al 2014). Hence, the GLNPC should prompt broad discussions of how real estate capital can best permeate through the city not only to secure green and healthy environments in different socio-spatial locales, but also to deliver new housing stock and create employment opportunities. Amongst others, such debates may bring together questions of greening with questions of urban density to negotiate solutions whereby intensification of natural qualities of existing green spaces and greening of built/infrastructural environments could be coupled with release of land (e.g. low quality greenbelt areas) for genuinely 'affordable' housing.

1.5. Political empowerment and transformative creativity

The GLNPC can play a strategic role in embedding the above-mentioned aims within London's governance networks. It will be capable of voicing the claims of communities on the ground and providing leverage to initiatives they pursue. In particular, the partnership can bring together individual experts, organisations, authorities and businesses with legal, planning and environmental expertise to offer support to: (i) proactive initiatives of local groups who elaborate Neighbourhood Plans or wish to acquire and manage environmental assets and, (ii) initiatives of local communities and groups of interest who wish to exercise their right to dissent against unfavourable forms of urban development. Hence, the GLNPC can help to embed the principles of 'recognitional justice' and 'justice of capabilities' (see: Fraser 1995, Nussbaum 2000, Dean 2009, Schlossberg 2007, Cook and Swyngedouw 2012) in the existing governance frameworks through playing a facilitative and supportive role for its members, clients and communities in need. More broadly, the GLNPC, as a forum for dialogue, innovation and mediation, can enhance the capability of particular communities and the city as a whole to agonise over main values and pathways to achieve them (Mouffe 2000a and 2000b, Hillier 2003). It can 'expose, propose and politicise' (Marcuse, 2009) the opportunities and challenges of New Localism. In other words, the GLNPC offers an opportunity to reimagine what a 'city' and what a 'national park' are, and what they can become. By doing so it can help mayors, councils and citizens to think differently about their cities.

The remainder of this Action Brief looks at how the potentials of the GLNPC can be put into motion.

2. Key recommendations

2.1. *GLNPC Charter*

The founding partners of the Greater London National Park City should develop and sign a charter outlining the values and recommended practices to which the GLNPC's institutional and non-institutional members and third parties will then be encouraged to voluntarily subscribe. The GLNPC Charter will serve as: (i) a signature of identity and repository of the values of the GLNPC, (ii) as evidence of and a safeguard for partners' commitment to delivering on agreed promises, (iii) an ethical, institutional and technical guide to partners and all third parties involved with the GLNPC; (iv) a platform for continuous negotiation of the highest standards of conduct reflecting the changing opportunities and challenges of the GLNPC.

It is recommended that the GLNPC Charter sets out:

- i. the **values** shared by the signatories;
- ii. a **vision** of the Greater London National Park City – a vision for a sustainable and prosperous global city where well-preserved green and blue spaces alongside new cutting edge green infrastructures and technologies form a synergic whole with other spaces, are enjoyed by all Londoners, and actively contribute to the formation of a prosperous, diverse and connected metropolitan society.
- iii. a **strategy** indicating how the vision will be pursued by the GLNPC in the next one, five and ten years
- iv. a **statement** laying out standards of conduct and a set of recommended practices
- v. a **bank of good practices** explaining conditions of applicability and a set of contextual sensitivities
- vi. **channels of support** (legal, financial, technical) that the GLNPC and its members will offer to support broader communities of practice and diverse stakeholders in pursuing the vision for sustainable and prosperous London.

Recommended practices can involve a wide variety of standards including, amongst others: (i) environmental, aesthetic, social and technical quality of spaces; (ii) processes through which green and blue spaces should be designed, delivered and managed; (iii) envisaged ways in which 'metropolitan nature' should relate to other forms and elements of the urban environment; (iv) rights of local communities and groups of interest to co-

shape green spaces; (iv) socially-just rights to the use of space and to exploitation of land for agricultural and other purposes; (v) broader standards for bringing environmental sustainability together with enjoyment, prosperity and connectivity for all Londoners. Recommended practices may also involve (i) for eco-system services providers: paying living wage, using local workforce, offering volunteering and vocational schemes to young people, participatory planning approaches, community management learning programmes; and (ii) for developers: participatory planning, delivery and management of public space schemes beyond Section 106.

The GLNPC Charter should become a **document in motion**. The GLNPC is expected to be constantly gaining its momentum and scope of action, and its membership is likely to expand far beyond the initial list of signatories of the Charter. Likewise, the opportunities and challenges for London's prosperity will be changing. Hence the IGP recommends that the Charter is updated and refreshed on an annual basis. Turned into a document in motion, the Charter will serve as a tool for collaborative creativity and collective action. Not only will it stimulate future-building, but – together with supplementary documentation – it will also serve as a means for recording the history of the GLNPC and the National Park City concept.

GLNPC members should subscribe to the Charter on a **voluntary basis**. This subscription could be encouraged through endorsement of the Charter and support given to its values and standards of conduct by strategic partners (e.g. London councils). Such an institutional architecture aims at finding a middle ground between those advocates of the GLNPC who wish the GLNPC to attain planning powers and those who do not wish to pursue such a route. Claims to planning powers at this stage of the development of the GLNPC are not recommended for two reasons. Firstly, such claims are not very realistic in the nearest future; and secondly, and more importantly, pursuing ambitions to gaining planning powers could retrench the positive and passionate grassroots spirit that has made the GLNPC a real possibility and that helped it to gain its momentum. At this early stage of the development the GLNPC should build aspirations, create connections and offer support to innovative initiatives rather than regulate and control.

That said, the Charter might become a **pathway to planning impacts**, and thus become a progressive solution for those who would like to see the regulatory role of the GLNPC. Once successful and broadly applauded, the Charter or its parts may be adopted by a council in or outside London as a basis for/contribution to supplementary planning

documents. At a later stage, potentially, some influential and widely accepted elements of the Charter might be taken up by interested local authorities and brought into statutory planning process through incorporation into Local Plans.

2.2. *The Natural Capital Fund*

The GLNPC should set up the Natural Capital Fund, a financial arm that will deposit all funds of the National Park City. The Natural Capital Fund (NCF) could be capitalised with financial philanthropic donations and endowments from local authorities, governmental departments, quangos, and the private sector. It is advised that the NCF will be capable of:

- i. depositing funds
- ii. distributing small grant funding to registered organisations, individuals and ad hoc groups (e.g. seed funding for community green space improvement programmes)
- iii. offering low interest micro-loans to individuals and ad-hoc groups
- iv. offering access to bigger loans (and matched funding) at commercial rates
- v. administering crowdfunding
- vi. administering special-purpose investments from private companies.

2.3. *GLNPC online platform (website and app)*

The GLNPC should set aside an amount of money to develop an attractive well-linked website and a mobile phone application that would be updated real-time to provide information on 'green initiatives' (a *Green Time Out*), increase the connectivity between dispersed 'green organisations' and support novel forms of knowing, learning, doing and enjoying a sustainable prosperous city. This platform will aim at increasing capabilities and scaling-up the impacts of existing initiatives by bringing together and networking different organisations, groups and individuals.

In particular, this platform could deliver on the following objectives:

- i. to inform the partners and the public about programmes, opportunities and activities of the GLNPC itself
- ii. to serve as an information entry point about existing green spaces, services and activities (*Green Time Out*) organised by a broad range of partners and third parties

- iii. to stimulate formation of new groups around certain initiatives
- iv. to stimulate networking and knowledge exchange between different groups enjoying the same spaces and undertaking similar projects
- v. to foster and mainstream behavioural change towards more sustainable lifestyles and consuming patterns among Londoners through consolidation of own and partners' campaigns, publicising indicators such as Greendex, and development of integrative sustainability apps.

The online platform will enable users to share information and exchange ideas in novel ways. Users should be able to upload information about events, form small purpose-oriented groups and exchange ideas. The administrator should both seek for and upload relevant pieces of information, moderate users' contributions, and establish the presence of the GLNPC on and through other online services (such as Facebook, Twitter, Meetup, Time Out, etc.).

2.4. Pilot 'proactive mediation' project

The GLNPC have decided to play a connective role between local communities, grassroots organisations and local government in their drive to make Greater London an environmentally sustainable urban community. The practice of mediation will therefore be embedded in everything the GLNPC does, since different groups typically harbour diverse and sometimes conflicting agendas. There is a potential for this practice to become more prominent as a dedicated service in tackling the perceived democratic deficit of urban planning. As the GLNPC begins to consider its activities and outputs for Greater London, proactive mediation ought to be put forward as a potential project, which the GLNPC can design, pilot and implement, thereby demonstrating its capacity to experiment with new, if not radical, means of delivering inclusive sustainable prosperity.

Proactive mediation ought to be adaptable to the circumstances and needs of the local community, and could therefore be run by diverse range of experts. It should, however, involve local communities, stakeholders such as developers and local planning authorities, and local businesses. Several academics and academic-led organisations already do similar work on a voluntary basis for certain communities, having conducted research in the area (see e.g. Just Space).

One way that potential mediators might be employed or commissioned by the GLNPC is to invite individuals and organisations that sign up to the GLNPC Charter to register as a mediator. Demonstration of commitment to the Charter or values of the GLNPC could allow registered mediators to access small funds within the Natural Capital Fund for workshops. The aim and value of the GLNPC proactive mediation programme is to provide an alternative to the consultancies managed by developers themselves.

2.5. *Mobile Green Hub*

To promote the work of the GLNPC, it is recommended that a Mobile Green Hub might be designed to move around London to explain the work of the GLNPC, host a series of public events, disseminate best practice, offer work and exhibition space to localised initiatives on the ground, and promote active and sustainable lifestyles.

A potential set-up can involve purchase of four convertible containers that could be 'parked' on local roads in different neighbourhoods and moved on a monthly basis (see e.g. R-URBAN Recyclab, Wick on Wheels).

These containers could host:

- i. **an information point** & mobile rangers headquarters
- ii. **a food growing lab** offering tools, support and advice to local urban farming initiatives
- iii. **a circular economy accelerator** hosting bike repair shops, makers' spaces and specialised recycling spaces
- iv. **a mini-exhibition space** for exhibitions, films and installations promoting initiatives undertaken by or in collaboration with the GLNPC in other parts of London
- v. **a 'free' container** rented at no cost for shorter periods of time to anyone who wishes to undertake any activity that is in line with the values of the GLNPC.

2.6. *GLNPC Cultural Programme*

A cross-London programme of cultural work, performances, and interventions inspired by the ideas and values of the GLNPC should be developed. This programme, which could be undertaken in collaboration with major institutions like the Barbican, Sadler's Wells and Southbank Centre, as well as smaller theatre companies such as Yard Theatre in Hackney Wick, can be used to narrate the history of the National Park City and

promote it among broader audiences. The cultural programme need not be a pedagogic or dissemination project: it can be used to feed back experiences and knowledge of Greater London's green spaces to inform the direction and governance of the GLNPC. The London Imaginaries Wall at the "Reimagine London" event is a great example of how an interactive and creative activity can be used to generate informative data about people's opinions, ideas and concerns for green space in London.

The GLNPC Cultural Programme ought to be multi-faceted. Taking the Southbank Centre's pre-Election cultural programme as an example, the GLNPC could create engagement with issues of sustainable urbanism within different discourses: an exhibition can be integrated within the same programme as an immersive theatre project; a workshop could disseminate and work through practices discussed in a conference. The GLNPC Cultural Programme is therefore able to appeal to a wide audience. The Cultural Programme can also occur at multiple scales by harnessing the huge pull of an institution like Tate and the community-fostered energy of local initiatives. In doing so, a GLNPC Cultural Programme could disseminate the values and ideas of a sustainable inclusive urbanism to a diverse and transient population as well as engage in the longer term with local communities of practice and place. The smaller-scale community-centered cultural projects could happen more frequently, and piggy-back onto existing programmes or festivals, thereby reducing the costs of organising and hosting events.

A cultural programme is a viable and feasible way of enabling intercultural interaction/connected diversity. It should not, therefore, be conceived *only* as a series of events but also as semi-permanent community architectures. Cultural projects such as the Wick Common Shop run by R-Urban (a mobile shed hosting an archive of materials and documents and basic equipment for recording memories of place) are able to encourage sustained interaction based on common interest and shared sense of place. This project is a strong example of how arts-run projects can involve local communities, make visible local and individual histories and experiences of Greater London, and promote opportunities for inclusive communities. The GLNPC Cultural Programme is therefore a proactive, iterative and creative entity in and of itself.

The GLNPC could integrate the proposed General Assembly of stakeholders for the review of the GLNPC Charter with the cultural programme in a multifunctional space like Southbank Centre. Thus, an annual celebration of the GLNPC's values and an artistic critique could exist in parallel with, and even inform, the Charter's annual review.

3. Further Considerations for Prosperity

3.1. Urban-environmental sustainability

- encourage Londoners to become local biologists, ecologists, and community systems thinkers
- work towards mainstreaming relatively successful local and small-scale innovation into local governments' policies and plans
- lobby for local and national legislation that would recognise the 'Rights of Nature'
- support building ecological corridors across the city that will develop synergies between recreation, conservation of fauna and flora, and climate change mitigation
- map and signpost community-owned technologies and infrastructure
- replace paving with absorbent surfaces where possible
- use community creativity and public engagement programmes to restore, preserve and enhance private gardens.

3.2. Health

- connect green space community initiatives to existing and future NHS interventions that exploit physical activity in addressing obesity, cardiovascular disease, hypertension and social isolation
- use educational activities linked to urban farming to better understand the relationship between agriculture and nutrition, and, by doing so, counteract eating habits leading to obesity and early onset diabetes.

3.3. Connected diversity

- support maintenance of existing and create new green and blue public spaces
- stimulate conversion of grass lawns and unused spaces on modernist estates into socially integrative and productive spaces (such as community gardens and city farms)
- defend local food markets from closure (as reservoirs of cultural heritage and spaces of economic and social exchange)

- engage local communities at all stages of delivery of green community space – planning, design, physical delivery and management – to turn these spaces in places of purposeful and meaningful interaction
- work together with schools, employers, community centres and other institutionalised spaces of multi-ethnic interdependence
- capitalise on spatial and temporal synergies by arranging engagement activities alongside religious and cultural festivals
- secure the provision of tools and outdoors-appropriate clothing when working with deprived communities.

3.4. Socio-economic inclusion

- secure new funds for new ecosystem services rather than divert stretched local authority resources from one pot to another
- release underused land for urban agriculture
- support urban agriculture as an integrated system of economic production, from agricultural land-use planning and conversion, through food growing to distribution of the produce to customers
- create a programme of support, experience-sharing and celebratory events for urban agriculture initiatives on council estates
- broker solutions for start-up social and for-profit enterprises
- use capital endowments to support employment, economic entrepreneurship, vocational training and voluntary work opportunities for young people
- create channels to integrate eco-system start-ups, new workforce and novel ideas with the mainstream economy
- privilege support to initiatives that benefit less affluent neighbourhoods and communities
- support local fuel markets
- identify the network of London makerspaces which can support local manufacturing, and repair/repurposing activities.

3.5. Political empowerment & transformative creativity

- use the Charter to champion, disseminate and promote best practice and sensitize business and policy communities to natural environment-related aspects of London's sustainable prosperity
- play intermediary roles between grassroots organisations, local authorities, business and governmental bodies
- design and implement a pilot 'proactive mediation' project that would strengthen the capacity of Neighbourhood Forums to dissent environmentally and socially unsustainable development projects
- work alongside local authorities to inform, evidence and influence progressive environmental policy
- employ/commission planning consultants to support neighbourhood planning initiatives
- provide institutional leverage for recreational, energy and arable land assets transfers to community groups (through Community Right to Bid, Community Right to Challenge, and Community Right to Reclaim Land schemes)
- support local communities and ad hoc groups pursuing initiatives allied with values of GLNPC through grants and loans from the Natural Capital Fund and help in securing suitable external funding
- use volunteering schemes to provide technical support (mapping, conceptual design, document preparation) to Neighbourhood Development Plans.

References

- Amin A. (2002) Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity, *Environment and Planning A* 34(6): 959-980.
- Andersson J., Delica K. and Frandsen M. (2013) From 'book container' to community centre, in: Moularet F., MacCallum D., Mehmood A. and Hamdouch A., *The International Handbook of Social Innovation. Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Askins K. and Pain R. (2011) Contact zones: participation, materiality, and the messiness of interaction, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29: 803-821.
- Bell J.F., Wilson J.S., Liu G.U (2008) Neighbourhood greenness and 2-year changes in body mass index of children and youth, *American Journal Preventative Medicine* 35(6): 547-53.
- Bohn K. and Viljoen A. (2005) New space for old space: An urban vision, in: A. Viljoen, K. Bohn and J. Howe (eds) *Continuous Productive Urban Landscapes: Designing Urban Agriculture for Sustainable Cities*, pp.3-9. Oxford and Burlington, MA: Elsevier Architectural Press.
- Byrne J. (2012) When green is White: The cultural politics of race, nature and social exclusion in a Los Angeles urban national park, *Geoforum* 43(3): 595-611.
- Checker M. (2011) Wiped out by the Greenwave: Environmental gentrification and the paradoxical politics of urban sustainability, *City and Society* 23: 210-229.
- Cook I. and Swyngedouw E. (2012) Cities, Social Cohesion and the Environment: Towards a Future Research Agenda, *Urban Studies* 49(9): 1959-1979.
- Coombes E., Jones P.J., Hillsdon M. (2010) The relationship of physical activity and overweight to objectively measured green space accessibility and use, *Social Science & Medicine*. 70(6): 816-22.
- Dean, H. (2009) Critiquing capabilities: the distractions of a beguiling concept. *Critical social policy* 29 (2), pp. 261-273.
- Dooling S. (2009) Ecological gentrification: A research agenda exploring justice in the city, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33: 621-639.
- Dukes T. and Musterd S. (2012) Towards social cohesion: Bridging national integration rhetoric and local practice: The case of the Netherlands, *Urban Studies* 49(9): 1981-1997.

- Fraser, N. (1995) From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Post-Socialist' Age, *New Left Review* 1(212): 68-93.
- Gandy M. (2003) *Concrete and Clay: Reworking Nature in New York City*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.
- Garcia M., Pradel M. & Eizaguirre S. (2009) 'Social Innovation and Governance: initiatives and processes' paper presented at 'Changing Cultures of Competitiveness' ESRC Seminar Series (Theme 6: Social Exclusion and Socially Creative Spaces), Newcastle, 13 July 2009.
- Heynen N. and Perkins H.A. (2005) Scalar dialectics in green: Urban private property and the contradictions of the neoliberalization of nature, *Capitalism. Nature. Socialism* 16: 99–113.
- Hillier J. (2003) Agonizing over consensus: why Habermasian ideals cannot be 'real', *Planning Theory* Vol 2(1): 37–59.
- Kaźmierczak A. (2013) The contribution of local parks to neighbourhood social ties, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 109(1): 31-44.
- Lee A. and Maheswaran, R. (2010) The health benefits of urban green spaces: a review of the evidence, *International Journal of Public Health* 33(2): 212-222.
- Lovell R. Husk K., Bethel A. and Garside R. (2014) What are the health and well-being impacts of community gardening for adults and children: a mixed method systematic review protocol, *Environmental Evidence* 3(20): 1-13.
- Low S., Taplin D. and Scheld S. (2005) *Rethinking Urban Parks: Public Space and Cultural Diversity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Marcuse P. (2009) From critical urban theory to the right to the city, *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory Policy, Action* 13 (2-3): 185-196.
- Mayor of London (2015) London Infrastructure Plan 2050 Update. London: Mayor of London
- Miciukiewicz K., Moulaert F., Novy A., Musterd S. and Hillier J. (2012) Problematizing Cities and Social Cohesion: a transdisciplinary endeavour, *Urban Studies* 49(9): 1855-1872.
- Mouffe C. (2000a) *The Democratic Paradox*, London: Verso.
- Mouffe C. (2000b) Deliberative Democracy and Agonistic Pluralism. Political Science Series 72, Vienna Institute for Advanced Studies
- Nussbaum, M. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Raven-Ellison D. (2015) *Greater London National Park City Green Paper*, available at: <http://www.greaterlondonnationalpark.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Greater-London-National-Park-City-Green-Paper-Final.pdf> [accessed: 10.05. 2015].
- Sadler J., Bates A., Hale J. and James P. (2010) Bringing cities alive: the importance of urban green spaces for people and biodiversity, in: K. J. Gaston (ed.) *Urban Ecology*, pp.230-260. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlosberg, D. 2007. *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shove E. (2014) Putting Practice into Policy: Reconfiguring Questions of Consumption and Climate Change, *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences* 9 (4): 415–29.
- Shove E. and Walker G. (2014) What Is Energy For? Social Practice and Energy Demand, *Theory, Culture and Society* 31 (5): 41–58.
- Swyngedouw E. (1996), The city as a hybrid: On nature, society and cyborg urbanisation, *Capitalism. Nature. Socialism* 7(1): 65–80.
- Swyngedouw E. (2006) Metabolic urbanization: The making of cyborg cities, in: N. Heynen, M. Kaika, E. Swyngedouw (eds.) *In the Nature of Cities*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Swyngedouw E. and Moulaert F. (2010) Socially Innovative Projects, Governance Dynamics and Urban Change, in: Gonzalez, S., Martinelli, F., Moulaert, F. and Swyngedouw E. (2010) *Can Neighbourhoods Save the City? Community Development and Social Innovation*. London: Routledge.
- Takano T, Nakamura K, Watanabe M. (2002) Urban residential environments and senior citizens' longevity in megacity areas: the importance of walkable green spaces, *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 56(12): 913-8.
- Tornaghi C. (2014) Critical geography of urban agriculture, *Progress in Human Geography* 38(4): 551-567.
- Valentine G. (2008) Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter, *Progress in Human Geography* 32(3): 323–337.
- Van den Broeck P., Abdelwahab M., Miciukiewicz K. and Hillier J. (2013) On Analysing Space From a Strategic-Relational Institutional Perspective: The Cultural Park for Children in Cairo', *International Planning Studies*, 18(3-4): 321-341.

- White M.P., Alcock I., Wheeler B.W. and Depledge M.H. (2013) Would you be happier living in a greener urban area? A fixed-effects analysis of panel data, *Psychological Science* 24(6): 920-8.
- Wolch J. (2007) Green urban worlds, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97(2): s. 373–384.
- Woch J., Byrne and Newell J.P. (2014) Urban green space, public health, and environmental justice: The challenge of making cities 'just green enough', *Landscape and Urban Planning* 125: 234-244.