Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration

Graeme Evans

Summary. Culture-led regeneration, as it has come to be known, is now a feature of cities—old and new—as they seek to revive former industrial and waterfront sites and city centres, and establish themselves as competitive cities of culture. At the same time, the rationale for cultural input to area and neighbourhood regeneration has been extended to include quality of life, as well economic outcomes. The evidence of how far flagship and major cultural projects contribute to a range of regeneration objectives is, however, limited. Measuring the social, economic and environmental impacts attributed to the cultural element in area regeneration is problematic and the 'evidence' is seldom robust. The paper reviews both evidence and the indicators used to measure impacts and concludes with an assessment of how and why gaps in evidence persist.

Introduction

My own blunt evaluation of regeneration programmes that don't have a culture component is they won't work. Communities have to be energised, they have to be given some hope, they have to have the creative spirit released (Hughes, 1998, p. 2).

As the above quote suggests, communities need hope—some would say 'trust' (Sennett, 1986)—in the process and outcomes of regeneration, not least since this instrumental process is controlled largely from the 'outside'. This sentiment can perhaps be read in two ways: culture is a critical aspect of mediating and articulating community need, as development is planned and takes shape, through culture's potential to empower and animate. This should in turn lead to participation in, and ownership of, regeneration by the residents and other beneficiaries in an area. Alternatively, culture-led regeneration can be used as a 'sop' to distract

attention from the underlying power over place that finally manifests itself in the type of projects and landscapes created and imposed on communities and sites undergoing regeneration. As Klunzman (2004, p. 2) succinctly put it: "Each story of regeneration begins with poetry and ends with real estate".

The extent to which cultural facilities and programmes positively contribute to the regeneration of areas and neighbourhoods which have been subject to economic and physical decline, and multiple social problems—unemployment, poverty, crime, poor amenities, education and housing—has become a more central concern of governments and regeneration intermediaries. This is particularly so in view of the duration of this phenomenon, its replication in post-industrial and developing cities world-wide and the growing call for evidence to support the claims which are made by city and cultural organisations in their pursuit of substantial capital funding and leverage.

Graeme Evans is in the Cities Institute, London Metropolitan University, Ladbroke House, 62–66 Highbury Grove, London, N5 2AD, UK. Fax: 020 7133 5123. E-mail: g.evans@londonmet.ac.uk.

The opportunity provided for a longer view of culture and regeneration projects and strategies and the evaluation of their success in both cultural and regeneration terms, is the subject of this paper. This draws on a review of evidence—how that evidence has been derived and the evaluation and measurement of impacts undertaken in both academic and policy spheres. This review is based in part on a study initiated by the UK Department for Culture Media and Sport, which, like its predecessors and equivalents in other countries, has promoted an urban renaissance through the arts and creative industries.[1] This panacea is viewed as one of the few remaining strategies for urban revitalisation which can resist (or embrace) the effects of globalisation and capture the twin goals of competitive advantage and quality of life which culture, somewhat optimistically, might offer. The current cultural resurgence has also been fed by Porter's 'new economic model' of city competitiveness (1995) and 'lifestyle' indices of diversity, the creative milieu and 'class' (Landry, 2000; Hall, 1998; Florida, 2004), as essential ingredients in city survival and growth. This "rhetoric has entered the vocabularies of local cultural policymakers and city boosters alike" (Stevenson, 2004, p. 119).

The following discussion introduces the growing demands for evidence-based policy evaluation in this field, including the types of reporting which arise in the regeneration process and promotion of major cultural facilities. A typology of the main approaches to culture and regeneration is then summarised, with 'exemplar' arts and urban regeneration schemes cited in order to illustrate particular impacts, and the 'counterfactual' where evidence is contradictory to the official discourse. The next section reviews a range of specific impacts and measurements used to evaluate the effects of culture and regeneration in physical, economic and social terms, with examples of the some of the evidence arising and its limitations. The paper concludes with an assessment of the gaps in evidence, with suggestions for a more integrated approach to measuring multiple regeneration outcomes. An underlying argument

throughout is that the attention to the high-cost and high-profile culture-led regeneration projects is in inverse proportion to the strength and quality of evidence of their regenerative effects. This is in part due to problems of measurement and evaluation criteria not being established either *a priori* or consensually, but also to the fact that, like hallmark event projects, major culture-led regeneration schemes are not wholly grounded or rational-decision-based. They rely more on (blind) faith, "pork barrel politics" (Sudjic, 1993, p. 31) and constructed visions which appear not to look beyond the short-term physical impacts and landscapes they create.

Search for Evidence

Writing over 10 years ago, Lim concluded that there was "a need to sort out the hype from the substance" in the claims commonly made for culture-led urban revitalisation, with the more positive results achieved by culture-based regeneration

> tending to be too general in content and conclusions, a situation clouded by the fact that there are no clear guidelines as to how the effects of these developments should be evaluated (Lim, 1993, p. 594).

Bassett, writing in the same year, cautioned that it is important not to exaggerate the economic impacts of these (culture-led) strategies; that smaller cities could not emulate the success of major cultural centres; and that, fundamentally,

> Cultural regeneration is more concerned with themes such as community self-development and self-expression. Economic regeneration is more concerned with growth and property development and finds expression in prestige projects and place-marketing. The latter does not necessarily contribute to the former (Bassett, 1993, p. 1785).

Reconciling the social with the economic and physical outcomes of regeneration has therefore been a challenge which more recent culture-led regeneration projects are expected

to meet and by which established schemes should now be judged.

At a conference entitled 'Building Tomorrow: Culture in Regeneration' held in Salford, north-west England, in February 2003, participants from national and city government and cultural agencies made a call for greater evidence to support the claims commonly made for the ways in which arts and cultural activity contribute to successful regeneration (DCMS, 2003). In particular, a concern was expressed for a 'joined-up approach'—a term coined to reflect the fragmented nature of government policy and departmental working, and between tiers of government, such as local, regional, national— and a longer-term perspective on the social and economic impacts that emerge over time. Greater emphasis on measurement and the quality of evidence itself was sought, recognising that

> The distinct lack of, and commitment to, in depth research into this issue creates a situation in which policymakers are unable to draw an evidence base upon which to make key decisions in the application of culture-led regeneration strategies (Bailey *et al.*, 2004, p. 47).

In many respects, the call for 'hard evidence' and measurement tools is part of the larger question of how regeneration itself is measured, how long should it 'take' and what makes for successful intervention in meeting policy objectives and community need—or, more fundamentally, how choices over development are made and evaluated and 'Pareto effects' are distributed and felt at a local level. A comprehensive review of urban policy, public choice and development appraisal is beyond the scope of a single article— although all require consideration in a critique of culture and regeneration. As Hall observes

> Moments of civic transformation tend to get portrayed in overly simplistic terms as seamless and unproblematic. The reality is much more messy (Hall, 2004, p. 63).

Evidence-based evaluation of urban policy and practice therefore needs to address a number of 'wicked problems' (Harrison, 2000), to which culture adds yet a further dimension.

Evidence-based Policy

Governments now refer to the need for 'evidence-based' policy-making and evaluation (PMSU, 2004), which can be interpreted on the one hand as rejection of, or at least disquiet with, simplistic ideological principles and more grand theories and, on the other, as a recognition that public policy interventions require robust testing and greater assessment of their 'fitness for purpose' and operational effectiveness in meeting policy objectives. This is seen as a necessity as competing needs and aspirations, opportunity costs and a more heterogeneous populace (Worpole and Greenhalgh, 1999, p. 38) demand more transparent 'evidence' of what works and where public intervention is good 'value for money', or not. The political imperative for evidence is therefore all-pervading, generating guidance and systems for the measurement of performance and impacts, and a range of quantitative indicators against which, in this case, regeneration programmes can be compared (ODPM, 2001, 2003). However, a recent review of the evaluation of social regeneration programmes called for a shift of focus *away* from evidence-based policy and practice, to building knowledge over time, drawing together local experience, research findings and, critically, a better understanding of trade-offs and political imperatives (Coote *et al.*, 2004). These latter aspects have been little considered and understood in the evaluation of culture-led regeneration to date and, therefore, the nature of 'evidence'—its perspicacity, and the need for a more grounded theory—emerges from this critical review.

Types of Reporting

Evidence in one sense can be compared with 'scientific proof', such as in peer-reviewed published research. However, in the fields of regeneration and cultural development, the

outcomes and value systems/judgements have been neither explicit nor established *a priori.* One example of this is the limited number of government or sponsor assessments which present robust evidence on regeneration effects generally—a long-term and multifaceted process itself—and even less where cultural impacts within regeneration are concerned (DCMS, 2000; 2004; ODPM, 2003). In a review of 'evidence', the source of such material and its efficacy also present problems, due to the nature—political, entrepreneurial and contested—of major regeneration projects typically taking place over several years, durations which exceed political terms of office. This also fuels a lack of transparency within the development and decision-making process, as risk and criticism are minimised and projects are continually 'negotiated'—one reason for common budget overruns (Evans, 2001a, 2003). As Bassett (1993, p. 1785) observed, "the problem in the process of alliance-building [is that] a critical or oppositional aspect of cultural development is lost". Published evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration is usually presented in one of the following types of report. Some are evidence-based, most however, are not—starting with the most common.

Advocacy and promotion. Reports and prospectuses are often produced during the feasibility, development and initial impact phase, or to justify further resources and support. Typically, such material is presented in the form of promotional, PR and descriptive case studies for media and public consumption, and design masterplans. They are also used to report on and 'celebrate' major programmes, as they move to the next phase—for example, *Birmingham's Renaissance* (BCC, 2003), Barcelona's *Universal Cultural Forum* (2000), *Building Culture Downtown* (National Building Museum, 1998).

Project assessment. These are normally produced for internal (management) and external (state/funder) use. This type of report typically concentrates on financial and user-related outputs, such as income and expenditure, audience/visitor numbers, direct employment—i.e. resident organisations (such as an orchestra) and construction activity. They tend not to evaluate the process or outcomes of the project, or profile beneficiaries (or 'non-users'), or the user experience. They are used principally by the organisation and its funders in annual assessment and are rarely published, although often publicly funded. Project assessment is also normally carried out once, post-completion, whether a capital project (building) or activity programme (education programme, event/festival). Regenerative effects (if any) are therefore subsumed into the facility or organisation's overall performance.

Project evaluation. The focus in this case is as much on the process employed to plan and deliver a project as on the 'results'. They may include quantitative and/or qualitative evidence. The most common forms of data collection are questionnaires, unstructured interview/focus groups and participant observation. The evaluation may be of one project only or of a group of projects (see below) whether locally (regeneration area) or nationally (arts education programme). The evaluation may be carried out by the organisation itself or with the support of an external evaluator. It is recommended that evaluation is integrated from the outset of a project (baseline), undertaken during, on completion and post-completion (Jackson, 2005). Evaluation methodology has developed substantially in the past decade (Evans and Shaw, 2001a, 2001b) in the cultural and regeneration spheres, drawing particularly from environmental health (Bowling, 1997), crime prevention, urban design and quality of life measurement (Rapley, 2001), with an interdisciplinary focus on process and participation.

Programme evaluation. Wider programme evaluation is undertaken of schemes made up of separate projects with common aims, or typically part of a single initiative or funding programme. These can draw on project evaluation techniques (see above),

but programme evaluation is also likely to entail standard output criteria (including PIs; see below)—for example, in regeneration programme assessment and grand-aid schemes. In the latter case, a comparative framework is used to assess individual projects as part of a wider initiative, whether local, national (Lottery), or transnational such as EU-funded programmes—for example, *European Capitals/Cities of Culture* (Palmer, 2004), *Culture and Neighbourhoods* (Bianchini and Ghilardi, 1997) and regional development funding of culture (Evans and Foord, 2000). Regeneration design and building types have been the subject of various published collections, notably waterfronts (Marshall, 2001; Wang, 2002), the reuse of heritage buildings (Bordage, 2002) and cultural facilities, particularly museums and galleries.

Performance Indicators (PIs). PIs are used to compare actual performance against targets and comparative standards, which are quantitative, benchmark and service-provision based. They therefore measure inputs (resources), throughput (capacity, attendance) and final outputs (productions, population penetration, such as frequency), but not process or outcomes: "the functional principle of organisation has bequeathed us any number of measures of activity but very few measures of outcome" (Perri 6, 1997, p. 65). PIs are applied more commonly in cultural organisations that are directly answerable to/ funded by government, such as national museums and galleries, and larger organisations funded on a regular basis by cultural agencies, such as national theatres and libraries (Arts Council, 1999; Evans, 2000). Per capita funding estimates are also used to make national comparatives, in pursuit of international benchmarks (DCMS, 2004, p. 75; Feist *et al.,* 1998). The growing use of quality of life indicators (see below) seeks to measure a range of environmental and liveability factors at local and national levels, including access to cultural amenities (DETR, 1998).

Impact assessment. These studies look at the likely or actual impact of an activity on a particular location/site, community or economy—typically economic impact, environmental impact (EIA), health impact, transport and tourism impacts—but these are seldom combined. Impacts are quantified wherever possible (or ignored where not) and intangible effects are translated numerically through the use of proxy measurement, such as cost–benefit analysis (CBA), contingent valuation and willingness to pay for otherwise 'free' activities (such as parks, museums and libraries). However, as Matarasso warns

> In a world of numbers and quantification, if there are no indicators to assess the value of activities, feelings or relationships, these things—however real—have no legitimacy (Matarasso, 1996, p. 1).

Secondary multipliers are also commonly used in economic and environmental impact studies. The use of formulaic impact methods, including disaggregated visitor and economic data, are seldom representative and are often out of date and not sectorally derived (Evans, 1998). Impact studies are also undertaken for large or environmentally sensitive schemes under national planning, European/EU and World Bank regulations, or are commissioned by local authorities, developers and investors. Full-blown cost–benefit and economic impact studies are seldom applied to culture-led and mixed (public–private) regeneration schemes and, where they are, there is little evidence of their *post hoc* evaluation or longer term reassessment. As a UK Treasury review of capital projects noted, the value of long-term benefit needs to be brought into the appraisal process (Treasury, 2003). Valuing benefits also requires greater consideration since, as the review also concluded, this aspect has been done poorly in the past, with many projects not describing and managing the realisation of benefits and overoptimism in projections, particularly capital costs.

Longitudinal impact assessments. Unlike one-off impact assessments, these take a baseline position and compare impacts over time

or at least two points in time, in some cases mapping attitude and perception changes of residents, users/visitors, as well as more quantitative effects such as visitor levels, demographic change and economic/employment impacts. This model is used, like evaluation, both for individual projects and for programmes of activity. These are rare, often involving research centres and national/European comparative studies.

Longitudinal Studies

Regional city examples include longitudinal studies at Glasgow University (CCPR; www.gla.ac.uk), where a retrospective assessment of Glasgow's 'City of Culture' and successive event-based cultural regeneration is in progress, and Northumbria University (CISIR, see Bailey *et al.*, 2004) with a 10-year impact assessment of the quayside regeneration on Tyneside, or 'NewcastleGateshead' as these two divided cities have now been rebranded in order to bridge their historic divide and create a sense of place. In London and Toronto, a 3-year international comparative *Creative Spaces* study (LDA, 2004) is also underway, with numerous European networks of cultural development (such as ATLAS, CIRCLE, Budapest Observatory) undertaking cross-national studies on arts development and cultural funding. The impact of new transport insfrastructure on cultural activity and regeneration has also recognised the importance of access to positive regenerative effects. For example, the extension of the Jubilee Line underground line in London involved a longitudinal impact study of the effects of new stations on visitors to new and established cultural facilities (Evans and Shaw, 2001b).

The compilation of various indices of creativity and city growth is associated in North America with Florida (2004) and Nichols Clark (2004) and see Gertler *et al.* (2002) on Canada, although these do not directly address regeneration impacts. In some respects, these essentially lifestyle rankings which correlate selected location advantages with creative milieus, are also associated with socio-cultural and spatial inequalities and gentrification effects. They are also not necessarily linked to higher productivity or innovation, despite the knowledge-based creative industries they supposedly represent (DTI, 2004; Simmie, 2001).

Longitudinal impact studies have also been undertaken of public and related environmental art (Shaw, 1990; Hamilton *et al.*, 2001). In a study of public art and commercial property, Roberts and Marsh (1995, p. 192) found that "the image or attractiveness of a development was a significant factor in an occupier's choice of building", although rental cost, location and quality were more important. However, as Ward Thomson *et al.* (2004) point out, most texts on this subject have little or no consideration of evaluation, confirming a resistance by practitioners to this process, despite the claimed benefits of 'public' (*sic*) art (Selwood, 1995). Hall and Robertson (2001) suggest that much public art criticism, although avowedly about the reception of public art, is actually written from within a 'productionist framework'—i.e. by artists and arts administrators who fail to say very much about the public reception of the work.

Major annual festivals such as Edinburgh (Gratton and Taylor, 1995; Prentice and Andersen, 2003) and the Notting Hill Carnival (LDA, 2003) have also been the subject of longitudinal impact studies, including the European City of Culture (ECC) programme. Originating in Athens in 1985, this has supplemented the International EXPO series originating in the early 19th century, with host cities using these events as part of their international profile-raising and longer-term regeneration of run-down areas, notably Seville (EXPO 1992), Lisbon (City of Culture 1994, EXPO 1998), Rotterdam (City of Culture 2001), Barcelona (1992 Olympics, *UNESCO Cultural Forum* 2004) and Liverpool in the run-up to Capital of Culture in 2008. Cultural festivals now feature in major sporting events which combine area regeneration, such as the 2002 Commonwealth Games, Manchester and contemporary Olympic bids. Although the ECC programme

was a self-conscious extension of the 'European project', the first City of Culture of the Americas was held in Merida, southern Mexico, in 2000. The recent assessment of ECCs (Palmer, 2004) found, however, that they have too often focused their efforts on funding one-off events and projects, with little time and investment given to the future.

Cultural Pessimism?

Where research on the arts and urban regeneration has featured in academic articles, these tend to be either descriptive and uncritical case studies, or highly critical (but lacking in robust empirical evidence), displaying a 'culture of pessimism'. This in contrast to both official and media discourses, and the promotional literature which surrounds these major schemes, with the exception of projects which run into financial crisis. The latter can occur: at the feasibility stage, with schemes that never see the light of day (for example, Cardiff Bay Opera House); when under construction as budgets are exceeded or designs fail (many 'grands projets' in France and Britain, Olympic stadia, such as in Athens 2004); after opening, when visitor targets and income are not met (for example, National Centre for Popular Music, Sheffield); or when management/leadership fail (for example, Prado, Madrid). Even 'successful' cultural facilities, judged so in the short term, suffer from leadership change, with artistic directors leaving within a year or so of opening. This phenomenon can be seen in 'provincial' cultural facilities importing their first directors and 'talent' from the capital city (for example, Paris; see Negrier, 1993) or from overseas, reflecting the international circuit which these cultural intermediaries now inhabit, along with the star international architects who design their showcase buildings (Evans, 2003).

Although not normally presented as 'evidence' in policy evaluation and impact assessment, in many respects academic discourses act as a counterbalance or response to the 'official' stories surrounding major regeneration and cultural development projects, including media depictions and campaigns. In some respects, the lack of 'hard evidence', of access to detailed data, decision-making processes and the basis to measure impacts over time, have limited more 'scientific' analysis, leaving little scope, outside political and policy discussions and micro-level case studies. These include more technical quantitative impact assessments (economic/econometric) and area and sectoral case studies of a particular cultural activity—for example, theatre quarter, fashion industry, heritage tourism and creative production 'clusters' (Evans, 2004a; Montgomery, 2003)—within a larger regeneration programme or site. As Bassett *et al.* point out, "detailed case studies are useful as windows onto local governance, helping to illuminate deeper aspects of local politics and power structures" (Bassett *et al.*, 2002, p. 1773).

Recent special issues on the culture and regeneration phenomenon, including the related area of creative cities/industries, reflect the growing interest across discipline and subject areas—for example, journals of cultural policy (*IJCP*, 2004), urban and regional research (*IJURR*, 2003), *Local Economy* (2004) and *Cultural Studies* (2004). More literature exists in the related fields of leisure and tourism studies, where impact studies (as opposed to evaluation) are common, particularly in the growing area of cultural/heritage and urban tourism. Whilst in some cases academic publications may also provide alternative perspectives, their currency limits any real impact on the regeneration process and the 'promotions' and 'protests' which surround them. Methodologies which bring together approaches across anthropology, cultural and urban studies/sociology (Stevenson, 2004) and apply these to evaluation models which can measure social, economic and physical change, are yet to be developed, although in culture and regeneration this is what the phenomenon demands.

The more pessimistic discourses also reflect a rejection, or at least suspicion, of the effects of post-industrial (post-Fordist) urban development and the commodification of place (Harvey, 1993, p. 8; Robins, 1996; Kearns

and Philo, 1993). A growing literature on city place-making and branding (Kavaratzis, 2004; Hannigan, 2003; Ward, 1998; Hauben *et al.*, 2002), which draws on marketing and product life-cycle concepts, in many ways cements this convergence of culture and commerce, and therefore of culture and regeneration, but without a deeper analysis of either concept or their relationship. As Paddison's earlier study of Glasgow's city reimaging campaign concluded, such marketing strategies tend to overlook the social and political implications they raise (Paddison, 1993, p. 339; and see Griffiths, 1993). An overconcentration on brand image also risks the inevitable process of 'brand decay' (Evans, 2003), which is seen in the reimaging and reinvestment in 'new' cultural facilities and experiences, in order to maintain visitor appeal and city marketing distinction. The demand for more robust evidence reflects in some quarters, resistance to the acceptance of the creative or 'thin air' economy (Leadbeater, 2000) as robust, or as an industry at all. Most criticism, however, is levelled at the gentrification effects which are associated with regeneration through what are seen as amenities and activities for the professional managerial classes (PMCs; see Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich, 1979; McGuigan, 1996) and who are therefore the disproportionate beneficiaries through participation, consumption and employment in this 'trade in signs and symbols' (Lash and Urry, 1994).

From Economic to Social Impacts and Quality of Life

Culture-led regeneration, or rather regeneration using cultural events and flagship projects, has also widened the rationale for cultural investment to include social impacts, in particular, arts-based projects which address social exclusion, the 'well-being' of city residents and greater participation in community life. As Betterton maintains

> The focus on the economic benefits of the arts and urban regeneration was overstated in the 1980s ... The argument has now

shifted back towards more 'soft edged' rationales for cultural investment: cultural activity as one key indicator of a city's quality of life (Betterton, 2001, p. 11).

Physical regeneration has not been limited to building-based flagships and city-centre public realm schemes, but is increasingly seen through smaller public art projects and concern for design quality in the everyday environment

> Regeneration is not simply about bricks and mortar. It's about the physical, social and economic well being of an area; it's about the quality of life in our neighbourhoods. In relation to the physical, this is as much about the quality of public realm as it is about the buildings themselves (ODPM, 2001, p. 3).

The arts have generated interest in regeneration through their symbolic potential, such as heritage and identity, assisting in change processes and cultural expression, and in reaching the parts which other regeneration activity does not reach. Examples include the use of heritage resources in developing greater social inclusion (Newman and McLean, 1998) and valuing identity amongst communities where historic industrial sites undergo culture-led regeneration (Bailey *et al.*, 2004). 'Public good' benefits arising, particularly from symbolic sites which are the subject of regeneration (Hayden, 1995), include their option, legacy and prestige values—where community members do not actually attend or directly benefit themselves (and even may have no interest in the culture on offer), but see value to others and also take pride in the development.

What are now looked for—and this distinguishes the position today from the 1980s—are the twin benefits of social cohesion and economic competitiveness and their interrelationship, through regeneration and related neighbourhood-based intervention (Boddy and Parkinson, 2004), seeking "Better engagement/consultation with local communities to improve ownership of the (cultural) project and (local) benefits"

(DCMS, 2003, p. 2). This confirms that, in measuring and evaluating regeneration programmes and culture-led regeneration, the tests of sustainability and distributive equity are now imperatives, suggesting that short-term impacts have not been sustained in the past and that social benefits have not been achieved, or have even been displaced by the gentrification associated with major redevelopment projects and high art venues. This is reflected in one view of the French *grands projets culturel*

> Whatever their value as architectural set-pieces, they are not the much-vaunted harbingers of a proclaimed urban renaissance. On the contrary, like circus games, they direct attention from the inexorable erosion of Paris and the brutal neglect of its suburbs (Scalbert, 1994, p. 20).

The contemporary adoption of the notion of 'social exclusion'—and associated Third Way policy responses (Stevenson, 2004)—originated in the housing estates of outer Paris and has informed cultural policy as much as broader social policy (EC, 1998) and urban regeneration objectives. Policy and project reviews which explicitly explore these social effects[2] include 'The Arts and Neighbourhood Renewal' (Shaw, 1999, 2003), the 'Evaluation and Social Impact of the Arts' (Matarasso, 1996, 1997); studies of arts and social inclusion in Australia, Canada and Scotland (Williams, 1996; Jeannotte and Stanley, 2002; Ruiz, 2004) and an assessment of the social impacts of lottery-funded projects in the UK (Evans and Shaw, 2001a; and see Jackson, 2000). The UK state-sponsored lottery celebrated its 10th anniversary in 2004 and has allocated over £15 billion to 'good causes' over this period, including major capital cultural, sport and millennium schemes—Britain's response to the '*grands projets*'. This has fuelled a roll-call of mega-projects which together have changed the landscape of cultural facilities in Britain at a scale not witnessed since the Victorian heyday and the inheritance from 19th- and early 20th-century international EXPOs and World Fairs. These buildings are too 'young' to be producing evidence of sustainable impact, although there is no shortage of claims for their *expected* impact. Much of the attention to evaluation has arisen from this massive programme, although this has been *posthoc* and limited to advocacy, project assessment and evaluation reporting, as outlined above. It is no coincidence that new European Union members look to state lotteries as a prime source of cultural investment (Bodo *et al.*, 2004), alongside the regional development aid which has benefited cultural projects in poorer industrial and rural regions of western Europe (Evans and Foord, 2000).

Models of Regeneration through Cultural Projects

The conflation of the social (*inclusion*, *liveability*) with the economic (*competitiveness*, *growth*), through physical redevelopment and architecture, reflects the current understanding of what site-based regeneration seeks to achieve. The term regeneration has been defined as the transformation of a place—residential, commercial or open space—that has displayed the symptoms of physical, social and/or economic decline

> breathing new life and vitality into an ailing community, industry and area [bringing] sustainable, long term improvements to local quality of life, including economic, social and environmental needs (LGA, 2000, p. 3).

Evidence of regenerative effects can therefore be sought where culture is a driver, a catalyst or at the very least a 'key player' in the process of regeneration or renewal. Three models through which cultural activity is incorporated (or incorporates itself) into the regeneration process can be distinguished over this period: culture-led regeneration, cultural regeneration and culture *and* regeneration, although these are not necessarily mutually exclusive, particularly over the longer term.

Culture-led Regeneration

In this model, cultural activity is seen as the catalyst and engine of regeneration—epithets of change and movement. The activity is likely to have a high-public profile and frequently to be cited as the sign or symbol of regeneration—most notably, the cultural flagship or complex. The activity might be the design and construction (or reuse) of a building or buildings for public or mixed use; the reclamation of open space (for example, garden festivals, EXPO sites); or the introduction of a programme of activity which is then used to rebrand a place, notably arts 'festivals', events and public art schemes. What these cultural interventions share is a claim for a uniqueness which 'non-cultural' regeneration such as the less glamorous housing, office, retail and site reclamation developments lack, a means for creating (or rediscovering) distinctiveness and for raising awareness and excitement in regeneration programmes as a whole.

Use and misuse. The phrase 'culture-led regeneration' is now commonly (mis)used where there is a high-profile arts facility in area regeneration, but in most cases this is a visible but less significant element in a wider and longer-term development scheme and investment programme, used to front, but not necessarily, drive, property and other economic development. Even in cases where a new cultural flagship dominates the external image and landscape, such as Guggenheim Bilbao, Spain, the Lowry, Salford, and Baltic/Sage Gateshead, UK, this belies major (and prior) investment in land preparation and transport infrastructure—air, road, rail/light rail, metro, as well as upmarket housing and hotels—and the upgrading of existing cultural facilities. Regenerative effects, in distributive and sustainable terms, on the other hand may be low particularly where economic leakage is high and regeneration activity and economies lack diversity. And as Giddens remarked

> Money and originality of design are not enough ... You need many ingredients for

big, emblematic projects to work, and one of the keys is the active support of local communities (Giddens; quoted in Crawford, 2001, p. 2). However, a feature of many flagship developments has been resistance by, or bypassing of, local communities (MacClancy, 1997; Plaza, 2000; Rodriguez *et al.*, 2001), with the legacy of event-based regeneration not delivering sustained benefits or ownership by residents, as in post-EXPO/Olympic Montreal (Kroller, 1996) and, more recently, Barcelona, Bilbao, Lisbon, Salford and Sydney (Garcia, 2004; KPMG, 1998).

Cultural Regeneration

In this model, cultural activity is more integrated into an area strategy alongside other activities in the environmental, social and economic sphere. Examples include the city of Birmingham where, at an early stage of the city's 'renaissance' (BCC, 2003), 'culture' was incorporated with mainstream policy, planning and resourcing through the council's joint Arts, Employment and Economic Development Committee, and in the 'exemplar' cultural city Barcelona which early on took an urban design, cultural planning and creative quarter approach, which is still recreating itself through the further expansion from the old city out to the former Olympic village site and declining Poblanou industrial district. This former manufacturing area on the city fringe is now targeted as a creative industries quarter, linking the old, overheating city to the expanding waterside commercial development promoted through a UNESCO 'EXPO' site. According to Gdaniec, "The redevelopment plan for Poblanou can be regarded as a model of how cultural production can flourish in a marginal area", but, as he goes on to admit,

> Urban regeneration combining culture can result in fragmented and unreal spaces, as well as contested space and culture ... in Poblenou, speculation and quasi-exclusion of locals from the new housing (Gdaniec, 2001, p. 387).

Creative city exemplars? Birmingham, which looked to Barcelona and North American cities such as Chicago for inspiration for their prestige city-centre redevelopment plans, incorporating major arts and events facilities, public art and landscaping schemes, also presented an early example of the divided 'event city'. Criticisms by local and central government and in the press were made of the diversion of public spending from mainstream education and social programmes (Loftman, 1990). This pattern of promotional and celebratory reports issued by the agents and promoters of regeneration, followed by more dismissive critical responses in the academic literature, typifies this field. Moreover, the perspective of local communities is less apparent and visible, at least from the outside, but some communities in self-styled cultural cities tend to remain 'outside'—perceiving these city-centre and new cultural spaces as not for them and 'inaccessible'—for example, the residents of Barcelona's El Raval (Miles, 2004; Ulldemolins, 2000); Birmingham's afro-caribbean youth (Dudrah, 2002; Symon, 1999); Chicago's south-siders and the occupants of Salford's precinct housing estates, where the metro train which links the Lowry cultural quarter to Manchester, does not reach.

Exemplars feature highly in city cultural and regeneration plans and have been a prime reference for cities seeking to emulate their 'success'. This goes as far as replicating design schemes, public art installations, and themes, such as modelling Barcelona's museum of contemporary art (MACBA, El Raval) on Pompidou—the "Beauborg of Barcelona" (Balibrea, 2001, p. 198); and in London, Covent Garden's piazza and mixed-use development mirroring Quincy market in Boston, as well as port cities such as Madeira and Montreal looking to emulate Barcelona's waterfront redevelopment.

This approach is also closely allied to the 'creative city' model of urban cultural policy and regeneration (Landry and Bianchini, 1995) and one to which the current culture and design-led city visions have turned

(Landry, 2000), including those where cultural flagships have failed to sustain or fulfil their promise in social and/or in economic regeneration terms. This is seen in the renaissance plans of industrial and port cities such as Bradford, Barnsley, Salford and Liverpool in the UK; Valencia, Marseilles and Rotterdam on the continent and waterfronts in Toronto and Montreal. From a near-historical perspective, the reality that many of these cities are on their second or third cultural investment, place-making and economic strategy, is seldom reflected in their current promotional literature or in the critiques and assessments of their latest plans. The opportunity for evaluation informing future development—what works, what hasn't—appears to be ignored in this revisioning process—this despite many years of public regeneration and regional development subsidy and, in some European cases, successive funding programmes which have run continually for several years (Evans and Foord, 2000).

Culture and Regeneration

In this 'model by default', cultural activity is not fully integrated at the strategic development or master planning stage, often because the responsibilities for cultural provision and for regeneration sit within different departments or because there is no 'champion'. Such interventions are often small: a public art programme for a office development, once the buildings have been designed; a heritage interpretation or local history museum tucked away in the corner of a reclaimed industrial site. In some cases, where no planned provision has been made, residents (individuals or businesses) and cultural organisations may respond to the vacuum and make their own interventions—commissioning artists to make signs or street furniture, recording the history of their area, setting up a regular music night and so on. Although introduced at a later stage, cultural interventions can make an impact on the regeneration process, enhancing the facilities and services that were initially planned. It is important to note that the lack of discernible cultural

activity or provision within a regeneration scheme does not necessarily mean that cultural activity is absent, only that it is not being promoted (or recognised) as part of the process.

Retro-fitting culture. Reasons why culture is frequently an 'add-on' rather than an integral part of a scheme include the fact that the local authorities and partnership bodies responsible for regeneration schemes are rarely structured to facilitate collaboration between those responsible for regeneration and those responsible for cultural activity and they may not naturally think of themselves as collaborators. The other common reason is the lack of a champion with experience of what cultural activity can contribute to regenerative projects. Leadership appears to be a fundamental ingredient for credibility to be established at city, national and international levels. The absence of a powerful voice can therefore disadvantage the less well-heeled and less connected groups and communities.

Frequently, regeneration programmes are developed without reference to, or inclusion of, incumbent arts and cultural groups, or past heritage associations/communities. This arises due to the different nature and perspective of the 'regenerators' and community-based activity (including municipal and 'amateur' arts) and the preference for the 'new' (flagship, public art, employment, residents, visitors) over the 'old'. Indeed, in the areas which are the subject of extensive regeneration, it is presumed that quality of life and, by association, indigenous culture, is poor and needs 'improving'. The factors that lead to the creation of cultural flagships, mega-events and related arts programmes in practice can minimise public choice or the more objective analysis of *cultural* impacts from a regeneration perspective and vice versa. Evaluation of the processes (see below and Table 1) which measure decision-making and stakeholder consultation is therefore important, since this will influence *a posteriori* assessment of community involvement, ownership and the success of a particular scheme.

Cultural Planners

These may be extreme examples (although feted as 'exemplars') and the conditions to improve this situation are evident with more integrated and inclusive cultural planning through guidance and toolkits on local cultural strategies (DCMS, 1999; Evans, 2001a). In this sense, lessons are being learned, both tactically and strategically (Landry, 2000). But the power of capital over culture should not be understated, however, liberal or benign a particular regeneration regime may present itself. Community consultation is a prerequisite and tool which developers and their designers now employ, but evidence of the impact of such consultation in the final built schemes is less apparennt

> City elites have now learned how better to incorporate dissenting groups (middle class ones, at least) and manage potential conflicts more effectively (Bassett *et al.*, 2002, p. 1774).

The pluralist model of regime theories (Stoker, 1995) suggests that, through multiple stakeholders, power over decision-making and resources is more equitably distributed, that minority and small, special-interest groups can influence outcomes. Whilst the process may be consensual, the physical end-product may be less so—evidence of local and community (however defined) influence on the shape and content of cultural facilities within regeneration schemes is rare, whilst masterplanners, star architects and cultural intermediaries are brought in to create a vision of place. Writing on waterfront regeneration in Bristol, Bassett *et al.* (2002, p. 1774) acknowledge that "the final masterplan is still within the broad parameters laid down at the very beginning by the planning brief". McCarthy (2002) also concluded, in an assessment of Detroit's entertainment-led regeneration, that the governance context is all-important if this approach is to be at all successful and where culture and regeneration are used to encourage gentrification and urban resettlement, as Seo (2002) found, objectives of social cohesion and sustainability are compromised.

Table 1. An overview of the evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration

Physical regeneration	Economic regeneration	Social regeneration
Policy imperatives		
Sustainable development	*Competitiveness and growth*	*Social inclusion*
Land use, brownfield sites	Un/Employment, Job quality	Social cohesion
Compact city	Inward investment	Neighbourhood Renewal
Design quality (CABE, 2002)	Regional development	Health and Well-being
Quality of Life and Liveability	Wealth Creation	Identity
Open space and amenity	SMEs/micro-enterprises	Social Capital
Diversity (eco-, landscape)	Innovation and Knowledge	Governance
Mixed-Use/Multi-Use	Skills and Training	Localism/Governance
Heritage conservation	Clusters	Diversity
Access and Mobility	Trade Invisibles (e.g. tourism)	Heritage ('Common')
Town Centre revitalisation	Evening Economy	Citizenship
Tests and measurements		
Quality of Life indicators	Income/spending in an area	Attendance/Participation
Design Quality Indicators	New and retained jobs	Crime rates/fear of crime
Reduced car-use	Employer (re)location	Health, referrals
Re-use of developed land	Public-private leverage/ROI	New community networks
Land/building occupation	Cost benefit analysis	Improved leisure options
Higher densities	Input-Output/Leakage	Lessened social isolation
Reduced vandalism	Additionality and substitution	Reduced truancy and anti-social behaviour
Listed buildings	Willingness to pay for cultural amenities/	Volunteering
Conservation areas	Contingent valuation	Population growth
Public transport/usage	Multipliers—jobs, spending	
Examples of evidence of impacts		
Reuse of redundant buildings—studios, museum/gallery, venues	Increased property values/rents (residential and business)	A positive change in residents' perceptions of their area
Increased public use of space—reduction in vandalism and an increased sense of safety	Corporate involvement in the local cultural sector (leading to support in cash and in kind)	Displacing crime and anti-social behaviour through cultural activity (for example, youth)
Cultural facilities and workspace in mixed-use developments	Higher resident and visitor spend arising from cultural activity (arts and cultural tourism)	A clearer expression of individual and shared ideas and needs
High density (live/work), reduce environmental impacts, such as transport/traffic, pollution, health problems	Job creation (direct, indirect, induced); enterprise (new firms/start-ups, turnover/value added)	Increase in volunteering and increased organisational capacity at a local level
The employment of artists on design and construction teams (Percent for Art)	Employer location/retention; Retention of graduates in the area (including artists/creatives)	A change in the image or reputation of a place or group of people
Environmental improvements through public art and architecture	A more diverse workforce (skills, social, gender and ethnic profile)	Stronger public–private–voluntary-sector partnerships

Table 1. Continued

Physical regeneration	Economic regeneration	Social regeneration
The incorporation of cultural considerations into local development plans (LPAC, 1990)	Creative clusters and quarters; Production chain, local economy and procurement; joint R&D	Increased appreciation of the value and opportunities to take part in arts projects
Accessibility (disability), public transport usage and safety	Public–private–voluntary-sector partnerships ('mixed economy')	Higher educational attainment (in arts and 'non-arts' subjects)
Heritage identity, stewardship, local distinctiveness/ vernacular	Investment (public–private sector leverage)	Greater individual confidence and aspiration

Furthermore, the internationalisation of the masterplanning and regeneration process is no longer limited to start architects/construction firms and a mobile cultural élite, but also to cultural planners who operate globally, with a small number of ubiquitous arts consultants featuring in creative strategy initiatives world-wide (for example, the World Bank; see Evans, 2001b). Writing from one recipient region, Stevenson remarks: "The relevance to Australian cities and cultures of these European-inspired prescriptions is an open question" (Stevenson, 2004, p. 129). There is now evidence that cultural strategies developed by external 'catalysts' have actually reinforced spatial divides and social exclusion, particularly amongst cultural minority and social groups (Evans and Foord, 2003), or the aspirations of the creative district and economy raised unrealistically, setting up local agencies to fail after the roadshow has moved on. References to ethnic and regional culture in design, content and operation of these cultural facilities have a tendency to fall at the outset (for example, the Guggenheim, Bilbao, see Baniotopoulou, 2000, and Rodriguez et al., 2001; the MuseumQuartier, Vienna, see Mokre, 1998), or all but disappear between the design concept stage, where community and political support (and minimisation of resistance) are required, and the final product. As Chang (2000) documented in the case of the 'Esplanade Theatres by the Bay' in Singapore, this $250 million 1800-seat concert hall and 2000-seat lyric theatre was supposed to house smaller studios and performance spaces for local groups, but these plans were eliminated early on. Arts practitioners expressed concern that with its mega-structures and high rentals, it will be amenable mainly to blockbuster events such as foreign pop concerts and Broadway shows, and less accommodating towards local and non-profit productions. A similar scenario is played out in mega-cities such as Shanghai, where Western-style regeneration is "sapping the city's own creativity" (Gilmore, 2004, p. 442; Wu, 2000).

Good and Bad Practice

All three of these culture/regeneration 'models' therefore provide examples of positive and negative effects. Their scope and motivation will also dictate the evaluation criteria and success factors which can be applied and the outcomes that might be expected from the cultural aspect of regeneration in each case. There are culture-led regeneration projects that have been too ambitious in their projections and landmark buildings that have failed to reach their targets (in terms of audience numbers, profiles and income generated) or secure community ownership. There are culture *and* regeneration projects in which arts programmes have been 'retro-fitted' to poorly conceived developments in an attempt to improve their appearance, to animate a place or to secure community involvement. The regenerative effect of *cultural* impacts also arises—the impact of cultural activity on the culture of a community, its

codes of conduct, its identity—and notions of citizenship, participation and diversity. This approach to reshaping cultural landscapes is also consonant with Bennett's argument that culture itself should be thought of as 'inherently governmental', so that "culture is used to refer to a set of practices for social management deployed to constitute autonomous populations as self-governing" (Bennett, 1998, p. 884). Cultural governance in this sense is another factor which can be assessed and which might offer useful approaches to community engagement in the fraught regeneration process. How these models of regeneration through/with culture can all be identified, their effects measured and schemes evaluated, requires questions to be asked at various stages in the process and change assessed and attributed as impacts are felt.

Impact Measurement and Indicators of Change

The generic term 'impact study' is now widely used in relation to the 'contribution' or 'role' or 'importance' of cultural activity to another objective—in this case, to regeneration. Much of the literature on the contribution of culture to society now uses the language of impacts. Studies that look beyond the project itself traditionally use one (and seldom more than one) of social, economic and environmental impact, which is generally tested using particular measurements. Table 1 summarises the current imperatives that drive a range of public policy agendas—economic and social—and therefore area regeneration programmes, including those with a cultural element. The tests by which policies are measured in practice in terms of physical, economic and social change, are largely quantitative, including the familiar economic and environmental impact indicators, but also more qualitative evaluation, particularly in terms of behavioural effects, social capital and perceptions such as community safety and the socially constructed notions of exclusion, diversity and heritage (Andra, 1987). Environmental

or more broadly, 'quality of life' indicators (above) have developed from international policy initiatives such as Agenda 21 and its local application—LA21—and are now used in countries such as the UK and Canada as national and local benchmarks of liveability (DETR, 1998; FCM, 2001). These include social as well as environmental qualities, such as access to services, fear of crime and community cohesion. 'Culture' *per se* does not have an equivalent 'quality of life' indicator set, outside the aspirational declarations of 'cultural rights' (CLRAE, 1992) and 'common heritage' (Maastricht; see HMSO, 1993), although measures of social impacts through arts participation have been developed (Matarasso, 1996). Not surprisingly, the indicators most commonly referred to in linking the arts and regeneration are those now widely used in the context of neighbourhood renewal and social inclusion, quantifiable—essentially—by reduced levels of crime, increased health and well-being, increased educational attainment, reduced unemployment, greater community cohesion and improved environmental quality (DCMS, 2003, p. 2).

Some examples of the kind of evidence which arise and flow from these policy imperatives and measurements are then indicated in Table 1. These are not exhaustive nor ranked in any sense, since they will vary according to the nature and scale of regeneration undertaken, local conditions, 'history' and the objectives being pursued. As recent guidance on regeneration evaluation recommends

A pick and mix approach is required as there is no universally applicable set of indicators that will be appropriate for a particular intervention [and, in heritage and cultural impacts in particular] valuing in this area tends to be highly context specific (ODPM, 2003, p. 164).

This also suggests that standardised performance indicators and quantitative benchmarks are neither desirable nor useful measures in this situation.

Additionality. The nature and variability of the cultural element in regeneration projects, surprisingly receive little attention, outside the external design which dominates media and design-sector coverage. The cultural programme, its purpose, sustainability, mix and relationship with regeneration objectives, is treated independently—being largely the preserve of arts and cultural organisations and funders (including state cultural institutions and private patrons)—and therefore has a benign place in the overall regeneration scheme. The evaluation and risk assessment of cultural projects also varies widely between those projects based on existing and relocated arts organisations and collections (such as galleries and museums) or where there is a clear and authentic heritage or symbolic association, and those where the cultural facility or concept is new to the area. Whether a traditional cultural venue or an experiential visitor 'theseum', relying on latent demand is risky. However, in both cases, safe and incremental culture-led regeneration projects can fail to attract or maintain attention, whilst new cultural experiences in new locations can attract and maintain visitors, such as the Eden project in Cornwall, the BALTIC, Gateshead in England and Parc de la Villette on the outskirts of Paris.

The geographical focus of regeneration projects means that it is particularly important to assess displacement effects at the local, regional and national levels, particularly if the programme is substantial, or for major flagship projects. This is extremely hard to measure in practice through tests of additionality and substitution ('zero-sum game'; see Bianchini, 1991), so much so that such local and regional impact assessments are not feasible (Connolly, 1997), leaving this question to anecdotal and largely non-attributable effects of culture-led regeneration in one area, on another. The feasibility and evaluation studies undertaken pre- and post-regeneration projects ideally would attempt to measure these wider effects and the assessment of demand/need, which in the past has been based upon basic urban settlement planning norms of amenity and infrastructure levels required to support a largely homogeneous population. Parameters are influenced by accessibility and transport; however, where cultural activities, heterogeneity and more intangible experiences are concerned, quantitative planning models, as used for parks and sports facilities, are less useful and may actually reinforce exclusion (Evans, 2001a).

Public Realm and Urban Design

A particular paradox which has emerged from the cultural flagship phenomenon—apart from the search for distinctiveness through commissioning copycat designs/designers (Evans, 2003)—is in the evaluation of buildings and public realm schemes themselves. These images dominate the reporting and promotion of regeneration schemes and are critiqued in the architectural press and monographs on both buildings and city transformations. A typical image in these publications is the blue sky backdrop to a person-free building, providing an optimum view of the finished product. Such appraisals tend to make no reference to the regeneration context or outcomes from the building, leaving its aesthetic impact as the prime contributor. This is in contrast to what is now a succession of new flagship cultural buildings which have failed to meet their operational and user requirements, where form has undermined function, even in award-winning schemes (Evans, 2003). An observation from culture-led schemes world-wide is that, despite the architectural and media attention to the design experiments which house otherwise traditional performing and visual arts spaces and programmes, public preference is still strongly directed at the prosaic bridges, ferris wheels and waterfront boardwalks and the reuse of industrial structures (Bordage, 2002) from Tate Modern, London; the BALTIC, Gateshead, and their respective millennium bridges, to the 'MuseumQuartier', Vienna (Bogner, 2001).

Poorly designed and uninspiring 'municipal' interiors, expensive materials and fittings which require high maintenance, or fail

(Guggenheim Bilbao), are less popular legacies which can limit regeneration effects over time. Likewise, public realm and spaces created in and around these projects, can be left over or unfinished. Given the scale of investment and expectations they demand, developing measurements of design quality requires greater consideration, not just of the designated public art schemes. Urban design quality indicators (DQIs) and techniques developed in landscape and pedestrian planning (Gehl, 2001) now draw on more social, obervational and qualitative assessment of the user experience. As Lefebvre observed, "The user's space is *lived*—not represented" (Lefebvre, 1974, p. 362). In the case of DQIs, this encompasses a wide range of 'users'—internal and external. Benefits which design indicators thus seek to measure include: identity/civic pride; place vitality; inclusiveness; connectivity; safety; and facilities and amenities, alongside the aesthetic design values and operational effectiveness over time (CABE, 2002; Carmona *et al.*, 2002).

Sustainability, in both design quality and integration terms, is therefore a fundamental success factor, which requires greater attention in evaluation and in learning from experiences elsewhere. Examples where repeated retro-fitting and makeovers take place are one indication of less sustainable regeneration schemes. Integration, which at the micro level includes the degree of mixed-use within a regeneration site and quarter, can be assessed in relation to existing urban areas, whether city centre or fringe. A particular feature of less successful waterfront, mixed-use and downtown regeneration schemes has been the failure to link with incumbent business and residential communities, or the creation of interstitial spaces which become unsafe or redundant—for example, waterfront and city centre/CBD-based regeneration schemes that remain empty and soulless much of the time, outside designated event usage. Mono-use complexes and/or those dominated at particular times by one user-group can also create exclusion and unsafe perceptions by other groups. This is becoming evident where

strategies promote late-night opening and a club and drinking culture dominated by young people in city and town centres (Thomas and Bromley, 2000). Integration which translates into positive regeneration indicators therefore includes safety/natural surveillance; labour market access; disability access, diversity (ethnic, lifestyle, age-groups), as well as the production and consumption flows which accrue to more successful compact regeneration areas.

Conclusions

The evidence of regeneration using major cultural projects and the sustained impacts arising—including the longer-term measurement required to test these out—does appear to be limited. Where evidence is emerging, distributive effects and regeneration objectives as now defined, are generally underachieved—or they are not sustained:

> Useful—as opposed to accurate—evaluation reports need to consider not just the impact of arts programmes on individuals, but also their effect and the extent to which it can be and is sustained on the communities in which individuals live (Newman *et al.*, 2003, p. 320).

A conclusion seems to be that the flagship and major city-centre and waterfront cultural schemes are less about regeneration than the conventional wisdom portrays them. The expectation that they will produce sustained social and distributive economic benefits alone is arguably an unreasonable one. Whether this a question of measurement, of asking the right questions, or the need for a more fundamental basic 'zero base' evaluation, is still an issue which is yet to be confronted, let alone resolved. Certainly, the nature of cultural projects which feature in regeneration schemes may need to be assessed more rigorously in terms of the impacts they actually produce—i.e. it is not only the opportunity cost *between* cultural and 'non-cultural' investment in regeneration, but between *which* type of cultural intervention and

where, best serves the regeneration and community objectives.

Community Ownership

Capturing baseline information and building evaluation questions into project assessment is therefore essential. Attention to basic social and economic data gathering and generation will be needed if any serious attempt at measuring effects and policy evaluation is being considered. The integration of project evaluation and clearly establishing the criteria against which 'success' is measured, also need to recognise that the criteria should be set by those benefiting and participating in the cultural activity itself

> To date too little attention has been paid to the voices of ordinary citizens whose cities have been reshaped, who live with these landscapes every day and whose experiences would validate or refute the theses put forward by others (Hall, 2004, p. 71).

This sentiment is echoed by Garcia: "the emphasis must lie in providing a platform for the local communities . . . to express their views and expectations" (Garcia, 2004, p. 324). This therefore echoes the need for greater community planning approaches which have been articulated in the development process in general (Healey, 1997; Solesbury, 1998).

In practice, local community involvement and the sense they might have of their 'place', is the least evident in this process, as the professional regeneration and cultural intermediaries control the territory and the rhetoric required to maintain the credibility of the expectations of culture-led regeneration. The institutional and major city cultural centres and events retain a residual and in some cases a symbolic value (Willis, 1991, p. 13), despite in many cases their declining popularity (especially in the performing arts) and narrow user-base. However, it is the everyday lived cultural practices and experiences (Lefebvre, 1991) which, the evidence suggests, better represent cultural regeneration occurring through primarily social and community-based projects.

Every Town Should Have One

In the North West region's response to the UK government's consultation on culture and regeneration (see above, DCMS, 2004), they rejected the "primary focus on new landmark investments as the route to regeneration". Rather, culture "needs to become more firmly embedded in regeneration policy and practice" (Culturenorthwest, 2004, p. 1). This is significant given that this region has hosted several major flagship regeneration projects represented by large cultural buildings and infrastructure—in Salford Quays, Manchester city centre and Northern Quarter, post-Commonwealth Games, and in a successful bid for 'Capital of Culture' in Liverpool, 2008. The Royal Institute of British Architects' annual conference held in Rotterdam, July 2003, also focused on culture-led regeneration in Liverpool. The vital issue of what was going to go in the iconic Fourth Grace building[3] prompted a comment: "If we can't decide, it won"t happen" (RIBA, 2003, p. 2). In 2004, the decision was made by the city that the Fourth Grace would *not* happen. Emblematic buildings were rejected, as was the idea that culture, broadly defined, can be used to revive declining cities. During the 1990s, over 50 per cent of capital funding of culture in this entire region was accounted for in 6 projects in the 2 largest cities of Manchester and Liverpool and this concentration is mirrored in the distribution of European regional funding to visitor-led 'cultural' projects to regional cities throughout the 1990s (Evans and Foord, 2000). This reflects the economies of scale required leading to the location of major facilities within large conurbations, and also the boosterist and competitive city strategies which now look to a distinctive design statement and image.

A problem presented by this response, is the towns and cities who still aspire to cultural city status, to their own iconic projects—or 'every town should have one' (Lane, 1978)—and who look to those recent winners, literally, in the cultural lottery game. This game is played out in cities in the earlier stages of culture and regeneration,

such as Singapore 'Global City of the Arts' (Chang, 2000), Adelaide (Montgomery, 2003) and Helsinki (Verwijnen and Lehto-vuori, 1999), and many others who wish to be considered part of the international cultural circuit and creative industry hubs. However, a group of artists working in and around the Thames Gateway region of South East England, which is the subject of massive house-building and regeneration plans, also recognise that

> The landmark building has become a staple element of urban regeneration, especially in industrial locations. But not every town can sustain its own Tate Modern (London), and the long term sustainability of such iconic statements is being increasingly questioned ... the iconic building as regenerative cata-lyst may be the wrong answer (Charrette 3, 2004, p. 3).

Whether this realisation can be accepted and alternative regeneration responses developed, here and elsewhere, remains to be seen.

There are particular issues in relation to the cultural dimension of regeneration impacts, aside from more subjective aesthetic and artis-tic considerations. These include the absence of planning norms for cultural facilities, against which to measure the quality and quantity of provision, and a hierarchy of such provision in terms of art form, practice and preference for the 'shock of the new' over the established, and the visible over informal and community-based culture. The latter is contrary to much of the evidence of the superior and sustained benefits of partici-patory arts activity compared with passive cultural consumption (a feature of most culture-led regeneration schemes). This can also reinforce the perceptual barriers to insti-tutional spaces and places, particularly from those with lower 'cultural capital', but to whom regeneration benefits are most directed.

Economic and facility planning models do not appear to be used or successfully devel-oped to support decision-making in this process. One consequence of the competitive 'cultural city' approach is therefore the drive for larger schemes and associated spectacular architecture, directly or indirectly, at the cost of more local and accessible and cultural pro-vision. As Borja and Castells point out

> In practice higher layers of government replace local government through sectoral programmes or individual projects. In other cases action is taken by the private sector, without being integrated into a coherent urban programme. In yet other cases, a major area of the city and of inhabi-tants are simply left without any cultural facilities (Borja and Castells, 1997, p. 113).

One might conclude that the preference and trend for more social and 'cultural' (for example, heritage) evaluation is in part an admission that the ongoing economic effects from culture-led regeneration are disappoint-ing and do not pass the 'additionality' test, but also in part, to the impact assessment models and resourcing required to measure and attribute economic impacts over the medium term.

Reasons for the Shortfall in Evidence

As summarised above in the case of the 'hier-archy' of types of information available in this field, evidence may exist but not be published or made public; or may exist in general form—via regeneration assessments—but not specifically analysed in cultural terms. More often, however, the rationale for measuring cultural impacts in relation to regeneration is not sufficiently understood or valued by stakeholders. In particular, culture is not generally recognised in urban policy or environmental and quality of life indicators (such as health, education, employment, crime) and therefore is absent from regener-ation measurement criteria. From the gaps in the literature and available guidance, there is a need for a comprehensive evaluation model of a major culture-led regeneration scheme and which would serve as a practical blueprint for others.

Measuring the contribution that culture can and does make to regeneration is primarily viewed as an externality. However, the current claims for culture-led regeneration

schemes, as commonly made in their advocacy and promotion, imply that these effects are endogenous, almost guaranteed. Nonetheless, internal barriers to the gathering of evidence of impact also exist within the cultural sector and state funding and planning systems. The most common include a lack of interest on the part of the cultural sector in developing evaluative systems through which to prove its value and the view held by some creative practitioners in particular, that evaluation is an unnecessary, bureaucratic intrusion in the creative process (Matarasso, 1996, p. 24).

The reasons for the barriers and resistance to the evaluation of impacts are therefore 'cultural' on the one hand and structural on the other, including the rationale for the resources needed to undertake the required gathering of evidence at the outset and over time. Today, few would dispute the role and value that culture has in regeneration in the narrow and, increasingly, in 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

> Culture-led regeneration does change people's lives after all. It is about time we understood how and why it does so (Bailey *et al.*, 2004, p. 64).

Despite a mixed experience of flagship and iconic buildings and mega-events, and the regenerative effects of these costly *grands projets*, these formulas and strategies continue to be emulated, whether in making the case for a Guggenheim franchise in Rio or Liverpool, in revisioning a post-industrial city, or in bidding for international events and festival sites. More grounded evidence and assessment of the cultural opportunities is therefore needed, as much as of general regeneration programme outcomes. For practitioners, researchers, community groups and policy-makers, developing an appropriate evaluation model and schema from the set of indicators and principles now available, is recommended. This requires learning selectively from the 'evidence' which must be conditioned by

what is an unhelpful but endemic bias in this field. A pluralist rather than a standardised 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 in 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. But nothing less can work (Catterall, 1998, p. 4).

Notes

1. The review undertaken by the author was commissioned by the UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in 2003–04. It comprised a critical literature review of 'published evidence' and case studies of culture's contribution to regeneration and good practice in evaluation. The definition of cultural activity used by the DCMS for this review includes the arts (including film), libraries, museums, heritage and cultural tourism. For the scope and methodology used, see p. 3 of the review. The DCMS consultation report arising: *Culture at the heart of regeneration* was launched by the Secretary of State in June 2004. This report and the review are both available at www.culture.gov.uk.

2. For a detailed review and bibliography of impact and evaluation studies in the culture and regeneration field, and used for this paper, see Evans and Shaw (2004) (www.culture.gov.uk) and, on social impacts, see Evans and Shaw (2001a, 2001b) (www.citiesinstitute.org).

3. The 'Fourth Grace', named 'The Cloud' by its architect Will Alsop, was designed to complement Liverpool's 'Three Graces'—the Royal Liver Building, the Cunard Building and the Port of Liverpool Building—on Merseyside's Pier Head. This spectacular flagship formed a key part of Liverpool's successful bid for 'European Capital of Culture 2008':

"a focus and catalyst for the next stage of Liverpool's renaissance, an eloquent image for a resurgent city" (www.liverpoolfourthgrace.co.uk). Following the 'Capital of Culture' designation, the City Council cancelled this project, citing 'spiralling costs' (forecast to rise from £228 million to £324 million), unclear usage and the experience of 'out of control' iconic building projects in other places.

References

ANDRA, I. (1987) The dialectic of tradition and progress, in: *Architecture and Society: In Search of Context*, pp. 156–158. Sofia: Balkan State Publishing House.

ARTS COUNCIL (1999) *Best value and the arts. Practical guidance to Assist Local Authority Arts Officers and Others in Applying the Duty of 'Best Value' to The Arts.* London: Arts Council of England.

BAILEY, C., MILES, S. and STARK, P. (2004) Culture-led urban regeneration and the revitalisation of identities in Newcastle, Gateshead and the North East of England, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(10), pp. 47–65.

BALIBREA, M. P. (2001) Urbanism, culture and the post-industrial city: challenging the 'Barcelona model, *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 2(2), pp. 187–210.

BANIOTOPOULOU, E. (2000) Art for whose sake? modern art museums and their role in transforming societies: the case of the Guggenheim Bilbao, *Journal of Conservation and Museum Studies*, 7, pp. 1–15.

BASSETT, K. (1993) Urban cultural strategies and urban regeneration: a case study and critique, *Environment & Planning A*, 25(12), pp. 1773–1789.

BASSETT, K., GRIFFITHS, R. and SMITH, I. (2002) Testing governance: partnerships, planning and conflict in waterfront regeneration, *Urban Studies*, 39(10), pp. 1757–1775.

BCC (BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL) (2003) *Birmingham's Renaissance: How European Funding has Revitalised the City.* Birmingham: Birmingham City Council.

BENNETT, T. (1998) The multiplication of culture's utility, *Critical Inquiry*, 21, pp. 861–889.

BETTERTON, J. (2001) Culture and urban regeneration: the case of Sheffield, *Sub-Regional Commentary*, S.Yorkshire, p. 11.

BIANCHINI, F. (1991) Alternative cities, *Marxism Today*, June, pp. 36–38.

BIANCHINI, F. and GHILARDI, L. (1997) *Culture and Neighbourhoods, Vol. 2. A Comparative Report.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

BODDY, M. and PARKINSON, M. (2004) *City Matters: Competitiveness, Cohesion and Urban Governance.* Bristol: Policy Press.

BODO, C., GORDON, C. and ILCZUK, D. (Eds) (2004) *Gambling on Culture: State Lotteries as a Source of Funding for Culture—The Arts and Heritage.* Amsterdam: CIRCLE/Boekmanstudies.

BOGNER, D. (2001) A product of chance or planned diversity? The concept of the MuseumsQuartiers, in: M. BOECKL (Ed.) *MuseumsQuartier Wien*, pp. 33–40. Vienna: Springer-Verlag.

BORDAGE, F. (Ed.) (2002) *The Factories: Conversions for Urban Culture.* Basel: Birkhauser.

BORJA, J. and CASTELLS, M. (1997) *Local and Global: Management of Cities in the Information Age.* London: Earthscan.

BOWLING, A. (1997) *Measuring Health: A Review of Quality of Life Measurement Scales.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

CABE (2002) *Design Quality Indicators.* London: Construction Industry Council.

CARMONA, M., MAGALHAES, C. DE, and EDWARDS, M. (2002) stakeholder views on value and urban design, *Journal of Urban Design*, 7(2), pp. 145–169.

CATTERALL, B. (1998) *Culture as a critical focus for effective urban regeneration.* Town & Country Planning Summer School, University of York.

CHANG, T. C. (2000) Renaissance revisited: Singapore as a "Global City for the Arts", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(4), pp. 818–831.

CHARRETTE 3 (2004) *New models of cultural facilities.* Tilbury: Thurrock, 26 May.

CLRAE (1992) European Urban Charter. Adopted by the Council of Europe's Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe on 18th March. Strasbourg.

CONNOLLY, S. (1997) The measurement of additionality: a case study of the UK National Lottery, in: *Business and Economics in the 21st Century*, *Vol. 1*, BES International Conference.

COOTE, A., ALLEN, J. and WOODHEAD, D. (2004) Finding Out What Works: Building Knowledge about Complex, Community-based Initiatives. London: King's Fund.

CRAWFORD, L. (2001) Bilbao thrives from the "Guggenheim effect", *Financial Times Weekend*, 28 April, p. 2.

CULTURENORTHWEST (2004) *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration.* Manchester, 30 September (www.culturenorthwest.co.uk).

DCMS (DEPARTMENT FOR CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT) (1999) *Draft Guidance for Local Cultural Strategies.* London: DCMS.

DCMS (2000) *The White Book—Option Appraisal of Expenditure Decisions. A Guide for the DCMS and its Sponsored Bodies.* London: DCMS.

DCMS (2003) *Building tomorrow: culture in regeneration.* The Lowry, Manchester, 25 February (www.culture.gov.uk).

DCMS (2004) *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration.* London: DCMS.

DETR (DEPARTMENT FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND THE REGIONS) (1998) *Sustainable Development Indicators—Local Quality of Life Counts.* London: DETR.

DTI (DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY) (2004) *Creative people, openness and productivity. An Exploration of Regional Differences Inspired by 'the Rise of the Creative Class'.* London: DTI.

DUDRAH, R. K. (2002) Birmingham (UK): constructing city spaces through Black popular cultures and the Black public sphere, *City*, 6(3), pp. 335–350.

EC (EUROPEAN COMMISSION) (1998) *Social Indicators: Problematic Issues.* Brussels: EC.

Q1 EHRENREICH, B. and EHRENREICH, J. (1979) The professional-managerial class, in: P. WALKER (Ed.) *Between Labour and Capital.* Boston, MA: South End.

EVANS, G. L. (1998) Study into the employment effects of arts lottery spending in England. Research Report No. 14, Arts Council, London.

EVANS, G. L. (2000) Measure for measure: evaluating performance and the arts organisation, *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 6(2), pp. 243–266.

EVANS, G. L. (2001a) *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* London: Routledge.

EVANS, G. L. (2001b) The World Bank and world heritage: culture and sustainable development?, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 26(3), pp. 83–86.

EVANS, G. L. (2003) Hard-branding the cultural city: from Prado to Prada, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(2), pp. 417–440.

EVANS, G. L. (2004a) Cultural industry quarters—from pre-industrial to post-industrial production, in: D. BELL and M. JAYNE (Eds) *City of Quarters: Urban Villages in the Contemporary City*, pp. 71–92. Aldershot: Ashgate.

EVANS, G. L. (2004b) Measuring impact: culture and regeneration, *Arts Professional*, 83(November), pp. 5–6.

EVANS, G. L. and FOORD, J. (2000) European funding of culture: promoting common culture or regional growth?, *Cultural Trends*, 36, pp. 53–87.

EVANS, G. L. and FOORD, J. (2003) Cultural planning in east London, in: N. KIRKHAM and M. MILES (Eds) *Cultures and Settlement: Advances in Art and Urban Futures, Vol. 3*, pp. 15–30. Bristol: Intellect Books.

EVANS, G. L. and SHAW, P. (2001a) Study into the Social Impact of Lottery Good Cause Spending.

London: Department for Culture Media and Sport.

EVANS, G. L. and SHAW, S. (2001b) Urban leisure and transport: regeneration effects, *Journal of Leisure Property*, 1/4, pp. 350–372.

EVANS, G. L. and SHAW, P. (2004) a review of Evidence on the Role of Culture in Regeneration. London: Department for Culture Media and Sport (www.culture.gov.uk).

FCM (FEDERATION OF CANADIAN MUNICIPALITIES) (2001) *The FCM Quality of Life Reporting System: Second Report Quality of Life in Canadian Cities.* March. Ottawa: FCM.

FEIST, A., FISHER, R., GORDON, C. and MORGAN, C. (1998) International data on public spending on the arts in eleven countries. Research Report No. 13, Arts Council of England (ACE), London.

FLORIDA, R. (2004) *The Rise of the Creative Class*, 2nd edn. New York: Basic Books.

FORUM BARCELONA 2004 (2000) *Agenda of principles and values: universal forum of cultures* (www.barcelona2004.org).

GARCIA, B. (2004) Cultural policy and urban regeneration in western european cities: lessons from experience, prospects for the future, *Local Economy*, 19(4), pp. 312–326.

GDANIEC, C. (2000) Cultural industries, information technology and the regeneration of post-industrial urban landscapes. Poblenou in Barcelona—a virtual city?, *Geojournal*, 50(4), pp. 379–388.

GEHL, J. (2001) *Life between buildings: Using Public Spaces*, 4th edn. Denmark: Arkitektens Forlag.

GERTLER, M., FLORIDA, R., GATES, G. and VINODRAI, T. (2002) *Competing on creativity: placing Ontario's cities in North American context.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation.

GILMORE, F. (2004) Shanghai: unleashing creative potential, Journal of Brand Management, 11(6), pp. 442–448.

GRATTON, C. and TAYLOR, P. (1995) Impacts of festival events: a case study of Edinburgh, in: G. ASHWORTH and A. DIETWVORST (Eds) *Tourism and Spatial Transformations*, pp. 225–238. Wallingford: CAB International.

GRIFFITHS, R. (1993) The politics of cultural policy in urban regeneration strategies, *Policy and Politics*, 87, pp. 84–94.

HALL, C. M. (1992) *Hallmark Tourist Events: Impacts, Management, Planning.* London: Belhaven.

HALL, P. (1998) *Cities and Civilization: Culture, Innovation, and Urban Order.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

HALL, T. (2004) Public art, civic identity and the new Birmingham, in: L. KENNEDY (Ed.) *Remaking Birmingham*, pp. 63–71. London: Routledge.

HALL, T. and ROBERTSON, I. (2001) Public art and urban regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debates, *Landscape Research*, 26(1), pp. 5–26.

HAMILTON, J., FORSYTH, L. and IONGH, D. DE (2001) public art: a local authority perspective, *Journal of Urban Design*, 6(3), pp. 283–296.

HANNIGAN, J. (Ed.) (2003) Symposium on branding, the entertainment economy and urban place building, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(20), pp. 352–360.

Q2 HARRISON, T. (2000) Urban policy: addressing wicked problems, in: H. DAVIES, S. NUTLEY and P. SMITH (Eds) *What Works: Evidence-based Policy and Practice In Public Services.* Bristol: Policy Press.

HARVEY, D. (1993) Goodbye to all that? Thoughts on the social and intellectual condition of contemporary Britain, *Regenerating Cities*, 5, pp. 11–16.

HAUBEN, T., VERMEULEN, M. and PATTEEUW, V. (Eds) (2002) City Branding: Image Building and Building Images. Rotterdam: NAI Uitgevers.

HAYDEN, D. (1995) *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

HEALEY, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies.* London: Macmillan.

HMSO (HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE) (1993) *Treaty on European Union*, Maastricht, 7 February 1992 (entered into force 1 November 1993). London: HMSO.

HUGHES, R. (1998) *Culture Makes Communities Conference.* Leeds: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 13 February.

JACKSON, A. (2000) Social Impact Study of the Millennium Awards. London: The Millennium Commission.

JACKSON, A. (2005) The Evaluation Toolkit. Belfast: Arts Council of Northern Ireland.

JEANNOTTE, M. S. and STANLEY, D. (2002) How will we live together?, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 27(2/3), pp. 133–141.

KAVARATZIS, M. (2004) From city marketing to city branding: towards a theoretical framework for developing city brands, *Journal of Place Branding*, 1(1), pp. 58–73.

KEARNS, G. and PHILO, C. (1993) *The City as Cultural Capital: Past and Present.* Oxford: Pergamon.

KLUNZMAN, K. (2004) Keynote speech to Intereg III Mid-term Conference, Lille, in: *Regeneration and Renewal*, 19 November, p. 2.

KPMG (1998) Impacto de las actividades de la Guggenheim-Bilbao Museoaren Fundazioa en Euskadi, Bilbao, Spain, *Connaissance des Arts*, 559, pp. 106–107.

KROLLER, E.-M. (1996) *EXPO 67: Canada's Camelot?*, in: *Proceedings of the British Association for Canadian Studies (BACS) Annual Conference*, April, Exeter University.

LANDRY, C. (2000) *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators.* London: Earthscan.

LANDRY, C. and BIANCHINI, F. (1995) *The Creative City.* London: DEMOS.

LANE, J. (1978) *Arts Centres—Every Town Should Have One.* London: Paul Elek.

LASH, S. and URRY, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Spaces.* London: Sage.

LDA (LONDON DEVELOPMENT AGENCY) (2003) *Economic Impact Study of the Notting Hill Carnival.* London: LDA.

LDA (2004) *Strategy for creative projects.* International Initiatives Unit, LDA.

LEADBEATER, C. (2000) *Living on Thin Air.* London: Penguin Books.

LEFEBVRE, H. (1974) *The Production of Space*, trans. by D. NICHOLSON-SMITH. Oxford: Blackwell.

LEFEBVRE, H. (1991) *Critique of Everyday Life*, trans. by J. MOORE. London: Verso.

LGA (LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION) (2000) *A Change of Scene: The Challenge of Tourism in regeneration.* London: LGA/DCMS.

LIM, H. (1993) Cultural strategies for revitalizing the city: a review and evaluation, *Regional Studies*, 27(6), pp. 589–594.

LOFTMAN, P. (1990) *A tale of two cities: Birmingham the convention and unequal city.* Research Paper No. 6, Faculty of the Built Environment, Birmingham Polytechnic.

LPAC (LONDON PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE) (1990) *Strategic planning policies for the arts, culture and entertainment.* Report No. 18/90, LPAC.

MACCLANCY, J. (1997) The museum as a site of contest: the Bilbao Guggenheim, *Focal Journal of Anthropology*, 1(7), pp. 271–278.

MARSHALL, R. (Ed.) (2001) *Waterfronts in Post-industrial Cities.* London: Routledge.

MATARASSO, F. (1996) *Defining values: evaluating arts programmes, the social impact of the arts.* Working Paper 1, Comedia, Stroud.

MATARASSO, F. (1997) *Use or Ornament? The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts.* Stroud: Comedia.

MCCARTHY, J. (2002) Entertainment-led regeneration: the case of Detroit, *Cities*, 19(2), pp. 105–111.

MCGUIGAN, J. (1996) *Culture and the Public Sphere.* London: Routledge.

MILES, M. (2004) Drawn and quartered: El Raval and the Haussmannization of Barcelona, in: D. BELL and M. JAYNE (Eds) *City of Quarters: Urban Villages in the Contemporary City*, pp. 37–55. Aldershot: Ashgate.

MOKRE, M. (1998) EU cultural intervention in area regeneration processes. UACES European Cultural Policy Conference, City University, London, April.

MONTGOMERY, J. (2003) *Cultural Quarters as Mechanisms for Urban Regeneration: A Review.* Adelaide: Planning Institute of Australia National Congress.

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM (1998) *Building Culture Downtown: New Ways of Revitalising the American City.* Washington, DC: National Building Museum.

NEGRIER, E. (1993) Montpellier: international competition and community access, in: F. BIANCHINI and M. PARKINSON (Eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*, pp. 235–254. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

NEWMAN, A. and MCLEAN, F. (1998) Heritage builds communities: the application of heritage resources to the problems of social exclusion, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 4, pp. 143–153.

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, pp. 310–322.

NICHOLS CLARK, T. (Ed.) (2004) *The City as Entertainment Machine.* Oxford: Elsevier.

ODPM (OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER) (2001) *Towns & cities: partners in urban renaissance. Breaking down the barriers.* London: ODPM/CABE.

ODPM (2003) *Assessing the Impacts of Spatial Interventions. Regeneration, Renewal and Regional Development. Main guidance* (Consultation, April). London: ODPM.

PADDISON, R. (1993) City marketing, image reconstruction and urban regeneration, *Urban Studies*, 30(2), pp. 339–350.

PALMER, R. (2004) *European capitals/cities of culture: study on the European cities and capitals of culture and the European cultural months (1995–2004)*, Part I and II. Palmer/Rae Associates. Brussels: European Commission.

PERRI 6 (1997) *Holistic Government.* London: DEMOS.

PLAZA, B. (2000) Evaluating the influence of a large cultural artifact in the attraction of tourism: the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao case, *Urban Affairs Review*, 36(2), pp. 264–274.

PMSU (PRIME MINISTER'S STRATEGY UNIT) (2004) *Strategy Survival Guide.* London: PMSU (www.strategy.gov.uk/su/survivalguide/index.htm).

PORTER, M. E. (1995) *The competitive advantage of the inner city, Harvard Business Review*, May/June pp. 55–71.

PRENTICE, R. and ANDERSEN, V. (2003) Festival as creative destination, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), pp. 7–30.

RAPLEY, M. (2001) *Quality of Life Research.* London: Sage.

RIBA (ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS) (2003) *Annual Conference Rotterdam 2003: Regeneration.* London: RIBA.

ROBERTS, N. and MARSH, C. (1995) For art's sake: public art, planning policies and the benefits for commercial property, *Planning Practice and Research*, 2, pp. 189–198.

ROBINS, K. (1996) Collective emotion and urban culture, in: B. BRANDER, S. MATTLE and V. RATZENBOK (Eds) *Kulturpolitik und Restrukturierung der Stadt*, pp. 73–96. Vienna: International Archives for Culture Analyses.

RODRIGUEZ, A., MARTINEZ, E. and GUENGA, G. (2001) Uneven development: new urban policies and socio-spatial fragmentation in metropolitan Bilbao, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 8(2), pp. 161–178.

RUIZ, J. (2004) *A literature review of the evidence base for culture, the arts and sport policy.* Scottish Executive Education Department, Edinburgh, February.

SCALBERT, R. (1994) Have the *Grands Projets* really benefited Paris?, *Architect's Journal*, 3(200), p. 20.

SELWOOD, S. (1995) *The Benefits of Public Art.* London: Policy Studies Institute.

SENNETT, R. (1986) *The Fall of Public Man.* London: Faber & Faber.

SEO, J.-K. (2002) Re-urbanisation in regenerated areas of Manchester and Glasgow–new residents and the Problems of Sustainability, *Cities*, 19(2), pp. 113–121.

SHAW, P. (1990) The Public Art Report: Commissions by Local Authorities. London: Public Arts Development Trust.

SHAW, P. (1999) *The Arts and Neighbourhood Renewal: a Research Report.* Policy Action Team 10. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

SHAW, P. (2003) *What's art got to do with it? Briefing Paper on the Role of the Arts in Neighbourhood Renewal.* London: Arts Council of England.

SIMMIE, J. (Ed.) (2001) *Innovative Cities.* London: Spon Press.

SOLESBURY, W. (1998) *Good connections: helping people to communicate in cities.* Working paper No. 9, Comedia, Stroud.

STEVENSON, D. (2004) 'Civic gold' rush: cultural planning and the politics of the third way, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), pp. 119–131.

STOKER, G. (1995) Regime theory and urban politics, in: D. JUDGE, G. STOKER and H. WOLMAN

(Eds) *Theories of Urban Politics*, pp. 54–71. London: Sage.

SUDJIC, D. (1993) *The 100 Mile City.* London: Flamingo.

SYMON, P. (1999) The new arts in Birmingham: a local analysis of cultural diversity, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Cultural Policy Research*, pp. 723–744. Bergen, November.

THOMAS, C. J. and BROMLEY, D. F. (2000) City-centre revitalisation: problems of fragmentation and fear in the evening and night-time city, *Urban Studies*, 37(8), pp. 1403–1429.

TREASURY, HM. (2003) *Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government* (The Green Book). London: HM Treasaury.

ULLDEMOLINS, J. R. (2000) From "Chino" to Raval: art merchants and the creation of a cultural quarter in Barcelona, in: *Proceedings of the Cultural Change and Urban Contexts Conference*, p. 19. Manchester, September.

VERWIJNEN, J. and LEHTOVUORI, P. (1999) *Creative Cities: Cultural Industries, Urban Development and the Information Society.* Helsinki: University of Art and Design Press.

WANG, C. (2002) *Waterfront regeneration.* Town & Country Planning Summer School, Cardiff University, Wales.

WARD, S. (1998) *Selling Places: The Marketing and Promotion of Towns and Cities 1850–2000.* London: E & FN Spon.

WARD THOMSON, C., PATRIZIO, A. and MONTARZINO, A. (2004) *Research on public art: assessing impact and quality* (draft report). Edinburgh College of Art, October.

WILLIAMS, D. (1996) *Creating social capital: a study of the long-term benefits from community based arts funding.* Community Arts Network of South Australia/Australia Council of the Arts.

WILLIS, P. (1991) *Towards a new cultural map.* Discussion Document No. 18, National Arts & Media Strategy. Arts Council, London.

WORPOLE, K. and GREENHALGH, L. (1999) *The Richness of Cities: Urban Policy in a New Landscape—Final Report.* Stroud: Comedia/Demos.WU, F. (2000) The global and local dimensions of place-making: remaking Shanghai as a world city, *Urban Studies*, 37, pp. 1359–1377.

| Journal... Urban Studies | Article ID   CURS110693 |

TO: CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

AUTHOR QUERIES - TO BE ANSWERED BY THE AUTHOR

The following queries have arisen during the typesetting of your manuscript. Please answer the queries.

Q1	In Refs, insert pp. span of Ehrenreich+ Ehrenreich in ed. vol.?	
Q2	In Refs, insert pp. span of Harrison in ed. vol.?	