1. Introduction

This paper is a first major attempt to explore the role of urban planning in responding to migration-related super-diversity. Whilst previous research has been undertaken on urban planning and the multicultural city (Fincher et al., 2014; Burayidi, 2003; Sandercock, 2003; 1998; Qadeer, 1997) as well as planning and diversity in the city (Fincher and Iveson, 2008; Uyesugi and Shipley, 2005; Baumann, 1996), little attention to date has focused on the challenges of increasing super-diversity for urban planning.

Super-diversity describes a demographic condition in which populations are more diverse than ever before (Vertovec, 2007). Vertovec argues that super-diversity has been driven by new migration wherein migration pathways are no longer dominated by post-Commonwealth relationships, and with the patterning of immigrants changing from many migrants moving to a few places to fewer migrants moving to many places (Vertovec, 2007; Phillimore, 2013). The scale, complexity, heterogeneity, fragmentation of populations and speed and spread of change associated with super-diversity exceeds any previously experienced (Meissner and Vertovec, 2015).

While it is acknowledged that almost everywhere, rural and urban, has become more diverse, the scale, speed and spread of super-diversity varies by country and by settlement area, and with large urban centres most affected (Vertovec, 2007). Super-diversity is in evidence in major cities such as London (29% from ethnic minority backgrounds and from over 170 countries; Greater London Authority - GLA, 2005), and Birmingham, where GP registration data has shown that 41,318 migrants moved to the city from 187 different countries between 2007 and 2010 (Phillimore, 2013).

Super-diverse areas may be 'layered', and accommodating both old and new migrants, as well as long-standing non-migrant populations. Whilst no tipping-point has yet been identified between being a multicultural area and a super-diverse area, what is important to recognise is that super-diversity espouses the

idea of communities being so diverse that there are no dominant ethnic groups. As such, it moves beyond the idea of multicultural communities consisting of a small number of ethnic groups with similar origins frequently living in close proximity to each other as distinct diaspora (Author, 2016).

However, to date little work has been undertaken on the role of urban planning in responding to increasing super-diversity. Urban planning has been defined as an action-oriented and interventionist approach that is fundamentally concerned with the process of development (Adams, 2001, p.2). The primary concerns of urban planning relate to decisions on how to share public goods, the use of public and / or private property by local residents, and managing conflict over how public goods are shared, or how land is used (Pestiau and Wallace 2003, p.255).

With reference to the relationship between urban planning and issues of diversity, Fincher et al. (2014) argue that urban planning has engaged with diversity in three main ways: i) to manage social difference in situations where difference has been associated with disadvantage or interpreted as disorderly; ii) to commodify and use the features of cities for urban tourism or urban regeneration purposes; and iii) to regulate public spaces and facilities where there is conflict over their use between ethnic groups.

In relation to super-diversity, this means that a broad view of urban planning is required, and which involves urban planning being defined as a key element of wider strategies of urban governance and management (Fincher and Iveson 2008, p.7). In so doing, urban planners need to think about how to balance competing interests, how to recognise and address specific needs, and how to respond to people in increasingly diversified (or diversifying) settings (Fincher and Iveson, 2008). However, interventionist activities that have traditionally been based around addressing the needs of a dominant ethnic or national identity cohering within particular neighbourhoods in the city (Boschman and van Ham, 2015; Becares et al., 2012) may no longer be applicable.

Consequently, this paper is focused on both the city and neighbourhood scale of analysis. It investigates the challenges for urban planning in responding to migration-related super-diversity within the context of Meissner and Vertovec's (2015) three-fold identification of super-diversity as: i) *population complexity* – involving a focus on the context of super-diversity and population reconfiguration; ii) as a *method*, involving the re-orientation of a focus away from ethnicity-based approaches; and iii) as a *policy,* including the implications of super-diversity for the nature of policy approaches or tools – in this instance urban planning.

Section 2 of the paper explores the nature of urban planning in the context of national multicultural policies and the implications and challenges for urban planners arising with the emergence of super-diversity. Section 3 sets out the methodology and sampling approach that were used to undertake the research. Sections 4 and 5 subsequently explore some of the challenges of super-diversity for urban planning through drawing upon Fincher and Iveson's (2008) concepts of *redistribution*, *recognition* and *encounter*. Section 6 summarises the discussion and identifies a number of areas for further research.

2. Urban planning and the challenge of super-diversity

The UK has long possessed an ethnically and culturally diverse population (Tasan-Kok et al., 2014). In the UK, immigration increased rapidly in the post-war era of economic growth, and with large-scale immigration from areas such as the Caribbean and South Asia (Vertovec, 2007). However, principles of universalism generally underpinned modernist planning during this period. This meant that in general, urban planning involved limited public input, the exclusion of difference and diversity, and a lack of focus on issues of race or gender (Sandercock, 1998; 2003). Indeed, urban planning during the post-war Keynesian social liberal period was viewed as a particular function of state policy, and reflecting broader national economic priorities, policies and ideologies (Healey, 1998). As such, urban planning processes were not designed with difference in mind and adopted a normative approach on what urban

planning ought to achieve in order to improve the life of inhabitants in urban areas (Campbell, 2006).

Thomas (1995, p.142) highlights that there was little consideration of diversity in urban planning in the UK during the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s because 'the black and ethnic minority population was invisible to the planning system'. In contrast, class was perceived as a key issue which needed to be addressed in the context of achieving social balance and social welfare (Thomas, 1995). But the increasing social and economic problems associated with many of inner cities in the UK in the late 1960s and early 1970s introduced a spatial dimension to discussions over diversity and how planning should respond to a racialised and unequal society. Nevertheless, the increasingly bureaucratized and technocratic role assigned for the planning system arguably undermined its ability to respond (Thomas 1995, p.143), and indeed did little to address patterns of institutionalized discrimination in the British planning system (Gale, 2005). The lack of sensitivity of the planning system to the needs and aspirations of black and ethnic minorities was also reflective of the neo-liberal, market-based 'Thatcherite' ideologies and practices that emerged from 1979 onwards, and with economic efficiency – rather than racial equality - being a specific concern of central government (Thomas, 2008).

Notwithstanding this neglect, the need to recognize and tackle issues of discrimination and racism within government and society was brought into sharp relief through the inner city riots of the early 1980s. The Scarman Report of 1981 identified how such disturbances had been generated – at least in part – by socio-economic inequalities within minority ethnic groups and perceptions of racial discrimination by the police (Tasan-Kok et al., 2014). In turn, the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) and the (then) Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) report on '*Planning for a Multi-racial Britain*' (1983) established a new long-term commitment by planners to racial equality (Thomas, 2000). However, questions were raised over the research that underpinned the report as well as the lack of explicit definition on what actually constituted a racial minority (Gale, 2008).

The specific requirements of a reformed Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) and the increasing requirement to be sensitive to diversity with the rise of multiculturalism – and as a character of good governance (see Harris and Thomas, 2004) – subsequently led to specific guidance being provided to local planning authorities. This set out how they should sensitize their policies and practices to the needs and aspirations of ethnic minorities, and to counter racism (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister [ODPM], 2005).

Multiculturalism - as a political philosophy is rooted in the values of diversity and equality (Qadeer and Agrawal, 2011, p. 135). Under multiculturalism, urban planning followed the lead of national multicultural policies and the provision of services on ethno-specific lines and the recognition of ethno-cultural differences (Fincher et al., 2014). Multicultural urban planning can therefore be viewed as a normative response to diversity within a city - primarily ethno-cultural diversity - and an awareness of race and culture (Qadeer and Agarwal, 2011). It also entails a more inclusive, democratic and communicative approach to planning practice by urban planners (Healey, 1998, Sandercock, 1998), and which seeks to provide equal opportunities to all minority cultural groups – including those 'from the borderlands' - in the planning and management of the built environment (Sandercock, 2003). As such, it involves urban planners placing a particular focus on ethnic, religious and / or cultural differences and associated 'rights to difference' and 'rights to the city', including public space and public affairs (*ibid*.). Ethnic minorities are seen as having distinct ways of life and subsequently these constructs are reflected in the need to develop different forms of consultation and participation (Beebeejaun, 2004).

In the UK there is a long history of debate about the desirability of community engagement and participation in planning processes (for example, see the Planning Advisory Groups' (1965) report on *The Future of Development Plans* and the Skeffington Committee (1969) on securing public participation in development plans; Sagoe 2016, p.2). Furthermore, under the former Labour government there was a commitment to reinvigorate community involvement

within planning through the introduction in 2004 of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Whilst highly variable in their content and coverage, the Statement of Community Involvement considers the types of community involvement to be undertaken (within each local authority area) and with whom, the ways in which such involvement will inform planning policies, and the likely resource implications of such measures (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister – ODPM, 2004). In so doing, what the Statement of Community Involvement also illustrates – and which arguably is more important than the document itself - are the values, underlying commitment and institutional support of a local authority that are likely to positively or negatively shape consultation and / or participation processes (Brownill and Carpenter, 2007).

However, Beebeejaun (2012) has highlighted that whilst consultation and participation in planning processes are inherently viewed as empowering, in reality there has been insufficient attention on the benefits or dangers of such participation. There have also been problems in terms of presuming ethnic minorities have a 'natural' ethno-cultural identity and participation based on group similarities, rather than on individual political identities (Beebeejaun 2004, p.437).

Recently, the concept of multiculturalism has been increasingly criticised as characterising and legitimising 'a retreat into culturally and physically separate minority communities' (Vertovec 2010, p.90). Sandercock (1998, p.3) also notes how it can lead to a 'fear of the 'other'……a fear of a whole way of life being eroded……and fear of change itself'. Multiculturalism can essentialise and reify differences between ethnic or cultural groups, while obscuring power differentials and inequalities within (Kymlicka, 2010).

Hence there has been a gradual demise of multiculturalism as both a public policy and as a political discourse (Berg and Sigona, 2013). The critique of multiculturalism has given way to a 'broader expression and recognition of different kinds of differences…..and resulting largely from new migration that has transformed the demographic profile of urban areas….' (*ibid*, p.348). In this

respect, successive national governments in the UK since 1997 have gradually shifted their focus away from an emphasis on multiculturalism to a focus on community cohesion and integration policies concerned with minimising social disorder and promoting greater individual responsibility amongst citizens and communities (Raco et al., 2014).

This leads into a discussion of 'super-diversity'. Migration-related super-diversity highlights the need to move beyond depictions of bounded communities differentiated along ethnic and cultural lines to consider representations of society that emphasise lifestyle, household and consumption differences; class-based differences; socio-economic, cultural, religious and linguistic differences; and the implications of differences in the legal status of individuals (Vertovec, 2007; 2011). However, super-diversity is about more than simply adding new variables of difference. Rather, it is more about how such variables may inter-relate and interact with each other to shape the composition of communities, their needs and their future direction (Vertovec, 2007).

Thus whilst it has been recognized that a redesign of the planning system for managing migration-related diversity is increasingly required (Burayidi 2003, p.270), to date the focus has been on urban planning 'needing to recognize ethnic differences' (Fincher and Iveson 2008, p.120). Moreover, if a focus is placed on super-diversity as a methodology, such methods need to increasingly reflect the context of super-diversity as population complexity and explore the extent to which urban planners are able to move away from ethno-focal approaches (Meissner and Vertovec 2015, pp.542-543).

At the same time, there is a need to consider the extent to which super-diversity is about reducing structural inequalities and the discrimination and marginalisation of individuals as opposed to simply mapping localised differences and obtaining access to people's practices and strategies of identification (Sepulveda et al., 2011). Indeed, some have argued that the super-diversity discourse risks creating an 'equivalence of differences' (Vertovec 2012, p.289). As such, it may be interpreted and utilized to deliver economic

development objectives (the 'diversity dividend') but which may serve to conceal structural forms of inequality between groups through individualizing explanations for inequality, discrimination and labour market exploitation (Raco et al., 2014).

In this context, the work of Nancy Fraser (1997) is of relevance in terms of the need to consider the social logics of planning cities for diversity. Fraser (1997) highlights how there have been on-going concerns with combining a cultural politics of difference with a social politics of equality to address cultural and economic injustices. However, this is not straightforward as addressing economic injustice (or redistribution) involves attempting to address the significance of the differences (for example, race or gender) on which inequalities are based. On the other hand, strategies of recognition to overcome cultural injustices involve highlighting the specific needs of particular groups or individuals. Thus Fraser (1997) highlights the importance of affirmative and transformative strategies: whilst the former may focus on tackling the symptoms of cultural and economic inequality, it is only transformative strategies that seek to address the causal processes generating and reinforcing injustice (Fincher et al., 2014).

Such work therefore draws attention to the importance of redistribution and recognition, and has also been used to provide a framework for evaluating local empowerment initiatives (for example, see Perrons and Skyer, 2003). However, Fraser's focus on addressing injustice has also been used by Fincher and Iveson (2008) to explore how urban planners may respond to people in increasingly diversified (or diversifying) settings. Their work is therefore drawn upon to structure the research and analysis presented in the following sections of the paper as it highlights the importance of the concepts of *redistribution, recognition* and *encounter*. These concepts articulate the key role of urban planning, namely: i) how to manage social differences, including balancing competing interests and sharing public goods, including the use of public and private property; ii) how to recognise and address specific needs of different individuals and provide services; and iii) how to respond to people in

increasingly diversified (or diversifying) settings.

3. Methodology

Whilst recent work has sought to consider policy narratives of diversity in global cities such as London, less focus has been placed on cities that are more recently diversifying and / or which are becoming increasingly super-diverse. Liverpool was therefore selected as a case study as it exemplifies super-diversity as population complexity (Meissner and Vertovec, 2015) given its changing population configuration. Moreover, although Liverpool's population is less ethnically diverse than other cities such as London and Birmingham (13.6% of the population is defined as Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) compared to a national figure of 18.8%; Liverpool City Council, 2013a), the speed and spread of change of Liverpool's diversification in the last fifteen years has been extremely significant. Indeed, the city experienced the greatest increase in the proportion of residents born overseas of all of the major UK cities between 2001 and 2011 (Liverpool City Council, 2013a).

There are now 250 self-declared ethnicities in Liverpool according to the 2011 Census (ONS, 2011). A significant influx of EU Accession country migrants have also arrived since 2004, decades after 'old migrant' populations (such as those from Africa and New Commonwealth immigrants). Some 6,400 residents (1.4%) of the city's population were identified as being born in the EU Accession countries according to the 2011 census (Liverpool City Council, 2013a). In addition, two fifths (19,600 people) of Liverpool residents born outside the UK identified that they had lived in the UK for less than five years (Liverpool City Council, 2013a).

It has been recognized how policy narratives of diversity may be socially constructed and reproduced through discursive practices (Fischer, 2003). Yet there has been little focus to date on the role of specific urban planning policies *per se* in responding to increasing super-diversity. Consequently, a systematic analysis of strategies concerned with urban planning in Liverpool was initially

undertaken in order to consider the extent to which diversity has figured in policy discourses over the past fifteen years. In total, over 20 documents were considered. These were split into four main types. First, key planning documents such as the existing *Unitary Development Plan* (2002), the draft Core Strategy[1] and the emerging *Shaping the Liverpool Local Plan* (2013), as well as emerging neighbourhood planning arrangements in the city. Together, these provide the planning context for the city in relation to the development plan system that emerged in England from 2004.

Nevertheless, given that it is often difficult to disentangle specific planning policies and practices from other interventions that impact on urban areas – and indeed which highlights how urban planning is a key part of urban governance and management (Fincher et al., 2014, p.3) - a number of other documents were considered. These included city-wide strategies concerned with urban regeneration and improving the quality of life of the city's residents – for example, the City's (then) Community Strategy (2009). In addition, development plans of the wider Liverpool City Region were analysed. Finally, plans more explicitly associated with diversity and equality in the city were also examined. These included the *Race Equality Impact Assessment* for the NewHeartlands Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Initiative (2006), the *Liverpool Black and Racial Minorities Action Plan* (2014) and the City Council's *Equality and Diversity Policy Statement* (2011; 2016).

Reference – where relevant - is made to such policies and strategies in the following section. However, in practice there was relatively little focus on diversity *per se*, and which was a revealing finding in itself. As a result, information collected from three separate qualitative studies conducted in Liverpool between 2009 and 2011 was also used to inform the arguments presented in this paper. Each of the studies engaged with new migrants who had arrived in the city since 2004 – both from within and beyond the EU. There was a

---

[1] Including the *Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal* (2005), the Core Strategy *Issues and Options* paper (2005), the Core Strategy *Preferred Options and Revised Preferred Options* reports (2008; 2010), the *Core Strategy Submission Draft* (2012), the *Core Strategy Equalities Impact Assessment* (2012) and the *Statement of Community Involvement* (2007; updated 2013).

specific focus on the extent to which their needs were being met through facilities in the local neighbourhood; the degree to which individuals' needs varied and were being recognised; and the importance of particular spaces or places in the neighbourhood that were deemed conducive to positive encounter and which were helping to facilitate the recognition of different needs and the nature of subsequent interventions.

Such material is pertinent given the extended period of time over which the implementation of a new development plan system for the city has taken place. In essence, changes in the broader national context (for example, the introduction of the 2011 Localism Act) have informed the incremental and gradual evolution of local planning policy. Consequently, earlier planning legislation – for example, the Unitary Development Plan – continues to be of relevance to strategic planning in Liverpool, and indeed exists alongside more recent (and incremental) activity to prepare a new development plan document (in the form of the Draft Core Strategy which has now morphed into a single Liverpool Local Plan). Hence through using material collected from the three qualitative studies it is possible to deliberate how – and to what extent – diversity has been encapsulated within urban planning agendas over time, and how this may be changing with regards to recent policy developments in the city.

In total 18 semi-structured interviews were held with policy-makers and practitioners in Liverpool and who were involved in responding to the needs of migrant communities. Such interviewees included a range of actors involved in the city's governance and management – including local authority planning and regeneration officers, other strategic and local delivery officers from the public and voluntary sector and local elected members - and reflecting the broad conception of urban planning's role within urban governance (Fincher et al., 2014). The intention was to focus on the nature and relevance of urban planning responses, including how - and to what extent - they were seeking to manage and respond to the needs of different groups; and the degree to which they were adopting an approach that moved beyond a focus on ethnic difference.

In addition, migrant interviewees were also recruited to solicit their needs and perceptions on whether these were being met. This was undertaken via a number of approaches, including local gatekeepers, snowball sampling and via community groups and leafleting. The interviews were undertaken in the migrants' mother tongue by multi-lingual community researchers. The intention was not to generalise across whole populations of migrants but to identify key trends. In total, 63 interviews and one focus group with nine migrants were conducted in different parts of Liverpool. The sampling strategy attempted to reflect the increasing super-diversity emerging in the city. Thus respondents varied according to migration channel, as well as gender, age, country of origin, employment status, family status and duration within the UK. The use of ethnicity to inform the sampling framework was limited.

Following the interviews – a process of open coding was used to scrutinise all of the interview transcripts in order to break up the data and which highlighted the importance of a number of new issues of relevance to super-diversity, such as recency of change, the importance of legal status and the visibility / invisibility of individuals. Axial coding was then used to put the data back together in new ways in order to consider the respective importance of redistribution, recognition and encounter, and the challenges to urban planning associated with new migrants in a context of emerging super-diversity.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

4. Redistribution, recognition and encounter and the challenge of super-diversity for urban planning

(i) Redistribution

Redistribution relates to the judgements and actions of urban planners – amongst others - in balancing competing interests and attempting to address issues of disadvantage and inequality (Healey, 1997). Such ambitions often relate

more broadly to state / market / civil society relationships and the nature of welfare regimes.

In Liverpool, two important issues arose in respect of redistribution. First, emerging super-diversity in the city meant that urban planners faced particular difficulties in both identifying and responding to the needs of different residents: '*there is a big push now on engaging minority communities as the lack of intelligence and statistics on such communities is a key issue in terms of addressing particular needs*' (Planning Officer, Liverpool). This has also been reflected in the latest Statement of Community Involvement associated with the development of the Liverpool Local Plan (Liverpool City Council, 2013b), and which highlights the need to engage with a number of 'hard to reach groups', including '*transient populations and new residents*'.

Second, and for many respondents, class-based differences in the city were seen to be *the* critical issue and were of primary importance in respect of activities of redistribution at the neighbourhood level. In the words of one interviewee: '*the one thing linked to everybody is poverty....the White Working Class in the city is the big issue to deal with......we're playing a numbers game*' (Local Strategic Partnership Officer, Liverpool). Such sentiments were also picked up in the Race Equality Impact Assessment for the NewHeartlands Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Initiative (WM Consultants, 2006, p.42) and which noted how '*local authority officers and local residents were living in parallel worlds and that 'class' was the biggest divider*'.

Hence in contrast to a focus on ethnic or cultural diversity, in cities or neighbourhoods of emerging super-diversity, a focus on class-based differences by urban planners may be more evident: "*the impact around the city will be less if we just focus on the needs of ethnic minority communities.....the whole job is a balancing act about which neighbourhoods and groups you invest resources*" (Local Strategic Partnership Co-ordinator, Liverpool). Nevertheless, the approach may equivalise differences between residents and conceal structural

forms of inequality and discrimination in shaping access to services and facilities in the neighbourhood. In the words of another respondent:

> '*The response that we have got a bigger problem in addressing the needs of White Working Class males in Liverpool is institutional discrimination and racism at its best. Because at the end of the day whilst you have to take care of the white working class – because you cannot forget about your 'own' – you have still got legislation to consider other groups subject to racial discrimination. Why can't you do it all? You can't just cherry pick*' (Local councillor, Liverpool City Council).

Accordingly, there is a need to acknowledge that some groups are more likely to be discriminated against and exploited than others, and hence require a specific focus in the context of urban planning and redistribution activities. In this respect, it was argued that a practical step forward would involve planning policies at a city and neighbourhood level being much more flexible in respect of change of use of land and property in order to facilitate access for all residents to a variety of infrastructure in the city; to highlight where increasing super-diversity may make this more difficult for some groups; and to respond to particular needs over and beyond those of a particular (dominant) ethnic minority. For example, the existing Unitary Development Plan (Liverpool City Council, 2002, p.25) highlights the need for '*equality of access to employment, housing, shopping, community and leisure opportunities*'. Operationalising such ambitions at a local level is therefore a key priority for the emerging Liverpool Local Plan (Liverpool City Council, 2013b).

ii) Recognition

Recognition involves urban planners identifying the specific needs of individuals and their subsequent attempts to address (Amin and Thrift, 2002). Traditional ('affirmative') models of recognition have been based on the imagined or projected identities of individuals or groups being a product of pre-existing differences, and which themselves have emerged from a shared set of

experiences or needs (Fraser, 2003). However, the approach fails to recognise the importance of 'within group' differences, or that individuals may belong to more than one group (Calhoun, 1994). Through the lens of super-diversity, there is therefore a need for urban planners to recognise that identities can be forged through difference, are relational and open to change and transformation, and may extend beyond a singular concern with ethnic identity.

A number of existing studies (for example, McDowell, 2009) have argued that new European migrants who are 'white' are more likely to be privileged despite their particular circumstances. However, a number of points emerged from the research in Liverpool that offered a differing perspective. First, recognition of the needs of such individuals in an increasingly super-diverse city by urban planners may be more difficult due to such 'whiteness' and their relative invisibility – '*There is less stuff about this community (EU Accession migrants), partly because they are white…you can be more invisible, can't you?*' (Chief Executive, Community Support Organisation, Liverpool).

A key question is how urban planners should therefore respond in order to identify the needs of those individuals who are less visible. It was identified that a focus on language could be one option: '*If it weren't for their accents you wouldn't know they weren't local lads……what impact has this had……probably a lack of take-up of services*' (Planning Officer, Liverpool). A second option involves a greater consideration by urban planners of the importance of identity and attachment to place. An assumption frequently made is that migrants cohere in distinct ethnic communities (Boschman and van Ham, 2015) and with the identity of such places reflecting a dominant ethnic group. However, in super-diverse neighbourhoods such identities can be increasingly layered, mixed and often hidden (Wessendorf, 2014). This was exemplified in the responses of Accession country migrants, who exhibited 'invisibility'. For example, a number of interviewees discussed how they had struggled to express their sense of identity in the context of super-diverse neighbourhoods given their recency of arrival and the transience and churn of individuals moving in and out. Whilst some local facilities had emerged (for example, Polish shops), overall there was a

general sense of being unconnected with the neighbourhood: '*I haven't built any strong links to people here…..this is not a reason for keeping me here*' (Slovak male migrant, Liverpool).

Thus in the context of emerging super-diversity urban planners need to recognize that the invisibility of many individuals can also impact on affinity with the neighbourhood and the projection of individual and place identity. This in turn can result in the needs of certain groups being hidden. Certainly, this needs to be picked up through the Statement of Community Involvement (Liverpool City Council, 2013c) - and which is reflective of an underlying commitment by the City Council to ensure that the needs of those less visible are recognized in participation processes - as well as the Liverpool Local Plan as it is finalized. The Neighbourhood Forums that are emerging in different parts of the city – and which require membership to be drawn from different sections of the community (see Localism Act 2011, 61F para. 7 a(ii)) - in order to produce local Neighbourhood Development Plans will also be crucial in facilitating the recognition of different interests and needs.

Finally, a super-diversity lens highlights the importance of legal status and recognition. Interviewees highlighted how recognition of need – and the subsequent ability of urban planners to respond was highly differentiated according to migration channel / legal status. As one officer stated: '*Our communities are changing with migration…..you need different services because you have different groups with different challenges……but there is a need for greater recognition of who can be supported*' (Local Strategic Partnership Officer, Liverpool).

However, this can operate in complex ways. On the one hand, it may be politically problematic to develop formal urban planning responses that take into account those without rights to public goods or services. But on the other, it may actually be easier to locate and to recognise such individuals and their needs in comparison with those subject to fewer restrictions on access to work and benefits, but who may be more invisible. Again, the ability to embed the

Council's Equality and Diversity objectives for 2016-2020 - and which highlight the need to strengthen the knowledge and understanding of the city's communities into the Liverpool Local Plan - will be important in this respect.

iii) Encounter

Encounter can support the interaction between individuals, potentially bringing together different identities (Amin and Thrift, 2002). Indeed, the recognition of need and associated responses in respect of directing resource allocation may emerge from individual encounters within particular spaces and 'micro-public' sites such as workplaces, shops, schools, youth clubs, libraries, swimming pools, the gym and community organizations (Amin, 2002). Nevertheless, in relation to super-diversity, there is a need to consider how urban planners may need to respond to individuals in increasingly diversified settings in order for individuals to experiment with identifications and to secure conviviality (encounters with a purpose) with others (Fincher and Iveson 2008, pp.153-154).

In Liverpool, A8 nationals and non-EU migrants noted the critical importance of a number of micro-public sites to facilitate meaningful encounters. These were not necessarily associated with any specific ethnic or national group and were reflective of the everyday lives of many individuals living in super-diverse neighbourhoods. For example:

> '*I do bodybuilding. We are a very diverse group of people but when we are inside, you don't see any differences, it doesn't matter whether you are white or black. A kilogram is the same for each*' (Portuguese male migrant, Liverpool).

Equally, it was apparent that there was variation between interviewees in respect of both their ability and willingness to experience new encounters in micro-public spaces. For example, in terms of the workplace, there may be

divisions based on ethnic, cultural and linguistic lines, as well as nationality, legal status and education (see Grzymala-Kazlowska, 2005; Fomina, 2009):

> '*I like educated people….talking to them, so it doesn't matter if they are migrant workers or local people; it's a matter shared interests and similar ideas; It is not always a matter of ethnicity or the country of origin*' (Polish migrant, Liverpool).

Resources, identity and dispositions, perceptions and interpretations and notions of place can also shape in-group variability and individuals' ability to experience encounter (also see Hickman et al. 2007). But of particular relevance to this study are experiences of discrimination and hostility by others based upon visible diversity. For some, this impinged upon their disposition to share encounters with other migrants who were more visibly different in super-diverse areas: '*Most Romani people have never been in these nice areas and probably will never go because of the discrimination. They just go to work, go back home and watch out from their windows*' (Czech Roma female migrant, Liverpool).

But interestingly, even those with visible diversity may experience differences in their ability to experience encounter. In-group variability may be informed by particular identities and dispositions:

> '*I was just talking to an African friend of mine; she said 'I wouldn't want to meet people in Liverpool 8 because it is almost like you have to be 'professionally black' to live there'. There is a hierarchy….if you are Liverpool-born black then, you know, you have got more status*' (Somalian refugee, Liverpool).

Hence the messages that arise for urban planners seeking to facilitate meaningful encounters between individuals in areas of emerging super-diversity are that i) a focus on facilitating micro-public spaces is equally as important as the creation of more traditional spaces (for example, public parks or squares) to

develop encounter; ii) not all micro-public spaces – and indeed other spaces - lead to the same shared (positive) experience and outcomes due to variation in individuals' dispositions, resources and associated legal status; and iii) more fundamentally it cannot be assumed that encounter and conviviality will take place in shared spaces.

With reference to planning frameworks in Liverpool, arguably the neighbourhood plans that are emerging across the city will again be pivotal in highlighting the micro-public spaces of relevance to meaningful encounter, as well as facilitating access and engagement by different groups in such spaces. Through highlighting the allocation of land for particular activities in Neighbourhood Development Plans, as well as through the use of Community Right to Build Orders (and which importantly involve individuals who are *unrelated* to the neighbourhood planning process being able to build, design and run particular facilities) locally driven encounters may be promoted.

5. Discussion

A broad theme that emerged from the research is the need to move beyond ethno-cultural approaches that have delineated neighbourhoods and provided services in line with the perceived dominance of a single ethnic group (Berg and Sigona, 2013); that have sought to reflect ethnic and cultural diversity in the physical form of the city (Sandercock, 1998); and which have adopted ethnic-focused routes of engagement (Qadeer, 1997; Uyesugi and Shipley, 2005).

More specifically, the use of super-diversity as both a method and policy has highlighted a number of key challenges facing urban planners. Two issues particularly stood out from the research conducted in Liverpool, namely i) the recency and dynamic nature of super-diversity as well as how such a concept is framed; and ii) the importance of legal status and the visibility associated with individuals residing in super-diverse neighbourhoods.

In respect of the recency and dynamic nature of super-diversity, populations are increasingly differentiated, and with population churn being a key feature of emerging super-diversity (Berg and Sigona, 2013), both at a city and neighbourhood level. Whilst some individuals are 'hyper-mobile' and transient, others are relatively fixed. This was reflected in the varying responses of individuals who noted the differential importance of the neighbourhood in shaping engagement in everyday activity spaces and their projection of identity. There is a requirement to develop approaches that are accommodating of the fluidity and hybridity of populations and the changing use of land or property. As such, both a relational and territorial perspective of super-diverse neighbourhoods is required given that some may use the neighbourhood as a key activity space whilst others may use the city or even beyond (Tasan-Kok et al., 2014). Urban planners therefore need to understand how increasing population complexity and population churn impinges on individuals *spaces of dependence* (including place attachment and the nature of local services that may be required) and their *spaces of engagement*, which equally may impinge on demands for services (for example, health and / or employment) both in the neighbourhood and in other parts of the city (see Cox, 1998). There is also a need to consider how increasing population complexity may be reflected vertically (within property) as well as across the neighbourhood / city.

Consequently, strategic planning frameworks such as the Liverpool Local Plan will need to incorporate some degree of flexibility in respect of focusing on future demographic change - as well as existing demographic pressures - that may emerge in different parts of the city, and the associated demands for particular activities. At a more local level, Neighbourhood Development Plans will also be important in responding to the changing needs and requirements of all local residents in super-diverse neighbourhoods, and in assigning usage (and flexibility of usage) to different tracts of land. However, their ability to perform such a role will be heavily dependent on the extent to which communities are able to meaningfully challenge and shape strategic development plans, as neighbourhood plans need to be in conformity with the city level plan (Sagoe, 2016) – and in this instance the Liverpool Local Plan

In addition, there is a need to acknowledge the importance of class-based differences in informing socio-economic diversity and how such issues may be of particular relevance in cities and neighbourhoods of emerging super-diversity, and especially where deprivation is both concentrated and widespread (as is the case of Liverpool). Thus transformative strategies – as highlighted by Fraser (1997) – are required by urban planners to overcome economic and cultural injustices. Furthermore, any attempts to redistribute resources need to be based around recognition of the differences and interconnections between different aspects of super-diversity on which inequalities are based (for example, ethnicity, culture, nationality and gender). In this respect Race Equality Impact Assessments and Equality and Diversity strategies will be important in terms of how they inform strategic and local planning frameworks. To summarise, there is a need to move beyond acting in the 'public good' for a single dominant ethnic group in the city – the reality is that there are multiple 'public interests' that need to be addressed through 'parity of participation' in planning processes (Fraser, 2003; Divercities, 2014).

Second, with respect to legal status and issues of visibility, access to services and facilities in super-diverse neighbourhoods is heavily influenced by legal / immigration status (Philimore, 2013). This is another distinctive feature associated with such areas. However, it was apparent that urban planners were not always entirely clear as to how their efforts to respond to increasing super-diversity should be targeted. This can subsequently impinge on efforts to secure redistribution.

In turn, this leads to a consideration of the respective visibility (and / or invisibility) of particular individuals or groups. For those more visible, urban planners need to recognize the importance of super-diverse neighbourhoods in providing an environment where those visibly different can avoid discrimination that may be more evident elsewhere in the city. But at the same time, such environments need to facilitate integration for all and not selectively focus on particular groups or individuals.

For those less visible, interviewees highlighted how they had often struggled to express their identity and belonging through the neighbourhood due to their recency of arrival; due to the transience of individuals moving in and out; and due – in many instances – to a general unfamiliarity with visible diversity. This was shaping 'negative pathologies' of place making (Gill, 2010). Thus urban planners need to consider alternative ways of engaging with and identifying those less visible. For example, a greater focus on 'linguistic landscapes' (Blommaert, 2015) and signage can help to ascertain where new groups may be concentrated or residing. Again, this could be picked up in the Statement of Community Involvement and its focus on different mechanisms to engage 'hard to reach' groups.

6. Conclusion

This paper has explored a number of challenges that super-diversity poses to urban planning in cities and neighbourhoods that are becoming increasingly super-diverse. Through a focus on the concepts of redistribution, recognition and encounter, a first key contribution of the paper has been to highlight how a focus by urban planners on class-based differences – over and above ethnic and cultural differences *per se* – may be of relevance in terms of attempts to address social and economic inequalities in areas of emerging super-diversity. But at the same time this may increase the risk of urban planning equivalising differences between residents and concealing issues of racism and discrimination.

A second key contribution of the paper relates to the focus on a city – and neighbourhoods – that are becoming increasingly super-diverse. In such places the fragmentation and speed of change can make it more difficult for urban planners to make (redistribution) judgments about competing claims, and especially where 'invisible' diversity may exist – and which may subsequently make recognition and encounter activities more problematic. Furthermore, in order not to underplay ethnic or racial discrimination, it is even more critical in the context of increasing super-diversity for urban planners to use a variety of

tools – some strongly interventionist (such as the use of the Statement of Community Involvement, Race Equality Impact Assessments and Equality and Diversity strategies that enforce such principles in respect of housing development and allocations, for example) and some more 'informal' (for example, relaxing planning controls on change of use through Supplementary Planning Guidance) to address such issues (also see Fincher et al., 2014).

Third, migration channel and legal status are crucial in shaping and informing a 'super-diversity' politics. However, the socio-demographic characteristics of individuals (for example, age, gender etc.), their identities and dispositions and perceptions, as well as their subsequent experiences also need to be recognized in shaping outcomes – and indeed can shape variation in need between those with a similar legal or immigration status.

Finally, context is all-important. Super-diversity in the UK remains concentrated within a relatively small number of urban areas (Sepulveda et al. 2011, p.5). Consequently, the central importance of ethnicity in respect of diversity, and associated planning discourses and practices under multiculturalism may continue to be important elsewhere. Nevertheless, broader issues of recognition, rights of access and entitlement, neighbourhood functionality and the role of micro-public spaces will be of importance to planners in other areas too. For example, some of the world's largest migration flows have been in the global South and where concerns with social justice have led to a focus on how urban planners 'balance the logics of governing increasing super-diversity in ways that facilitate the creation of 'proper' urban communities (whatever these might be) in 'proper' urban environments' (Watson 2009, p.2268). This paper therefore sets an agenda for future research exploring the extent to which super-diversity within different cities shapes the nature of urban planning.

Bibliography

Adams, D, 2001, Urban planning and the development process. Abingdon: Routledge

Amin, A and Thrift, N, 2002, Cities: Reimagining the Urban, Cambridge: Polity Press

Amin, A, 2002, Ethnicity and the multicultural city, Environment and Planning: A, 34, 6, 959-980

Author, 2016

Baumann, G, 1996, Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-ethnic London, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Beebeejaun, Y. (2004) What's in a Nation? Constructing ethnicity in the British planning system, Planning Theory and Practice, 5, 4, 437–451

Beebeejaun, Y, 2012, Including the Excluded? Changing the Understandings of Ethnicity in Contemporary English Planning, Planning Theory and Practice,13, 4, 529-554

Becares, L, Shaw, R, Nazroo, J, Stafford, M, Atkin, K, Albor, C, Kiernan, K, Wilkinson, R, Pickett, K, (2012), Ethnic density effects of physical morbidity, mortality and health behaviors: A systematic review of the literature, *American Journal of Public Health* 102, 12, 33-66

Berg, M L and Sigona, N, 2013, Ethnography, diversity and urban space, Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 20, 4, 347-360

Blommaert, J, 2015, Commentary: Super-diversity old and new, Language and Communication, 44, 1, 82-89

Boschman, S and van Ham, M, 2015, Neighbourhood selection of non-western ethnic minorities. Testing the own-group effects hypothesis using a conditional logit model, Environment and Planning, 47, 1155-1174

Brownill, S, and Carpenter, J, 2007, Increasing participation in planning: Emergent experiences of the reformed planning system in England. Planning, Practice and Research, 22, 4, 619-634

Burayidi, M A, 2003, The multicultural city as planners' enigma, Planning Theory and Practice, 4, 3, 259-273

Calhoun, C, 1994, Social Theory and the politics of identity, in C. Calhoun (ed) Social Theory and the Politics of Identity, Oxford: Blackwell, 9-36

Campbell, H, 2006, Just planning: The art of situated ethical judgment, Journal of Planning Education and Research, 26, 1, 92–106

Committee on Public Participation in Planning, 1969, People and Planning: Report of the Committee on Public Participation in Planning (the Skeffington Report), London: HMSO

Cox, K, (1998) Spaces of dependence, spaces of engagement and the politics of scale, or: looking for local politics, Political geography 17, 1, 1-23

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) / HM Treasury, 2011, Localism Act, London: DCLG / HM Treasury.

Divercities, 2014, Governing Diversity, European Policy Brief, Brussels: European Commission

Fincher, R and Iveson, K, 2008, Planning and Diversity in the City: Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Fincher, R, Iveson, K, Leitner, H and Preston, V, 2014, Planning in the multicultural city: celebrating diversity or reinforcing difference?, Progress in Planning, 92, 1-55

Fischer, F, 2003, Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices, New York: Oxford University Press

Fomina, J, 2009, *Światy równoległe – wizerunek własny Polaków w Wielkiej Brytanii* (*Parallel worlds: Poles' self-image in the UK*, Warsaw: Institute of Social Policy, http://www.isp.org.pl/publikacje,25,473.html

Fraser, N, 1997, Critical Reflections on the Postsocialist Condition, New York: Routledge

Fraser, N, 2003, Social Justice in the age of identity politics: redistribution, recognition and participation, in N Fraser and A Honneth (eds) Redistribution or recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange, London and New York: Verso, 7-109

Gale, R, 2005, Representing the city: Mosques and the planning process in Birmingham, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31, 6, 1161–1179

Gale, R, 2008, Locating Religion in Urban Planning: Beyond 'Race' and Ethnicity?, Planning Practice and Research, 23, 1, 19-39

Gill, N, 2010, Pathologies of migrant place making: the case of Polish migrants to the UK, Environment and Planning A, 42, 1157-1173

Greater London Authority (GLA), 2005, GLA Economics Annual Report, London: GLA

Grzymala-Kazlowska, A, 2005, From ethnic cooperation to in-group competition: undocumented Polish workers in Brussels, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31, 4, 675-697

Harris, N and Thomas, H, 2004, Planning for a diverse society? A review of the UK Government's Planning Policy Guidance, Town Planning Review, 75, 4, 473-500

Healey, P, 1997, Collaborative planning. Shaping places in fragmented societies, London: MacMillan

Healey, P, 1998 Building Institutional Capacity through Collaborative Approaches to Urban Planning, Sage: London

Hickman, P, Robinson, D, Casey, R, Green, S and Powell, R, 2007, Understanding Housing Demand: Learning from rising markets in Yorkshire and the Humber, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Kymlicka, W, 2010, The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies, International Social Science Journal, 61, 199, 97-112

Liverpool Black and Racial Minorities (BRM) Network (2014) Liverpool BRM Action Plan, Liverpool, Liverpool BRM Network

Liverpool City Council, 2002, Unitary Development Plan, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2005a, Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2005b, Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2007, Statement of Community Involvement, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2008, Core Strategy Preferred Options, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2010, Revised Core Strategy Preferred Options, Liverpool, Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2011, Equality and Diversity Policy Statement, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2012a, Core Strategy – Submission Draft, Liverpool, Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2012b, Core Strategy Equalities Impact Assessment, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.

Liverpool City Council, 2013a, Local Migration Profile, Number 13 (November 2013), Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2013b, Shaping the Liverpool Local Plan, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2013c, Statement of Community Involvement, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council, 2016, Equality and Diversity Policy Statement, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.

Liverpool First, 2009, Liverpool 2024: A Thriving International City, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.

McDowell, L, 2009, Old and new European economic migrants: whiteness and managed migration policies, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 35, 1, 19-36

Meissner, F and Vertovec, S, 2015, Comparing super-diversity, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 38, 4, 541-555

Office for National Statistics (ONS), 2011, 2011 Census Data, http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/census-data/index.html

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, Statement of Community Involvement, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2005, Diversity and Equality in Planning: A good practice guide. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Perrons, D and Skyer, S, 2003, Empowerment through Participation? Conceptual Explorations and a Case Study, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 27, 2, 265-285

Pestieau, K and Wallace, M, 2003, Challenges and opportunities for planning in the ethno-culturally diverse city: A collection of papers—introduction, Planning Theory and Practice, 4, 3, 253–258

Phillimore, J, 2013, Housing, Home and Neighbourhood Renewal in the era of Super-diversity: Some lessons from the West Midlands, Housing Studies, 28, 5, 682-700

Planning Advisory Group, 1965, The Future of Development Plans, London: Planning Advisory Group.

Qadeer, M A, 1997, Pluralistic Planning for Multicultural Cities: The Canadian Practice, Journal of the American Planning Association, 63, 4, 481-494

Qadeer, M A, and Agrawal, 2011, The practice of multicultural planning in American and Canadian cities. Canadian Journal of Urban Research, 20, 1, 132-

Raco, M, Kesten, J and Colomb, C, 2014, Urban Policies on Diversity in London, United Kingdom, London: Bartlett School of Planning, University College London

Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) / Commission for Racial Equality (1983) Planning for a Multi-racial Britain, London: RTPI.

Sagoe, C, 2016, One Tool Against Many: Considering the Political Potential of Neighbourhood Planning for the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood, London, Architecture, Media, Politics, Society, 9, 3, 1-20

Sandercock, L, 1998, Towards Cosmopolis, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons

Sandercock, L, 2003, Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century, London: Continuum

Sepulveda, L, Syrett, S and Lyon, F, 2011, Population Super-diversity and New Migrant Enterprise: The Case of London, Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 23, 7-8, 469-97

Tasan-Kok, T, Van Kempen, R, Raco, M and Bolt, G, 2014, Towards Hyper-diversified European Cities: A Critical Literature Review, Utrecht: Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences

Thomas, H, 1995, 'Race', public policy and planning in Britain, Planning Perspectives, 10, 2, 123-148

Thomas, H, 2000, Race and Planning—The UK Experience, London: UCL Press

Thomas, H, 2008, Race equality and planning: a changing agenda, Planning Practice and Research, 23, 1, 1-17

Uyesugi, J L and Shipley, R, 2005, Visioning diversity: Planning Vancouver's multicultural communities', International Planning Studies, 10, 3-4, 305-322

Vertovec, S, 2007, Super-diversity and its implications, Ethnic and racial studies, 30, 6, 1024-1054

Vertovec, S, 2010, Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity, International Social Science Journal, 61, 199, 83-95

Vertovec, S, 2011, Migration and New Diversities in Global Cities: Comparatively Conceiving, Observing and Visualizing Diversification in Urban Public Spaces, http://www.mmg.mpg.de/?id=579

Vertovec, S, 2012, Diversity and the social imaginary, European Journal of Sociology, 53, 3, 287-312

Watson, S, 2009, Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe's Central Urban Issues, Urban Studies, 46, 11, 2259-2275

Wessendorf, S, 2014, Commonplace Diversity: Social Relations in a Super-diverse Context, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

WM Consultants, 2006, Race Equality Impact Assessment for the NewHeartlands Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Initiative (2006), Birmingham: WM Consultants