

Evaluation of Living Places
Programme Year 3
MLA Council
Final Report
April 2011



Carlisle

Suite 7 (Second Floor)
Carlyle's Court
1 St Mary's Gate
Carlisle CA3 8RY
t: 01228 402 320
m: 07501 725 114
e: stephen@dcresearch.co.uk

Leicester

1 Hewett Close
Great Glen
Leicester
LE8 9DW
t: 0116 259 2390
m: 07501 725115
e: jon@dcresearch.co.uk

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF EVALUATION APPROACH	10
Aims of the Evaluation.....	10
Spatial Focus at the Priority Place level.....	12
2. LIVING PLACES RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES.....	13
Research, evidence and strategy influence	13
Resources	16
Living Places Meetings	17
3. OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES IN PRIORITY PLACES	19
Specific Priority Place outputs and outcomes	19
Priority Place engagement with planning and economic development.....	22
Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit	24
4. UNDERSTANDING IMPACTS AND VALUE ADDED OF LIVING PLACES.....	27
Policy Influencing.....	27
Attracting Additional Investment.....	31
Profile.....	32
Future Impacts and Sustainability	33
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	34
The importance of local leadership	34
‘Flypaper Effect’ and the importance of dedicated resources	35
Planning and development impacts	35
Lessons for locality working.....	35
Legacy and Next Steps	36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An Evaluation of Year 3 of the Living Places Programme has been carried out on behalf of the Living Places Partners by DC Research Ltd. The purpose of the Year 3 Evaluation was to build on Year 1 and Year 2 Living Places Evaluations, with particular focus to be given to capturing learning from the Living Places Priority Places in relation to the partnerships and successes of the programme.

Living Places emphasises the use of culture and sport to support local distinctiveness and quality of place and promotes the advantage of cultural bodies working together to support local services for communities and individuals, particularly in areas that are experiencing housing led growth and regeneration. The aims of the Living Places Programme are to:

- Align investment from the sporting and cultural sector across organisational boundaries so it can be used more efficiently for people and places.
- Provide information, advice and support on the use of culture and sport in sustainable communities to people working in local government, housing, property development, planning and a host of other fields who take the day-to-day decisions that shape communities of the future.
- Build the capacity of communities themselves so people can be empowered to bring cultural and sporting activity and infrastructure to their communities.

The Living Places Programme is supported by seven partner organisations, that form a National Partner Group, with MLA being the national lead for the Programme: Arts Council England, The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), English Heritage, Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), Sport England, Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), and Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

Five Priority Places (Corby, Pennine Lancashire, Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH), Thames Gateway and The South West) were chosen as they were all places experiencing significant change at the beginning of the Programme, whether through regeneration or growth, demonstrated ambition and/or good practice in terms of the role of culture and sport in this change, and were sufficiently different to allow the learning to be of broad application. Regional Living Places and Place Shaping Groups have also supported the Programme across the English Regions.

Learning from the Priority Places to date has aimed to inform national policy making relating to regeneration and growth and culture and sport, and it has also provided evidence of good practice, which has helped to support better delivery. This learning can help the current government understand how culture and sport can contribute to some of its major agendas (e.g. the role of cultural and community based institutions contributing to the building of successful places (the "Big Society"), and supporting local determination and demand for culture and sport provision in communities).

This Executive Summary summarises the study findings and is structured around the following three key headings:

- The Impact and Added Value of the Living Places Programme at the Priority Place Level.
- The Conditions and Factors that Enabled the Impact and Added Value to be Achieved.
- The Lessons and Learning from the Living Places Programme.

The Impact and Added Value of the Living Places Programme at the Priority Place Level

Influencing Policy

A key achievement in terms of influencing policy has been the increased recognition of the role of culture and sport in regeneration and development through inclusion in key regeneration strategies and plans in some of the Priority Places. For example, there has been the inclusion of the Priority Place in the Multi Area Agreement (MAA) for Pennine Lancashire, where the MAA specifically mentions Pennine Lancashire as a Priority Place, with an Action within the MAA¹ being for: "Pennine Lancashire partners to work with Government to maximise its status as a 'Priority Place'".

A second achievement has been the **inclusion of culture and sport within government and governance structures** in the Priority Places, thereby better positioning culture and sport stakeholders to be able to engage with and influence key local government representatives. For example, in Pennine Lancashire there has been establishment of a Culture, Leisure and Sport Group of the Pennine Lancashire PLACE Joint Committee (a fully constituted Joint Committee with representation by Leaders from each local authority). The Group is chaired by a local authority chief executive, has local government engagement, and has Living Places as part its Terms of Reference. This is regarded as a key achievement in both the recognition of the role of culture and sport in Pennine Lancashire as well as a way in which the role of culture and sport has been mainstreamed into key local government arrangements.

Another example of local policy influence relates to the **use by local partners of the evidence and research that has been commissioned** through/by Living Places, in each of the Priority Places. The evidence and research is being used to inform key local strategies. For example, planners in Pennine Lancashire are using the results of the cultural sector mapping research as a key source of evidence to help inform the development of new local planning documents and policies. In **PUSH** there have been a range of studies and research exercises completed, focussing on culture and sport evidence, design guidance and creative industries research.

Finally, there are examples of cultural strategy and plan development in the Priority Places, where the engagement with key regeneration and development stakeholders through being a Priority Place has enabled these cultural strategies and plans to achieve engagement with, and sign up by, local government leaders, chief executives and other key local stakeholders. Examples include the recently completed **Pennine Lancashire Cultural Plan 2011-2014 and the MKSM Plan for Culture 2010-2014, and a number of cultural strategies being produced by local authorities in North Kent.**

Developing Evidence and Research

Living Places Priority Places have been involved in the **commissioning and development of a range of key sources of research and evidence** that have enabled a range of impacts and provided added value in a variety of ways. The results of such studies added, and continue to add, value in a number of ways. For example, helping to reinforce the national profile of Priority Places, supporting and enabling the engagement with key local government partners, informing the business and planning processes for specific projects (e.g. the Corby Cube), and providing an evidence base for future cultural policy. In addition, value is added from the expertise in culture and sport that NDPBS can add to the commissioning of such research.

¹ http://www.penninelancsplace.org/Shared%20Documents/09240_MAA_Document_Final_with_App.pdf

Attracting Additional Investment and Support

Due to designation as a Priority Place, many of the five areas have **attracted/received additional investment and support** for the delivery of cultural and sport activities and projects that would otherwise have gone elsewhere.

Examples include the Our Place Empty Shops project that took place in 2010 in both Blackburn and Taunton, which attracted a total of £100,000 funding from BIS Skills Learning Revolution Transformation Fund, as well as Heritage at Risk work in PUSH, Our Corby Community Archives work, the development of a modern library, museums and arts and creative facilities in Southend, and projects receiving additional funding to add additional value to what might have been otherwise achieved (such as PUSH's Spatial Planning and the Provision of Cultural and Sporting Infrastructure research, and a range of capital investments across the Priority Places).

In addition, the establishment of posts – such as the **Living Places Manager** in Pennine Lancashire, the **Cultural Co-ordinator** in PUSH, and dedicated officer time in Corby, have provided additional capacity and capability to enable culture and sport to be even better engaged and influential in key local government and place shaping agendas across the Priority Places, helping to maintain and build upon Living Places activity, and ensure that Living Places becomes integrated into the agendas of the local authorities.

Improving Engagement between Culture & Sport and Planning & Development

In terms of planning and development, there is strong consultation evidence to suggest that culture and sport is now better embedded with planning in policy terms in a number of Priority Places. For example in Corby, the North Northants Joint Policy Unit is fully signed up to the role of culture and sport in the development of the Core Spatial Strategy, and culture is embedded in planning practice both in terms of a culture input in design surgeries and consultation on major projects, and in terms of the wider North Northants Design Action Programme (funded by ACE and CABE). Examples from Priority Places, along with the evidence based developed both by the CSPT (and through work done by PUSH in particular) will be useful to other places as and when they consider place shaping as public and private sector development and regeneration contexts improve.

Pennine Lancashire is benefiting from improved engagement with planning and economic development as a result of the Culture, Leisure, and Sport Group of PLACE. The creation of a Group specifically dedicated to culture and sport, and chaired by a local authority chief executive is thought to have added weight and recognition to the role of culture and sport within the sub-region by economic development, planning and other core local government services. In Thames Gateway, North Kent Cultural Partnership has also benefited from direct engagement with local authorities.

The Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit (CSPT) is increasingly seen as a tool that is there for planners to engage with as appropriate. Its ongoing existence and impact is likely to be more pronounced within policy influence terms than in terms of actual use, but it is envisaged that once it has influenced core strategies and local development frameworks, influence will cascade down to the development level.

Recent enablers to support improved engagement with planning and economic development has occurred as a result of the recent Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit workshops in Pennine Lancashire, which have taken place to engage planners and cultural officers within Pennine Lancashire in the refresh of the CSPT, and have provided a very useful opportunity for engagement and communication between planners from the Pennine Lancashire local authorities and their cultural counterparts. Similarly, the

funding of additional support to five London Boroughs has supported the development of a number standard charge approaches.

In terms of economic development, Living Places has put culture and sport on the radar of planning and economic development professionals, and is making the transition in the successful Priority Places into mainstream thinking. A number of economic development consultees noted that this might not necessarily be the case for all places, but Living Places highlights how it can work well in receptive places.

Summary of Impact and Added Value

Whilst enjoying a significant profile, and animating a range partnership activity at the national, regional and Priority Place levels, Living Places as a 'programme' of deliverable actions has been relatively modest, and it is therefore crucial that the relative merits of, and the attribution of outcomes and impacts to, the Living Places Programme is understood in the context of activity that has been achieved from an investment of just over £500,000 of funding by the National Living Places Partners over the lifetime of the Programme.

Living Places has established that planning and place is important to culture, and that culture and sport has a strong role to play in the development and regeneration of places. Whilst there is much change at both the national and locality levels, to maintain the legacy of Living Places, and to reinforce the place role of culture, it is important that the Living Places partners assert their ongoing support for the role of culture and sport in places.

Conditions and Factors that Enabled Impact and Added Value

There are a number of clear and transferable success factors that continue to emerge in successive Living Places evaluations. These include:

- The importance of leadership at the local level.
- The need for local capacity to support this leadership and help ensure delivery.
- The national profile and recognition that being a Priority Place has given.
- The pre-existence of partnership/joint working between key partners.
- The added value of the cultural agencies working together to deliver a shared agenda in specific localities.

The importance of local leadership

Partnership remains a core success factor in terms of Priority Places. Driven by personalities and key individuals, places have in many cases got the best out of Living Places as part of a common agenda of the positive development of a place. Whilst these processes would have happened without Living Places, most consultees agree that in successful Priority Places, much more has been achieved than would otherwise have been the case. In the cases of Corby, PUSH and Pennine Lancashire, key partnerships and key individuals have grasped Living Places as a high profile opportunity to better deliver existing culture, sport and place aspirations.

The importance of local 'persuasive' leaders, including the role of key individuals who appreciate and recognise the contribution that culture and sport make to communities are important success factors for places.

The enthusiasm and drive of these key individuals who 'get' the vision of the Living Places Programme has also enabled the commitment of time and (where possible) resources to supporting the Priority Place.

At the end of Year 3 of the Living Places Programme there is awareness amongst all Living Places partners that culture and sport's role in place shaping is more than buildings and supporting infrastructure, but involves being a part of the entire process of creating positive places.

'Flypaper Effect' and the importance of dedicated resources

The 'flypaper' effect relates to the additional resources that have gone to the Priority Places which might otherwise have gone elsewhere, especially from the cultural agencies. This has resulted in funding and projects coming to Priority Places (such as Heritage at Risk work in PUSH, Our Place Empty Shops in Blackburn and Taunton, Our Corby Community Archives work), and projects receiving additional funding to add additional value to what might have been otherwise achieved (such as PUSH's Spatial Planning and the Provision of Cultural and Sporting Infrastructure research, and a range of capital investments across the Priority Place).

It is no coincidence that examples of this 'flypaper effect' stem from those Priority Places who have **benefitted from dedicated resources in terms of officer time** (be it funded by Living Places partners and/or local partnerships, in house or on a consultancy basis). Such resources in Priority Places has enabled actions to be taken forward, proposals to be developed, connections to be made between complementary activity and opportunities to be fully exploited.

Priority Place Profile

A key supporting factor that underpinned many of the impacts achieved has been the **profile that areas have received due to the designation of being a Priority Place**. This profile has manifested itself in a variety of ways, including Ministerial Visits, alongside visits by NDPB Chief Executives (e.g. by Roy Clare, Chief Executive of MLA). Such visits are thought to have helped to increase the awareness and profile of Priority Places amongst local authority chief executives and other key local partners. The designation of being a Priority Place has therefore provided national profile and recognition which has been useful in a variety of influencing aspects.

Those with a leadership role at the Priority Place level are clear that Living Places has resulted in high level dialogue and contact that would otherwise have been very difficult to secure. This has enabled places to raise their profile at the regional and national levels in terms of culture, sport and place shaping.

Partnership Arrangements

Partnership remains a core success factor in terms of what has been achieved across all of the Priority Places. From the outset, the effectiveness of the partnership working within Priority Places was supported by a range of factors and conditions, including:

- Pre-existing **acceptance of particular Priority Places as well-defined areas**, cohesive markets that are appropriate spatial levels to address key issues such as housing market, wider economy, and visitor economy (e.g. Pennine Lancashire as a Housing Market Renewal Area, Southend and Corby as local authorities in their own right (with Corby also being part of the North Northants Development Company area), PUSH as a well established sub regional economic development partnership).

- The well established **pre-existing partnership working** within Priority Places as well as the **pre existing joint working between the cultural agencies** also helped and supported the effectiveness of partnership working in the Priority Places.
- The **resources provided by various partners** have also helped – which allowed the Partnership to have extra capacity in a variety of ways.
- Early **clarity** about key aspects of partnership such as membership, level of representation, principles and values, specification about what members must be able to do, frequency and format of meetings, and so on.
- The ability to evolve and develop the partnership arrangements to ensure that they continued to be fit for purpose and were appropriately aligned to emerging wider agendas was important. This included: changes in partnership structure (e.g. in Pennine Lancashire), frequency of meetings (e.g. Corby), and development and widening of partnership agenda and remit (e.g. PUSH). Such evolutions and developments helped to increase the effectiveness of the partnership working, as well as support the mainstreaming of the Living Places agenda, and the engagement of senior level local government officers and members.

Pre existing support and arrangements

Prior to the launch of the Living Places Programme and the designation of the five places as Priority Places, there had been a range of activities relevant to Living Places already occurring.

For example, in Pennine Lancashire, this included work commissioned by the Housing Market Renewal (HMR) Programme (e.g. the Wilson-Livesey report – “Dreaming of Pennine Lancashire”), pre existing joint working between the regional cultural agencies, pre existing partnership working (through PLACE) between the local authorities has also been a key contributory factor.

Finally, some of the Priority Places (e.g. Pennine Lancashire, Corby, PUSH and North Kent) are thought to have **benefitted from being nested within/well linked to established regeneration partnerships with a wider agenda** that includes regeneration, growth and MAA development.

Priority Place Scale

For Priority Places such as Corby, Pennine Lancashire, and PUSH, the evaluation evidence identified that Priority Places operating at this sub regional (or smaller) level have benefitted in terms of place definition and a clarity of vision and purpose that has supported the higher levels of achievement in these localities, as compared to the two larger Priority Places (Pan-Thames Gateway and the South West).

The Lessons and Learning from the Living Places Programme

It is clear that the context for Living Places in Year 3 is radically different compared to the start of the Programme, and that this wider context it is still in transition (both in terms of its public sector funding, and private sector development drivers). Joint working by the cultural agencies, both in places and through regional arrangements, is now a matter for localities and agencies themselves to make decisions about in terms of when and where to engage.

In the context of Living Places this change in context is reinforcing gaps observed in earlier evaluations – firstly between those regions with Priority Place partnerships and those without, and secondly between those priority places with a spatial focus (i.e.

Corby, PUSH and Pennine Lancashire, and those without (The South West and Thames Gateway).

In short, future engagement, in the short to medium term at least, is likely to be in those places where culture is seen as a priority in terms of place shaping, and where such engagement is seen both as important, and as contributing to wider goals.

There are important lessons from Living Places for the cultural agencies to learn in terms of engagement with local places.

- Firstly, cultural agencies need to be sure that places are committed to the notion of culture being central to the development and regeneration of places, with this being demonstrated by local investment, or existing commitments to invest.
- Secondly, this locality commitment needs to be supported by strong partnership working across a range of locality agendas. Whilst it is not for the cultural agencies to foster such partnership working, successive Living Places evaluations have identified this as a prerequisite to success.
- Thirdly, agencies need to be sure that concepts about place shaping that are understood and are communicable at the national and regional level work effectively at the locality level. For example, the Living Places brand itself was often not understood outside the Living Places network, and indeed in some Priority Places themselves. This led to partners dropping the brand entirely, and engaging with activity on either a mainstream basis or on a task specific locality basis.
- Finally, it may be beneficial to align cultural place shaping activity more closely with the improvement agenda, especially given that in a number of places many of the same stakeholders are engaged in both agendas.

Moving forwards, some consultees in these Priority Places noted that culture and sport agencies need to learn lessons from MLA Council about effective locality engagement in consideration around the types of relationships they need to broker with local authorities in the future. This should be considered in partnership with the remaining cultural agencies to retain the positive working relationships that Priority Places have enjoyed during the lifetime of Living Places.

In terms of **legacy**, there continues to be consensus that the Living Places Programme has coincided with significant improvements in dialogue and partnership working between the cultural agencies in localities, in regions, and at the national level. Whilst Living Places is by no means solely responsible for this development, it has provided an agenda and a set of place-based priorities through which enhanced partnership working can work towards tangible outcomes.

At the national level, there is an opportunity for partners to consider and promote the roll out of work done by PUSH on cultural infrastructure evidence (perhaps also using the Cultural Mapping Tool developed by the London Living Places Partnership), and approaches to top slicing developer contributions to support strategic cultural projects at the sub regional level.

Going forward, the case for culture and sport in regeneration will thrive if the Priority Places sustain this momentum and activity, if the cultural agencies continue to engage in those localities that prioritise the role of culture and sport in regeneration and development, and if investment in cultural facilities transfers into impact and participation in the medium to longer term.

Priority Places appreciate that the (national) profile and recognition that came with being a Priority Place added value in a number of ways, and there is a keenness in some places to continue this (for example, in Pennine Lancashire discussions are at an early stage

with Arts Council regionally about maintaining (post Living Places) recognition of Pennine Lancashire as a 'Priority Place').

In terms of **partnership sustainability**, a number of Priority Places will continue to meet beyond the lifetime of the Living Places Programme, which is a good indication of sustainability in those places where culture and sport remains prominent in development and regeneration agendas.

In terms of **Local Enterprise Partnerships**, many consultees are keen to see culture and sport influence LEP thinking, and much of the Living Places work at the Priority Place level can be used to support arguments and advocacy targeted at LEPs as they develop. However, consultees are also aware of the business growth focus of LEPs, and accept that much of the Living Places agenda will remain with local authorities moving forwards.

Finally, many consultees are concerned about the future availability of the evidence and resources held on the Living Places website. This material, which constitutes an important Living Places legacy, will be of great benefit to localities looking for lessons about culture and sport led regeneration and development at the place level, and it is important that National Partners secure a future hosting solution for this material into the medium term. The recent joint letter² from Jeremy Hunt, Secretary of State for Culture and Cllr Chris White, Chair, LG Group Culture, Tourism & Sport Programme Board identified the Living Places website as a 'suite of online resources developed by DCMS and key public bodies to support the contribution of culture and sport to planning', and this recognition should be built on by ensuring the continuation of the Living Places website.

Lessons for Local Authorities

Allowing for place-based focus, areas can enhance the ability of cultural and sporting issues to be integrated into local development and regeneration schemes through the following approaches:

- Be willing and prepared to evolve the partnership arrangements to ensure alignment with changing policy context and government/governance structures.
- Capitalise on pre-existing support for culture and sport by promoting joint working and engagement as well as sharing knowledge of 'what works' in the local community to increase the chances of success for projects.
- Develop effective local government engagement through linking to, or being embedded within relevant, wider partnership arrangements.
- Develop the local area's evidence base through scoping and mapping studies in order to effectively inform and provide groundwork for future policy and development direction.
- Ensure that key individuals understand, recognise and 'buy into' the role that culture and sport can play in creating sustainable communities.
- Ensure that key partners and sectors work together on a number of fronts to assist with the level of communication, integration and mainstreaming of culture and sport and other shared priorities.
- Ensure that the spatial scale of working is appropriate and effective - building on, and linking to, appropriate pre existing partnership working arrangements and experience.
- Ensure that there is strong local leadership, commitment, drive and engagement from key individuals to support the agenda of culture and sport within sustainable communities.

² <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pageId=15930812>

- Integrate consultation and design quality priorities into culture and sport policies in order to facilitate local support and promote the area as a better place to live, work and visit.
- Integrate culture and sport issues into Local Development Frameworks and Section 106 agreements to improve the level of awareness and funding for such areas.
- Working alongside pre existing partnerships can assist with integration of Living Places issues into a wider remit and enhance both communication and understanding amongst key partners.

1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF EVALUATION APPROACH

Aims of the Evaluation

- 1.1 MLA Council (on behalf of the Living Places Partners (Arts Council England, CABE, English Heritage, MLA Council, Sport England and DCMS)) commissioned DC Research in November 2010 to carry out an evaluation of the third and final year of the Living Places Programme.
- 1.2 The purpose of the Year 3 Evaluation was to build on Year 1 and Year 2 Living Places Programme Evaluations (both of which have been delivered by DC Research), with particular focus to be given to capturing learning from the Living Places priority places in relation to the partnerships and successes of the programme.
- 1.3 **Living Places** emphasises the use of culture and sport to support local distinctiveness and quality of place and promotes the advantage of cultural bodies working together to support local services for communities and individuals, particularly in areas that are experiencing housing led growth and regeneration. The aims of the Living Places Programme are to:
 - Align investment from the sporting and cultural sector across organisational boundaries so it can be used more efficiently for people and places.
 - Provide information, advice and support on the use of culture and sport in sustainable communities to people working in local government, housing, property development, planning and a host of other fields who take the day-to-day decisions that shape communities of the future.
 - Build the capacity of communities themselves so people can be empowered to bring cultural and sporting activity and infrastructure to their communities.
- 1.4 The Living Places Programme is supported by seven partner organisations, which form a National Partner Group, with MLA being the national lead for the Programme:
 - Arts Council England
 - The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)
 - English Heritage
 - Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA)
 - Sport England
 - Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
 - Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
- 1.5 Five Priority Places (Corby, Pennine Lancashire, Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH), Thames Gateway and The South West) were chosen as they were all places experiencing significant change, whether through regeneration or growth, demonstrated ambition and/or good practice in terms of the role of culture and sport in this change, and were sufficiently different to allow the learning to be of broad application. Regional Living Places and Place Shaping Groups have also supported the Programme across the English Regions.
- 1.6 Learning from the Priority Places to date has aimed to inform national policy making relating to regeneration and growth and culture and sport, and it has also provided evidence of good practice, which has helped to support better delivery. This learning can help the current government understand how culture and sport

can contribute to some of its major agendas (e.g. the role of cultural and community based institutions contributing to the building of successful places (the “Big Society”), and supporting local determination and demand for culture and sport provision in communities).

- 1.7 The evaluation is intended to answer the following key questions, and to satisfy the following key objectives:

Key evaluation questions	Key evaluation objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Which partnerships have been successful in establishing good partnerships, why and how? ▪ What have been the key facilitators to success? ▪ What have been the key barriers to success, and how have they been/are they being overcome? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrate and communicate the learning from the Priority Places in order to inform policy making by key national policy makers in regeneration, growth and community building. ▪ Inform practice by those delivering culture and sport’s contribution to regeneration and growth; and to ▪ Shape future approaches to sustainability and regeneration.

Structure of the report

- 1.8 This report is the Final Report for the Year 3 Evaluation (produced in March 2011) and is structured as follows.

- This section (Section 1) provides an introduction, sets out the aims of the Evaluation, and provides a summary of the spatial focus that has been adopted for the evaluation.
- Section 2 considers the added value that Living Places has provided in terms of the **resources** that Priority Places have invested and the **activities** that have either been initiated or supported by Living Places.
- Section 3 summarises a range of the **outputs and outcomes** that have been achieved across the Priority Places. This includes highlighting specific developments in the Priority Places, examples of engagement with planning and economic development audiences, and achievements relating to the Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit.
- Section 4 presents the analysis and findings about the **impacts and added value** that Living Places has generated in Priority Places.
- Finally, Section 5 provides a summary of the **key findings** from the evaluation, with particular emphasis on the **legacy and sustainability** of Living Places, the alignment of Living Places to emerging locality based approaches, and implications and lessons from the findings of this evaluation for future locality engagement through culture and sport.

- 1.9 There are also a number of Annexes to the main report, provided as a stand-alone document – which provides more detail about the approach and methodology adopted for the evaluation, as well as presenting further information about some of the analysis that has been carried out to underpin the key findings from the evaluation:

- Annex 1 outlines the **approach** adopted for the Evaluation, the **methodology** that has been used, and the Living Places **Evaluation Framework** that has underpinned both the approach and method.

- Annex 2 provides a **list of the individuals and groups that were consulted** as part of the Year 3 Living Places Evaluation.
- Annex 3 presents the results from the Living Places **Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit (CSPT) survey** that was carried out as part of the evaluation.
- Annex 4 presents the results of the **quantitative data analysis** for the evaluation, which focused on the Impacts element of the Living Places Evaluation Framework.
- Finally, Annex 5 presents a summary of the **review of the key strategies** for each of the Priority Places/agreed spatially focused areas for the Year 3 Evaluation of Living Places, focusing on the key regeneration, planning, economic development and culture strategies for each of the Priority Places, as well as any specifically commissioned studies in the Priority Places that have occurred as a result of Living Places.

Spatial Focus at the Priority Place level

- 1.10 The Year 3 Living Places Evaluation has a clear focus on the impacts from Living Places at the Priority Place level. This necessitated a need to adopt a narrower spatial focus for the study, especially for the larger Priority Places, to ensure that the evaluation had a 'place' based specificity that would enable meaningful and comparable impact analysis to be undertaken.
- 1.11 Annex 1 explains in detail the overall approach adopted and the specific spatial focus adopted in each of the Priority Places. In brief, at an early stage of the evaluation scoping discussions were held with lead representatives in each Priority Place to examine ways in which an appropriate spatial focus could be achieved for each individual Priority Place, which led to the following approach being adopted :
 - **Corby:** The spatial focus matches the Priority Place, covering the whole local authority area.
 - **Pennine Lancashire:** The spatial focus matches the Priority Place, covering 6 local authority districts Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle, Ribble Valley, and Rossendale (and also part of Lancashire County Council, given that some parts of Pennine Lancashire have a two-tier local government structure).
 - **PUSH:** The spatial focus matches the Priority Place, covering 11 local authorities – Portsmouth Council, Southampton Council (both unitary authorities), Hampshire County Council and district authorities of Eastleigh, East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, New Forest, Test Valley and Winchester.
 - **South West:** The spatial focus is on the town of Taunton, as this was recognised by partners as the key place in the South West where there has been any degree of impact at a place-based level from the Living Places programme.
 - **Thames Gateway:** The spatial focus is on two areas – Canning Town and Southend, building on the fact that both locations are places where there has been a concentration of investment and activity through Living Places.

2. LIVING PLACES RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES

- 2.1 This section considers the added value that Living Places has provided in terms of the resources that Priority Places have invested and the activities that have either been initiated or supported by Living Places.
- 2.2 It includes a summary of secondary evidence in the form of studies commissioned by Priority Places, with more detail being provided in both the separate Priority Places summaries, and also Annex 5

Research, evidence and strategy influence

- 2.3 There has been a range of relevant studies either commissioned formally through the Living Places Programme, or via partners working to promote the role of culture and sport on development and regeneration in the Priority Places.
- 2.4 For example, in **Corby** this notably includes the 'Our Corby' work, studies by Jura, work on Public Realm and the development of strategies such as North Northants Cultural Investment Plan and the Northants Cultural Strategy for Children and Young People. In **PUSH** there have been a range of studies and research exercises completed, focussing on culture and sport evidence, design guidance and creative industries research.
- 2.5 The **Canning Town and Customs House Cultural Framework** was designed to add value to existing activity and inform cultural partners as to the role of culture in the physical transformation of Canning Town. This cultural framework was produced in partnership with Living Places and outlines its overall aim as creating a place where people wish to live and work and promoting participation in local life to help achieve this goal. It recognises the role in which culture and sport can contribute to this development and in bringing communities together to form a unique sense of place. It is expected that cultural developments will help to unify promote social cohesion, increase opportunity in the area and change perceptions of Canning Town in the medium to long term.
- 2.6 In **Pennine Lancashire**, the key primary piece of research that Living Places supported has been the Mapping the Cultural Sector in Pennine Lancashire by Jura Consultants. The study has achieved influence in a number of ways. First, the findings of the research were launched by the then Culture Secretary, helping to reinforce the national profile of Pennine Lancashire as a Priority Place, thereby ensuring the engagement of key local government partners. Second, the study is currently being used by planners within the Pennine Lancashire local authorities as a key source of evidence to help inform the development of the new planning documents. An issue that the use of the study in such planning documents has reinforced is the need for such mapping to be regularly refreshed and updated. This is an issue that Pennine Lancashire is aware of, and is under consideration.
- 2.7 Table 2.1 overleaf provides a summary of the studies and research reports that have been commissioned by, or through, the Living Places/Priority Place partnerships.

Evaluation of the Living Places Programme Year 3: MLA Council

Table 2.1: Research Studies and Plans commissioned by Priority Places (as lead or as partners) (x=some contribution, xx=significant contribution, xxx= critical contribution)						
Place	Name of Document	Status	Geography Covered	Produced by partner/Commissioned	Name of Company/Partner who Produced it	Strength of Culture and Sport Reference
Canning Town	Newham Community Infrastructure Study: Culture and Regeneration	Newham	Development Document.	Commissioned by London Borough of Newham.	Colin Buchanan.	XX
Canning Town	Canning Town & Custom House, Cultural Framework	Canning Town	Cultural Framework	Commissioned by LB Newham and London Living Places Partnership	Anita Nadkarni, placemarc	XX
Corby	Plan for Culture 2010 to 2014	Research Report	Milton Keynes and South Midlands	Commissioned by Future City, C Network, MKSM.	BOP Consulting.	XXX
Corby	The Cultural Strategy for Children and Young People	Research Report	Northamptonshire	Commissioned by Northamptonshire County Council and Arts Council.	Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy	XXX
Corby	North Northamptonshire Mapping Overview of Cultural Assets: Cultural Investment Plan, Feb 2010.	Mapping Report	North Northamptonshire	Commissioned by Arts Council, Northamptonshire County Council and Corby Borough Council, North Northants Development Company, Joint Planning Unit and WNDC.	Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy	XX
Corby	Excellence & Innovation in Northamptonshire's Public Realm: Review and Recommendations, Apr 2010.	Research Report	Northamptonshire	Commissioned by Arts Council, Northamptonshire County Council and Corby Borough Council, North Northants Development Company, Joint Planning Unit and WNDC.	Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy	XX
Corby	Community Archives and the Sustainable Communities Agenda	Research Report	Corby	Commissioned by MLA Council	Jura Consultants	XX
Corby	A Cultural Investment Plan for North Northamptonshire, Feb 2010.	Research Report	North Northamptonshire	Commissioned by Arts Council, Northamptonshire County Council and Corby Borough Council, North Northants Development Company, Joint Planning Unit and WNDC.	Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy	XXX
Pennine Lancashire	Mapping the Cultural Sector in Pennine Lancashire	Pennine Lancashire	Development Document	Commissioned by Living Places.	Jura Consultants	XX
PUSH	PUSH Design Infrastructure Review, (2008).	PUSH	Development Document	Commissioned by PUSH.	Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design	X

Evaluation of the Living Places Programme Year 3: MLA Council

Table 2.1: Research Studies and Plans commissioned by Priority Places (as lead or as partners) (x=some contribution, xx=significant contribution, xxx= critical contribution)						
Place	Name of Document	Status	Geography Covered	Produced by partner/Commissioned	Name of Company/Partner who Produced it	Strength of Culture and Sport Reference
PUSH	A Framework for Creative Industries Development in South Hampshire, (2009).	South Hampshire	Development Document	Written by partner.	PUSH.	X
PUSH	The South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit, (2010).	South Hampshire	Development Document	Commissioned by PUSH.	Audience South/Cultural Consulting/ Professor M. Elson/ Charles Freeman	XX
PUSH	PUSH Cultural Strategy	PUSH	Development Document	Commissioned by PUSH.	Agenda UK Ltd	XXX
PUSH	Spatial Planning and the Provision of Cultural and Sporting Infrastructure in the PUSH area.	PUSH	Development document	Commissioned by Living Places and the PUSH Quality of Life Delivery Panel.	Martin J Elson.	XX
Southend-on-Sea	Developing a Cultural Hub in Southend-on-Sea (2007).	Southend-on-sea	Development document	Commissioned by the University of Essex.	Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy.	XX

Resources

- 2.8 A key element in evaluating and assessing the impact of Living Places is to understand the resources that have been invested into the Priority Places from a range of sources. However, evidence in this regard is partial for many Priority Places, particularly in terms of 'in-kind' and also investment from 'non-cultural' sources.
- 2.9 Whilst labelled a 'programme', Living Places does not benefit from traditional programme resources, so any assessment of resources invested (both in cash and in kind) has been dependent upon information and evidence provided to the study team, primarily through consultation.
- 2.10 The Year 2 Living Places Evaluation³ summarised the various partnerships that have operated during the lifetime of the Living Places Programme, and this in itself has represented significant time resource from a range of national, regional and local partners.
- 2.11 In addition, at the national level, the Living Places partners have invested over £500,000 to support Living Places partnerships, commissioned specific studies and supported evaluation and learning across the three years of the programme. In addition to this, the programme was supported by dedicated officer resources during its lifetime (1.5 FTE staff supporting the programme in Year 1, and 1 FTE member of staff in both Year 2 and 3).
- 2.12 At the Priority Place level, Corby, Pennine Lancashire, PUSH and the London Living Place Partnership have all benefited from dedicated resources that have enabled a **Living Places/Priority Place post** to be supported (e.g. the Living Places Manager in Pennine Lancashire, the Cultural Co-ordinators in PUSH and London, and so on). These posts have been funded by a mix of local and Living Places resources.
- 2.13 Support such as this has allowed Priority Places to engage in a range activity that has added value to the effectiveness of these locations as Priority Places. One aspect of this has been the additional NDPB investment in, and focus on, Priority Places as a result of enhanced profile and reputation, as well as engagement in a range of other arts, culture and sport related project activity and the leveraging in of additional resources, examples of which include the following:
- Use of HCA and S106 funds (Rockingham Forest near Corby), and engagement in 'major projects' groups and design surgeries with local authority planners in Corby.
 - Successful leveraging funding for community and cultural activity through Landfill Tax and WREN⁴ in Corby.
 - Investment by PUSH of £1.2m in the Theatre Royal in Portsmouth, and by ACE in Southampton's new arts centre, which leveraged additional investment in both cases.
 - Investment in Southend in a modern library, museums and arts and creative facilities.
 - Support from Arts Council England to help establish and develop the Taunton Cultural Partnership.

³ <http://research.mla.gov.uk/evidence/view-publication.php?dm=nrm&pubid=1138>

⁴ <http://www.wren.org.uk/>

- Investment by the London Living Places Partnership in the development of the Canning Town and Customs House Development Framework and (support by grant aid) the CSPT projects in Enfield, Islington, Merton, Southwark and Wandsworth.
- 2.14 There are many other examples of activities occurring in the Priority Places as a result of such additional dedicated resources, and it is clear that the funding of such activity to support Living Places activity in Priority Place, (whether by the places themselves, or by Living Places partners), has resulted in significant additional outputs and outcomes as a result of the enabling and supporting role that this can provide.
- 2.15 Where such posts have been funded by Living Places partners, it is reasonable to attribute any resulting outcomes and impacts to Living Places, and more generally, consultees are clear that such investment would have been unlikely without the confidence and credibility that was provided from being a Priority Place. Whilst the lack of clear monitoring mechanisms for such roles prevents precise attribution of impact, it is clear that these roles have been essential in many of the successes of Living Places in Corby, Pennine Lancashire and PUSH.
- 2.16 These examples highlight the position of the successful Priority Places as hotspots for culture and sport activity and investment, suggesting the existence of a 'fly paper' effect that has made these Priority Places attractive to the NDPBs and other funders. The term 'flypaper effect' refers to activity and support/resources highlighted and observed through consultation where Priority Places have received additional investment as a result of their profile as a Priority Place. This is discussed in more detail in subsequent sections of the report.
- 2.17 However, currently, Priority Place consultees are increasingly unable to distinguish between Living Places activity and mainstream activity in their Places, and this is something that they think will increase going forward. Whilst this is to be expected in places such as Southend, Canning Town and Taunton, as they are not formally designated as Priority Places in their own right, it is also increasingly the case that Living Places activity has been mainstreamed in Corby, PUSH and Pennine Lancashire.

Living Places Meetings

- 2.18 Of the Priority Places, it has been Corby, Pennine Lancashire and PUSH that have met as Priority Place Partnerships throughout the lifetime of Living Places.
- 2.19 Priority Place meetings in **Corby** have been on an annual basis for the past two years, and have evolved into meetings where mainstream activity around the Living Places agenda is discussed and coordinated. For example, the meeting in November 2010 had a focus on LEPs, and how best to ensure that culture and sport could influence LEP development. This suggests that Living Places has been successful in embedding culture and sport in development, regeneration and place shaping, and the activity between partners is ongoing on a number of fronts.
- 2.20 In Corby, Living Places meetings have tended to be attended by regional representatives from cultural agencies, as well as Milton Keynes South Midlands (MKSM), North Northamptonshire Joint Policy Unit (NNJPU) and North Northamptonshire Development Corporation (NNDC), providing a strong mix of culture, local authority, development and planning representation. Meetings are planned to continue beyond the end of Living Places based on continuing demand to coordinate activity and momentum.

- 2.21 The **PUSH** Quality Places Panel meets on a quarterly basis, and has widened its remit in Year 3 to include tourism, retail and creative industries sector in addition to culture and sport. Engagement includes higher education, economic development and planning, and a range of thematic representatives reflecting the sectors engaged. In contrast to Corby, the engagement of the cultural agencies has become more infrequent in the past 12 months in comparison to the first two years of the Living Places Programme.
- 2.22 In the **South West**, the cultural agencies meet on a quarterly basis through the SW Cultural Executive Board, supported by the Officers Group, and this has been the basis for Living Places discussions for the majority of the lifetime of the programme.
- 2.23 In **Pennine Lancashire**, the partnership arrangements have now evolved into a regional partnership group for the cultural agencies and other key regional partners (with this group focusing on four localities of priority, including Pennine Lancashire), and the development of a sub regional group, in the form of a Culture, Sport and Leisure sub group of the PLACE Joint Committee (a fully constituted Joint Committee with representation by Leaders from each local authority). The Culture, Sport and Leisure subgroup is chaired by a local authority chief executive, has local government engagement, and has Living Places as part of the group's Terms of Reference. This is regarded as a key achievement in both the recognition of the role of culture and sport in Pennine Lancashire as well as a way in which the role of culture and sport has been mainstreamed within this key local government structure.

3. OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES IN PRIORITY PLACES

- 3.1 This section summarises a range of outputs and outcomes across the Priority Places. This includes highlighting specific developments in the Priority Places, examples of engagement with planning and economic development audiences, and outputs and outcomes that relate to the Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit.
- 3.2 It should be noted that whilst there are a range of specific outputs and outcomes within Priority Places that are presented in the first section below, the extent to which these can be regarded as being attributable to Living Places is open to question, and will vary from place to place. What is clear from the consultations carried out for this evaluation is that the support from Living Places and the profile from being a nationally recognised Priority Place, alongside the added value of the resources outlined in Section 2, has been an enabling factor that has supported these outputs and outcomes.

Specific Priority Place outputs and outcomes

- 3.3 At the end of the Living Place Programme Corby has benefited from a diverse mix of focus and activity, ranging from the capital developments in and around Corby Cube, detailed work on specific projects, full engagement of culture in the planning process both in terms of policy, regular formal engagement in meetings and by case by case engagement through major projects.
- 3.4 In summary, Corby has developed high quality facilities underpinned by good relationships and a reputation for delivery. Figure 3.1 shows Corby Cube and Corby Pool, located at the main gateway to the Town Centre.

Figure 3.1: Corby Cube



Source: www.corbycube.com

- 3.5 PUSH has commissioned and developed the Spatial Planning and the Provision of Cultural and Sporting Infrastructure⁵ research, which can be used as evidence to support provision for culture in S106 and CIL agreements. This work has led to proposals currently being considered by PUSH to top slice CIL and S106 funding for strategic culture projects, and has provided the evidence base that allows planners to be confident in asking for affordable developer contributions.
- 3.6 This planner confidence in the culture and sport evidence base is essential, and can be regarded as an outcome in terms of the Living Places Evaluation Framework, with S06 and CIL contributions being the related impacts.
- 3.7 The Design Charter⁶ recently launched by the Quality Places Panel represents a another product developed by PUSH that can be seen both as an outcome in the Living Places sense, and an approach that could be adopted and adapted for use in other places. The Charter recognises the importance of high quality design in adding social and economic value to an area. It aims to set a standard for such design to ensure that developments within the whole area covered by PUSH are contributing to the overall plans.
- 3.8 Whilst not a Priority Place in its own right, Southend on Sea is undergoing substantial culture and sport led regeneration and development, with a number of high profile projects delivered and planned. For example, a joint £35m library project between the Borough Council, Essex University and Southend College will combine resources and replace the current central library. This new library represents a fundamental part of a strategy to regenerate the top of Southend's High Street, and is one of a number of significant developments (along with the Metal arts laboratory/venue⁷, the Southend Swimming & Diving Centre, the development of a new museum, and the redevelopment of Prittlewell Priory, supported by an investment of £1.3m from the Heritage Lottery Fund) that demonstrate the Borough's commitment to culture and sport led regeneration. This investment in cultural facilities is supported by a range of arts, culture and sport, and creative industries events and activities.
- 3.9 Figure 3.2 shows a visualisation of the new Priory Museum in Southend.

⁵

www.push.gov.uk/spatial_planning_and_the_provision_of_cultural_and_sporting_infrastructure_in_the_push_area.pdf

⁶ http://www.push.gov.uk/quality_places_charter.pdf

⁷ <http://www.metalculture.com>

Figure 3.2: Visualisation of Southend's new museum development



Source: MLA Council

- 3.10 In Canning Town, the development of the town centre will have a strong cultural offer, with the SPD setting out LB Newham's expectations in terms of cultural facilities. Development is effectively occurring on a blank canvas, and given the amount of development planned for East London in the run up to 2012 and beyond, Canning Town centre will have high quality cultural facilities as its unique selling point to be competitive as a location.
- 3.11 The **Canning Town and Customs House Cultural Framework** networked the LB Newham regeneration team with cultural partnerships both locally and across London, mixing opportunities for 'quick wins' (such as the Growing Place16 at Clarkson Road) with an articulation of the role of cultural facilities as a core element of the long term physical regeneration of the area.
- 3.12 The work at Canning Town has included the engagement of a number of social enterprise and third sector groups in utilising 'meanwhile space'⁸ in the period between site clearance and development for a range of activities and events. This has included work on community allotments, temporary BMX tracks and providing a range of cultural offers.
- 3.13 In the short term, the use of meanwhile space is regarded as a positive use of development space, resulting in positive outcomes in terms of community engagement and participation. In addition to LB Newham and London Living Places Partnership, partners include Core Arts, University of East London (UEL), Groundwork and a range of community groups.
- 3.14 Figure 3.3 highlights the Growing Place16 development in Canning Town.

⁸ <http://www.meanwhile.org.uk/showcase/growing-place16-canning-town-london>

Figure 3.3: Growing PlacE16, Canning Town



Source: Placemarc

Priority Place engagement with planning and economic development

- 3.15 There are a number of examples where culture and sport has become effectively embedded with planning and economic development processes in Priority Places. For example, **Corby** has benefited from close engagement with the North Northants Joint Policy Unit. The Core Strategy for North Northants NNJPU sets out combined planning powers for Kettering, East Northants and Wellingborough as well as for Corby. For example, Corby has benefited from strong engagement from economic development and planning stakeholders, particularly in the form of North Northants Development Company (NNDC).
- 3.16 Covering Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough, NNDC is the Local Delivery Vehicle for the area, bringing forward the necessary infrastructure improvements to in turn create the right environment for investment, new jobs and significant housing growth. In addition to NNDC, Corby benefits from being engaged in the North Northants Joint Planning Unit (JPU) and Joint Planning Committee (JPC). This relationship has underpinned the prominence of culture and sport in the development of Corby.
- 3.17 Culture is represented on NNJPU's 'Major Applications Group', and ACE and CABE have funded the Design Action Programme and a Design Action Manager role which ensures major applications meet Core Strategy objectives and are of high design quality. Whilst this role pre-dates Living Places, and covers a larger area than Corby, there are clear synergies that have added value to developments via high quality design and strong culture and sport inputs.
- 3.18 The Design Action Programme has also included hosting and facilitating a series of workshops and training events, including CSPT, inputs on culture and public realm and informal workshops with arts officers to promote public art opportunities. This activity has helped to influence the approach taken to Developer Contributions and Supplementary Planning Document.

- 3.19 In the South West, whilst **Taunton** has provided a focus for activity, the cultural agencies are less engaged with activity and progress on the ground compared to 12 months ago, and this is thought to be primarily due to a lack of capacity within the cultural agencies for such engagement at the current time/in the current funding climate.
- 3.20 In **PUSH**, the Quality Places Panel has been actively engaged with other PUSH Panels regarding the focus of economic development activities, especially around the relative priority of the creative industries sector. This engagement is indicative of the increasing reach of the Quality Places Panel, which has also taken on PUSH lead for tourism and retail activity.
- 3.21 A current enabler to improved engagement with planning and economic development in **Pennine Lancashire** has occurred as a result of the recent workshops organised by the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA). These workshops, which have taken place to engage planners and cultural officers within Pennine Lancashire in the revisions of the CSPT that TCPA are currently involved in, have provided a very useful opportunity for engagement and communication between planners from the Pennine Lancashire local authorities and their cultural counterparts.
- 3.22 In addition, Pennine Lancashire is also benefiting from improved engagement with planning and economic development as a result of the Culture, Leisure, and Sport subgroup of PLACE. The creation of a PLACE subgroup specifically dedicated to culture and sport, and chaired by a local authority chief executive is thought to have added weight and recognition to the role of culture and sport within the sub-region by economic development, planning and other core local government services.
- 3.23 Finally, engagement within Pennine Lancashire between culture and sport and planners/economic development has also been aided by the inclusion of culture and sport in the Pennine Lancashire Multi Area Agreement (MAA). The MAA specifically mentions Pennine Lancashire as a Priority Place, with an Action within the MAA⁹ being for: "Pennine Lancashire partners to work with Government to maximise its status as a 'Priority Place'".
- 3.24 In contrast to the above successes in terms of engagement, there appear to be more challenges around other localities that are located within Priority Places, but have not received the scale of support and resource that some of the Priority Places have benefitted from (e.g. Taunton and Southend). In locations such as this, planners and economic development officers have a low awareness of both Living Places generally, and the CSPT (with the exception of the explicit Living Places support for the Empty Shops project in Taunton, which is well understood). Such examples however, should not be regarded as unsuccessful from a Living Places perspective, as the role of culture and sport is well recognised within Taunton in a variety of ways, within the key strategies for the area, as well as via Project Taunton. It is more likely to be an example of planners and economic development officers not being explicitly aware of Living Places or the CSPT, whilst their engagement with culture and sport has improved in recent years, and this has been due to the support that Living Places has been able to provide to cultural partners within the area (e.g. the development of the Taunton Cultural Partnership).

⁹ http://www.penninelancsplace.org/Shared%20Documents/09240_MAA_Document_Final_with_App.pdf

Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit

- 3.25 With particular consideration of those that are aware of, and have engaged with the CSPT, it (the toolkit) is increasingly seen as a tool that is there for planners to engage with as appropriate. Its existence and impact is likely to be more pronounced within policy influence terms than in terms of actual use, but it is envisaged that once it has influenced core strategies and LDFs, influence will cascade down to the development level.
- 3.26 There is a general awareness of the CSPT amongst planners within Priority Places, and there are good examples of its approach influencing planning policy. For example, the evidence underpinning CSPT is seen as being very influential in the North Northants Core Strategy refresh, and it is this sort of influence where planners see the impact of CSPT being most pronounced.
- 3.27 The CSPT is part of a wider evidence base that has been developed over the last 5 years around the role of planning in place shaping. Whilst it has had a policy influencing role, there is a disconnect in terms of its influence and use at the individual application/development level, as planners in most of the Priority Places are mindful of adding to the burden of detail that developments need to consider and allow for (such as crime impact assessments, biodiversity etc), fearful that over burdening developers could lead to schemes being taken forward in alternate locations.
- 3.28 Whilst the CSPT can be regarded by developers as one of a plethora of 'add ons' above and beyond the minimum to secure permission to develop, the CSPT can help planners to ensure arguments for improved cultural facilities are robust. Nevertheless, planning and economic development consultees noted caution concerning current economic conditions, with many developers looking for the bare minimum in terms of additional public sector requirements for developments.
- 3.29 In terms of the CSPT, there has been a range of additional activity in: Corby (where there has been an additional MKSM specific seminar), Pennine Lancashire (through the University of Liverpool Masters level planning students coursework, as well as the recent, additional workshops on the refresh of the CSPT delivered by TCPA) and PUSH (with the study about Spatial Planning and the Provision of Cultural and Sporting Infrastructure in the PUSH area study).
- 3.30 Furthermore, the London Living Partnership granted additional CSPT support to five London Boroughs to develop standard charges for culture. Authorities who had attended the CSPT Seminars in June 2010 were invited to apply for one of up to five grants of up to £10,000 to support a piece of work that would embed the use of the Culture and Sport Planning Toolkit and the standard charge mechanism.
- 3.31 The aims of this support were to promote the inclusion of culture in SPDs, LDFs and core strategies, and to promote the use of the Library and Archive and the Arts and Museum Standard Charges. The five local authorities were Enfield, Islington, Merton, Southwark and Wandsworth, and the project is due to finish in February 2011. As of the beginning of February, most of the local authorities have successfully developed standard charge approaches.
- 3.32 Taking a wider perspective, the results of the Living Places CSPT survey carried out as part of this evaluation (see Annex 3 for the detailed survey results) highlighted the key considerations with the CSPT. The key findings from the survey are outlined below.

- 3.33 In terms of the aim/purpose of the CSPT is, the majority of respondents mentioned features such as bringing together those working in culture, sport, heritage, planning and regeneration to provide a **common set of guidance, information and best practice** that could be used by all.
- 3.34 Another commonly identified purpose was that the CSPT aims to **promote awareness of cultural issues** in order to strategically integrate it into development plans with the aim of meeting cross-sector local demands and objectives. Others outlined that the toolkit was important in **creating a common dialogue**, a coordinated approach and a method by which local authorities can both assess and act on local need. Several responses suggested that this coordinated method will **lead to improved delivery of cultural priorities and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities**.
- 3.35 **Awareness** of the CSPT (87%) and of the CSPT website (82%) is high, and this high level of awareness is consistent across all Priority Places. The vast majority of those that are aware of the CSPT have visited it (93%), with three quarters (75%) of respondents having visited the CSPT website on 5 or less occasions.
- 3.36 In terms of the top benefits of the CSPT, the majority of answers mentioned that providing **case studies**, guidance and a **shared methodological approach** in one place was a clear benefit, allowing users to access information needed and to ensure consistency. Others mentioned that providing a **common language** by which both planners and the cultural sector could work from would assist with the effective promotion of cultural developments and make the inclusion of cultural issues into development plans easier to achieve. There were also several answers that mentioned the toolkit as being **helpful in providing useful links to other guidance** (such as Sport England) and in ensuring new guidance is up to date and relevant.
- 3.37 Further benefits included **creating better relations between the various sectors** involved and raising awareness amongst these departments of linked objectives and strategies that require such joint working to be fully achieved.
- 3.38 In contrast, when considering the two main drawbacks/limitations of the CSPT, many people commented that the **visibility of the toolkit was low** and the fact that it was **not a mandatory tool meant that many did not use it**. Another common response was around the **quality of the guidance** and its relevance to everyday work. Other comments included that the toolkit had **limited applications in practice** and was too prescriptive to take account of individual applications.
- 3.39 Those that had described the CSPT as being of limited use offered two main reasons for this – first, people had not used it as they **did not find it relevant to their role or work** and that there was too much general information in the toolkit and not enough clear guidance., and second, some are **unaware of the purpose or uses of the toolkit**, leading to a lack of its use.
- 3.40 In terms of **use of the CSPT**, less than a quarter (24%) of respondents had actually used all or even part of the toolkit. Those that have used it were asked what they had used it for, and what impacts it had provided. Notably, only ten replies were received to these questions, re-emphasising the lack of use of the CSPT. Of those that replied, the common responses related to using the CSPT as a general source of information for research, information and case studies, as well as being used to add weight and evidence when putting the case to planners about the inclusion of culture and sport in potential developments. Examples where the CSPT has been used in more detail include:

- Swindon – where it has been applied in reviewing and planning libraries provision and also the wider Cultural offer of Swindon
 - MKSM – where a report was commissioned by the MKSM Partnership, which looked at where each local authority in the subregion was in terms of the 5 steps of the CSPT.
 - Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire – where the MLA and ACE tools (located via the CSPT website) were used to inform infrastructure mapping across the Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Sub Region.
- 3.41 In terms of the key challenges to the success of the CSPT many respondents identified political change, **securing developer interest in times of recession** and the **lack of awareness of the toolkit and its uses**. Spending and **funding cuts** were also seen as key issues, suggesting that future development would be limited and the loss of regional development agencies as well as many other quangos was viewed as being detrimental to the promotion of the toolkit and its priorities.
- 3.42 Also, the **current profile was viewed as a limiting factor**, and there were several comments suggesting that awareness and knowledge of the toolkit was low and a lack of evaluation and evidence demonstrating the benefits of using such methods meant that **planners did not view it as a priority**.
- 3.43 A further key challenge was viewed as a **lack of interest in developing the toolkit**, both due to funding priorities and as a result of the low level of people currently aware of and using the toolkit.
- 3.44 In terms of addressing the challenges to the CSPT, the majority of answers focussed around the **need to generate more publicity and awareness** of the toolkit, secure Government and policy backing, make the guidance more user friendly, and **develop a greater evidence base**. In terms of generating publicity, the key methods suggested included e-news bulletins/publishing newsletters of recent news and updates, journal and magazine publications and promotion of success stories. Securing Government backing and **inclusion in policy or planning guidance** was additionally seen as a necessity in addressing the challenges of supporting Section 106 agreements, increasing usage and to promote greater interest.
- 3.45 Recommendations for improvement of the CSPT involved aspects such as changing the layout, **updating information regularly**, creating a **downloadable version of guidance**, and providing a **facility to share local knowledge and best practice**. The need to **provide more training** was mentioned as it was felt that this would allow for a better understanding of its uses.
- 3.46 The majority of respondents thought the next key steps in the delivery of the CSPT were related to the need for **more training and events on using the toolkit** and for the **guidance to be kept up to date with policy changes**. Other steps proposed included the need to **improve the layout and structure of the CSPT website** to make it more user-friendly and the **need to promote the benefits of using the CSPT** and the wider value of prioritising culture and sport in place making considerations.

4. UNDERSTANDING IMPACTS AND VALUE ADDED OF LIVING PLACES

4.1 This Section presents the analysis and findings about the impacts and added value that Living Places has generated in the Priority Places, focusing on impacts around policy influence, additional investment into the Priority Places, the profile provided by being a Priority Place and the sustainability of what has been achieved.

Policy Influencing

4.2 In planning terms, there is strong qualitative evidence to suggest that the development of culture and sport through Living Places has influenced planning and economic development policy in Corby, PUSH, Pennine Lancashire, Southend, London and in some parts of the South West (e.g. Taunton, with consultees also making reference to Exeter, Bristol, South Gloucestershire and Plymouth having benefited from the influence of culture in place shaping developments, as well as the emerging Cornwall Culture Board).

4.3 Given that cultural infrastructure provision is a new topic area for planners in relative terms, influencing planning policy is an important outcome for the Living Places programme, as is the learning and raised awareness among many cultural professionals in these places about the planning system. It should be noted however that whilst planners in Priority Places are very aware of the priority and importance attached to culture and sport in place shaping, they are less aware of Living Places and the Priority Place status of their area.

4.4 However, there is consensus amongst planners that the use of CSPT as a toolkit for assessing planning applications from developers is not, and never was, a realistic outcome, and despite some instances of such uses (for example in South Gloucestershire in the context of a combined library and museum development in partnership with a college in Cheltenham, and with some eco towns), it is thought that such uses of the CSPT should not be the criterion of success for the CSPT. The CSPT is more likely to achieve success in terms of influencing planning policy (as outlined above and in Section 3), in addition to which it is a useful means of helping to bring together planning and culture and sport, improving communication and creating a common dialogue. As such, it is a means to an end (with the end being better recognition and embedding of the role of culture and sport within planning and development) rather than an end in itself.

4.5 Issues around awareness of Living Places by planners should be regarded in context, as a number of economic development consultees noted that engaging with planners was also a challenge for them. Nevertheless, the fact that planners are increasingly receptive to the arguments around the importance of culture and sport is a strong outcome for Living Places. For example, in Corby culture is represented at borough level design surgeries as well as the major projects group for North Northants. These surgeries have served to raise the profile of culture and public art in the borough, and also an appreciation of the many other factors and partners involved (e.g. Police).

4.6 In Pennine Lancashire, the key policy influencing success of Living Places is the **inclusion of culture and sport in the Pennine Lancashire Multi Area Agreement (MAA)**, with one of the key actions of the policy being for: "Pennine Lancashire partners to work with Government to maximise its status as a 'Priority Place'".

- 4.7 An example of local policy influence within Pennine Lancashire relates to the use of the 'Mapping the Cultural Sector in Pennine Lancashire' research by planners within Pennine Lancashire as a key source of evidence to help inform the development of new local planning documents and policies.
- 4.8 Finally for Pennine Lancashire in terms of policy influence, the creation of the PLACE subgroup specifically dedicated to culture and sport, and chaired by a local authority chief executive is thought to add weight and recognition to the role of culture and sport within the sub-region by economic development, planning and other core local government services and as such will enable culture and sport to better influence the mainstream local government policies and strategies. In addition, this subgroup working with the Pennine Lancashire Living Places Manager has recently completed the Pennine Lancashire Cultural Plan 2011-2014 along with an Action Plan, with engagement from the leaders and chief executives of the Pennine Lancashire authorities being achieved as part of this process.
- 4.9 Table 4.1 represents an analysis of policies and strategies from the Priority Places that have been influenced by Living Places.

Evaluation of the Living Places Programme Year 3: MLA Council

Table 4.1: Priority Place Strategies and Plans influenced by Living Places (x=some contribution, xx=significant contribution, xxx= critical contribution)					
Place	Name of Document	Status	Geography Covered	Name of Company/Partner who produced document	Strength of Culture and Sport Reference
Canning Town	Newham Local Development Framework: Policy options.	Newham	Planning Document	Southend-on-sea Borough Council.	X
Canning Town	Newham Local Development Framework: Issues and options.	Newham	Planning Document	Southend-on-sea Borough Council.	-
Canning Town	Newham Sustainable Community Strategy	Newham	Planning Document	Newham London Council.	XX
Canning Town	Canning Town and Custom House Supplementary Planning Document (2008)	Canning Town and Custom House	Planning Document	LB Newham	XX
Canning Town	Canning Town and Custom House Regeneration Masterplan	Canning Town	Planning Document	Newham London Council.	-
Corby	North Northamptonshire Local Development Plan	Planning Document	North Northamptonshire	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit.	-
Corby	North Northamptonshire Draft Supplementary Planning Document: Developer Contributions	Planning Document	North Northamptonshire	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit.	XX
Pennine Lancashire	Pennine Lancashire Cultural Plan 2011-2014	Pennine Lancashire	Development Document	Pennine Lancashire.	XXX
Pennine Lancashire	Pennine Lancashire Culture Plan – Action Plan 2011-2014	Pennine Lancashire	Development Document	Pennine Lancashire.	XXX
Pennine Lancashire	An Integrated Economic Strategy for Pennine Lancashire	Pennine Lancashire	Development Document	Pennine Lancashire.	XX
Pennine Lancashire	Multi Area Agreement for Pennine Lancashire	Pennine Lancashire	Development Document	Pennine Lancashire.	XXX
PUSH	Portsmouth & Southampton 2013: UK City of Culture Bid	Portsmouth and Southampton	Development Document	Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council.	XXX
PUSH	PUSH Economic Development Strategy	PUSH	Economic Development Document	PUSH.	-
PUSH	South East Regional Spatial Strategy: South Hampshire	South Hampshire	Planning Document	South East Regional Government.	XXX

Evaluation of the Living Places Programme Year 3: MLA Council

Table 4.1: Priority Place Strategies and Plans influenced by Living Places (x=some contribution, xx=significant contribution, xxx= critical contribution)					
Place	Name of Document	Status	Geography Covered	Name of Company/Partner who produced document	Strength of Culture and Sport Reference
PUSH	PUSH Design Charter	PUSH	Development Document	PUSH.	XX
PUSH	PUSH Business Plan 2009-2011	PUSH	Development Document.	PUSH.	XXX
Southend-on-Sea	Southend-on-Sea Local Development Framework: Core Strategy	Southend-on-sea	Planning Document	Southend-on-sea Borough Council.	X
Southend-on-Sea	Southend's Regeneration Framework 2007-2021.	Southend-on-sea	Regeneration Document	Renaissance Southend Limited	XX
Southend-on-Sea	Regeneration Southend: The Legacy 2005-2010	Southend-on-sea	Regeneration Document	Renaissance Southend	X
Taunton	Local Development Framework	Planning Document	Taunton Deane	Taunton Deane Borough Council.	XXX
Taunton	Taunton Town Centre Area Action Plan	Planning Document	Taunton Deane	Taunton Deane Borough Council.	XXX
Taunton	The Taunton Vision: Taunton Urban Design Framework, (2004),	Development Document	Taunton Deane	Terence O'Rourke.	XX
Taunton	A New Economic Development Strategy for Taunton Deane: "Grow and Green", (2010).	Economic Development Document	Taunton Deane	Taunton Deane Borough Council and Geo Economics.	XX
Taunton	Economic Development Service Delivery Plan 2011 and 2012.	Economic Development Document	Taunton Deane	Taunton Deane Borough Council.	XX
Taunton	Somerset Cultural Strategy	Development Document	Somerset	Somerset County Council.	XX
Taunton	Project Taunton: Bring Your Business to Taunton.	Development Document	Taunton Deane	Project Taunton.	XXX
Taunton	Taunton Regeneration Masterplan, (2005),	Development Document	Taunton Deane	Terence O'Rourke.	XX

Attracting Additional Investment

- 4.10 The 'flypaper effect' referred to in earlier sections has resulted in the successful Priority Places receiving investment from NDPBs over and above what might otherwise have been expected (for example the £180,000 invested in the 'Our Corby' project, the £100,000 BIS Skills Learning Revolution Transformation Fund support for the Our Place Empty Shops projects in Taunton and Pennine Lancashire (Blackburn), Heritage at Risk work in PUSH, and capital investment in venues in PUSH and Southend). This means that cultural and non cultural investors have increased confidence in the ability of the successful Priority Places to deliver results.
- 4.11 Whilst consultees have varying views as to the extent to which Living Places is directly responsible for this effect, Living Places provided an opportunity for the successful Priority Places to showcase themselves at a national level. At the end of Year 3 of Living Places, it is clear that many of the Priority Places are regarded as 'willing partners' by the NDPBs, who as a result have confidence in the ability of these localities to deliver.
- 4.12 A number of consultees made the connection around the benefits that high quality investment in cultural and sporting infrastructure has on the ability to market quality of life aspects of a place to an external investment market. Consultees in Corby and PUSH particularly noted the investor perception benefits of showcasing facilities such as the Corby Cube and Pool, and in PUSH the Theatre Royal (in Portsmouth) and the new arts centre in Southampton.
- 4.13 In terms of engaging with Priority Places, the existence of a 'flypaper effect' is reinforced by a range of NDPB consultees (with one citing the attraction of additional investment and resource as a 'no brainer'). This effect is a clear outcome of the confidence that activities and outputs will be effectively delivered, and that key partners are both credible and are willing to engage.
- 4.14 This focus on culture and sport in the regeneration of Southend has led to similar effects in terms of attracting support from the cultural NDPBs. For example, MLA Council has supported the library development by commissioning a library content strategy, and has also provided substantial officer time in support of the library and museum transition and development. Similarly, the location of the second (after Liverpool) Metal development in Southend, and development of high quality leisure facilities in the borough have been supported by the cultural agencies.
- 4.15 In the case of Corby in particular, the cultural agencies in the East Midlands are clear that it is very unlikely that they would have invested in the town to anything like the same extent had it not been for Living Places and the status and focus that was derived from being a Priority Place. There was confidence in the ability of local partners (notably Corby BC and NNDC) to deliver, and Corby Cube in particular is regarded as a both a key delivery facility and a tangible outcome to which the programme can claim a proportion of the credit.
- 4.16 However, in a number of instances, the credibility and strength of engagement is longstanding and whilst Living Places has enhanced this (especially at the profile/national level), it cannot be said that Living Places is responsible for its creation. For example, Corby is regarded by a number of partners as having benefited from the long term engagement of planning with culture, with an ability to fully understand 'what works' in their communities. Similarly, PUSH is well recognised as an established mechanism for sub regional priority setting and collaborative working, with the Quality Places Panel increasingly taking on

responsibility on the basis of sub regional local government efficiency in terms of place and culture, promoting better joint working in areas such as tourism, museums and heritage, and being seen as the most appropriate place to engage in such debates. In Pennine Lancashire and PUSH, the pre existing partnership working between the authorities has been a key contributory factor for what has been achieved there, whilst in Taunton, Corby and Southend the fact that key individuals understand, recognise, and 'buy into' the role that culture and sport can play in creating sustainable communities has been an important factor.

- 4.17 Annex 4 presents the data analysis from the CASE Investment data that has attempted to provide a cross-Priority Place assessment of culture and sport investment levels into the Priority Places. The results of this analysis are inconclusive in terms of identifying any additional investment into the Priority Places due to Living Places, but this is regarded as a data issue, and a reflection of the level of any such additional investments (such as those examples outlined above) within the wider context of all culture and sport funding for localities rather than a sign of a lack of success of attracting additional investment.

Profile

- 4.18 Those with a leadership role at the Priority Place level are clear that Living Places has resulted in high level dialogue and contact that would otherwise have been very difficult to secure. This has enabled places to raise their profile at the regional and national levels in terms of culture, sport and place shaping, and has created good networks between Corby, PUSH and Pennine Lancashire in particular, and all referenced the role of MLA Council in particular as facilitators and supporters of this process at the national and regional levels.
- 4.19 The role of culture and sport in the profile of a particular Priority Place is most pronounced in Corby, where changing perceptions have lead to increased profile and community confidence. The Priority Place status and the developments at the Cube and the Pool have enabled North Northamptonshire Development Corporation (NNDC) to better market Corby as a place to live and work to potential commercial investors. NNDC and the Joint Policy Unit (JPU) have also developed a detailed understanding both of Corby's culture and sport ambitions and the improvements that can be achieved through using developer contributions to support cultural infrastructure and activity.
- 4.20 Similarly, Southend on Sea, whilst not a Priority Place in its own right, is additionally striving to change perceptions through the development of signature culture and sport developments. Whilst such areas still face socio-economic challenges, such step changes in local confidence represent significant outcomes that are attributable in part to local leadership promoting a strong culture and sport agenda.
- 4.21 There are a number of Priority Place specific examples of the impact of profile, including:
- In Southend, the profile of culture and sport in the Borough Council is well established, with culture and sport being priorities in the Sustainable Community Strategy. Indeed the Council has had Culture and Sport portfolio holder in the cabinet for a considerable period of time, and the Borough Council has a vision for Southend to be the 'Cultural Capital' of the east of England (a position reinforced by a recent bid to become the UK City of Culture for 2013). There is a clear ambition to build on Southend's tourism history and use leisure and culture to drive regeneration and profile to support increased economic impact and job creation.

- Corby Cube and the 50m swimming pool are regarded by local and regional partners as a clear statement of intent about the future of the town and the borough, and this has led to further enhanced national profile and a step change in local perceptions about facilities (manifested in a statistically significant increase in satisfaction with local facilities (from 65.2% in October 2006 to 77.8% in October 2010), a reasonable early local proxy for the impact of these investments on Corby's communities).

Future Impacts and Sustainability

- 4.22 Priority Place consultees do expect to see sustained improvements in terms of participation as a result of the culture and sport investments made. As an example, Corby has moved from a position of underperformance to over performance in key culture and sport indicators around satisfaction with facilities.
- 4.23 A number of Priority Places also expect to benefit from increased economic impacts as a result of investment in cultural infrastructure. Of all the places considered in this evaluation, Southend is the most overt in terms of long term economic expectations given that its cultural investment strategy is in part designed to improve the tourist offer and make progress in increasing the proportion of overnight visits to the town.
- 4.24 Corby has been more resilient during the most recent recession in comparison to those of the 1980's and 1990's, and it is felt by economic development practitioners that increased focus on culture and sport at the heart of Corby's communities has contributed to its relative resilience (along with other developments such as the new rail station). These developments, taken together, are beginning to make progress in terms of external perceptions around Corby as a location to live and work.
- 4.25 In terms of partnership sustainability, it is clear that in some places much of the momentum that drove Living Places at the start of the programme has been lost. For example, the London Living Places Partnership was a very active partnership, chaired at a senior level by MLA Council and ACE, and was successful in bringing a lot of other partners together. However, at the end of Year 3, many partners have fallen away and the partnership is likely to end once the CSPT grant aided projects have been completed.
- 4.26 Nevertheless, a number of Priority Places will continue to meet beyond the lifetime of the Living Places Programme, which is a good indication of sustainability in those places where culture and sport remains prominent in development and regeneration agendas. This sustainability is observed in those places that have exhibited high levels of senior locality leadership, with examples being:
- The next meeting of the Corby Living Places partnership will have a focus on 2012 opportunities.
 - The Quality Places Panel in PUSH has widened its remit to include tourism and retail in addition to the creative industries sector.
 - CSR and resultant cuts in funding has led to improvements in engagement and impetus for the North Kent Cultural Partnership.
 - The Culture, Leisure and Sport PLACE subgroup (chaired by a local authority chief executive) in Pennine Lancashire will take forward the Living Places agenda for the area, ensuring that it is continued and that it is led by the local authorities.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 There are a number of clear and transferable success factors that continue to emerge in successive Living Places evaluations. These include:
- The importance of leadership at the local level.
 - The need for local capacity to support this leadership and help ensure delivery.
 - The pre-existence of partnership/joint working between key partners.
 - The national profile and recognition that being a Priority Place has given.
 - The added value of the cultural agencies working together to deliver a shared agenda in specific localities.
- 5.2 This section provides a summary of the key findings with particular emphasis on the legacy and sustainability of Living Places, the alignments of Living Places to emerging locality based approaches, and implications and lessons from the findings of this evaluation for future locality engagement through culture and sport. It is aimed at understanding where and how Living Places has benefitted communities at the local level.
- 5.3 Whilst enjoying a significant profile, and animating a range partnership activity at the national, regional and Priority Place levels, Living Places as a 'programme' has been relatively modest, and it is therefore crucial that the relative merits of, and the attribution of outcomes and impacts to, the Living Places Programme is understood in the context of activity that has been achieved from an investment of just over £500,000 of funding by the National Living Places Partners.
- 5.4 Living Places has established that planning and place is important to culture, and that culture and sport has a strong role to play in the development and regeneration of places. Whilst there is much change at both the national and locality levels, to maintain the legacy of Living Places, and to reinforce the place role of culture, it is important that the Living Places partners assert their ongoing support for the role of cultural facilities in places.

The importance of local leadership

- 5.5 Partnership remains a core success factor in terms of Priority Places. Driven by personalities and key individuals, places have in many cases got the best out of Living Places as part of a common agenda of the positive development of a place. Whilst these processes would have happened without Living Places (with Southend being a case in point), most consultees agree that in successful Priority Places, much more has been achieved than would otherwise have been the case. In the cases of Corby, PUSH and Pennine Lancashire, key partnerships and key individuals have grasped Living Places as a high profile opportunity to better deliver existing culture, sport and place aspirations.
- 5.6 The importance of local 'persuasive' leaders, including the role of key individuals who appreciate and recognise the contribution that culture and sport make to communities are important success factors for places.
- 5.7 At the end of Year 3 of the Living Places Programme there is awareness amongst all Living Places partners that culture and sport's role in place shaping is more than buildings and supporting infrastructure, but involves being a part of the entire process of creating positive places.

'Flypaper Effect' and the importance of dedicated resources

- 5.8 The 'flypaper' effect mentioned earlier in this report has meant that additional resources have gone to the Priority Places that might otherwise have gone elsewhere, especially from the cultural agencies. This has resulted in funding and projects coming to Priority Places (such as Heritage at Risk work in PUSH, Our Place Empty Shops in Blackburn and Taunton, Our Corby Community Archives work), and projects receiving additional funding to add additional value to what might have been otherwise achieved (such as PUSH's Spatial Planning and the Provision of Cultural and Sporting Infrastructure research, and a range of capital investments across the Priority Place).
- 5.9 It is no coincidence that examples of this 'Flypaper Effect' stem from those Priority Places who have benefitted from dedicated resources in terms of officer time (be it funded by Living Places partners and/or local partnerships, in house or on a consultancy basis). Such resources in Priority Places has enabled actions to be taken forward, proposals to be developed, connections to be made between complementary activity and opportunities to be fully exploited. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that this effect happens as a result of the emphasis on culture/sport in that place by locality leaders and NDPBs.

Planning and development impacts

- 5.10 In terms of planning and development, there is strong consultation evidence to suggest that culture and sport is now better embedded with planning in policy terms in a number of Priority Places. For example in Corby, the North Northants Joint Policy Unit is fully signed up to the role of culture and sport in the development of the Core Spatial Strategy, and culture is embedded in planning practice both in terms of a culture input in design surgeries and consultation on major projects, and in terms of the wider North Northants Design Action Programme (funded by ACE and CABE). Examples from Priority Places, along with the evidence based developed both by the CSPT (and through work done by PUSH in particular) will be useful to other places as and when they consider place shaping as public and private sector development and regeneration contexts improve.
- 5.11 In terms of economic development, Living Places has put culture and sport on the radar of planning and economic development professionals, and is making the transition in the successful Priority Places into mainstream thinking. A number of economic development consultees noted that this might not necessarily be the case for all places, but Living Places highlights how it can work well in receptive places.

Lessons for locality working

- 5.12 It is clear that the context for Living Places in Year 3 is radically different compared to the start of the Programme, and that this wider context it is still in transition (both in terms of its public sector funding, and private sector development drivers). Joint working by the cultural agencies, both in places and through regional arrangements, is now a matter for localities and agencies themselves to make decisions about in terms of when and where to engage.
- 5.13 In the context of Living Places this change in context is reinforcing gaps observed in earlier evaluations – firstly between those regions with Priority Place partnerships and those without, and secondly between those priority places with a spatial focus (i.e. Corby, PUSH and Pennine Lancashire, and those without (The South West and Thames Gateway).

- 5.14 In short, future engagement, in the short to medium term at least, is likely to be in those places where culture is seen as a priority in terms of place shaping, and where such engagement is seen both as important, and as contributing to wider goals.
- 5.15 There are important lessons from Living Places for the cultural agencies to learn in terms of local engagement with places.
- Firstly, cultural agencies need to be sure that places are committed to the notion of culture being central to the development and regeneration of places, with this being demonstrated by local investment, or existing commitments to invest.
 - Secondly, this locality commitment needs to be supported by strong partnership working across a range of locality agendas. Whilst it is not for the cultural agencies to foster such partnership working, successive Living Places evaluations have identified this as a prerequisite to success.
 - Thirdly, agencies need to be sure that concepts about place shaping that are understood and are communicable at the national and regional level work effectively at the locality level. For example, the Living Places brand itself was often not understood outside the Living Places network, and indeed in some Priority Places themselves. This led to partners dropping the brand entirely, and engaging with activity on either a mainstream basis or on a task specific locality basis.
 - Finally, it may be beneficial to align cultural place shaping activity more closely with the improvement agenda, especially given that in a number of places many of the same stakeholders are engaged in both agendas.
- 5.16 Some consultees in these Priority Places noted that culture and sport agencies needed to learn lessons from MLA Council about effective locality engagement on agendas relating to the place of culture and sport in regeneration and growth in consideration around the types of relationships they need to broker with local authorities in the future. This should be considered in partnership with the remaining cultural agencies to retain the positive working relationships that Priority Places have enjoyed during the lifetime of Living Places.

Legacy and Next Steps

- 5.17 In terms of legacy, there continues to be consensus that the Living Places Programme has coincided with significant improvements in dialogue and partnership working between the cultural agencies in localities, in regions, and at the national level. Whilst Living Places is by no means solely responsible for this development, it has provided an agenda and a set of place-based priorities through which enhanced partnership working can work towards tangible outcomes.
- 5.18 At the national level, there is an opportunity for partners to consider and promote the roll out of work done by PUSH on cultural infrastructure evidence (perhaps also using the Cultural Mapping Tool developed by the London Living Places Partnership), and approaches to top slicing developer contributions to support strategic cultural projects at the sub regional level.
- 5.19 Going forward, the case for culture and sport in regeneration will thrive if the Priority Places sustain this momentum and activity, if the cultural agencies continue to engage in those localities that prioritise the role of culture and sport in regeneration and development, and if investment in cultural facilities transfers into impact and participation in the medium to longer term.

- 5.20 Priority Places appreciate that the (national) profile and recognition that came with being a Priority Place added value in a number of ways, and there is a keenness in some places to continue this (for example, in Pennine Lancashire discussions are at an early stage with Arts Council regionally about maintaining (post Living Places) recognition of Pennine Lancashire as a 'Priority Place'.
- 5.21 In terms of Local Enterprise Partnerships, many consultees are keen to see culture and sport influence LEP thinking, and much of the Living Places work at the Priority Place level can be used to support arguments and advocacy targeted at LEPs as they develop. However, consultees are also aware of the business growth focus of LEPs, and accept that much of the Living Places agenda will remain with local authorities moving forwards.
- 5.22 Finally, many consultees are concerned about the future availability of the evidence and resources held on the Living Places website. This material, which constitutes an important Living Places legacy, will be of great benefit to localities looking for lessons about culture and sport led regeneration and development at the place level, and it is vital that National Partners secures a future hosting solution for this material into the medium term. The recent joint letter¹⁰ from Jeremy Hunt, Secretary of State for Culture and Cllr Chris White, Chair, LG Group Culture, Tourism & Sport Programme Board identified the Living Places website as suite of online resources developed by DCMS and key public bodies to support the contribution of culture and sport to planning, and this recognition should be built on by ensuring the continuation of the Living Places website.

¹⁰ <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pageId=15930812>