

Type  
Guide Book

Section  
Case Study Spa Fields,  
Islington Youth Shelter, Fluid

Date  
November 2011

Author  
Rowena Hay

Editor  
James Parkinson

Published by  
Royal Institute  
of British Architects

---

**RIBA Guide to Localism: Opportunities for Architects**  
Part 2: Getting community engagement right

---

A guide for design professionals in understanding their role in community engagement, in the context of the new Localism Agenda.

# Guide to Localism Opportunities for architects

Part two: Getting community  
engagement right





Internet  
Cafe style  
with computer  
access to say  
www.google.com

YES PLEASE

- Drama classes
- Poetry readings
- Play readings
- Book clubs
- Performances

Please try and make sure that this doesn't become a facility just targeted at middle class people, but does cater for the range of social groups in the area. There is a huge need for facilities for young people in the area.

I used to have a stall for 5 yrs opposite the church, and used the

MORE POLICE  
ON THE BEAT  
OR  
ON BICYCLES.  
Especially Summer  
Evenings.

Please [redacted] ions about yourself. We want to [redacted] representative' of the area.

**How old are you?**

**What sex are you?**

What is your ethnic background? (Fill in number based on categories below)

Are you registered disabled? (Write 'yes' or 'no.')

Do you live or work in Clerkenwell?  
(Write 'live', 'work', 'both' or 'neither'.)

What should happen there?  
How should it look and feel?

Come along and have your say!

Activities for a  
mixed age-range  
to encourage  
ownership



# Foreword

**‘Architects have a role to play as enablers of successful community engagement.’**



Angela Brady  
RIBA President 2011–2013

Localism should play to the strengths of the architectural profession. For decades now, many architects have used community engagement and collaborative design techniques as a crucial part of the design process, essential to producing buildings and spaces that meet the needs and future potential of the end user.

Far from being an onerous burden, the introduction of measures such as the new Duty to Consult provides both new opportunities and new responsibilities. There will be a new opportunity for communities to shape their built environment whilst at the same time placing a responsibility on developers to genuinely engage in the process and therefore make it more difficult for banal, poor quality developments to get through the planning process in the future.

The formalisation of processes such as community consultation and brief development in statute should also be a signal to architects that their skills are valuable, that they should look to engage them in new ways and look to capitalise more on the services they provide. This document intends to outline the role architects can play as enablers of successful community engagement; by introducing key principles and tactics associated with best practice and demonstrating how the profession can emerge as an integral leader in this field.

# Introduction

---

**‘The time has come to disperse power more widely in Britain today’<sup>1</sup>**

---

Localism is the driving principle underpinning the Government’s changes to the policy framework for planning, housing, regeneration and economic growth. The proposals involve a radical devolution of responsibilities to the local level, giving new powers and opportunities to councils and communities to plan and design their places. The aim is to drive change at a local level and empower communities with new rights to have more say in the development process.

**This new approach to planning – to managing change in local communities – has profound implications for the working practices of all built environment professionals. Localism requires a shift to partnership approaches with local people, requiring new skills in building effective dialogue and developing a shared understanding of places, their challenges and their potential.**

Architects have exceptional opportunities to use their skills within this new context. They can emerge as integral design enablers and facilitators of localised plan-making, helping communities and local authorities to maximise the potential of their places.

Many practitioners are already doing substantial work in this area; others are actively seeking to develop new skills and capacities in response to the emerging policy proposals.

The aim of this guide, part two of the RIBA’s *Guide to Localism*, is to consider the role architects can play in community engagement by applying their skills creatively. The principles of successful and meaningful community participation within the design process will be introduced and then illustrated through case studies.

Localism needs design professionals to succeed, but the quality of the places created by this new process will be dependent on their ability to appropriately engage with local people and local issues, right from the beginning, designing ‘with’ rather than ‘for’ communities.

The format of this document is intended to guide architects in this process.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister (2010), *Coalition Agreement*. Available at [www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/news/coalition-documents](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/news/coalition-documents)

# Key policy proposals

---

Community engagement skills will be essential with respect to the emerging policy context outlined within the Localism Bill, particularly for projects that are led by developers and community groups. These include housing schemes and developments that will fall under the forthcoming Duty to Consult legislation as well as existing and new community buildings that may be developed or improved through the Community Right to Build and the Community Right to Buy.

## Duty to Consult

Developers will be required to consult with local communities prior to submitting planning applications, so that local people have a chance to comment and suggest changes to developments at an early stage in the project. Ideally this consultation will take the form of meaningful community engagement, so that the needs and aspirations of local people feed into the development from its initiation onwards. Within their proposal developers will need to show how they have consulted with local people, what comments they have received, and how they have taken the comments into account. It is likely that this will be applied to residential developments of over 200 units, or on a site area of four hectares or more, and to non-residential developments providing 10,000 square metres of new floor space or with a site area of two hectares or more.

## Community Right to Build

Local community groups will be allowed to take forward developments for the benefit of their community including housing, local shops and community facilities. If supported by the local people, who will vote on developments through a referendum, schemes will bypass the usual requirements of the planning system. The scheme aims to encourage local people to determine local solutions to problems such as a lack of affordable housing or local amenities through community-led development.

## Community Right to Buy

Local community groups will have the right to bid for (and take over) valued community assets and facilities that are threatened with closure, for example a shop, a local pub, a community centre, or a library. A list of buildings and land that are valued by the local community will be kept by local councils and updated by members of the community. If assets on the list come up for sale, communities will be given extra time to prepare a bid to take them over.

# Contents

---

## Section 1

The role architects play in community engagement  
page 4

## Section 2

The principles of successful community engagement  
page 6

## Section 3

Case studies  
page 8

---

**This guide should be read in conjunction with Part one in this RIBA *Guide to Localism: Neighbourhood planning* which explains the proposed changes to the planning system in detail and suggests some ways in which architects can get involved in neighbourhood planning.**

This guide has been prepared for the RIBA by Rowena Hay and edited by James Parkinson with input and assistance from many practising architects and planners who have supplied case study material and examples from their inspiring work with communities. Our thanks go to them all.

© Royal Institute of British Architects  
November 2011

# Section 1

## The role architects play in community engagement

**'If people are to feel a sense of belonging to the world in which they live, an involvement in the spaces they inhabit is a good starting point'<sup>2</sup>**



2 Blundell Jones, P, Petrescu, D, and Tili, J (2005), *Architecture and Participation*, Abingdon: Spon Press.

3 <http://www.futurecommunities.net/case-studies/byker-estate-newcastle-1967-present>

4 <http://www.segalsselfbuild.co.uk/about.html>

5 <http://www.spatialagency.net/database/community/technicalaid.centres>

6 Established in 1972, Assist is one of the few remaining Community Technical Aid Centres in the country. The practice has, from its early days, worked on participatory design projects with community-led clients, housing associations and cooperatives. Assist work on the basis that architects should be listeners and primarily guide the design process, which they achieve by working in close consultation with stakeholders in the preparation of design briefs, the development of design options and during construction. Through open days, design workshops and planning weekends, Assist work to achieve a point of consensus where all members of a community embrace a shared vision for the design of a new building or plan.

7 Forsyth, L, Pereira, M, Townsend, L, and Edge, M (2009), 'Case studies of organisations with community based practices' in Jenkins, P and Forsyth, L *Architecture, Participation and Society*, London: Routledge.

8 <http://www.spatialagency.net/database/matrix.feminist.design.co-operative>

9 CABE (2004), *Being involved in school design*. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/being-involved-in-school-design>

10 Rural Studio, a design-build enterprise operating from the architecture department at Auburn University in Alabama, USA, aims to teach students about social responsibility in architecture by working with poor communities to build real projects.

<http://apps.cadcauburn.edu/rural-studio/Default.aspx>

The University of Sheffield School of Architecture in the UK has also pioneered a similar 'Live Project' element to diploma education

<http://www.ssoa.group.shef.ac.uk/#panel-1>

Many of the changes proposed as part of the Localism Bill are about getting people involved in the design decisions that shape the look and feel of their neighbourhoods, parks, community buildings and homes. The direct involvement of building users in the design process is not new, and since the 1970s architects have been at the forefront of new approaches to community engagement. Early collaborations between communities and architects formed in reaction to the failures of some modernist planning and architecture, which imposed universal design solutions on communities who had no say, or ownership, over the outcomes. Many architects sought new collaborative ways of working that involved users in the design process through workshops, consultation exercises, and even self-build construction methods. In the 1970s UK participatory design practice was pioneered by projects like Ralph Erskine's Byker Wall in Newcastle, a social housing project that gave local people a say in the design of their new estate,<sup>3</sup> and Walter Segal's self-build housing in Lewisham, which involved residents in the design and construction of their own homes.<sup>4</sup>

This philosophy of participatory design practice, particularly with less affluent members of the community who would not usually be able to afford design services, continued with the establishment of a network of Community Technical Aid Centres in the late 1970s.<sup>5</sup> These include Assist in Glasgow<sup>6</sup>, who provided design and technical advice for the improvements to tenement housing;<sup>7</sup> and a decade later Matrix, a design and research practice that created participatory design methods to develop projects that aimed to respond to the needs of women.<sup>8</sup>

In the last decade there has been a renewed interest in participatory design. The large-scale school rebuilding programme initiated by the last Government has produced many great examples of the successful and productive engagement of students, parents and the wider community in the design process<sup>9</sup> [Kingsdale School page 12]. Many architects have worked directly with community clients to improve community facilities [Castleford Bridge page 8] and have engaged the most excluded groups in projects to improve the public realm [Spa Fields page 10 and Broadway Community Garden page 9]. Housing associations and developers have come to recognise the value of involving current and future residents in the development of housing designs and have employed architects to facilitate this involvement [Graylingwell Park page 9]. There has also been a move within architectural education to increasingly consider community participation as a key part of design studio projects.<sup>10</sup>

**Evidence and experience drawn from participatory design practice points to the fact that a collaborative design process done well not only engages local people in the design of the built environment that they experience everyday, but can also lead to better and more sustainable projects, and to a more collaborative and positive process of change.**

Photo left: Segal Close  
Architectural Press Archive/RIBA Library  
Photographs Collection

Photo right: Byker Wall  
RIBA Library Photographs Collection







## Section 2

# The principles of successful community engagement

**‘The idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you.’<sup>11</sup>**

In the current policy context a lot of lip service is paid to community engagement, which is uncritically accepted as ‘good for you’. However, there are degrees of involvement ranging from token consultation to full community control over decisions as illustrated in Sherry Arnstein’s ‘ladder of citizen participation.’<sup>12</sup> If communities cannot see the impact of their involvement on final outcomes, then community engagement can be an ‘empty and frustrating process for the powerless’<sup>13</sup> and people feel that their contributions are falling on deaf ears. This can very quickly lead to apathy within the participants, often referred to as consultation fatigue, where the community lose enthusiasm for the process. Consultation exercises that are measured by the number of people who attend meetings or amount of surveys returned, remain a ‘window-dressing ritual’ because there is ‘no assurance that community concerns and ideas will be taken into account.’<sup>14</sup> In this type of engagement, all that communities achieve is that ‘they have participated in participation’; all that ‘powerholders achieve is the evidence that they have gone through the required motions of involving ‘those people.’<sup>15</sup>

It is widely understood that successful and meaningful engagement depends upon handing over some element of power to local communities, so that they can have a real say in the decision making process and, therefore, design outcomes. Underpinning this is the notion of trust. People become acutely aware of the difference between manipulation and participation; they know when they are unlikely to get what they want out of a process and once trust is lost, it can be very difficult to regain.

Trust must be earned and can be fostered if a two-way learning relationship (between the community and the design professionals) is established early on. There can then be a collaborative investigation of the issues, requirements and aspirations for a project. If this process is clearly evident in the emerging design strategy, then it is more likely that the community will accept and appreciate the eventual design solution. This will ultimately lead to a design that better fits local needs and fosters a sense of ownership within the community, enhancing civic pride; a key factor in good placemaking.

**A number of principles can be drawn from the practical and academic literature on community participation in the design process, and from the case studies that are presented in this briefing. There is no one way of ‘doing’ community engagement. The following principles offer an approach, for inspiration, rather than a prescriptive method.**

<sup>11</sup> Arnstein, S (1969), ‘A ladder of citizen participation’, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35: 4, 216–224.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.partnerships.org.uk/part/am.htm>

<sup>13</sup> Arnstein, S, ‘A ladder of citizen participation’

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*

---

## Why involve people?

- to create a robust brief and vision that is based on local knowledge and expertise
- to reflect on what the building or site is for
- to bring people together with similar and/or different views to explore options, identify solutions, and avoid future conflicts and opposition
- to create a stronger sense of belonging and ownership over the project
- to raise design aspirations that remain achievable
- to educate people about design and the development process
- to develop mutual learning between all parties involved in the project
- to create an environment that is more responsive to social and environmental change.

## Who to involve?

- people who use, visit, work in, govern, maintain, build and fund the project
- local resident bodies, local businesses and voluntary groups
- people who are too often left out of the design process including young and older people, less affluent communities, black and minority ethnic groups, women, LGBT communities and individuals, as well as people with physical and sensory disabilities
- people who visit the area regularly, such as tourists or people travelling to work.

## When to involve?

- draw up an involvement plan at the outset of the process
- begin involvement at an early stage in the project so that a brief and shared vision can be collaboratively defined
- continue involvement as the design evolves so that ideas, suggestions and changes can be taken on board at key stages
- carry out a post-occupancy evaluation.

## How to involve?

- set clear objectives for engagement and be transparent about the process
- set aside appropriate time and resources
- make sure there are clear benefits from taking part in the process
- let participants set the ground rules for engagement
- raise awareness of opportunities and be transparent about challenges and limitations
- raise awareness, knowledge and skills about design
- use language that is free of jargon and simplify technical terminology
- promote discussion as a listener and guide, rather than identifying definitive solutions
- recognise the importance of ordinary conversations and storytelling
- recognise that one technique or method of engagement will not suit all people in all situations
- hold events in community venues where people feel comfortable and welcome
- provide a crèche or other support facilities that promote inclusive attendance
- hold events at different times of day, and in convenient, local venues to suit different needs
- consider different communication routes to reach people who don't attend events; for example, social media is often a cheap and flexible option.



# Section 3

## Case studies

### Castleford Bridge



Photo: Tim Soar and McDowell + Benedetti

#### Castleford, West Yorkshire Practice: McDowell + Benedetti

Local people were at the heart of the development of Castleford Bridge, which not only links two sides of the town, but also provides a meeting place for local people and visitors that the community can be proud of.

Castleford Bridge was one of a number of community-led design projects developed as part of the town of Castleford's regeneration. The project started with a series of public meetings in bars, clubs and community centres around the town. A simple question was asked: how do you want to see your town improved? One priority that came out of these early conversations was the need to reconnect the town with the River Aire and to provide a new pedestrian bridge to connect 'duck island' – a primarily residential area cut off from the rest of Castleford – with the town centre. Two community champions

were chosen by local people to work on the project and provide an important link between design and regeneration specialists and the local community. As crucial members of the development team they had a key role in determining the selection of the bridge's architect, McDowell + Benedetti, and helped keep regeneration specialists and designers focused on the project aims as defined by the local community. The success of the final scheme owes much to their passion and commitment to the project. The result has been a bridge of considerable architectural merit that reunites the town with its river and provides local people and visitors with some much needed quality public realm where they can relax, meet their friends and enjoy nature. The bridge has become a symbol of positive change for Castleford and a source of pride for the local community.

[www.castlefordheritagetrust.org.uk/](http://www.castlefordheritagetrust.org.uk/)



## Broadway Community Garden

### Tilbury Estate, Essex Practice: Muf architecture/art

Muf architecture/art facilitated a creative engagement process with local people who wanted to transform an underused and dangerous space at the centre of their estate into a community garden for everybody.

The Broadway Community Garden was developed with residents from the Tilbury estate through a 12-week engagement and community art project. The Residents Association wanted to ensure that the community had a sense of ownership over the project and wanted everybody to be involved in making it happen. Muf ran a variety of participatory events, which were held in different community venues to provide different groups on the estate with an opportunity to share their ideas. Instead of running traditional stakeholder meetings, Muf went out to the community and ran informal sessions in local pubs and businesses. Stories about the connection between the local travelling community and horses led to

a number of community events focused on this theme. Children made horse costumes and photographed themselves around the estate. These images were turned into posters which were put up on bus shelters around the local area, allowing local children to share their work with the community, promote the project and make a small but positive change to their surroundings. The final outcome of the engagement process and community art project was a new garden in the estate that included space for younger and older children, as well as an area for horses. During the engagement process, horses had become a symbol of pride and local identity for a community who previously lived in an estate with a bad name, and who had felt neglected and undervalued.<sup>16</sup>

[www.muf.co.uk](http://www.muf.co.uk)

<sup>16</sup> Muf, (2005), 'Rights of common: ownership, participation, risk', in Blundell Jones, P, Petrescu, D, and Till, J, *Architecture and Participation*, Abingdon: Spon Press.  
<http://www.spatialagency.net/database/muf>  
<http://web.archive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/case-studies/broadway-community-garden>

## Graylingwell Park

### Chichester, West Sussex Practice: John Thompson & Partners

Early and sustained involvement of members of the community, using a variety of engagement methods, ensured that local people's priorities were central to the design of this new mixed-use development.

John Thompson & Partners were commissioned to engage the community in the design of a new residential and commercial development in Chichester. The process was initiated at the pre-planning stage so that local people had a real say in the development of proposals and options. At a Community Planning Weekend a plan for the area was developed through hands-on design workshops involving the community and the design team. A set of core priorities was agreed – the need to retain and celebrate the site's history, to meet high environmental standards, to provide community space for all ages, to offer a mix of housing types and tenures and to establish a Community Development Trust to manage the site post-completion. Ideas put forward by the community have been integrated into the design, with the development of a cultural hub to provide facilities for local artists and designers, and the retention of historic buildings on site for community use, including a new 'people's pub' in a listed farmhouse. To ensure that genuine dialogue with the community was sustained, other engagement methods were also used, including a regular community forum, a newsletter, a website to keep everyone up to date, and focus groups to address specific concerns such as arts, culture and the development of a zero-carbon strategy.

[www.jtp.co.uk/](http://www.jtp.co.uk/)





## Spa Fields

### Islington, London Practice: Park Life/Fluid with students from London Metropolitan University

This participatory design project saw the transformation of a much needed but neglected green space, into a popular park that accommodates the diverse needs of the local community.

A range of engagement techniques were used in order to involve different parts of the community in the redesign of Spa Fields, a small park located in a densely populated part of Islington. The park serves a diverse community including office workers, local teenagers and young families. Participatory exercises focused on the individual needs of these different groups, particularly women and young people. The Women's Design Service facilitated the engagement of local women, who as a result highlighted the safety concerns that stopped them using the park. Their input led to a number of design changes

leading to a safer and more welcoming park for everyone, including the addition of new entrances, safer and more visible routes through the space, as well as a children's play area that is not cut off from the rest of the park.<sup>17</sup> Young people were also actively engaged in the design and construction of new youth shelters. The architecture practice Fluid and students from London Metropolitan University facilitated formal engagement events at the local youth centre and also spoke to young people on their own turf in places where they congregated with their friends. In collaboration with the design team young people made key decisions about the purpose of the shelters, where they should be located and the materials used. As a result young people have their own space within the park redevelopment, feel respected because they were asked to be involved and have a sense of ownership over the shelters, which they look after.<sup>18</sup>

[www.fluidoffice.com](http://www.fluidoffice.com)

<sup>17</sup> CABE. (2008), *Inclusion by design*. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/inclusion-by-design>  
<http://www.parklifelondon.com/spa-fields.html>

<sup>18</sup> Fluid, (2005), 'Your place, or mine..? A study of participatory design, youth, public space and ownership', in Blundell Jones, P, Petrescu, D, and Till, J., *Architecture and Participation*, Abingdon: Spon Press.



Photo: Fluid



## Homes for Older People

### Camden, London Practice: Niall McLaughlin Architects

A thoughtful and sensitive consultation process engaged older people, including those with dementia, in the development of a design strategy for Camden care homes to meet residents' needs and aspirations.

Niall McLaughlin Architects were commissioned to prepare a feasibility study and designs for two new care homes to meet the current and future needs of frail older people in Camden. Three workshops were facilitated by the practice and informed the development of an aspirational brief reflecting the needs and hopes of residents including those at various stages of dementia, front-line caring staff and care home managers. At the first workshop,

cameras were handed out so participants could take photos of things they wanted to be included in their care homes. These photos were turned into postcards and circulated to residents who wrote comments on the back that were – according to the design team – ‘demanding, challenging and often moving’. The second workshop was held in two existing care homes to find out what worked and what didn’t for staff and residents. Large-scale models were made on which comments and observations could be recorded, and local historians and residents shared memories about each site. The designers also spent time immersed in care homes, including overnight stays to learn about the day-to-day running of the homes and the daily pattern of life for the residents. In the third workshop participants arranged pieces of furniture within bedroom,

bathroom and living room spaces that had been taped out on the floor. Input and opinions about the size of spaces, arrangement of furniture and location of windows were recorded. A document in the form of a scrapbook entitled *What You Told Us* was produced to record all the accumulated ideas from the consultation; key themes that emerged included the importance of mobility and social interaction to the well-being of residents. The design strategy responded to these priorities through a series of social spaces, gardens and courtyards where older people may wander freely, return ‘home’ easily and feel part of the public life of their community, whatever their level of independence.

[www.niallmclaughlin.com](http://www.niallmclaughlin.com)



Images: Niall McLaughlin Architects



## Kingsdale School

### East Dulwich, London Practice: dRMM

The extensive involvement of students, staff and the wider school community in the redevelopment of this previously run-down building provided a unique opportunity to set a new educational vision for the school.

dRMM worked with a cross-disciplinary team that included an educational psychologist, an education researcher and performance artist to facilitate an innovative participatory process from brief development, through design, construction and post-completion phases of this school refurbishment. Various engagement techniques were used during the one-year consultation period including interviews, workshops, seminars, questionnaires and meetings with staff, students and parents. Creative sessions and visits to other inspiring buildings and projects ran alongside

the more formal process. The design team built real-size models of different rooms and spaces so that children and adults could understand the design and make decisions about various options, including materials and colours.<sup>19</sup> The design was developed alongside a vision for the educational future of the school, which included the integration of the built environment into the curriculum, changes in the structure of the school day, and consideration of the role the school could play in the wider community. As a result of this thorough and creative engagement, project staff and students now have a sense of pride and ownership over their new school. There has been a reduction in staff turnover, reduced levels of vandalism, increased use of school facilities by the wider community and students results have improved.<sup>20</sup>

[www.drmm.co.uk](http://www.drmm.co.uk)



<sup>19</sup> Forsyth, L. Pereira, M. Townsend, L. and Edge, M. (2009), Case studies of social participation in different building types. In Jenkins, P and Forsyth, L. *Architecture, Participation and Society*. London: Routledge.

<sup>20</sup> Case study taken from CABE, (2004), *Being involved in school design*. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/being-involved-in-school-design>



Photos: Alex de Rijke

## Links and resources

---

Architecture Centre Network

[www.architecturecentre.net/docs/home/](http://www.architecturecentre.net/docs/home/)

Asset Transfer Unit

<http://atu.org.uk/>

Association for community design

[www.communitydesign.org/](http://www.communitydesign.org/)

The Building Futures Game

[www.buildingfutures.org.uk/projects/building-futures/the-building-futures-game](http://www.buildingfutures.org.uk/projects/building-futures/the-building-futures-game)

Centre for Accessible Environments

[www.cae.org.uk/](http://www.cae.org.uk/)

Community Land Trusts

[www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/home](http://www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/home)

Community Planning

[www.communityplanning.net/](http://www.communityplanning.net/)

Design Council CABE

[www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/cabe/](http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/cabe/)

The Glass-House Community Led Design

[www.theglasshouse.org.uk/](http://www.theglasshouse.org.uk/)

Groundwork

[www.groundwork.org.uk/](http://www.groundwork.org.uk/)

Helen Hamlyn Centre for Design

[www.hhc.rca.ac.uk/](http://www.hhc.rca.ac.uk/)

Landscape Institute Spaceshaper

[www.landscapeinstitute.org/Spaceshaper/inaction/index.html](http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/Spaceshaper/inaction/index.html)

Locality

<http://locality.org.uk/>

Meanwhile project

[www.meanwhile.org.uk/](http://www.meanwhile.org.uk/)

NESTA Compendium for the Civic Economy

[www.nesta.org.uk/assets/features/compendium\\_for\\_the\\_civic\\_economy](http://www.nesta.org.uk/assets/features/compendium_for_the_civic_economy)

People and participation

[www.peopleandparticipation.net/display/Involve/Home](http://www.peopleandparticipation.net/display/Involve/Home)

The Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment

[www.princes-foundation.org/](http://www.princes-foundation.org/)

RUDI

[www.rudi.net/pages/16651](http://www.rudi.net/pages/16651)

Rural Studio

<http://apps.cadc.auburn.edu/rural-studio/Default.aspx>

Sheffield School of Architecture – Live Projects

[www.ssoa.group.shef.ac.uk/#panel-1](http://www.ssoa.group.shef.ac.uk/#panel-1)

Spatial Agency

[www.spatialagency.net/](http://www.spatialagency.net/)

Walter Segal Self Build Trust

[www.segalselfbuild.co.uk/home.html](http://www.segalselfbuild.co.uk/home.html)

Women's Design Service

[www.wds.org.uk/index.htm](http://www.wds.org.uk/index.htm)





Royal Institute of British Architects  
66 Portland Place  
London W1B 1AD  
T 020 7580 5533  
[www.architecture.com](http://www.architecture.com)

Cover image: Lighthouse walk to  
engage the entire town of Fleetwood  
Photo: BCA Landscape