

Arts-led regeneration in the UK: the rhetoric and the evidence on urban social inclusion

1. Introduction

Since the 1980s, in the UK, but also in Europe more widely, ‘the arts (within a broader category of the cultural and creative industries) have been given a key role in strategies to deal with urban problems from social exclusion to the rehabilitation of post-industrial sites’ (M. Miles 1995: 2). In the UK between 1999, when Policy Action Team 10¹ issued its bold statement in favour of the arts as a means of neighbourhood renewal and community regeneration, and 2010, when DCMS’s Evidence Programme published its report on two years of research into the value of engagement in culture and sport, New Labour issued a raft of policy proposals and legislation supporting the principle that the arts and culture could play a significant, instrumental role in urban regeneration by combating ‘social exclusion’ (see Hewitt’s, 2011, discussion of the rhetoric of arts public good under New Labour). Its position was endorsed across the range of its departments covering urban, social, cultural and arts policies, including the Cabinet Office, DCMS, DETR, ODPM, DCLG and the Departments of Health, Education and Social Security. It was further supported by a range of publications and reviews issued by the Arts Council, the Local Government Association, and regional arts organisations, creating a landscape of rhetoric in the UK in which the instrumental role of the arts in combating urban social exclusion was embedded as *quasi-social fact*:

‘Participation in the arts and sport has a beneficial social impact. Arts and sport are inclusive and can contribute to neighbourhood renewal. They can build confidence and encourage strong community groups... We do not believe that every artist or sports person should be a social worker by another name, or that artistic or sporting excellence should take second place to community regeneration. But we do want the benefits of arts and sport to be widely spread and the pool of talent available to be as wide as possible’ (DCMS/ PAT 10 report to Social Exclusion Unit, 1999: 5).

‘Developers to park wardens are turning to the arts for new ideas, regeneration, problem solving and community bridge building. The employment of artists in these (traditionally non-cultural) fields, where there are non-art issues and agendas at stake, is becoming the norm’ (Butler 2003:83).

However, throughout New Labour’s three terms in office, little or no substantive evidence was gathered in support of this position, despite a proliferation of statements relating to the

¹ Hereafter PAT. Other acronyms in the paper include: ACE – Arts Council England, DCLG – Department of Communities and Local Government, DCMS – Department for Culture, Media and Sport, DETR – Department of the Environment, Transport and Regions, ODPM – Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

importance of evaluation and a number of initiatives to implement evaluation methods (eg. Matarasso 1997, 2009; DCMS 1999; Evans and Shaw 2004; Moriarty 2002; Arts Council 2006). Furthermore, the difficulty of evaluating arts projects, particularly their long-term impacts, and the variation of impacts on multiple stake-holders, has been highlighted both by critics within the field of academia (eg Hall and Robertson 2001; Belfiore 2002; Merli 2002, Newman et al 2003), and in policy documents: ‘Social regeneration is a new area of inquiry for the cultural sector and researchers are still working out what to measure and how to measure it’ (Evans and Shaw, 2004: 28). More recently, the Coalition government’s CASE report (2010) into ‘the value of engagement in culture and sport’, acknowledges that, following a two-year research programme, it cannot present any evidence for, or conclusions on, the long-term benefits relating to community cohesion, and that further work needs to be carried out in this area, based on both existing and new data:

‘Further research should focus on analysing existing survey data, or generating new data, to assess the effect of engagement in culture and sport on such longer-term effects such as improved learning and community cohesion’ (DCMS/ CASE, 2010: 6).

‘Engagement in culture is associated with a better knowledge of one’s own culture and other cultures. Such outcomes provide a socialisation function, producing a common standard of citizenship and social cohesion. However, these benefits are experienced by society as a whole, rather than the individual deciding whether to engage in culture. Thus, from a societal point of view, too few people will decide to engage in culture’ (DCMS/ CASE, 2010: 8).

At the same time, it remains unclear as to how the Coalition government will take forward New Labour’s policies on arts-led regeneration, if at all. The ex-Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport - Jeremy Hunt - in his keynote speech on the Coalition’s arts and culture policy, acknowledged that ‘we should credit the last government with the way in which arts policy has become a much more mainstream part of government policy as a whole... we have seen cultural policy take a front seat in economic, education and regeneration policy-making’ (Hunt 2010, Roundhouse speech). But, as public spending cuts dig in across the board, it would appear for now that a ‘golden era’ of state-promoted investment in arts projects and culture as a component of urban regeneration in the UK may have come to some kind of close. Paradoxically, then, it seems a good moment to launch a new investigation into the evidence for the impact of the arts in urban regeneration over the last decade and more, with a view both to learning the lessons of the past, and looking ahead to potential applications for the future.

To that end, in this paper we unpack the rhetoric and the evidence on arts-led regeneration in the UK. We begin by unmasking the rhetoric that surrounds the use of the arts, including the benefits claimed for it, with respect to urban regeneration and urban social inclusion. In so doing we debate whether the arts are, or can be, drivers of social regeneration in socially excluded urban communities. We turn then to the tensions, unconvincing evidence on, and evaluations of, arts-led regeneration in the UK and conclude with some ideas about where to go from here.

2. Urban Regeneration

For more than 50 years, governments in the UK and Europe more widely have struggled to tackle the vacuum left by the collapse of manufacturing in urban centres, including the decay of redundant buildings and the unemployment and redeployment of workers in restructured economies. Until the late 1970s, a climate of social optimism fuelled by socialist idealism tied to Modernist ideology in architecture and planning was manifested in expansive redevelopment programmes for city centres, including social housing provision on a large scale, new schools and health centres, and radical restructuring of vehicular circulation to accommodate new levels of mobility, as well as a new generation of new towns. By the 1980s the backlash had kicked in, and burgeoning popular conservation movements put a halt to demolition and redevelopment, demanding the preservation and re-use of the remaining historic urban fabric. But the emerging social problems linked to rising post-war unemployment, immigration and race riots, the ‘baby boom’, and the decline of traditional forms of social association and family life could not be halted in the same way. Social inequality increased significantly, with poverty levels rising from 10% in the 1960s to 20% in the 1990s (Imrie and Raco 2003); or, as Will Hutton put it in 1995, the emergence of the 40:30:30 society – 40% in secure permanent employment, 30% in insecure employment; and 30% marginalised, out of work or working for poverty wages and most at risk of social exclusion (Hutton 1995, 105-110; cited Belfiore 2002).

Harvey (2000) describes the entrenchment of ‘neoliberal authoritarianism’ during the 1980s, following the withdrawal of Welfare State social policies under Thatcherism which left vulnerable (urban and rural) communities largely at the mercy of market forces, and produced increasingly stark contrasts between rich and poor neighbourhoods. Imrie and Raco (2003) summarise the characteristic results of neoliberal policies as: polarisation of incomes and intensification of poverty, especially in so-called ‘sink estates’; gentrification, rising land values, and a shortage of affordable

housing; increasing job insecurity and low-waged employment, with a disempowerment of communities to look after themselves.

From ‘urban reconstruction’ in the immediate post-war years, to ‘urban renewal’ and ‘urban redevelopment’ in the 1960s and 70s, ‘urban regeneration’ in the 1980s, and ‘urban renaissance’ in the (late) 1990s (and early noughties), successive British governments have adopted different terminologies each signifying a subtle shift in their approaches to the resolution of the social and material problems created by the decline of post-industrial city centres (Lees 2003: 67). From the late 1960s, Harold Wilson’s Labour government attempted to tackle the emerging social issues through policies of ‘community development’ (the Community Development Programme 1968) combined with a surge of building activity (1966-72: National Plan 1965); and in 1969 Skeffington’s People and Planning report explicitly focused on the notion of public participation in the planning process for the first time. During the 1970s, ‘planning for people’ became a watchword and the Inner Urban Areas Act of 1978 affirmed the principle of partnership strategies to promote economic and social regeneration in designated areas. During the 1980s, Urban Programme funds were diverted to new Urban Development Corporations, representing a shift to a more property-centred approach, relying on private sector development, particularly in redundant industrial areas such as London Docklands and Merseyside. But at the same time, a number of New Urban Left councils emerged (eg the London Borough of Islington), which advocated community participation in the planning process, through capacity-building initiatives and neighbourhood forums, and inclusive policies towards minorities which have since become mainstream. The rhetoric of community empowerment and participation grew stronger during the 1990s, promoted through City Challenge and Single Regeneration Budget initiatives based on partnerships between local authorities, communities, the private sector and voluntary interests, and targeted at specific localities.

Indeed it was during the 1980s and 1990s that the concept of public art and arts participation, as a vehicle for social and community engagement began to occupy a significant place within the discourse of British urban regeneration, drawing into the mainstream ideas from the community arts movement and participatory arts developed by radical artists during the 1970s (see Belfiore 2002). The democratisation of access to the arts and culture had been a principle of post-war social policy, partly in response to visions of a post-industrial ‘leisure society’ (Berry Slater and Iles 2010), and

was therefore central to the remit of the Arts Council on its foundation in 1946, in conjunction with direct support of artists. However, the shift to right-wing politics in the 1980s downgraded the importance of access to culture per se, especially for disadvantaged groups – both in the UK and Europe (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993) – and, following developments in the United States, placed a new emphasis on the construction of flagship cultural projects as a catalyst for private sector-led property development (for example, the Burrell Collection in Glasgow, 1983; Tate Liverpool, 1988; or the Design Museum in London’s Docklands, 1989), and the designation of Cities of Culture to attract investment.

Bianchini and Parkinson (1993) suggest that cultural policies had compensated during the 1960s and 1970s to some extent for jobs lost in the industrial sectors, and contributed to diversification and social cohesion, helping to integrate unemployed young people, new residents, immigrants and social groups displaced by economic restructuring through participation in cultural activities. Much was made, during the 1980s, of the potential of the arts and creative industries to regenerate post-industrial cities economically, in the anticipation of a ‘trickle-down’ effect that would indirectly help poor, socially marginalised communities. The positive contribution of culture and creativity to tangible economic outputs was expounded in Myerscough’s (1988) study of Ipswich, Glasgow and Merseyside, published by the right-wing Policy Studies Institute, which emphasised the attraction of cities with strong cultural profiles to inward investment. The following year, the British and American Arts Association’s conference proceedings *Arts and the Changing City* (BAAA 1989) also made the same points, comparing American case studies with four UK cities – Glasgow, Liverpool, Dundee and Swansea. Wynne’s report, *The Culture Industry* (1992), to Greater Manchester Economic Development Ltd and North West Art, compared Toronto and Boston with Dordrecht and Rotterdam in Europe, and Glasgow, Sheffield, Birmingham, Liverpool and Cardiff in the UK – all cities radically affected by the loss of manufacturing industry and working docks. At around the same time, the Arts Council’s (1989) *An Urban Renaissance: the role of the arts in urban regeneration* (making first use of the subsequently ubiquitous New Labour term ‘urban renaissance’) and Bianchini, Fisher (the Labour MP and, significantly, first New Labour Arts Minister), Montgomery and Worpole’s (1988/ 1991) *City centres, city cultures: the role of the arts in the revitalisation of towns and cities* also reiterated the same themes – that culture could revive urban economies.

Amongst the urban policy strategies highlighted in this context were the creation of cultural

districts, preservation and promotion of urban heritage, the use of arts projects and events to generate tourism, and the role of public art – including street furniture, landscaping and environmental art – both to beautify cities and to stimulate new forms of community engagement and cohesion. It was in this area, then, that state-sponsored, private-sector-led, regeneration policy came together in an uneasy alliance with the motivations and ideals of community art practice, and provided the basis for a development of social exclusion policies through arts input as a key element of regeneration policy and practice during New Labour's time in power.

In 1990 the Arts Council launched its 'Percent for Art' initiative as a direct incentive to developers and local authorities to invest in art as an element of new development (Shaw, 1990). Although Maycock (1998), writing on the controversial redevelopment of London Docklands, suggested that it was not necessary, since developers were already willing to invest in art as a way of compensating for the radical social and cultural changes they were producing in local communities. A number of organisations and consultancies were set up at this time, such as the Public Arts Commissions Agency and the Public Art Development Trust, to advise and help with the commissioning process, many of whom had an explicit interest in promoting community engagement. The Arts Council had lent its weight to an economic justification of expenditure on the arts during the Thatcher regime, simply as a survival strategy. But as the climate of opinion moved steadily towards a further justification of the arts on the grounds of their impact in alleviating the conflicts produced by urban restructuring, and promoting social regeneration within the context of a broader and more aspirational concept of 'urban renaissance', it moved with it – notwithstanding the dissenting comments of some academic critics.

Malcolm Miles commented, 'Mickey Mouse architecture and sculpture galleries in the rain will not cure our cities of either economic or cultural sickness' (2005: 249), and underlined the lack of evidence for any such claims: 'The case for public art claims that it contributes to urban regeneration; but the case is speculative and the values of contemporary art are seen as independent of the problems of city life' (M. Miles 1997: 12). He cited a University of Westminster report (*Public art in private places*, 1993), which suggested that the added value of art was weak, and pointed out the inherent incompatibility of developers' aims and those of a broadly-conceived public good: 'Developers do not develop in order to construct the "city beautiful", they construct the city beautiful in order to conceal the incompatibility of their development with a free society' (M. Miles 1997: 130).

But if there were critics of the increasingly dominant ideology, one of the key players in creating and promulgating the ideas which came to underpin New Labour's urban policies was the Comedia consultancy, a fluid group of writers (Landry, Bianchini, Worpole, Mulgan, Matarasso et al) which came together in different combinations to produce a large number of significant publications on various aspects of creativity, the arts and urban regeneration throughout the 1990s. It was Comedia who were commissioned to produce a full-scale study of London Docklands (1989) by the LDDC – one of the most controversial of Thatcher's UDCs – its art provision and needs, and the way the LDDC should involve itself in the process. Described in terms redolent of the community arts movement as an 'Arts Action Plan', it argued that the arts were as important an ingredient of urban regeneration as the physical, economic and social aspects (see Maycock 1998).

Landry and Bianchini's subsequent book, *The Creative City* (1995), published by Demos, had a strong influence on the development of New Labour's concept of 'urban renaissance', and remained central to the discourse around urban regeneration. It was re-published by Landry in 2000, sub-titled 'a toolkit for urban innovators', at the same time that Richard Roger's Urban Task Force report was transformed into the Urban White Paper under Deputy PM John Prescott's direction (see Lees, 2003) – and two years prior to Richard Florida's equally influential *Rise of the creative class* (2002), reinforcing a similar message from a North American perspective.

Landry stressed that 'cultural resources are the raw materials of the city and its value base' (Landry 2000: 7), and the need to adopt a culturally-informed perspective in urban planning in order for cities and communities to survive restructuring. However, its celebratory tone hardly considered the depth of the social impact of such processes, nor the problems associated with gentrification and displacement that may come with a 'culturally-informed perspective'. Indeed, its approach to the latter was somewhat cavalier:

'The artist in effect is the explorer and regenerator kick-starting a gentrification process, bringing life to rundown areas and generating the development of support structures such as cafes, restaurants and some shops. They then attract a more middle-class clientele who would not have risked being the first, either through fear, the dislike of rundown areas, or pressure from peer groups. Only when the grottness has been tamed and made safe by the artist will this second group arrive.' (Landry 2000: 125).

New Labour's 'new vision for urban living', embodied in the term 'urban renaissance' (DETR 2000), was little more than a euphemism for 'gentrification', perceived as ultimately a desirable alternative to the decline of rundown urban centres. Moreover, it was based on the

decidedly middle-class tastes and experiences (particularly of continental European city life) manifested in architect Richard Rogers's Urban Task Force report (1999) (Lees 2003, p 61). The first Urban White Paper to be published since 1978, 'Delivering an urban renaissance' (DETR 2000) placed a new emphasis on the importance of design (DETR/ CABE 2000) – particularly of public buildings (DCMS 2000), streets, and public places embellished by art – to produce better, more 'liveable' cities and harmonious mixed communities. It explicitly drew on the expertise of architects and professionals from the design and creative industries (including the Minister for Arts, Mark Fisher, himself, a former screenwriter) to contribute to a formulation of government policy that brought together the two strands of discourse that had evolved during the preceding decade: the economic contribution which the arts and creative industries could make, and the role of arts and arts participation in bringing communities together and resolving social conflicts: 'a new vision for urban regeneration founded on the principles of design excellence, social well-being and environmental responsibility' (DETR 1999, Mission Statement: 1). Public art itself constituted a significant element of the design repertoire (listed under 'Urban form and public space' in the spatial master planning checklist of design issues (DETR 1999: 74). The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) was set up as a new advisory body to the government specifically in this area, while English Partnerships published a supporting *Urban Design Compendium* (2000) to provide direct guidance to planners and developers.

When Mark Fisher launched New Labour's cultural strategy, *Create the Future*, in 1997, he stated: 'The Labour government will be sympathetic [to the arts] because we know the cultural economy is not only good for cities but it affects investment. Culture creates jobs' (Matarasso 1997: 13, citing 'Labour announces arts policy', *Arts Management Weekly*, 21st Mar 1997). At the same time, New Labour's urban design policy demonstrated an increasing interest in the European City model (eg Barcelona and Bilbao, see Balibrea 2001) of urban life, mixed in with the powerful influence of American models of urban regeneration: 'The first Urban Task Force report and subsequent Urban White Paper were full of references to compact form, high density living and café culture' (Nathan and Marshall 2006: 3). These ideas were set out with renewed emphasis in New Labour's third re-election campaign, underpinning its core cities strategy (see ODPM 2004): 'the clearest illustration of the seriousness with which the British government has sought to promote a culture-led agenda for cities is the Core Cities Initiative' (S. Miles and Paddison, 2005: 835). However, the new Urban Task Force report, *Towards a strong urban renaissance* (2005), expressed

frustration that the management and delivery of urban change through government policy had not integrated design or cultural imperatives to anything like the extent that had been hoped for (Vickery 2007). Indeed, from around 2005 the term ‘urban renaissance’, with its strong arts inflection, largely disappeared from New Labour government discourse and became subsumed under the more pragmatic and environmentally-driven concept of ‘urban sustainability’ (and sustainable communities) during its last term in office, perhaps reflecting the increasing weakness of its position in government.

3. Urban social exclusion

The 2004 State of World Cities report from UNCHS noted that ‘regeneration’ had become a global phenomenon, but that while the term ‘regeneration’ on its own tended to mean basic physical redevelopment of land, ‘urban regeneration’ had come to stand for the development of the orbit of social habitation as well (Vickery 2007: 14). This understanding was outlined by Bob Caterall some years earlier in the UK, at the Town and Country Planning Summer School of 1998, when he expounded on ‘Culture as a critical focus for effective urban regeneration’, while noting the lack of evidence to date:

‘A pluralist rather than a standardized approach is therefore an imperative, since this is unlikely to emerge from the regeneration regimes and ‘evidence base’ currently on offer. Culture... can make communities. It can be a critical focus for effective and sustainable urban regeneration. The task is to develop an understanding (including methods of study) of the ways – cultural and ethical – in which even the ‘worst estates’ can take part and help shape the relics of their city (and society) as well as their locality. This is a massive challenge to academics, professionals, business, and to local and ultimately national government and – of course – citizens’ (Caterall 1998).

New Labour launched its Urban Task Force report and Urban White Paper in tandem with the new Social Exclusion Unit’s Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, evocatively titled *Bringing Britain Together* (Cabinet Office 1998). The document described a concentration in poor neighbourhoods, not of poverty per se, but of a range of interlocking problems such as high levels of unemployment, crime, ill-health and poor education, together producing the effect of exclusion from mainstream (productive) society (see Levitas 1998). These identified areas for improvement in social outcomes became the keystones of social policy on urban regeneration during the New Labour years, and were explicitly linked with its urban design strategy and arts and cultural programmes, implemented through area-based initiatives by DCMS, Local Strategic Partnerships, local authorities, and the Arts Council through its regional bodies.

In 1999, Policy Action Teams in each government department were tasked to report back to the Social Exclusion Unit with recommendations as to how they could tackle social exclusion in their own policy areas. PAT 10, for DCMS (1999), endorsed the role of arts and sports in social inclusion, and their beneficial impact on social outcomes, while anticipating criticism in the qualifying statement that artists and sportsmen should not all be viewed as social workers by any other name (see quotation in introduction). In his Foreword to the document, Chris Smith, New Labour's first Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, wrote:

'art and sport can not only make a valuable contribution to delivering key outcomes of lower long-term unemployment, less crime, better health and better qualifications, but can also help to develop the individual pride, community spirit and capacity for responsibility that enable communities to run regeneration programmes themselves' (DCMS/ PAT 10 1999: 2).

Smith himself was author of *Creative Britain*, championing the creative industries, published the previous year (Smith 1998). This drew extensively on the work of Comedia (Bianchini and Landry 1995, Landry et al 1996) on the 'creative city', defining culture-led regeneration as,

'an effective route for personal growth; a valuable contribution to social cohesion; of benefit to environmental renewal and health promotion; a producer of social change and a flexible, responsive and cost-effective element of a community development strategy [that]... strengthens rather than dilutes Britain's cultural life, and forms a vital factor of success rather than a soft option in social policy' (Smith 1998: 135).

Chris Smith went on to launch the Year of the Artist in Britain in 2000, a (millennial) celebration of Britain's particular brand of creative excellence - 'Cool Britannia' - presented as a foundation stone of the national economy and society. This initiative, supported by the launch of DCMS's *Creative Industries Mapping Documents* in 1998 (DCMS 1998a, 2001), focused policy and public attention again on the role of the creative industries and, importantly, associated cultural consumption, as an economic generator in the UK; while also serving to hold up a model of competitiveness and individualism to the publicly-funded and non-commercial arts sector, as well as other areas such as education and business in general, for emulation (see Pratt 2008).

Andy Pratt describes this process as a manifestation of New Labour's essentially neo-liberal approach to governance and economic regeneration (Pratt 2008). Notwithstanding its rhetoric around 'social exclusion', and Tony Blair's pointed comments in 1997 on the widening of the gap between rich and poor during the Conservative era, New Labour's approach to urban regeneration

really represented a pragmatic evolution of strategies and mechanisms, heavily dependent on private-public partnerships, which had already been put in place during the 1990s (Imrie and Raco 2003). What was different, however, was the explicit discourse around arts and culture in the context of social exclusion, and as an instrument of inclusionary policies and social transformation.

In 1999 the ODPM published its *Regeneration through culture, sport and tourism* policy document, which stated that,

‘Councils are being encouraged to adopt the more inclusive term culture rather than leisure in the strategic planning for regeneration. Culture includes: arts, media, sports, libraries, museums, parks, play, countryside, the built heritage, tourism and the creative industries’ (Executive Summary). It went on to say that, ‘Providing a coherent vision in this area is an important part of improving the quality of life, and enhancing the way in which local communities see themselves and are seen by others’ (Section 1.2). This made an implicit link to the Social Exclusion Unit’s (SEU) theme of social exclusion as a dynamic and relational process, determined by self-perception and the perceptions of others, rather than – and in contrast to poverty - a fixed state (Kearns 2003). It suggested that individuals could be encouraged to embrace aspirations, through the means of interventions like arts and culture, which would enable them to improve their own lives, achieve positive outcomes (in health, education, employment), and move away from the margins to re-position themselves within the mainstream of productive social life.

The ODPM further endorsed its position with a reference to the view from Europe, represented by the Council of Europe’s 1997 report, *In from the margins*: ‘It [the report] stresses the joint purposes of cultural development for economic regeneration and as a means of bringing the disadvantaged in from the margins of society..... marginalised groups... including; the elderly, poor, disabled, those in hospital or prison, ethnic minorities, women, the young, gays and lesbians and the unemployed’ (ODPM/DCLG, 1999: Section 1.4).

The SEU’s stated aim was to reduce the gap between the ‘worst estates’ and the rest of the country, focusing attention on the need to continue with the area-based approach established through City Challenge and the SRB, because social problems had become concentrated in particular areas (SEU 2000: 7). A raft of new ‘community empowerment’ measures were put in place to ‘harness the knowledge and energy of local people’ (SEU 2000: 7), through the Active Community Unit, Community Chests, and Community Empowerment Fund. The Urban White Paper reiterated the same message: ‘we intend to build the capacity of communities to help themselves and bring about

social cohesion right across the country' (DETR, 2000: 6). But at the same time neighbourhood renewal was to be driven by a new set of supra-local partnership organisations – Neighbourhood Renewal Teams, Local Strategic Partnerships and Regional Development Agencies under central government control and guidance (Imrie and Raco 2003).

Arts and cultural strategies were to be an integral part of this process, with a remit to improve communities' performance in the four key indicators identified by the government (DCMS 1999: 21-22). In 2002, QUEST, the DCMS watchdog on performance and quality, issued a report underlining this understanding, called *Making it count: the contribution of culture and sport to social inclusion* (DCMS 2002). All local authorities were to develop Local Cultural Strategies for their area, reconceived as integrated policies which 'did not merely concern the use and provision of local cultural facilities and services... [but] embodied an integrated understanding on how the whole area (eg. of a city centre) could develop culturally' (Vickery 2007: 55; DCMS 1999, 2000).

AS ODPM (1999:10) pointed out, 'The increasing use of the term urban renaissance to describe what would have been up to very recently referred to solely as urban regeneration is indicative of the extent of the influence that culture now has'. But this was a much more ambitious and wide-ranging project for councils to take on and, as the ODPM (1999) acknowledged, one of the problems was that the intended 'wide and inclusive' meaning of the term 'culture' in itself was not 'widely recognized within all communities' (p.8). It noted that 'continued work on publicising the wider definition is required' – a task undertaken by Tessa Jowell in 2004-5; but in the meantime offered a set of fairly general outcomes which local cultural strategies should achieve – notably, economic growth; image change (with a view to attracting investment); the creative use of redundant space, development of individuals' potential and self-confidence (by appealing to individuals' interests); promotion of community identity and collective effort; and building links with the wider community.

These objectives basically presented a combination of the perceived economic and social benefits of public art and cultural participation outlined during the 1990s by the Policy Studies Institute (Selwood 1994) on the one hand, which emphasised positive outcomes for employment, investment and land values, and the Comedia consultancy, on the other, emphasising the potential for positive social outcomes (Landry et al 1996, Matarasso 1997). Landry et al's (1996) findings were issued by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in its Social Policy Summary series the same year: arts programmes 'have been shown to contribute to enhancing social cohesion and local image;

reducing offending behaviour; building private/ public sector partnerships; promoting interest in the local environment; developing self-confidence; enhancing organisational capacity; supporting independence and exploring visions of the future' (JRF 1996: 1). Similarly, Matarasso's (1997) review of 60 participatory arts projects (based on a short Comedia study for the Arts Council in 1993) identified the key themes for analysis of the social impacts of participation in the arts in 60 case studies as: personal development, social cohesion, community empowerment and self-determination, local image and identity, imagination and vision (at personal and collective level), and health and well-being (p. 60). Importantly, Matarasso stressed that participation in the arts was not just about giving people practical skills and opportunities, but also was key to motivating people 'to *want* to take part' in the wider democratic process (ibid: 70) – in other words, it had an important instrumental role to play in helping individuals to move away from the margins, and into the mainstream. This conceptualisation became key to New Labour's Third Way approach to governance, based on an understanding that 'participation in society (full citizenship) can only be achieved through participation in the economy' (Stevenson 2004: 126; cited by S. Miles and Paddison 2005: 836).

In 1999, the Arts Council issued its own 'Framework for action' on the arts and social exclusion in a similar vein, undertaking to raise the profile of the arts in this context to government and other agencies through a programme of research and evaluation of impact - while also noting that, although 'expanding access has always been an important part of the work of the funding system... Advocating the role the arts can play in addressing social exclusion is ... a new departure...' (ACE 1999). The statement was followed by two substantial reviews (Jermyn 2001; Reeves 2002) which highlighted the need for 'measurement of impact' but, equally, the difficulties of doing so, since 'hard social impacts' were often not an intended outcome (Jermyn 2001: 10).

In 2004, it was noted by Gould for Creative Exchange that 'Arts and Social Inclusion' had become a shorthand for a wide range of arts activities with a number of specific targets including improved health and wellbeing and crime reduction. But Gould complained that arts activity and culture still did not feature in the Audit Commission's Quality of Life Indicators, despite their important role in generating social capital and liveability.

In 2004, DCMS issued a consultation document on the role of culture in regeneration, following a national conference held at the Lowry Centre in Salford, and based on a briefing report by Evans and Shaw (2004). Its aim was to promote the relevance of culture to the activities of other

government departments, as well as wider stakeholders, but at the same time it invited a response to some pertinent questions. Divided into three main sections, covering cultural icons and landmarks, place-making and urban identity, and community consolidation, it drew attention to the problems of making cultural projects relevant to local communities, and, furthermore, relevant to rural regeneration as well as the urban context. It pointed out that local communities could be resistant to innovation, and that local consultation and participation were key to the success of projects, especially since ‘one model does not fit all’. Above all, it underlined the fact that, despite PAT 10’s emphasis on the need for evaluation in 1999, and again in 2001 (*Building on PAT 10*), and New Labour’s insistence across the board on evidence-based policy making as a keystone of its drive to modernise governance, there remained a lack of evidence for the role of culture in strengthening communities and bringing different social groups together, and a lack of methodology for measuring ‘the benefits, or added value that culture could bring to delivering key social policy objectives’ (DCMS 2004: 5). Six years later, its CASE report came to much the same conclusion (DCMS, 2010).

4. The tensions generated by the promotion and deployment of the arts

DCMS’s recognition of the local conflicts that could be triggered by regeneration using arts and cultural strategies as a tool of intervention stands in contrast to the large amount of literature and policy produced during the 1990s and during New Labour’s term in office to support and celebrate the beneficial impacts of arts and culture in economic and social regeneration. It underlines the fundamental tensions which could be generated by the promotion and deployment of the arts, and artists as protagonists, to produce both socio-economic change and social cohesion at the same time - particularly when focused on specific ‘problem’ areas and urban communities already de-stabilised through the effects of economic decline and marginalisation (or ‘social exclusion’).

At the heart of these tensions lies an idealistic and essentialised sense of place and community (Hall and Robertson 2001), combined with an unspoken expectation for arts and culture to be uncritical or ‘minimum risk’ (Phillips 1988: 100) and certainly not to question or undermine the motivations of funders and social policy-makers. This inherent essentialism consistently framed government rhetoric around economic and social renewal at both local level and on a macro-scale – notwithstanding a growing literature questioning the validity of these concepts in the multi-cultural context. Amin, Massey and Thrift (2000), for example, argued that there could be no such thing as

a unified, place-based community; while Paddison (2001: 202) warned that ‘community can be a dangerous construct if it hides the process of making individuals and groups behind the façade of its inclusionary rhetoric’. S. Miles and Paddison (2005: 836) pointed out the tension between New Labour’s embracing of place and community-based rhetoric and its larger economic, supra-local aims: ‘The impact of culture-led regeneration is clearly closely tied up to a *localised sense of place*. Government discourse around culture certainly acknowledges this fact, but it remains doubtful as to whether local issues are given full rein when broader economic ones appear to be so much more immediate’. Artists, arts production, and arts participation were embraced as a means by which the local effects and global goals of economic renewal might be mediated, and the essential conflicts between them resolved. Evaluation and measurement of these processes therefore became essential to prove they worked. But the difficulties of this negotiation, underpinned by an unrealistic rhetoric around place and community identity which, it was hoped, could be expressed through localised, participatory arts and cultural production were obvious - especially in view of artists’ traditional, and self-selected (critical) position outside the mainstream economy and society themselves. For many artists, the role offered in the service of government policy, notwithstanding the persuasive influence of the influx of social programme funding into arts projects across the UK, presented a double-edged sword which forced them to examine the artistic and ethical principles of their practice.

The problems of social displacement and alienation produced by urban regeneration initiatives aimed at post-industrial restructuring, both in city centres and in more peripheral former industrial areas have been widely discussed, especially in the literature on gentrification (Lees, Slater and Wyly, 2008). Research on gentrification has underlined the problematic role played by artists, seeking cheap studio and living space, in regenerating urban neighbourhoods perceived as marginal, only to be displaced themselves (eg. Zukin 1982; Deutsche 1996; Ley 1996, 2003; Bowler and McBurney 1991). While on the one hand gentrification, triggered by the pioneering colonisation of artists, has been presented as emancipatory and a key to urban renewal (including by DCMS through the Urban White Paper) (see Lees, 2002, 2004 on the emancipatory city thesis), critics such as Neil Smith (1996) have also described it as a manifestation of the ‘revanchist city’ – the revenge of the middle-classes on the poor and minority groups whose interests were privileged in the post-war years of the Welfare State. For David Ley (2003: 2542) gentrification represents an intensification of capital accumulation which simultaneously commodifies art and art production

itself and re-evaluates cultural capital within the context of the ‘harsher, more individuated civil society’ produced by neo-liberal economics. Involvement in the urban regeneration process therefore threatens art and artists with commodification and loss of authenticity, which ultimately undermines the value of art itself. As an instrument of urban regeneration, then, artists and their production occupy a problematic position: agents of positive renewal but also displacement, and mediators of potential social conflicts, but also catalysts for social fragmentation.

Tornaghi’s discussion (2007) of Newcastle and Gateshead’s public art and urban regeneration programme contrasted the different strands of a strategy which included the construction of new upmarket housing and art galleries in the redundant industrial buildings of the quayside area, alongside the installation of new public arts works, including most notably Anthony Gormley’s *Angel of the North*, but also public art installations in local gardens managed by professionals working in collaboration with elected residents. While on the one hand, Newcastle’s strategy is credited with transforming its image and reversing population decline, on the other hand it has highlighted the material and cultural contrasts between different areas of the city – the ‘desirable’ quayside area which has become attractive to young professionals but is inaccessible to locals, and the less desirable peripheral areas beyond it to which locals have become restricted (see also Cameron and Coaffee 2005). Tornaghi (2007) argues that public art can contribute to place attachment through beautification, and art in the public sphere, notably relational or participatory arts projects, can raise social or political issues and activate citizens’ engagement with the environment. But, as the case of Newcastle demonstrates, those effects may be peripheral to the underlying structural facts of economic restructuring and deployed simply to mask the realities of social displacement.

As Maycock (1998) points out, the LDDC hardly needed an incentive to engage in a public art programme, because it was well aware of the need to make some gesture towards recognizing and, if possible, alleviating the local impacts of its radical social and economic intervention in the area. It initiated an arts programme as a vehicle for social remediation – but also, importantly, as a public relations exercise. Artists Lorraine Leeson and Peter Dunne (*Arts of Change/ Docklands Community Poster Campaign*) responded by deploying their community arts practice as a vehicle for critiquing the actions of the LDDC itself (see Dunn and Leeson 1993), in a tradition continued by artists such as Mel Jordan and Andy Hewitt today (see the *Freee* art collective). Lorraine Leeson has subsequently observed that, although the role of artists in social regeneration has become widely

accepted since the 1980s, ‘if they are not careful, artists can find themselves pawns in a game neither of their making nor choosing, and designed to benefit abstract policy rather than real people’ (Leeson 2008). She maintains ‘that social and cultural benefits actually do emanate from radical work by artists’, but that ‘weaving a way through these positions is not easy for emerging artists today’ (Leeson *ibid*).

As Sharp, Pollock and Paddison (2005) point out, the role that public art can play in negotiating the conflicts triggered by the re-structuring of urban space is balanced by the tendency of public art projects, especially those where community consultation and participation is integrated into the process of commissioning and production, to expose cultural differences and fundamental structural fissures in community structures. In their discussion of the impact of public art in Milton Keynes, Massey and Rose (2003) argue that public art should be understood as an intervention into social space which will actively help to produce that space through a negotiation of social difference, rather than by affirming sameness. Public art therefore should not be viewed necessarily as a process and product of consensual interaction, but the very opposite; however, they do argue that it has the capacity to create a sense of place through the process of recognizing and negotiating dissimilarity. Thus, although the experience of public art (and participatory arts projects) may be conflictual, they also have the potential to generate positive results which do serve to create an identification with community and place – albeit one that recognizes difference.

Malcolm Miles (1997) has been an outspoken critic of public art projects used as a superficial means of legitimising the interventions of private capital into public space through a rhetorical appeal to notions of authentic place and community, and of the arts in general as ‘problem-solvers’ to fix social problems without tackling the underlying issues created by capitalism, neo-liberal economics, and segregationist Modernist city-planning and aesthetics. M. Miles (2005:897) has noted, with some cynicism, that ‘The extent to which the arts are now seen as problem-solvers is seen in the statistics for Single Regeneration Budgets (SRBs) in the UK. Of 66 SRBs in England in 1998–99, 31 included a cultural project; linked funding from bodies such as English Heritage and the environmental charity The Groundwork Trust brought the total support for cultural projects in SRBs that fiscal year to more than £100 million (Selwood, 2001, pp 60–65)’.

Such critiques force the fundamental question of whether or not arts-led regeneration can be shown to have social benefits, and what evidence there actually is of its transformative effects on socially excluded urban communities. As Paola Merli (2002: 113) has argued:

‘The concern for addressing social cohesion and inclusion through a “soft” approach, such as the use of cultural projects, might be seen as a convenient means to divert attention from the real causes of today’s social problems and the tough solutions that might be needed to solve them. According to this line of reasoning, the whole discourse of social inclusion is a lot more appealing to the political elite than the old fashioned rhetoric of poverty and the call for economic redistribution’.

5. Evaluating arts-led regeneration

Although New Labour built in, from the start, a requirement for ‘external evaluation... derived directly from the expressed needs and aims of those benefiting’ (DCMS 1999: 9), of projects and programmes implemented by all bodies involved in arts and regeneration, it has been widely acknowledged that such processes more often recorded the views of commissioners and managers than the actual experiences of artists, participants, and communities, and only from a short-term perspective. Following the publication of New Labour’s various policy statements on the importance of the arts and culture in mitigating urban social exclusion, a significant number of reviews were published with a view to examining the validity of its claims, which served, above all, to also highlight the difficulty of establishing suitable methods of evaluating arts projects – particularly in terms of engaging artist practitioners and communities positively in such processes (rather than simply justifying the expenditure) and over the longer term. In 1999, the PAT 10 report stated that all bodies involved in arts-led regeneration programmes ‘should wherever possible make external evaluation and the means to carry it out integral to the funded project/programme and ensure that the criteria against which success will be judged are clearly established and derived directly from the expressed needs and aims of those benefiting’ (DCMS 1999: 9). This was re-stated in 2001 (PAT 10 2001), and the lack of evidence to date noted. The same situation was recorded again in DCMS (2004).

Evans and Shaw’s (2004) briefing to DCMS had listed a set of eleven indicators for ‘evidencing’ the contribution of the arts and culture to social regeneration: a change in residents’ perceptions of the place where they live; greater individual confidence and aspiration; a clearer expression of individual and shared ideas and needs; an increase in volunteering; increased organisational capacity at local level; increased social capital – ‘the norms and networks that enable collective action’ (World Bank); a change in the image or reputation of a place or group of people; stronger public-private-voluntary sector partnerships; reduced school truancy/offending behaviour; higher educational attainment; and, finally, new approaches to evaluation, consultation and

representation (p. 28). They noted that evaluations were normally presented in one of a number of formats – advocacy and promotion (often to justify resources); project assessment (for manager’s and funder’s use); project or programme evaluation (involving some participants, and based on questionnaires, interviews, and observations); performance indicators (in line with Audit Commission benchmarks); impact assessment; and longitudinal impact assessment (over a period of time – and rarely carried out). And that most studies focused on the impact of participation on individuals and communities, participation usually meaning ‘hands-on activity’, and also only focused on the immediate or very short-term results of an activity (p 32). The report highlighted a number of gaps in the evidence – in particular, a lack of holistic and integrated approaches to evaluation, reflecting both a lack of understanding of cultural impact, and a conflict in the interests between the different parties involved in project commissioning and implementation, and their perceptions of desirable or undesirable outcomes - including the relative importance of impacts perceived as mainly economic or mainly social. It also reiterated themes that had emerged through the Arts Council’s own evidence reviews (Jermyn 2001, Reeves 2002) relating to the resistance of artist practitioners themselves to evaluation, on the basis that the instrumentalisation of their arts practice in the context of social programmes was not a situation that they necessarily felt comfortable with, and that working with a pre-defined social output or outcome in mind was not intrinsic to their practice. Evans and Shaw (2004: 60) concluded that, ‘Today few would dispute the role and value that culture has in regeneration in the narrow and increasingly the wider sense, but there is much less understanding of the very different effects that different types of cultural intervention produce in the short and longer term’. Their conclusions were echoed in Ruiz’s (2004) review for the Scottish Executive – who asserted: ‘Social impact is not only difficult to define, it is also difficult to measure in a “hard”, robust way, and although quantitative methods are necessary to measure the extent of social impact across a particular population, “softer” qualitative research methods are required to explore the type and depth of social impact on individuals and communities’ (p.11).

In a subsequent article Evans (2005) suggested that new methodologies should bring together approaches from anthropology and sociology and apply these to evaluation models to measure social change, noting a shift away from the rhetoric around evidence-based policy and practice to one which emphasised the importance of building knowledge over time, drawing together local experience and research findings. This built on Bianchini and Parkinson’s (1993)

earlier call for an implementation of qualitative indicators to counter the output-driven Performance Indicator approach favoured by the Arts Council (see also Belfiore 2002). Matarasso's (1997) study of 60 participatory arts projects presented the first large-scale attempt to tackle these issues and reflect on the perspectives and experiences of those involved. In this he criticised the arts sector's earlier embrace of an economic case for public funding as a compromise on principles, and stressed that the real purpose of the arts was 'to contribute to a stable, confident and creative society' (ibid), not to create wealth. He described his research approach as based on social research methodologies, aimed at drawing out participants' own views of their experiences by means of a questionnaire. The results were collated into a list of 50 outcomes which might be used as indicators (see Matarasso 1997).

But Matarasso's methodology was subsequently criticised by Belfiore (2002) and Merli (2002) as being too vague, based on questionnaire-generated data which in many cases was incomplete or inconclusive. It indicated long-term impacts which were not actually monitored over any period of time, and avoided any assessment of the aesthetic merit of the art itself. Belfiore (2002) argued that there was a need for new definitions of quality and value in arts projects, that might be based on a diversified notion of quality relating to the different contexts of production. The Arts Council's 2006 report *The power of art/visual arts: evidence of impact* stressed the importance of measuring impact from an 'evidence-based' approach, but provided no account of the evaluation processes applied to each case study (referring readers to evaluation references instead) and provided only a brief summary of impacts without any substantiation bar a few random quotes from stakeholders. The evaluation impacts were mainly based on financial and numerical statistics.

More recently, in a new study of evaluation procedures, Matarasso (2009) has highlighted the continuing tension between approaches to evaluation which verge towards either a management consultancy model or a social anthropology model – auditing versus long-term qualitative research. He points out that commissioners and practitioners seek different outcomes from evaluation, and that 'practitioners spoke most positively of their experiences of working with academic researchers, perhaps because this work combined authoritative methods with a discursive process' (ibid: 26). He is critical of the large body of reports and evaluations that exist on the role of arts projects within the context of social programmes that do not meet the needs or interests of potential users, but rather the predetermined requirements of commissioners. Despite this O'Brien's (2010) report to DCMS seems to step back into the old established economic evaluation approach.

More recently Ennis and Douglass (GLA 2011) have produced a working paper on behalf of GLA Economics asking what evidence there is of a link between culture and regeneration and how we can measure it. Their conclusions make sobering reading, they argue that most evaluations to date have been too ad hoc, short-term and specific and are difficult to compare as an evidence base, complicated by the difficulty of evaluating regeneration itself. They conclude: ‘So we are still not sure about the role that culture can play in regenerating neighbourhoods, but there must be some way to measure this, even if only to observe change over time’ (GLA Economics, 2011:10).

6. Conclusion

‘...the capacity of public art to foster inclusion is at best partial, able to address symbolic more than it is material needs. Whether this means that public art has become an unwitting agent in the overprivileging of cultural justice at the expense of socioeconomic redistribution is a moot point. However, this argument not only exaggerates the influence of public art on economic regeneration, but is itself an overeconomistic interpretation of the meaning of urban citizenship’ (Sharp, Pollock and Paddison, 2005:1001).

This paper has shown that under New Labour the rhetoric of arts-led regeneration developed to become a quasi-social fact. In similar vein Hewitt (2011) discusses three mutually supporting rhetorics that were produced by DCMS, ACE and arts advocates, during the years of New Labour’s third way government, in their claim-making about the benefits of the arts to economic, social and democratic change: art as cultural democracy, art as an economic driver, and art as social amelioration. But the evidence is not robust on any of these measures.

In 2011 the Coalition government released its regeneration strategy: ‘Regeneration to enable growth: What the Government is doing in support of community-led regeneration’ (DCLG 2011). In this they pin their ‘regeneration’ colours to economic growth and localism, drawing on their Local Growth White Paper (2010) in which they underline putting residents, local businesses, civil society organisations and civic leaders in the driving seat and providing them with local rewards and incentives to drive growth and improve the social and physical quality of their area. The government’s new regeneration strategy is a toolkit that is distinctly focused on promoting economic growth but it has no strategy for Britain’s most deprived urban communities. In similar vein to New Labour there is an implicit assumption that wider economic growth will ‘trickle down’ to deprived communities (see Lees 2008 on New Labour and trickle down in deprived

neighbourhoods), yet unlike under New Labour deprived urban neighbourhoods are no-longer provided with a spatial policy fix (like the problematic Housing Market Renewal and Mixed Communities Initiative, see Allen 2008; Lees 2008). The focus is on big schemes like Cross Rail and High Speed Rail, the Regional Growth Fund, New Homes Bonus etc, whose main focus is not on tackling urban social deprivation. The thoughtful and detailed responses given to the parliamentary select committee are worth reading (see <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmcomloc/1014/1014vw.pdf>). The Joseph Rowntree Trust (2011) summarizes these concerns well: the Coalition's regeneration strategy 'favour(s) more prosperous growth areas at the expense of more deprived places. This risks increasing the gap between deprived and affluent communities and also risks creating a spiral of decline in certain deprived areas'. The fact that one of the first things the Coalition government did was to abolish The Social Exclusion Taskforce, based in the Cabinet Office but coordinating work across departments, tells us a lot about their interest in social inclusion. Their response to the Select Committee Report reveals a rather ambivalent and defensive stance:

'At its core, regeneration is about concerted action to address the challenges and problems faced by the community of a particular place. It's about widening opportunities, growing the local economy, and improving people's lives. But beyond that high-level definition, it is not for Government to define what regeneration is, what it should look like, or what measures should be used to drive it. That will depend on the place – the local characteristics, challenges and opportunities' (2012:2, <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm82/8264/8264.pdf>).

After a prolonged period in which the arts enjoyed relatively generous funding and became the object of widespread policy interest as a tool for urban regeneration and social inclusion, the arts are now entering a new age of austerity that raises important questions both about the sustainability of creative arts communities themselves and the viability of the hopes invested in them as engines of economic growth and progressive social change (Pratt, 2009). Those questions and viabilities cannot be answered without some hard evidence that the arts can help improve the lives of socially excluded/marginalised urban communities. As such we would like to urge social scientists to begin the difficult task of creating a robust evidence base, including artists, local communities and policy-makers in this process.

Past evaluations of programmes of art-led regeneration have been criticised for being too short-term, too quantitative and too much like management consultancy reports. The methods used to collate more robust evidence must move away from this quantitative and survey work to include

more in depth qualitative investigations into the processes and practices involved when artists work in/with socially excluded urban communities. Longitudinal and ethnographic work is needed. Such an approach would necessarily include the voices of the community, the artist and the funders. In arts-led regeneration artists have a key role in the process and practices of regeneration, there are few if any studies of how artists actually 'do' regeneration and inclusion in socially excluded urban communities.

A more rigorous, in-depth, inter- and trans-disciplinary body of research is needed on the role of art in urban regeneration and urban social inclusion. Future approaches must make use of the expertise of the researcher/s involved, the artist/s themselves (as they are on the front line), and there must be direct input from the local community. Beyond statistical counts of economic value, ethnographic methods could be the most fruitful for studying social value, including researchers' ethnographic observations *of* the artists as they work in community regeneration and ethnographic observations *by* the artists themselves (auto-ethnography) reflecting on their practices and 'doings' on a day to day basis 'in the field'. In addition, direct community-based input focused on community-level operations is important (this might be ethnographic, auto-ethnographic, or other). The latter allows community involvement in *producing* an evidence base, rather than just contributing to it in an insignificant and often unfulfilling way. Involving artists auto-ethnographically could help counter the fact that many artists resist evaluation and has the potential to draw on recent work on precarity which works against the dominant tendencies of culture-led redevelopment (see <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0704/raunig/en>), recognising that artists (rather than their Art) have agency which hitherto has been, if perhaps unwittingly, used to foster gentrification. Such methods have the potential to be used both to justify public (and private) expenditure on artists in urban regeneration programmes in communities experiencing social exclusion and to develop best practice for art-led regeneration with respect to urban social inclusion. Some will of course charge that this is tantamount to reproducing existing forms of neoliberal governmentality, but in a period of austerity tough choices have to be made about how to spend public money in the best interests of the most marginalized in society. And of equal importance artists (academic researchers and local communities themselves) can use these methods to challenge the links between 'regeneration' and gentrification (see Lees and McKiernan, in prep), and artists can use the data gathered to make the case for future funding of their work in socially excluded urban communities.

Acknowledgements

The research for this paper was funded by a 2011 *AHRC Connected Communities Project Development Grant*, title: “The art of regeneration: community resilience in an age of austerity”, PI: Lees, L. CoIs: Pratt, A., Jordan, M., Miles, M. and Bachmann, G. 2011. Special thanks to Mel Jordan, Malcolm Miles and Andy Pratt for their impressive knowledge and expertise. Thanks also to Rebecca Birch and Goetz Bachmann. The paper was presented in an earlier form at ‘*Art and the Public Sphere: Critical Urban Geography I*’ (School of the Arts, Loughborough University, 2012).

References

Allen, C. 2008, *Housing market renewal and social class*, Routledge: London.

Amin, A. Massey, D., and Thrift, N., 2000, *Cities for the many not the few*. Bristol: The Policy Press

Arts Council England, 2006a, *Our agenda for the arts: 2006-8*. London: ACE

Arts Council England, 2006b, *The power of art: visual arts: evidence of impact*. London: ACE

Arts Council (ACE), 1999, *Addressing Social Exclusion: A Framework for Action*. London: Art Councils

Arts Council England (ACE), 1989, *An Urban Renaissance: The Role of the Arts in Urban Regeneration*. London: ACE.

Belfiore E., 2002, Art as a means towards alleviating social exclusion: does it really work? – A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8.1.

British and American Arts Association (BAAA), 1989, *Arts and the Changing City: an agenda for urban regeneration* (ed Keen). BAAA.

Balibrea, M., 2001, Urbanism, culture and the post-industrial city: challenging the ‘Barcelona Model’, *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 2:2: 187–210.

Berry Slater, J. and Iles, A. (2010) *No room to move: radical art and the degenerate city*, Mute Books.

Bianchini, F. and Landry, C., 1994, *The creative city: a methodology for assessing urban vitality and viability*. Stroud, Glos: Comedia

Bianchini, F and Parkinson, M., 1993, *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*, Manchester University Press.

Bowler, A. and McBurney, N., 1991, Gentrification and the avant garde in New York's East Village: The good, the bad and the ugly, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 8:4:49-77.

Butler, D., 2003, *Changing people's lives – art and social inclusion*, Interrupt Artists in Socially Engaged Practice, Arts Council England: London.

Cabinet Office, 1998, *Bringing Britain Together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal* (Cabinet Office, 1998)

Cameron, S. and Coafee, J., 2005, Art, gentrification and regeneration: from artist to pioneer to public arts, *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 5(1), pp. 39-58.

Catterall, B., 1998, *Culture as a Critical Focus for Effective Urban Regeneration*, (unpublished), Town and Country Planning Summer School 1988, University of York.

Chelliah, R., 1999, *Arts and Regeneration*. London: Local Government Information Unit (LGIU).

Comedia, 1989, *Creating a Real City: An Arts Action Programme for London Docklands*.

CASE, 2010, 'Understanding the value of engagement in culture and sport' (work undertaken by Matrix Knowledge Group). www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/research_and_statistics/5698.aspx

Council of Europe, 1997, 'In from the margins'. The European Task Force on Culture and Development: Council of Europe Publishing.

DCLG, 2011, *Regeneration to enable growth: what government is doing in support of community-led regeneration* (<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/regeneration/pdf/1830137.pdf>).

DCMS, 2010, *Understanding the value of engagement in culture and sport/ CASE: Culture and Sport Evidence Programme* (EPPI Centre/ Matrix Knowledge Group)

DCMS, 2004, *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration* (DCMS FOI RESPONSE - Case Number 91090) (http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/freedom_of_information/91090doc6.pdf)

DCMS, 2002, *Making it Count: The Contribution of Culture and Sport to Social Inclusion*. London: DCMS/ Stationery Office

DCMS, 2001a *Creative industries mapping document*. London: Department of Culture, Media and Sport/ Stationery Office

DCMS, 2001b, *Building on PAT 10: the DCMS Report on Social Inclusion*. London: DCMS/ Stationery Office.

DCMS, 2000a, *Better public buildings: a proud legacy for the future*. London: DCMS/ Stationery Office

DCMS, 2000b, *Creative Industries: the Regional Dimension* . London: DCMS/ Stationery Office

DCMS, 2000c, *Creating Opportunities: Guidance for Local Authorities in England on Local Cultural Strategies*. London: DCMS/ Stationery Office

DCMS, 1999a, *The Arts and Neighbourhood Renewal: a research report*. Policy Action Team 10 (PAT 10) report to the Social Exclusion Unit/ SEU. London: DCMS/ Stationery Office

DCMS, 1999b, *Local Cultural Strategies: Draft Guidance for Local Authorities in England*. London: DCMS/ Stationery Office.

DCMS, 1998a, *Creative industries mapping document*. London: Department of Culture, Media and Sport/ Stationery Office

DCMS, 1998b, *A new cultural framework*. London: DCMS/ Stationery Office

De Propris et al, 2009, *The Geography of Creativity*, NESTA.

DETR/CABE, 2000, *By design. Urban design in the planning system: towards a better practice*. London: DETR/ CABE.

DETR, 2000, *Our Towns and Cities - the Future. Delivering an Urban Renaissance* (London: DETR).

DETR, 1999, *Towards an Urban Renaissance* (London: ODPM).

Deutsche, R., 1996, *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dunn, P. and Leeson, L., 1993, The art of change in the Docklands, in: J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam et al. (Eds) *Mapping the Futures*, pp. 136–149. London: Routledge.

English Partnerships/ Housing Corporation, 2000, *Urban design compendium*. London: English Partnerships

English Partnerships, 1996, *Time for design*. London: EP

Ennis, N. and Douglass, G., 2011, *Working Paper 48: Culture and regeneration – what evidence is there of a link and how can it be measured?* GLA.

Evans, G. and Shaw, P., 2004, The contribution of culture to regeneration in the UK: a review of evidence, DCMS.

Evans, G., 2005, Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration, *Urban Studies*, 42, 5/6, 959–983

Evans, G., 1993, *An Urban Renaissance? the role of the arts in urban regeneration; a survey of local authorities in Greater London*. London: University of North London Press.

Florida, R., 2002, *The Rise of the Creative Class* (New York: Basic Books).

Gould, H., 2004, *Developing the role of the arts in UK Social Policy*. Creative Exchange

Fisher, M. and Worpole, K., 1991, *City Centres, City Cultures: The Role of the Arts in the Revitalisation of Towns and Cities*. Manchester: Centre for Local Economic Strategies.

Hall, T. and Robertson, I. (2001) Public art and urban regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debates, *Landscape Research*, 26, 1: 5 - 26

Harvey, D., 2000, *Spaces of Hope* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Hewitt, A., 2011, Privatizing the public: three rhetorics of art's public good in "Third Way" cultural policy, *Art and the Public Sphere*, 1:1:19-36.

Imrie and Raco, 2003, *Urban renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Jermyn, H., 2001, *The arts and social exclusion: a review prepared for the Arts Council of England*. London: ACE .

Joseph Rowntree Trust, 2011, *Response to Communities and Government Select Committee, Regeneration to enable growth – What government is doing in support of community-led regeneration* (<http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/consultation-regeneration-growth.pdf>).

Joseph Rowntree Trust, 1996, *The art of regeneration: urban renewal through cultural activity*. *Social Policy Summary* 8 March.

Kearns, A. 2003, Social capital, regeneration and urban policy, in Imrie, R. and Raco, M. (eds.) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, Community and Urban Policy*. Policy Press, pp. 36-60

Landry, C., 2000, *The creative city: a toolkit for urban innovators*. London: Earthscan

Landry, C., and Bianchini, F., 2005, *The creative city*. London: DEMOS

- Landry, C., Greene, L., Matarasso, F., Bianchini, F., 1996, *The Art of Regeneration: Urban Renewal Through Cultural Activity*. Stroud, Glos: Comedia. (findings summarized by JRT, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation)
- Lees, L. and McKiernan, J. (in prep) Art-led regeneration in Margate: learning from Moonbow Jakes.
- Lees, L., 2008, Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Urban Renaissance? *Urban Studies* 45 (12): 2449-2470.
- Lees, L. (ed.), 2004, *The Emancipatory City? Paradoxes and Possibilities* (London: Sage).
- Lees, L., 2003, 'Visions of "Urban Renaissance": the Urban Task Force Report and the Urban White Paper' in R. Imrie and M. Raco (eds) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, Community and Urban Policy* (Bristol: Policy Press) pp.61-82.
- Lees, L., 2000, 'A reappraisal of gentrification: towards a "geography of gentrification"', *Progress in Human Geography* 24, 3: 389-408.
- Lees, L., Slater, T. and Wyly, E., 2008, *Gentrification*, Routledge: New York.
- Leeson, L. 2008, *Art with Communities: Reflections on a changing landscape*, Ixia Public Art think tank (<http://ixia-info.com/new-writing/loraineleeson/>)
- Levitas, R. 1998, *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ley, D., 2003, Artists, aestheticisation and the field of gentrification, *Urban Studies* 40, 12: 2527-2544.
- Ley, D., 1996, *The New Middle Class and the Remaking of the Central City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- LGA 1999, *The Road to Regeneration*. London: LGA
- Massey, D., and G. Rose. 2003. *Personal Views: Public Art Research Project*. Social Sciences Faculty, The Open University, commissioned by Artpoint on behalf of Milton Keynes Council.
- Matarasso, F., 2009, The human factor: experiences of arts evaluation, (<http://web.me.com/matarasso>)
- Matarasso, F., 1999, *Towards a Local Cultural Index*. Stroud, Glos: Comedia.
- Matarasso, F., 1997, *Use of ornament? The social impact of participation in the arts*, Stroud, Glos: Comedia.

- Maycock, R., 1998, *Regeneration and the arts in London Docklands*. LDDC
- Merli, P. , 2002, Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities: a critical review of Francois Matarasso's "Use or ornament?", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8:1: 107-118.
- Miles, M., 2005, Interruptions: testing the rhetoric of culturally-led urban redevelopment, *Urban Studies*, 42:5-6:833-840.
- Miles, M., 1997, *Art, space and the city*, Routledge: London.
- Miles, S. and Paddison, R., 2005, The rise and rise of culture led urban regeneration, *Urban Studies* 42 : 5-6 pp 833-840
- Moriarty, G., 2002, *Sharing practice: a guide to self-evaluation in the context of social exclusion*. London: Arts Council England.
- Myerscough, J., 1988, *The Economic Importance of the Arts in Britain*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Nathan, M. and Marshall, A., 2006, *Them and us: Britain and the European City*. Research paper No. 7. London: Centre for Cities/ IPPR.
- Newman, T., Curtis, K. and Stephens, J., 2003, Do community-based arts projects result in social gains? A review of the literature, *Community Development Journal*, October: 310-322
- O'Brien, D., 2010, *Measuring the value of culture: a report to the DCMS*
- ODPM, 2006. *State of the English cities* (vols 1 and 2). London: ODPM/ Stationery Office.
- ODPM, 2004, *Making it happen: urban renaissance and prosperity in our core cities*. London: ODPM/ Stationery Office
- ODPM/DCLG 1999. *Regeneration through culture, sport and tourism*. (<http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/localgovernment/regenerationthroughculture>)
- Paddison, R. 2001. Communities in the City, in Paddison, R. (ed) *Handbook of Urban Studies*. London: Sage, 194-205.
- Phillips, P, 2000 [1988], 'Out of order: the public art machine', in Miles, M., Borden, I, and Hall, T. (eds), *The city cultures reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 96-102.
- Pratt, A., 2009, The creative and cultural economy and the recession, *Geoforum* 40:495-496.
- Pratt, A. 2008, Creative cities: the cultural industries and the creative class, *Geografiska Annaler Series B-Human Geography* 90B(2): 107-117.

- Reeves, M., 2002, *Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts: a review*. ACE Research Report 24. London: ACE.
- Ruiz, J., 2004, *A literature review of the evidence base for culture, the arts and sport policy*, for The Scottish Executive (<http://scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/17002/0023718.pdf>)
- Selwood, S., 1995, *The benefits of public art: the polemics of permanent art in public places*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- SEU, 2000, Cabinet Office, 2000, *The social exclusion leaflet*. www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/seu/index/march.
- Sharp, J., Pollock, V. and Paddison, R. (2005) Just Art for a Just City: Public Art and Social Inclusion in Urban Regeneration, *Urban Studies*, 42:5/6: 1001–1023.
- Shaw, P., 1990, *Percent for Art: A Review*. Arts Council England.
- Smith, C., 1999, The contribution of arts and sports to combating social exclusion: a speech by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
- Smith, C., 1998, *Creative Britain*. London: Faber.
- Smith, N., 1996, *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Stevenson, D., 2004, 'Civic gold' rush: cultural planning and the politics of the Third Way, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10: 119-131.
- Tornaghi, C. (2007) Questioning the social aims of Public Art in urban regeneration initiatives. The case of Newcastle Upon Tyne and Gateshead (UK). <http://www.ncl.ac.uk/guru/assets/documents/EWP42.pdf>
- UNCHS, 2004, *The state of the world's cities*.
- Urban Task Force, 2005, *Towards a strong urban renaissance*, An independent report by members of the Urban Task Force chaired by Lord Rogers of Riverside.
- Vickery, J., 2007, *The Emergence of Culture-led Regeneration: A policy concept and its discontents* Warwick: Warwick University Centre for Cultural Policy Studies.
- Wynne, D. (ed.), (1992), *The Culture Industry*, Arena: Aldershot.
- Zukin, S., 1982, *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

