

Culture at the Heart of Regeneration

Summary of Responses



Contents

| | page |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Background | 3 |
| General Response | 3 |
| Who Responded? | 4 |
| Responses to Questions | 4 |
| Question 1 | 5 |
| Question 2 | 5 |
| Question 3 | 6 |
| Question 4 | 7 |
| Question 5 | 8 |
| Question 6 | 8 |
| Question 7 | 9 |
| Question 8 | 10 |
| Question 9 | 10 |
| Question 10 | 11 |
| Question 11 | 11 |
| Question 12 | 12 |
| Question 13 | 13 |
| Question 14 | 13 |
| Question 15 | 14 |
| Question 16 | 14 |
| Other Responses | 14 |
| Next Steps | 14 |
| List of Respondents | 16 |

Background

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) launched the 'Culture at the Heart of Regeneration' consultation document on 30 June 2004. The consultation ran until 15 October 2004, 132 responses were received. This summary sets out who responded and what they said.

The views represented here are those of the respondents and are not necessarily the views of DCMS. Nor do they represent the Department's policy directions or future commitments.

A full delivery plan will follow this document and will analyse the responses in order to inform the Department's next steps.

General Response

The responses to the document were generally positive and supported the DCMS in taking a lead in the promotion of culture in regeneration projects. The overall tone was that the document was an interesting stimulus for debate and although some areas could be discussed in more detail, it is a useful advocacy tool.

The responses identified the need for a better base of evidence, with which to lobby for the use of culture in regeneration. Many respondents felt that more quantitative evidence needs to be developed, but that the sector also needs to convince decision makers that qualitative evidence should be accepted.

Consultation also made it clear that visionary individuals are essential in leading projects to completion. In many cases it is the work of a few influential and driven individuals which delivers results on the ground.

Respondents generally agreed that DCMS could support the sector by making a clear statement of support for the use of culture in regeneration. This could be supported with a toolkit of best practice for practitioners to refer to.

Who Responded?

The following categories responded:

| Category of respondent | Number | % of total |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Company/Individual | 14 | 10.6 |
| of which Consultants | 4 | 3.0 |
| Individuals | 4 | 3.0 |
| Architects/Developers | 5 | 3.8 |
| Foundation | 1 | 0.8 |
| Government | 55 | 41.7 |
| of which Councils/Boroughs | 41 | 31.1 |
| Cultural Organisations | 7 | 5.3 |
| Government Offices | 4 | 3.0 |
| Other Government Departments | 3 | 2.3 |
| NDPB/Cultural Organisation | 49 | 37.1 |
| of which Heritage | 6 | 4.5 |
| Sports | 2 | 1.5 |
| Arts | 19 | 14.4 |
| Museums/Libraries/Archives | 12 | 9.1 |
| Representative Organisations | 10 | 7.6 |
| Faith/Academic | 14 | 10.6 |
| of which Faith Groups | 12 | 9.1 |
| Academic | 2 | 1.5 |
| Total | 132 | 100 |

Further information on who responded is given at the end of this document.

Responses to Questions

The document posed 16 questions, which guided responses and focused on what we wished to learn. The section below gives a summary of the responses to each question. Respondents answered the questions in a variety of ways, but also posed new questions.

ICONS, CITIES AND BEYOND

1. How can we make sure that landmark cultural buildings achieve the right balance between maintaining cultural excellence and relevance to their local communities?

It was widely felt that cultural excellence and relevance to the local community were not mutually exclusive. Respondents believed it to be essential to carry out early, extensive and ongoing consultation with the local community before plans are finalised.

There was a general feeling that too much emphasis was put on buildings and that there is a need for more focus to be put on smaller scale community based schemes, concentrating on the people involved. There was a view that buildings did not have to be big to be of high quality and some respondents believed that icons are no longer needed as they can deliver less value and success than smaller projects and can be less relevant to the communities they serve. It was noted that icons can often draw opportunities away from surrounding areas. There was also a concern that the pre-eminence of the building could detract from the cultural offering within.

Responses expressed the views that where an icon is built, it needs to be:

- well designed;
- have a sustainable business case;
- flexible to changes in future requirements;
- open and accessible to all members of the community;
- relevant to the local environment, history and community; and
- not be designed solely to attract visitors.

It was suggested that projects and community events should precede the building, so that the community feels ownership of the building and included in it.

It was felt that the Government should take a lead on providing more guidance and commissioning research into this. Local Authorities should also be more involved.

2. What role does culture have to play in tackling the complexities of rural regeneration, and what evidence is there of what works best?

There was a divided view on whether or not rural areas faced a different set of issues to urban areas. Some felt that it is difficult to deliver rural regeneration due to the complexities of:

- poor infrastructure;
- lack of funding;
- rural poverty;
- difficulties in bringing businesses together; and
- a reliance on volunteers to deliver culture.

However, others took the view that culture could play the same role in rural areas as it does in urban settings in uniting communities, bringing different people together, and improving health and well being. The necessarily small scale of the rural cultural offering makes it hard to gather evidence and assess its impact, particularly in economic terms.

The key role played by community centres, libraries, village halls, churches and other faith centres was highlighted in the responses. These facilities are often the only ones available, and are at the heart of rural communities. The importance to rural communities of fêtes, country shows and festivals, including their often high quality cultural events was also mentioned. Some recognised that rural communities are often close knit and strong, but that the sparseness of the rural population could pose problems and difficulties. The increasing prevalence of second-home ownership can sometimes reduce community cohesion.

Tourism was seen by some as playing a crucial role in cultural provision to rural areas, but others cautioned that it was not always the best way to solve rural complexities and can lead to rural areas becoming 'theme parks'. The value that rural areas bring to the maintenance of traditional crafts and skills was mentioned.

A number of responses suggested the need for an increase in the level of rural touring and visits by the rural community to cultural centres. More use should be made of regional hubs to deliver cultural services in rural settings and more use of modern IT should help to take culture to rural settings.

3. We have found that strong leadership has been the key to driving through cultural innovation. But innovation can be controversial and is often opposed by local communities. How do we achieve a balance between leadership and meeting the needs and aspirations of communities?

It was generally felt DCMS should encourage leaders and provide support to them. Respondents believed that strong leadership meant:

- consulting well with the community;
- being open to their suggestions;
- communicating a strong vision to raise expectations and show what is possible;
- communicating the project's relevance to the community;
- often coming from the local community;
- evolving as the project goes on;
- being willing to hand on the project at the appropriate time;
- not being territorial or protective of the project;
- being encouraged to take risks in certain cases; and
- becoming a cultural champion.

Good communication, which is transparent and up-to-date, is essential to show openness of the decision making process.

The community should not feel that culture is being forced upon them and the culture should be relevant to the community. However, it was also pointed out that projects will not please everyone, and leaders need to be strong enough to drive through projects despite not having unanimous support. It was noted that disputes are not always started by communities; developers also start them.

There were split views over the value of masterplanning; while some considered it important in setting out the vision, others considered the process of planning stifling to the creative drive behind a project.

The need to join up or instil planning guidance into Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs), Community Plans and Cultural Consortia was identified, as was the need to work through elected councillors to provide accountability. When working with disparate partners, there seems to be a need to provide clarity over the roles and responsibilities of those involved.

A SENSE OF PLACE

4. **Many claim that public art has impacts beyond its aesthetic value, but we have found little evidence of this. Are there ways of measuring its wider impact, and do you have any examples?**

The general view was that the impact of public art is very difficult to measure, and that DCMS should take a lead on formulating methodologies and frameworks to gather evidence and that these should be made compulsory for all projects. Caution was sounded by some respondents who believe that the value of public art is overstated and that the burden of data collection is too heavy for some projects.

The need to accept more qualitative and anecdotal evidence was highlighted. 'Public art' was also felt to be a difficult term and it should be considered as part of the wider public realm and the cultural offering of an area.

Respondents were widely in agreement that public art did have a positive effect on an area, improving its image and diversity. This increases social value and adds to an area's liveability. It was noted in a number of responses that despite not having substantial quantitative evidence, it is often seen that good regeneration projects include a central element of public art or culture. Others did caution that the addition of public art is not a panacea and could not make up for a poor regeneration project.

There have been some studies into the effect of Public Art, including the 'Art in Public Spaces' strategy by Warwick District Council, the Policy Studies Institute's 'Benefit of Public Art', and the conclusions of the 'Per Cent for Art' programme.

A number of measures were suggested, including the tracking of improvements in indicators such as:

- crime;
- education;
- health; and
- property prices.

This could be collected through surveys, consultation groups and tracking of changes in attitudes before and after the intervention. The Museums, Libraries and Archives Association (MLA) suggested the adoption of their Generic Learning Outcomes framework to assess public art, which measures the community's:

1. knowledge and understanding;
2. skills;
3. attitudes and values;
4. enjoyment, inspiration and creativity; and
5. activity, behaviours and progression .

5. What more can be done to encourage developers and planners to include culture in regeneration strategies and programmes?

Many responses highlighted the need for the inclusion of culture to be a condition of the sale of land to developers and the subsequent granting of planning permission. Planning guidance needs to be strengthened in order to persuade developers to invest more in culture, especially when using public money. It was widely thought that DCMS should take the lead in promoting culture in regeneration and to attempt to improve the planning rules. Some thought that DCMS should put out a positive statement of support, in conjunction with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), fostering more cross-departmental work. However, others felt that there was no need for further statutory intervention.

In general, the belief was that all plans and policies, such as Local Plans, Community Plans, Strategic Plans, Masterplans and Unitary Development Frameworks, should be 'culture proofed'. At One North East, the Regional Development Agency (RDA), the MLA has a part-funded post, which ensures that MLA is included in all One North East's plans and policies.

RDAs in general have a key role to play here. As with answers to previous questions, many believed that RDAs should have a cultural as well as economic remit. The economic benefits brought by culture to a regeneration project should be more clearly articulated.

Section 106 agreements could be used more and the 'Per cent for Art' scheme should be encouraged. A more streamlined and clear set of funding streams would also help.

The need for professional training for local authorities and developers in the value of cultural regeneration was also noted. Training should also be given to cultural organisations, so that they can understand how developers work and how to lobby them effectively. The sharing of best practice would help facilitate this training. Developers should become more joined up with cultural organisations in order for them to understand each other. This could be done through the auspices of the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE).

The British Urban Regeneration Association (BURA) and some others noted that many developers are not resistant to the use of culture, that many already use culture in order to increase the attractiveness of their developments and that culture is an essential part of creating successful mixed-use developments.

DELIVERING FOR COMMUNITIES, WITH COMMUNITIES

6. What role does culture have to play in strengthening communities and bringing different social groups together? Do you have any evidence-based examples?

It was generally felt that culture does strengthen communities through:

- enhancing the reputation of an area;
- improving the residents' quality of life;
- raising aspirations;
- giving a sense of shared place and history;
- building human and social capital; and
- increased social, educational and employment opportunities.

It was felt that the above lead to a more cohesive and responsible community.

Responses recommended that culture should be more prominent in the Comprehensive Performance Assessment, and that this would help to promote the use of culture with its positive effects on communities.

Culture gives different groups a shared, non-stigmatising platform where they can meet. It provides public space, which improves interaction between different groups, giving the opportunity to share their cultural experiences with others. The importance of the voluntary sector was mentioned in a number of responses.

The important role that libraries, churches and other faith centres play in bringing people together was reflected. A number of churches highlighted the diverse range of cultural activities they host; from choirs, artists in residence and architectural tours, to the thousands of tourists who visit each year. Festivals were also strongly represented as a way that different groups come together. Theatres, with their mix of spaces including auditoria, mingling areas and catering facilities were highlighted by the Theatres Trust as being especially suitable for bringing groups together. As with many of the questions, the importance of making culture relevant to the community and locally focused was highlighted.

Many examples were listed of where culture has had a positive effect on bringing communities together. Again, many respondents believed that DCMS should take a lead on commissioning research.

7. How can we measure the benefits, or added value that culture brings to delivering key social policy objectives?

It was the general view that it is very difficult to measure hard outcomes and collect quantitative evidence for culture's benefits. A number of responses also highlighted the need for a more robust definition of culture.

As discussed above, respondents believed that Government and Local Authority policies should be 'culture proofed' and the delivery of culture should be included as a key measure of a successful regeneration project. Some cautioned about being over prescriptive about a project's outcomes, as this can stifle creativity.

The suggestions on what to measure were quite similar to other questions, and included:

- changes in land values;
- economic stability of an area;
- reduction in anti-social behaviour; and
- outcomes of resident surveys.

It was hoped that new measures could be found, which might include the improvement of visual impact of an area. The MLA's Generic Learning Outcomes (as described in question 4 above) could be adopted.

Respondents felt that DCMS should develop a toolkit to share best practice and should lead on commissioning long-term research. To successfully measure the benefits of culture, it was felt that it should be compulsory for new projects to collect data.

DCMS should also lobby for others to accept alternative forms of evidence, such as qualitative and anecdotal data. Nottinghamshire Council were given as an example of a body who are accepting evidence measured in softer, more qualitative outcomes. The difficulty in relating cause and effect was highlighted by a number of responses.

8. What incentives could be put in place to align developers' short-term objectives with the longer-term cultural and social aspirations of the community?

The general consensus was that incentives will have to be ultimately financial, or linked to an improved profit on the development. There was a split view on whether or not developers were already supportive of the inclusion of culture. There was also the view that the planning regime should be stronger, to force developers to include culture. Some thought this could be achieved if the Government set out a clearer regeneration framework.

There were suggestions that the existing mechanisms could be used to promote culture to developers, such as through Urban Development Corporations and RDAs. DCMS should ensure that more good publicity is generated about the use of culture in regeneration projects.

As discussed previously, it was thought that Section 106 agreements and the 'Per Cent for Art' scheme should be used more often to persuade developers to use culture. It was cautioned that the long term maintenance of the cultural offering needs to be considered from the outset, and funding set aside so that it does not fall into disrepair.

The local community should be involved in planning at an early stage to ensure that a long-term approach is taken. Developers should receive training and support to show them the benefit of using culture. Furthermore, it was suggested that developers form partnerships with cultural organisations to improve mutual understanding. Cultural organisations should also have training in how developers work and how best to lobby them.

Respondents thought that the argument for culture is that its inclusion in regeneration leads to individualism and uniqueness, which leads to a more attractive development, which in turn could deliver higher financial returns. These hard financial benefits need to be articulated more clearly to developers. Some considered that local developers are more likely to take long-term community needs into account than national developers.

An alternative way of ensuring developers' long term commitment to the community was that developers could consider maintaining ownership of the freehold of cultural buildings in order to supply longer term income and an incentive to plan for the community. Another suggestion was that developers should retain a share of the development to tie them in to longer term sustainability and profits.

MAKING THE ECONOMIC CASE

9. How do we ensure that the gentrification of an area does not lead to displacement? Do you have any good examples?

The general view was that more research is required, along with a better planning policy framework which considers the long term needs of the local community. Regeneration strategies should be well planned and sufficiently robust to guard against the type of gentrification that pushes prices beyond the means of local residents and leads to displacement.

Suggestions on how to avoid displacement included the encouragement of mixed-use and mixed-tenure developments as they are less likely to lead to harmful gentrification. Affordable housing, on first refusal to local residents, should be included in all developments, an approach some councils already appear to be undertaking to stop displacement. Section 106 agreements should be used more to create affordable living and working space. The local community should be well consulted before developments go ahead, to ensure they have the opportunity to lodge any complaints.

Schemes could also be put in place to train local residents to give new skills to the community. Local businesses should also continue to be supported, so that they are not lost as a result of regeneration. A not-for-profit organisation could take ownership of a proportion of the development, to ensure that the long-term community good is considered.

It was noted by some that gentrification is a natural corollary and part of the economic reality of regeneration. A number of respondents believed that it was important to regenerate surrounding areas, so that the positive effects are not limited to just one area and detrimental gentrification could thereby be avoided.

10. In urban regeneration, how do we strike a balance between meeting the needs of the so-called “creative class” and the needs of the wider community, particularly those from disadvantaged groups?

A number of respondents questioned if the perceived distinction and tension between the classes was actually there. Responses highlighted that the creative class are a part of the community, just like any other class and that their energy could be harnessed as a way to reduce class boundaries and unlock latent talent in the community. It was also suggested that training was needed to encourage the creative individuals present in all communities.

If opportunities are provided for all members of the community to get involved in the projects and be inspired to be creative they will participate in the project more. Education and outreach work was discussed as being key in ensuring community engagement. It was thought that local authorities had a key leadership role to play here, through the use of planning policies and community strategies.

Responses highlighted the need to involve the local community and work to improve areas for the whole community, including disadvantaged groups. The need for more funding was again brought up. The regeneration project should reflect an area’s history, in order to represent its community.

11. How can we ensure that cultural regeneration projects offer a range of employment prospects for the local community, not just low paid service jobs? Is there an argument for training as an element of such regeneration and how might this be incorporated?

Appropriate training needs to be offered around the regeneration agenda and a wider diversity of people need to be attracted. Courses should be pitched at artists and professionals, such as doctors or lawyers, rather than just concentrating on planners and developers.

Regeneration projects should include an element of training for the local community, which will build capacity and social capital. This training should start with the young at school and should include an element of vocational training with transferable skills. The creative industries and social enterprises play a key role in providing local employment opportunities. There needs to be more opportunity for progression, especially amongst volunteers and low paid workers, perhaps working through the Sector Skills Council and other national training organisations. Libraries were suggested as providing a good network of facilities for training and Creative Partnerships were cited as having been a success in providing training.

The economic benefits to a regeneration project of including local employment and training should be highlighted. Section 106 agreements should be used to provide training and job brokerage schemes for the community. It was felt that there is a need to focus on jobs being available to local people, an example was given of Tesco stores looking locally for employees. It was cautioned, however, that the opportunity to provide training and employment depends on the size of the regeneration programme.

The economic argument is that a better social mix will encourage the knowledge economy, which draws in other businesses. However, pay and conditions for employees in all creative businesses need to be improved. The economic impact of tourism was recognised by respondents.

NEXT STEPS: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

12. Are these the right priorities for action?

The general feeling was that the document had identified the correct priorities for action, but that others should also be considered:

- Definitions of culture need to be further developed and it was felt that there is a need to distinguish between culture as a starting point for regeneration as opposed to culture being a part of regeneration;
- There was a general feeling that the Government should advocate more for the use of culture in regeneration, and this could be achieved by 'culture proofing' all strategies and policy documents;
- The need to work with ODPM, DTI and other partners more was brought up, as was the need for DCMS to further support its sponsored bodies to deliver this agenda. Government should work harder to encourage innovation, creativity and sustainability;
- DCMS should take a lead in commissioning more research and evidence collection over the long-term, perhaps by proposing an evidence framework to guide monitoring. It was suggested that all regeneration projects should include measurement and monitoring. Best practice guidance should be published, but failures should also be studied to see what should be avoided in future;
- A number of responses prioritised the need for RDAs to include culture, and that weaker RDAs should be challenged more. More clarity is also needed about the roles of RDAs and Government Offices;
- Local communities should continue to play an important role in regeneration projects and their involvement should be sought more. Developers should gain a clearer understanding of the community before projects get underway;
- There needs to be more focus on the financial framework and how more money can be raised. The funding system should be reviewed and streamlined to make it easier to apply for funding; and
- The need to include sport, faith communities, village halls and the historic environment was noted by a significant number of responses. The voluntary sector should also be supported more to encourage the build up of capacity.

13. What else could be done to strengthen partnerships?

There was a generally shared view that DCMS could strengthen partnerships by taking a lead in drawing stakeholders together and promoting best practice examples of good partnerships.

Respondents believed that the Government should set out a clearer regeneration strategy, with defined roles so that bodies would not have to compete with each other. Partnerships could be stronger if the RDAs adopted a cultural as well as economic strategy, as this would promote the use of culture. Devolution of decision-making from the centre could ensure that partnerships make real decisions and have an impact, thereby making the partnership stronger.

It was felt that partners should be involved from the start of a project and should understand each other's motivations and agendas. The purpose of the partnership should be clearly set out at the beginning of the process and partners should also agree roles and what each is bringing to the partnership. Bodies should also be willing to give up an element of control in order to make the partnership work and reach consensus. It was highlighted that partnerships could be strengthened if training was given to all members of the partnership, to improve understanding of the project and other partners.

Partnership working could be improved if public bodies had a wider cultural remit and if they were able to share services and office space. Lottery distributors should also work more closely with public bodies, thereby helping to streamline the funding system, which would make it easier for partners to work together

Local Authorities should also be given more support and advice on how and where to include culture in regeneration projects. It was suggested that elected local councillors should sit on regeneration boards to make the project accountable. Local Strategic Partnerships, Urban Regeneration Companies, Regional Cultural Consortia and other organisations should have cultural strands to them to promote culture and improve partnership working between agencies.

14. What else could be done to support those directly involved in regeneration?

The main view was that a toolkit of best practice examples should be developed and training or seminars organised on how to use the toolkit. Many respondents also thought that DCMS should send out a clear message of support, advocating for the use of culture in regeneration.

Many respondents discussed the importance of setting up standard, compulsory monitoring arrangements for all projects. It was suggested that evidence should be collected according to HM Treasury guidelines for measuring impact, to ensure that it is acceptable and presented in the correct way. There was widespread agreement that a better evidence base, such as a case study bank, would greatly assist those involved in regeneration.

A number of respondents thought that there should be more funding and help made available to navigate the funding streams. There was also the view that training on the value of culture should be provided to local authority arts officers, councillors, young people and cultural organisations. The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) was suggested as a good delivery vehicle for this training.

Some responses discussed the need for the Government to adopt a stronger policy in support of culture and art in regeneration. This could be achieved through improvements to the planning system. It

would help regeneration practitioners if culture's importance were reflected and included in Local Strategic Partnerships, Regional Development Agencies and other strategic bodies.

Cultural organisations should be involved in the planning phase of any regeneration project. These organisations should also work harder to encourage inward investment to the sector by developers.

15. Do you have any evidence-based examples of culture's impact on regeneration?

A number of responses listed examples of where culture was being successfully used in regeneration. The examples are too numerous to list in this summary, but will be published elsewhere and used in the development of an action plan and best practice toolkit.

16. What else should be done to strengthen the evidence of culture's role and impact on regeneration?

The summary of responses covers a number of ideas on improving the evidence base. The general view was that DCMS should take a lead in commissioning research and that long-term monitoring should be compulsory for all projects. It was also suggested that DCMS should develop a standard analysis framework to guide others.

Other responses

Respondents included a number of other suggestions:

- There was a need to include the role of sport and faith communities in regeneration, in order to make the policies more joined up;
- There is a need for a holistic assessment of all regeneration projects undertaken to date;
- The Government should develop a framework to decide which areas will be regenerated before others;
- Reassessment of the VAT regime for refurbishment and renovation works was suggested, in order to encourage more regeneration rather than new build;
- There was a question about what sort of culture a regeneration project should reflect. Should it be based on traditional notions of culture, or be newer and up to date to reflect a younger society?
- The role of the media in gaining support for and delivering projects was noted; and
- Higher education was omitted, it is an important cultural resource which should be acknowledged.

Next Steps

A delivery plan will follow this consultation during 2005. It will set out how the Government is going to put the learning from the consultation into action. It is likely that there will be three key strands to the delivery plan:

- 1. Building partnerships with, amongst others:**
 - Other Government Departments;
 - Local Authorities; and
 - RDAs, RCCs.
- 2. Supporting delivery by:**
 - sharing best practice;
 - providing training and support for practitioners; and
 - producing a toolkit of ideas.
- 3. Improved evidence base:**
 - continue to strengthen the evidence base;
 - establish quantitative and qualitative measures.

Respondents

Responses were received from the following:

Company/Individual

Consultants

1. Really Useful Knowledge Consultants
2. Cultural Intelligence Ltd
3. B +B Art Consultancy
4. Public Arts

Individuals

1. Simon Mallin
2. Peter Draper
3. Richard York
4. M A Hodges

Architects/Developers

1. Frontline Estates Limited
2. Hope Street Association
3. MacCormac Jamieson Prichard (architects)
4. CIQ Agency
5. Cultural Industries Development Centre

Foundations

1. Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Government

Councils/Boroughs

1. Rother District Council
2. Penwith Council
3. Cumbria County Council
4. Gateshead Council
5. Wigan Met Borough Council
6. Colchester Borough Council
7. Westminster City Council
8. Brighton and Hove City Council
9. East Sussex County Council
10. Herefordshire Council
11. Education and Culture Department, Bolton Council
12. South Shropshire District Council
13. Salford City Council
14. Libraries, Heritage & Trading Standards, Warwickshire County Council

15. Nottinghamshire County Council
16. London Borough of Newham
17. Durham County Council
18. Northampton Council
19. Dorset County Council
20. Kent County Council
21. Bradford Council
22. Lancashire County Council
23. Devon County Council
24. Burnley Cultural Strategy Partnership (Burnley Borough Council)
25. Croydon Council
26. Coventry City Council
27. Salisbury District Council
28. Hull City Council
29. Warwick District Council (in conjunction with Warwick LSP Cultural Theme Group)
30. London Borough of Merton
31. London Borough of Havering
32. Southwark Council
33. London Borough of Sutton
34. London Borough of Waltham Forest
35. Gravesham Borough Council
36. Manchester City Council
37. South Norfolk Council
38. Leicestershire County Council
39. London Borough of Lambeth
40. Cornwall County Council
41. Fylde Borough Council

Cultural Organisations

1. Wight Leisure, Isle of Wight Leisure
2. Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
3. Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers
4. Thames Gateway South Essex Partnership
5. Thames Gateway London Partnership
6. Kent Thameside Delivery Board and Dartford & Gravesham Local Strategic Partnership
7. Yorkshire Culture

Government Offices

1. Government Office North West
2. Living East, GO East
3. Culture North East, Association of North East Councils and North East Assembly,
Government Office North East, One North East
4. Government Office West Midlands

Other Government Departments

1. Countryside Agency
2. Audit Commission
3. ODPM Economic Performance PSA Team AND Urban Policy Directorate

NDPB/Cultural Organisation

Heritage

1. English Heritage
2. Institute of Historic Building Conservation
3. Heritage Link
4. English Heritage, Ancient Monuments
5. Heritage Lottery Fund
6. The National Trust

Sports

1. The British Wheel of Yoga
2. Sport England

Arts

1. De La Warr Pavillion
2. The Theatres Trust
3. Harrogate International Festival
4. Public Art South West
5. The Public
6. Community at Heart's Arts Programme
7. Artpoint
8. Turner Contemporary Margate
9. The Castleford Project/Talkback UK
10. Arts Council North West (& stakeholders)
11. Creative Exchange
12. Ixia (formerly Public Art Forum)
13. Creative Partnerships Bristol
14. Architecture Centre Network
15. Richard Gerald Associates Ltd. (Hebridean Celtic Festival)
16. Arts Council England
17. London Schools Arts Service
18. National Campaign for the Arts
19. Arts in the Peak

Museums/Libraries/Archives

1. Leicestershire and Rutland Museums Forum
2. Archives, Libraries and Museums London
3. East Midlands Museums, Libraries and Archives Council
4. Museum, Libraries and Archives Council
5. West Midlands Museums, Libraries and Archives
6. Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals

7. The National Archives
8. The Library Campaign – supporting friends and users of libraries
9. National Museums Liverpool
10. Tyne & Wear Museums
11. British Library
12. National Museum of Science and Industry

Representative Organisations

1. BURA Steering and Development Forum
2. Royal Town Planning Institute
3. Civic Trust South West Region
4. Planning Officers Society
5. Voluntary Arts Network
6. National Youth Agency
7. Community Media Association
8. RICS Regeneration Forum
9. The Civic Trust
10. The Architecture Foundation

Faith/Academic

Faith Groups

1. The Diocese of Oxford
2. South East England Faith Forum
3. The Arthur Rank Centre
4. Lincoln Cathedral
5. Diocese of Leicester
6. Blackburn Anglican Church
7. Christ Church
8. Gloucester Cathedral
9. The Cathedral Church of St Peter Bradford
10. Ripon Cathedral
11. Newcastle Cathedral
12. The Church of England

Academic

1. Centre for Tourism and Cultural Change, Sheffield Hallam University
2. De Montfort University



**Department for Culture,
Media and Sport**
2-4 Cockspur Street
London SW1Y 5DH
PP 786 February 2005