

# CULTURE AT THE CENTRE

## CULTURAL PLANNING: A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO SUCCESSFUL AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY-BASED REGENERATION IN SCOTLAND



Picture © Owen Logan, Craigmillar Community Arts, NGS, CCP (detail)

***“Culture cuts across every aspect of government – it can make a difference to our success in tackling poverty, it can make Scotland a healthier place and it has a significant contribution to make towards our economy.”***

***Jack McConnell, St Andrew’s Day, 2003***

Report by Lia Ghilardi  
Noema Research and Planning, London  
[Ghilardi@ntlworld.com](mailto:Ghilardi@ntlworld.com)

## Contents:

I.	Report Summary	3
I.1	Introduction and Commissioning of Report page	4
II.	A Broader Context for Culture	5
II.1	Culture-led Regeneration: The Issues	7
III.	What Is Cultural Planning?	8
III.1	Cultural Planning – The Ingredients	9
IV.	Cultural Planning – A Review of Current Applications	10
IV.1	UK Cultural Strategies and Examples of Cultural Planning Implementation	12
V.	Towards Cultural Planning in Scotland – Context and Potential	17
V.1	Examples of Implementation	16
V.2	Local Cultural Strategies	19
VI.	The State of Play	21
VII.	Feedback from the Consultation	24
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>26</b>
	References	28
	Acknowledgements	30
	St Andrews Day 2005 – “The Cultural Matrix Reloaded” Consultees and attenders at the SURF Seminar held on 30/11/2005	31

## **I. Report Summary**

*This report has been developed by Lia Ghilardi of Noema Research and Planning on behalf of the National Cultural Planning Steering Group (N.C.P.S.G.). The purpose of the research was:*

- To assess the relevance and application of Cultural Planning as an overarching vision for cultural and community regeneration in Scotland*
- To propose Cultural Planning as a successful strategic tool for real community engagement in Community Planning.*
- To consolidate the understanding and participation of mainstream funders and decision makers.*

*The report highlights some of the examples of existing good practice in the practical application of Cultural Planning as a basis for regeneration strategies at community and city levels. It also indicates the considerable potential of the approach if it were to be adequately supported at a national policy level in Scotland and makes some recommendations for implementation.*

## **I.1 Introduction and Commissioning of Report**

Scotland, since devolution, is demonstrating a new confidence across its broad cultural remit, which is increasingly set in the context of Europe and the global economy. First Minister Jack McConnell chose culture as the theme for his key 'state of the nation' address in Glasgow on St Andrews Day, 30 November, 2003. This was a major speech which showed a national region rediscovering its confidence, and regaining the political determination to restore the cultural agenda to its most *productive* place for the good of its citizens.

By this we mean that cultural entitlement can only become a reality if Scotland rises to the challenge of moving from the compensatory logic of traditional arts policy to more 'productive' forms of cultural development, where funding is understood as investment in creativity and in providing employment and wealth-creation opportunities for its people. Culture's special and often difficult association with policy resides in its relationship to civil society. In both historical and contemporary terms, culture is about citizen-formation and about conduct and affiliation, identity and sense of place: folk, work and place, as Scottish biologist Patrick Geddes once put it.

Culture, moreover, is an important structure for democracy, autonomy and self-expression. Culture is also about social exclusion and inclusion. We know these things both tacitly and theoretically and until now there had been little work done (in Scotland and elsewhere) to translate this knowledge into democratic, inclusive and effective forms of delivery. This is why we believe that the St Andrews Day speech, and the establishment of a Cultural Commission by the Executive to review cultural provision in Scotland, open the way to radical and exciting policy mechanisms which, for the first time, see culture in its broader definition at the centre of nation building.

However, since the delivery by the Cultural Commission of their report to the Executive in June 2005, there has been relatively little (public) debate among the interested stakeholders about the content and the recommendations contained in that report. However, the parliamentary debate that took place in September 2005 on this issue brought some clarification and a mid-December statement by the Culture Minister is expected. This document, therefore, constitutes an attempt to address some of the issues raised in the Cultural Commission report. In particular, the aspiration of this document is to focus the discussion on the delivery mechanisms identified by the Commission under the Cultural Planning heading (Section 8.5).

Critical to the commissioning of this discussion document was the role played by the National Cultural Planning Steering Group (henceforward NCPSPG). This is a co-operative group of individuals from a range of different backgrounds and organisations, sharing a common interest in promoting the role of Cultural Planning at all levels within the Scottish inclusion, education and regeneration policy framework.

As well as advising the Cultural Commission on issues of policy implementation, the NCPSPG participated in the first public discussion of the implications of the Cultural Commission report at a Scottish Urban Regeneration Forum (SURF) Open Forum in July 2005. In the conclusions to this meeting, the group noted that Section 8.5 of the Cultural Commission's report is devoted to the concept of Cultural Planning and the NCPSPG is

cited in the Commission's report as potentially the appropriate vehicle for undertaking the task of developing and sharing national and international experiences of the Cultural Planning approach with other partners and, particularly, with local authorities.

Amongst its current stated aims, the NCPSG is committed to research, consult on and respond to important questions raised by the Scottish Executive and others as part of a process of further refining concepts, promoting engagement and 'buying into' the Cultural Planning approach by key partners. The commissioning of this report by the NCPSG (with support from the Scottish Executive, the Capital City Partnership, and the Arts and Communities Association) signals the NCPSG's intention to provide the Executive with an informed response to the Cultural Commission's report on the opportunities for strategic implementation provided by the Cultural Planning policy model.

The methodology employed in the development of this report consisted of desk research and consultation (face-to-face meetings, telephone and email interviews) with key stakeholders involved in the delivery of cultural and community development programmes across Scotland. The desk research aspect focused on a close examination of the Cultural Commission's report in order to highlight the opportunities for linking references to Cultural Planning to practical processes and initiatives within a coherent framework.

The consultation process focused on testing out in practice perceptions of the Cultural Planning approach and its applicability to the Scottish context among key stakeholders such as Local Authorities, COSLA, Communities Scotland, the Scottish Arts Council, HMI Education, Scottish Enterprise, academic bodies, and the Arts and Communities Association. In addition, feedback from the audience taking part in a half-day event organised on the 30 November by SURF on behalf of the NCPSG was also considered as part of the consultation exercise.

## **II. A Broader Context for Culture**

In Scotland and elsewhere, at neighbourhood, city, regional and national levels, there is a growing realisation that culture can deliver on many aspects of community engagement, empowerment and leadership. As the World Conference on Cultural Policies, held in Mexico City in 1982, put it: "Culture is a leading source of intellectual renewal and human growth, and can be understood as embracing all creative activity, not only the traditional, or 'high', arts but popular mass culture as well."

Anthropologist Ulf Hannerz defines culture as "The meanings which people create, and which create people as members of societies". In *The Long Revolution*, Raymond Williams states that culture can be understood as "a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning, but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour".

Culture is linked to society and it is in the urban context that this link has progressively been negotiated over the past twenty years in the Western world. The next section of this report briefly sets the context for the connections being created between culture, quality of life and urban development.

Cultural activities both traditional and new create **meaning** as they are concerned with expression, celebration and achievement. They embody the identity and values of a place. They express local distinctiveness and can engender social cohesion. Culture, moreover, can assist in providing positive solutions to problems resulting from social exclusion by developing self-confidence and capacity in individuals and communities.

There is a strong and growing evidence base of the links between cultural participation, including sports, and **social capital** (bonds and networks of trust and reciprocity) in communities. In particular, connections have been established between a range of forms of cultural participation and access to cultural capital in:

- civic participation and volunteering rates;
- improved literacy, writing, numeracy skills
- increased skills in the key competencies of problem solving, planning and organising, communication, and working with others; and
- sustainable and innovative economic development

Social Capital is seen by many agencies not as an 'additional' or supplementary factor in sustainable development but as a fundamental condition for development simultaneously in social and economic fields.

Culture is associated with a high **quality of life**. For this reason, place-marketing strategies tend to focus on the local cultural offer, on the presence of artists and creative people and cultural industries in general. Thus, by helping to create positive images the cultural sector has a direct impact on inward investment.

**Culture's role in tourism** is key. However, tourism offers are now increasingly focused on what is unique in a place, and 'cultural tourism' represents an average of 6% to 8% of a nation's GDP in Europe. Cultural tourism gives visitors the opportunity to understand and appreciate the essential character of a place and its culture as a whole, so a good cultural tourism strategy can also satisfy the requirements of sustainable economic development. According to the World Tourism Organisation in 2002, 37% of all tourism (265 million international trips) was cultural tourism and this is growing at a remarkable 15% per annum. According to the European Commission, 45-50% of tourist motivations in the world's largest single market are 'cultural' in nature and origin.

As well as the 'multiplier effect' **spending on cultural activities** has on income and employment with regard to local economies, it is worth mentioning the key role of contemporary cultural industry development. The **cultural industries** – in forms ranging from publishing to television, video production and design – are claimed to be the fourth or fifth fastest growing sector in the world's developed economy after financial services, information technology, pharmaceuticals, bio-engineering and tourism. In global cities such as London or New York, the cultural industries employ over 500,000 people. In both these cities, investment in culture is seen as a key goal of their global competition strategies.

**Culture-led Regeneration.** The increased concern with culture, consumption and image in urban policies is well documented, and, from the late 1980s onwards, cities and regions with different economic functions in the European urban hierarchy have used cultural policies to improve and develop their internal and external images. In this scenario, cultural activity is seen as the catalyst and engine of regeneration. The design and construction (or re-use) of a building or buildings for public use and for hosting creative businesses (see for

example, the Baltic and Sage Music Centre in Gateshead, Tate Modern in London or the Lace Market in Nottingham); the reclamation of open space (e.g. for festivals, parades and large scale events) and the creation of Cultural Precincts or Cultural Quarters are all examples of culture-led regeneration.

However, although, so far, this culture-led type of regeneration has been the preferred model for re-positioning cities and localities in the global economic hierarchy, issues are emerging regarding the sustainability of these developments over time. In particular, doubts have been raised in relation to the capacity of big developments to reflect the 'specificities' of local life and to set in motion a virtuous cycle where economic, social and creative development go hand in hand.

## II.1 Culture-led Regeneration: The Issues

The key concern about large cultural developments (for example Cultural Quarters) relates to the fact that local cultures are packaged in order to appeal to potential inward investors, and, in so doing, 'distinctive' urban lifestyles become absorbed into the progressive gentrification of city centres. In some cases, city centres have been developed as sites for tourism and cultural consumption, while peripheral neighbourhoods have been left to their old functions of dormitory areas, with a few derelict leisure and cultural amenities.

This process of *post-modernisation* of the urban space has resulted in a short-term, property-led form of regeneration with an urban scenario characterised by urban commentator David Harvey as 'voodoo cities', where city-centre redevelopment is used to cover the slow decline of everything else around it. An associated risk is that of the banalisation of both cultural production and space. In this scenario, 'anywhere-ville' is the playground for visitors endlessly consuming the same standardised product (the same exhibition touring from city to city, the same cultural event, or drinking from the same cappuccino bars).

This tendency to use banal forms of culture for regeneration runs in parallel with a general concern, at least in Western societies, that globalisation processes may be putting at risk cultural policies as *nation-state projects*. The argument put forward within this debate centres mostly on the observation that economic and political power is increasingly transferred to international commercial networks existing in a global "space of flow" creating a *legitimisation* problem. Whereas in late 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe, cultural policies were developed in nation-state-based societies legitimated by the slow and contested growth of democratic politics, today the nation-state as "an imagined community" (Benedict Anderson) appealing to public interests in terms of collective identity, meaning and purpose, is constantly challenged by a variety of *other* imagined communities.

This is why there is a need for more inclusive, transparent and accountable forms of delivery mechanisms for urban *governance*. In particular, integrated approaches to culture and place-making is what policy-makers are increasingly turning to.

**The argument policy-makers are using is that, in order to be effective, local cultural plans must be *joined up* to all the different aspects of the local quality of life agenda and citizenship.**

The assumption is that the arts and culture should not be viewed only as products to be consumed globally, but also as processes and systems that are integral to the life of local communities. In other words, at a time when culture is becoming strategic in its connections with industry, communications, identity and civic engagement, citizenship is what cultural plans should be about.

In particular:

**There is a need for new policy tools. These need to be holistic, joined up to the mainstream of public policy, and rooted in the local context and embed the cultural factor in planning, development, education regeneration, inward investment and preservation. (Colin Mercer, UK-based Cultural Planner)**

This is the context from which Cultural Planning has emerged over the past fifteen years in North America, Australia and Europe, mainly as a methodology for dealing with the socio-economic changes mentioned earlier.

### **III. What Is Cultural Planning?**

In moving towards a definition it is important to point out that:

**Cultural Planning is not the 'planning of culture', but a culturally sensitive, understanding of urban planning and policy, and while cultural policies have a sectoral focus (e.g. the arts) Cultural Planning has a broader remit including a territorial and developmental remit.**

Unlike traditional cultural policies – which are still mainly based on aesthetic definitions of 'culture' as 'art' – Cultural Planning adopts as its basis a broad definition of 'cultural resources'.

**There is more to culture than just an aesthetic component. In particular, when we talk about Cultural Planning we are starting from a perspective of a very broad, anthropological understanding of 'culture' as 'a way of life'.**

The main purpose of adopting this new way of thinking is to see how the 'distinctive' pool of local cultural resources can contribute to the integrated development of a place, whether a neighbourhood, a city or a region. This definition of cultural resources is a pragmatic one and while it includes the arts, it also includes urban design, the leisure and entertainment infrastructure of a place; its history and heritage, and all the creative activity that feeds the contemporary cultural industries.

**Cultural Planning gives culture a high value, and uses it to influence all policy portfolios cutting across traditional divisions between the public, private and voluntary sectors, government departments and different professional specialisations.**

This means that by linking the unique and distinctive cultural features of a place to other aspects of economic and social life, Cultural Planning can be instrumental in creating development opportunities for the whole of the local community. In this way, for example,

the Scottish Executive's focus on citizens, outcomes and entitlements could find its embodiment in integrated policy solutions which respect local needs, aspirations and potential on the ground.

Cultural Planning derives from a tradition of radical planning and humanistic management of cities championed in the early 1960s, chiefly by urbanist Jane Jacobs. Cities are our own artefacts, argued Jacobs, and the trouble with dealing with them is that planners and policy-makers can only contemplate a city's uses one at a time, by categories. Jacobs saw the city as an ecosystem composed of physical-economic-ethical processes interacting with each other in a natural flow which connected to create the unique cultural ecology of a place.

In her thinking, Jacobs implicitly acknowledged her debt to the Scottish biologist and philosopher Patrick Geddes, who, at the beginning of the 20th century, imported from French geography the idea of the 'natural region'. For Geddes, policy had to start with a survey of the resources of such natural region (whose ingredients were Folk-Work-Place) and of the human response to such a natural region. Thus, the idea of a territory as a living ecosystem, made up of diverse resources which need to be surveyed and acknowledged by the local community at large before policy can intervene, is at heart of Cultural Planning.

**In moving away from a narrow definition of culture as art, and in putting cultural resources at its centre – compared to traditional cultural policies – Cultural Planning is intrinsically more democratic, more conscious of the realities of cultural diversity and more aware of the intangible features of cultural heritage and patrimony.**

The notion of Cultural Planning, widely applied in both the USA (since the 1970s) and Australia (since the mid-1980s), is fast gaining ground also among European policy-makers. Whereas in the USA precedents of the concept can be traced back to the civic programmes of the New Deal and to the strong tradition of neighbourhood-based community arts centres, in Australia applications of the concept can be related to the community cultural development of the 1980s, and to the local autonomy lent by the federal systems of government to local agencies, which could then run independent cultural development programmes.

In Europe, following a period where aesthetic definitions of culture prevailed and policies for the arts were rarely co-ordinated with other policies, Cultural Planning is now increasingly being used to deal with regeneration and economic development programmes, with a focus on citizenship and inclusion.

### **III.1 Cultural Planning – The Ingredients**

The cultural identity of a community comprises who the people are; and their backgrounds, tastes, rituals, experiences, diversity, talents and aspirations for the future. The cultural richness of a place is also governed by local heritage attributes and the natural and built qualities that attracted residents to the area. Cultural Planning demands a recognition of the distinctive resources of a place in the first instance and then the development of policies rooted in those resources.

Key to the Cultural Planning method are two characteristics: cultural and community mapping, and strategy building.

- **Mapping** A pre-condition for identifying, harnessing and then exploiting potential is to conduct a wide-ranging audit (or mapping) of possibilities based on exploring the distinctive cultural assets of a place. Cultural mapping is a technique that can be used to define a community's cultural activities, capacities and needs. Such broad spectrum mapping of the local culture can provide vital information to the policy-makers about the best way to respond more effectively to local needs while maximizing opportunities. Knowledge of a community's cultural profile is also useful in advocating for change: it can inform policy development, attract funding and resources, and be instrumental in the adoption of new approaches.

Supporting and connecting those resources with cross-departmental and cross-sector collaboration is also an important part of any cultural plan. This connects with the second key ingredient of Cultural Planning:

- **Strategy Building** Potential resources need to be placed in a framework where catalyst actions are identified. Places that successfully conduct cultural mappings must also have a clear vision of what they want to achieve, who is leading the process, and why and for whom this process has been set in motion.

#### **IV. Cultural Planning – A Review of Current Applications**

##### **Australia**

Australia may be the only country in the world that has a central government authority with a declared responsibility for the support of Cultural Community Development (also known as Cultural Planning) along with a network of independent State-based (and state-supported) organisations with a similar function (the community arts networks).

**The Community Cultural Development Board** of the Australia Council (now undergoing restructuring) provides funds, infrastructure and other support for companies and individuals involved in a wide range of community cultural development activities. In particular, Cultural Planning research and practice is supported at Federal, state and local levels, through a range of government agencies, statutory authorities, and through a series of interlinked networks, including Queensland Community Arts Network, Community Arts Network South Australia, and Community Cultural Development NSW. These organisations represent literally hundreds of companies and individuals, and projects providing evidence of the effectiveness of the Cultural Planning approach on the ground.

In Australia, Cultural Planning is understood as a way to ensure that the values people hold for the place where they live are protected and reflected in the way government plans, approves and provides infrastructure and services. Key moments for implementation in the Australian context have been: a) the 1990 Brisbane Cultural Development Strategy, which first outlined the logic behind Cultural Planning and guaranteed a wide circulation of the model among policy-makers keen to develop a framework for the strategic development of their community's culture; b) the Joondalup Cultural Plan (1992), which was the first time the principles had been applied to a newly built greenfield city development; c) the endorsement in 1993 by three levels of government of the policy framework Cultural Development in South East Queensland; and, d) the publication by Arts Queensland and the Australia Council of the *Cultural Planning Handbook*, compiled by David Grogan and Colin Mercer with David Engwicht.

Brisbane's Cultural Development Strategy is particularly relevant as it constituted the first attempt to develop a truly culturally inclusive framework for the city. In this document, local stakeholders stated a set of principles on which to base an effective policy. One of these principles is that, to assure cultural pluralism, it is essential that cultural planners understand what different segments comprise the community, conduct discussions and carry out research with each group, and include representations from each group on boards, committees and in the evaluation process.

As mentioned earlier, evidence and awareness of the benefits of community Cultural Planning may be due to an historically consolidated attitude among policy-makers to see culture as already joined up with all aspects of the local social and community agendas. This broader understanding of culture, coupled with a certain level of autonomy lent by the federal system to local agencies is allowing Australian cultural planners to experiment with community plans which could set an example for Scotland too.

## North America

During the past 20 years, **Partners for Livable Communities** – a non-profit organisation working locally to promote quality of life, economic development and social equity – has provided new thinking about cultural policy which moves away from the compensatory logic of community arts programmes. It has also addressed issues of access, equity and participation within the framework of more general objectives for social and economic development.

Back in 1992, Robert McNulty, the director of the Partners organisation, published *Culture and Communities: the Arts in the Life of American Cities*, a collection of case studies focusing on cities and towns representing a cross-section of life in the USA. The overall aim of the research was to place the arts and culture in the broader context of community development, building on their economic role, and expanding that role to include other social and community concerns. By using some examples of implementation of Cultural

Planning strategies, the report considered the way in which more and more communities in the USA were using the arts as a means of fostering community pride and cultural identity.

Cultural Planning applications demand a concerted effort supported by partnerships and, at present, Partners tend to work on small-scale initiatives rooted in geographically contained urban zones. The explanation given by Partners to this departure from their original approach (much broader in scope) is that in areas of great deprivation (such as in contemporary American cities) the need to show immediate improvements is such that there is often no time to set up large partnerships, capable of operating outside the boundaries of the local. The implication here is that strategic neighbourhood cultural action plans – if coupled with adequate funding – can really make an immediate difference across a whole spectrum of social agendas.

Partners are not the only organisation working within the USA around issues of community Cultural Planning. The **National Endowment for the Arts** (the nation's largest annual funder for arts) has recently developed the 'Lessons Learned Toolsite', a web-based resource aimed at fostering exchange of information about community Cultural Planning implementation across the country (<http://www.nea.gov/resources/Lessons>). A cursory scanning of this resource, however, reveals that fully-fledged cultural plans at municipal, county, or regional level are less common than those developed at neighbourhood level (with the exception of ArtsPlan Portland, OR). Before we draw conclusions about the link between geographical delimitations and the effectiveness of Cultural Planning, we need to look at other evidence from elsewhere – and the place to go for examples of strategic thinking about community Cultural Planning at city, or regional, level is the UK.

#### **IV.1 UK Cultural Strategies and Examples of Cultural Planning Implementation**

As one of the countries to experiment extensively during the 1980s with culture-led revitalisation, the UK has continued to research, over the past decade, integrated policies designed to strengthen the quality of life for local communities. In particular, the present Labour government is committed to encouraging local authorities to develop Cultural Strategies aimed at a greater degree of integration of all cultural services. The political process begun in June 1999 when the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) published the document: "Local Cultural Strategies: Draft Guidance for Local Authorities in England", in which all local authorities were called on to develop a cultural strategy by the year 2002. Although not a statutory duty, local Cultural Strategy development was strongly encouraged by the government and the adoption of a strategy became part of performance review for local authorities under the Best Value National Performance Indicator BV 114.

This recommendation was an attempt to encourage local authorities to formalise and promote the strategic development of their cultural and culture-related services, in the context of a broad definition of culture and the recognition of partnership working within localities, regions, and sub-regions in which local authorities take the lead. This was also reflective of the advocacy of a Cultural Planning approach by central government for local government. In particular, DCMS policy intended cultural strategies to be both a way of

enhancing the impact of local government services and a tool for increasing participation in democracy.

**In the DCMS's words, "We believe 'culture' emphasises both the inclusiveness of the Strategy and the need to think and act beyond traditional boundaries, departments and delivery mechanisms. What matters is that the overarching aim of promoting the cultural well-being of the area is achieved." (DCMS: 2000: 2.4)**

However, three years into the development of cultural strategies it is easy to see how far removed from a true democratic and integrated cultural development these are. Without wishing to be dismissive of the innovative work carried out by civic leaders in some cities, it is apparent that in most cases cultural strategies have resulted in bland statements of intent with little scope for implementation.

A number of issues have emerged from cultural strategies pilots, and these mostly focus on the obstacles encountered by the many different mechanisms set up to deliver the broad DCMS cultural agenda (for example Local Strategic Partnerships). In particular, the problem seems to be that local political culture is frequently too weak to be able to offer a solid ground for strategic/joined-up thinking. Thus the partnership organisations designed to bridge the gaps between sectors of the local authorities and community constituents lack the experience and the time to develop shared learning before being expected to deliver. In addition, the fact that Cultural Strategies were not 'statutory' has been interpreted by some Local Strategic Partnerships as a sign of the 'peripheral' role of culture in community development and regeneration.

However, more recently, these considerations have led to a radical reassessment by the DCMS of Cultural Strategies and to the issuing of a set of new guidelines linking Cultural and Community Strategies (DCMS: Leading the Good Life, 2004). There are a number of reasons why it is beneficial to merge Cultural and Community Strategies together.

Both Strategies have at their core the intention of improving the quality of life of local people; and both are intended to be shaped and determined by local needs and aspirations. Both are based on an inclusive approach to local improvements, actively seeking to broaden opportunities for all sections of the community. They are both concerned with fostering social capital and both see culture as key in developing a sense of place and local identity and in strengthening community pride and bonds between individuals and groups. In addition, cultural programmes can deliver benefits, such as, for instance: enhanced employability, or wider community and democratic engagement in projects which improve the local environment. In being able to access spending earmarked for community development and by contributing to local regeneration initiatives, culture (and cultural services) may also be able to tap into new sources of funding, such as, for example, the NRF programmes.

At last, at the end of six years of debate about the role of culture in local community development, England is facing a new round of strategic implementation, this time via new cultural/community partnership hybrids tied to 'statutory' requirements. Though it is too early to offer definitive conclusions, there is a feeling among seasoned cultural planners that this new round of Strategies could throw-up the same old tension between a push to deliver against targets (set at national level) and the pull of local specificity and potential. In particular, the present guidelines for merging Cultural and Community Strategies do not

pay enough attention to the need to map community potential on the ground (cultural or otherwise) before setting priorities for actions.

In Cultural Planning, by contrast, the process of stocktaking of assets, developing a vision, partnership working, and community consultation all combine to ensure that a clear vision is established about the quality of life of a particular area. Through this democratic process, the unique assets of an area, including the local communities, are combined in a shared vision, and allow for the establishment of a meaningful sense of place.

However, this scenario of 'top down policy versus bottom up implementation' is not as stark as it seems at first glance, and there are interesting examples across the UK of places that have pioneered integrated cultural community developments before and outside the existing policy scenario. One such place is Bristol.

**Bristol** is the leading city in the South West of England and a centre of excellence in aerospace, education, financial services, media, new technology, arts and culture. Today the city is a major player in the European urban arena. At the heart of all this has been the promotion of a better quality of life for all. Sustainability is a key principle in the city's transport and business sectors, and arts and culture are used both to redefine the identity of Bristol for its inhabitants and to attract visitors. Central to this success has been the decade-long partnership working practice between public, private and voluntary sectors, of which the **Cultural Development Partnership (BCDP)** is one.

Inspired by the Cultural Planning approach, the Bristol Cultural Development Partnership (BCDP) was set up in 1993. Bristol City Council, the Bristol Chamber of Commerce, local cultural organisations such as South West Arts, the University and local entrepreneurs came together to create and implement a medium to long term strategy for the improvement of the quality of life in the city. The early 1990s were a difficult time for Bristol, with urban dereliction, poverty and social exclusion dominating the political agenda. Moreover, due to internal political divisions, the local Council had been until then unable to play a leading role in encouraging policy initiatives or strategy development. So when the idea of the Partnership was put on the table by the Chamber of Commerce, the Council had no choice but to become a partner.

Since then, the BCDP has been influential in brokering the development of a series of ground-breaking projects, such as the annual short-film festival *Brief Encounters*, the creation of the Watershed Media Centre, and the Arnolfini contemporary art gallery, which has played a major role in the development of the Harbour-side area. The Partnership continues to deliver projects (ranging from Bristol 2008 to the Legible City public art strategy), to smaller neighbourhood initiatives focusing on cultural diversity and cohesion.

The lesson to be learned from Bristol is that 'organic' partnerships such as the BCDP can sometimes achieve better results than policy-led mechanisms because 'organic'

partnerships often start from the local (from a cultural mapping in the case of Bristol) and with a specific issue they want to tackle. This local focus (and knowledge) ensures support from key local stakeholders and communities alike, and gives partnerships the freedom and flexibility to implement actions in the way they want, and with the partners they chose to work with. In both the UK and outside there are other examples of similar 'ad hoc' partnerships implemented at both city and neighbourhood level.

## Europe

**Antwerp** has recognized its wealth of creators in fashion by making this a central plank of its cultural policy and in 2001 initiated a 5 month programme which combined both artistic and commercial initiatives (Modeland 2001) and celebrated the city's fashion talent in a variety of ways. Since then the initiative has been repeated bi-annually putting Antwerp on the 'cool destination' map. The support strategy for the fashion sector was not conceived in isolation but gained strength from the 'image' legacy of Antwerp Capital of Culture (1993).

In this case, the process of setting up the Partnership to deliver the Capital of Culture events was the testing ground for thinking more strategically about the cultural potential of the city through a compilation of a community profile. Other examples of implementation of holistic developments through flexible, ad hoc partnerships are: Barcelona, Lille, Goteborg, Rotterdam.

In the European context there are good examples of implementation at neighbourhood level. The two examples selected below show how in the absence of national policies (or guidelines) for using culture in regeneration, European funding has been instrumental in creating the conditions for effective partnership working on the ground. In these two cases, the partnerships originally created for accessing European regeneration funding and delivering outputs have acted as a learning device for the stakeholders involved, with the result that, today, those partnerships have been formalised and accepted as strategic mechanisms that continue to work cross-sectorally on other projects.

The **Living, Not Leaving** project developed in Turin, Italy within the European Urban Pilot Projects Programme is an example of how cultural planning thinking can help in turning 'issues' related to cultural diversity into a potential for economic integration. The project is focused on interventions aimed at the revitalisation of the run-down district of San Salvario through initiatives managed by immigrants, youth and women resident in the area. Issues of crime, safety, housing and community empowerment have been tackled under the umbrella of community renewal, but the improved access of the immigrant communities to the economic life of the city has been a priority for the project from the beginning.

As a result of developing this project, Turin Council has set up a strategic unit to deal with issues of neighbourhoods' social exclusion and economic development and San Salvario is today a thriving, exciting space where ethnic traders have a licence to sell not only original craft artefacts, but also new types of products, such as 'fusion music' records.

Another example of a neighbourhood project aimed at community regeneration is that of Randers, Denmark. Here too culture has been used as a catalyst to create more inclusive urban renewal strategies, this time aimed at immigrant communities.

**Underværket** is an European Urban Pilot project combining city renewal with cultural activities, education, space for workshops, and housing specifically designed for young people.

Starting in the early 90s, the project has undertaken the redevelopment of a vast derelict area near the city centre. The overall aim of the project is to allow both ethnic minorities (32% of the population in Randers) and local youth to achieve a stronger presence on the labour market as a base for further integration. The Underværket initiative is managed by a partnership with a board of directors, which includes representatives elected by the City Council of Randers, the County Council of Aarhus, Randers Tourist Association, Randers Association of City Traders and the Randers Chamber of Commerce and Development.

In the absence of any national framework to foster joined-up thinking, the Underværket constitutes the first example in Denmark of innovative ways of delivering inclusion and urban development through culture.

## **V. Towards Cultural Planning in Scotland – Context and Potential**

### **V.1 Examples of Implementation**

Having reviewed the Cultural Planning approach in both its definitions and applications, this section of the report will discuss the potential benefits that the implementation of Cultural Planning-type strategies could bring to Scottish communities. However, as a way into the discussion, there are two related questions we need to ask. The first is: are there existing examples of implementation in Scotland? Then – given that the Cultural Commission report includes a whole section devoted to the discussion of Cultural Planning (Section 8.5) and that there is now a mechanism (unique to Scotland), called the National Cultural Planning Steering Group, that deals with advice, evidence-gathering and advocacy for the model – is the Executive prepared to back implementation of Cultural Planning-based strategies with adequate policy and funding support? If yes, from which branch of the Executive should the policy initiative in favour of Cultural Planning come from? (for example, from culture, or community development, or both?)

Overall, the implementations present at various levels (neighbourhood initiatives, community mechanisms and strategic plans) in Scotland show an interpretation of Cultural Planning mainly as a tool in community development (similar to the Australian and North American cases) with examples of artists' organisations and networks acting as catalysts between community needs and delivery agencies. In particular,

**Fablevision** is a Glasgow based artists' organisation comprising members professionally trained in Cultural Planning delivery. Fablevision has been active in the community arts sector for a number of years, but over the past three years the organisation's focus has been mainly on the application of Cultural Planning in Scotland.

In particular, Fablevision has been influential in developing a number of neighbourhood projects across Glasgow (and outside) within a programme of action called Creative Communities. The philosophy of Fablevision is that the arts are inextricably joined-up with local place development, education, life-long learning and community planning and can have wider impacts than traditional community schemes in those areas in need of regeneration.

Fablevision's work in encouraging culturally focused cross-sector partnerships in Glasgow was one source of inspiration for the Cultural Commission in the formulation of recommendations concerning the adoption of Cultural Planning Partnerships by Local Authorities. Fablevision was also instrumental in the implementation of a very successful example of community regeneration in Royston, Glasgow. Here there are now eight cultural enterprises developing their own income, but cultural activity in isolation would not have produced these results, and one of the vital ingredients of the Royston success was

the encouragement of culturally focused cross-sectoral partnership working. This has led to a sharing of learning across the disciplines with support (financial and in kind) from both the public and private sectors. The **Royston** example ([www.roystonroadproject.org](http://www.roystonroadproject.org)) has been used as evidence of the success of culture-led regeneration within European networks such as, for example, Banlieues d'Europe.

Scotland also offers examples of the implementation of Cultural Planning through established partnerships set up within the broader Social Justice heading of community development. The Edinburgh Capital City Partnership, for example, is a cross mechanism which includes key statutory, voluntary and community agencies working together to promote social inclusion and achieve social justice for the people of Edinburgh. Recently, the Partnership has launched the scheme featured below, which is aimed at providing creative and sustainable solutions to overcome social exclusion and to promote joined up governance in the city.

**The Edinburgh Arts & Social Inclusion Project**, based at the Capital City Partnership) has been working over the past three years to investigate how community based arts organisations can work in partnership across the city and with others, to make local sense of, and act as delivery agents for, national policies; advocate a Cultural Planning approach for area regeneration; and develop the cultural elements of the Partnership's community planning Regeneration Outcome Agreement 2005-2008.

These examples show that in Scotland at present there is a great deal of experimentation taking place at various levels of the community planning and regeneration agenda, with organisations working very effectively with cultural mapping and planning tools. However, there is much more happening on the ground, through both formal and informal partnerships, which needs to be brought to light.

For example, outside the main cities and in a rural context, the work of **The Shetland Arts Trust** over the last couple of decades has ensured a Cultural Planning approach which places cultural development in a key position – allowing it to impact on economic regeneration, tourism, planning, education and other key components of community development. In addition, since 2004, **The Highlands and Islands Enterprise** has developed a Community Cultural Strategy centred on the four key priorities of : strengthening communities, developing skills, growing business, making global connections. This is a very advanced and totally integrated (into the economic and community development priorities) approach to the use of both culture and the creative industries for the benefit of the area. This strategy was developed with the assistance of **Hi-Arts**, an organisation which for many years has worked in collaboration with the Highlands and Islands Enterprise and the Scottish Arts Council to deliver arts programmes throughout the Highlands and Islands.

As it is the case in Europe, in Scotland too there are examples of city-wide strategic plans. These tend to be 'ad hoc', integrated actions (with a cultural component) aimed at tackling specific problems. A key example in Scotland is Dundee. Over the past ten years the city has undergone a number of innovative regeneration plans (at both urban and community level) which have contributed to the improvement of the image of the Dundee among outside investors, visitors and residents alike. Key to this change has been the implementation of cross-sector work chiefly through the **Dundee Partnership**. This is an umbrella organisation co-ordinated by the City Council and representing all major local stakeholders involved in economic and social development. As the success of the Dundee Contemporary Arts, The Dundee Rep, The Sensation Science Centre shows, culture features highly in the partnership's priorities, and plays a major role in supporting this new image of Dundee.

In particular, evidence of cross-sector, joined up thinking in Dundee is present in the way culture is now pursued under the Work and Enterprise theme of the Community Plan. Dundee is possibly the only example in Scotland that is comparable to Bristol. Both cities started off with the need to tackle a problem (city image) and both have responded successfully with a strategic and innovative approach which puts culture at the centre. Both are examples of how successful flexible, ad hoc, cross-sector partnerships, rooted in the local context, can be.

Another interesting example of a partnership (albeit with a narrower focus on the arts) is the **Aberdeenshire Arts Partnership**. This is a body set up to oversee the implementation and monitoring of the Arts Strategy and to examine opportunities for further improvements of arts development in the North East, including partnerships with other regional and national bodies. The Aberdeenshire Partnership is interesting because it provides a mechanism through which public, private, professional and voluntary sector organisations are working together across departments and disciplines to create a solid infrastructure for the arts to flourish. This is the ground on which to build the future Cultural Strategy.

## **V.2 Local Cultural Strategies**

The St Andrews Day speech was a turning point which helped to launch the National Cultural Strategy (along with the Guidelines for local authorities to implement Cultural Strategies), the Policy Statement and, more recently, the work of the Cultural Commission. At the heart of these policy statements and debates is the recognition by the Executive of a broad definition of culture as joined-up to the social agenda. Political recognition of a broader definition of culture has played a key role in encouraging the implementation of some of the initiatives mentioned below, as well as in raising awareness at local authority level of the contribution of cultural provisions to cross-cutting issues and community planning.

Until now, however, this 'national' awareness has been backed by policy frameworks which somewhat lack the strength of conviction as regards putting the cultural factor into the practice of local delivery. A case in point is that of the Guidance issued in 2003 to local authorities for the development of Cultural Strategies. Although the Guidelines recognise the importance of the connection between cultural provision and community planning, and the importance of partnership work, guidance for implementation is only given on an advisory basis. In other words, local authorities were given advice on how to manage

cultural provision within their existing authority-wide resources and in the context of Best Value, but were not 'obliged' to deliver outside these targets.

This familiar (DCMS guidelines 1999) 'non prescriptive' approach to culture can send out the wrong message to those in charge of implementing on the ground. In Scotland in particular – where local authorities were encouraged to make full use of community planning and appropriate forms of partnership to maximise opportunities for developing cultural provision – the situation has become even more confused, with various agencies duplicating each other on the delivery of community targets, while leaving cultural services in a limbo. The result is that, in the absence of clear policy statements, not many local authorities have gone down the road of implementing cultural strategies, choosing instead to back culture-based initiatives within community development plans.

There are exceptions and one such case is Glasgow. The city has just launched a cultural strategy document which sets out a number of priorities, including a rebalancing of existing culture-led regeneration plans (e.g. actions not just in the city centre but also in the East End and North Glasgow), the restructuring of Council Services (to tackle duplication) and the development of a number of actions aimed at supporting community development.

Since 1990 (Capital of Culture) Glasgow has a history of using culture for a successful implementation of joined-up initiatives. It could be argued that it is precisely this 'historic' ability to use culture to tackle issues of image, competitiveness and community cohesion that has allowed the city to adapt the national guidelines to its advantage. But this is only part of the explanation, for there is also another element which is quite relevant here: the existence in Glasgow of a number of community-based initiatives, which, over the years, have been implementing culture-based projects on the ground. This 'informal' activity (see examples below) constitutes a reservoir of practical evidence which the city is only now beginning to acknowledge and bring to the table of policy-making.

The question is: what about those cities and localities that do not enjoy the same benefit of experience? **The Executive could consider think about collecting and disseminating evidence already existing on the ground of the benefits culture brings to communities?**

**Also, given the examples presented earlier of Cultural Strategies in England finally merging with Community Plans, why is Scotland apparently 'reinventing the wheel' by issuing Cultural Strategies guidelines in isolation from community planning when we know that Community Plans have a 'mandatory' duty to deliver and can deliver on culture too?**

The point of Cultural Planning is precisely that of providing a framework in which culture and community planning can act together to improve the quality of life of people, provide better response to local needs, broaden opportunities and gain social cohesion. So while emerging Community Planning Partnerships in Scotland are grappling with issues of how to engage meaningfully with local people and develop community leadership, Cultural Planning offers the potential of participatory opportunities combined with long-term strategic thinking.

## **VI. The State of Play**

An analysis of the Cultural Commission report provides much food for thought. In particular, section 8.5 of the report highlights the benefits of adopting a Cultural Planning approach to local development.

Section 8.5 addresses Cultural Planning, particularly in terms of the roles and responsibilities of Local Authorities towards implementation at local level, but also the role and potential of the voluntary and private sectors to assist in cultural planning. It also considers new technologies and how they may assist in implementing successful Cultural Planning, particularly in terms of engagement and access. The possibility of a cultural think tank, at a national level, to gather information and evidence of practice is also considered.

The Cultural Planning approach supported here rests on the importance (and uniqueness) of the local. This extends beyond thinking about distinctive local assets, and moves to an understanding of the importance of local environments to local communities, (and local economies), as well as the idea of culture's importance to place making.

The view of Cultural Planning expressed in the report continues to stress that it is not about delivering culture, rather recognising the importance of culture in cross-sectoral strategic local development. The key to this lies in partnership working, and the report makes clear that local authorities will not have ultimate responsibility for decision-making and provision in this area. Partnership working in this context may be seen as a 'separation of cultural powers', facilitating the input from the private (and voluntary sectors) whilst limiting the role (and presumably costs) of Local Authority involvement (although LA's will continue to be key players in the proposed Cultural Planning system as recommendation 59 elsewhere in the report makes clear).<sup>1</sup>

The importance of Scotland's voluntary sector is highlighted as a key asset in implementation of cultural planning. Indeed, arts, sports and cultural voluntary organisations make up 40% of all third sector organisations. This is clearly useful to the establishment of Cultural Partnerships to ensure delivery of the planning process, particularly at a local level. Whilst there may be concerns expressed about the adequacy of this sector's administrative ability, as well as operational issues, this sector still presents a strong resource at grass roots level.

According to the report, the role of the private sector in Cultural Planning initially rests on the financial promise of sponsorship and funding. However, the limits of this assumption are also examined. Rather than direct sponsorship, a more 'hands-on' approach to the private sector is discussed, and ideas such as skill-share, and knowledge transfer from the private to other sectors (and back), may well be more suitable to a long-term partnership for culture than one-off sponsorship and investment. Education providers can play a key role here too. Indeed the approach of Arts & Business Scotland, of 'skills exchangers, board placement, creative partnerships,' as well as sponsorship should be recommended.<sup>2</sup> The SODEC model that impressed the authors fits in well with these ideas.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Recommendation 59 states: "Local Authorities should take the lead in establishing and servicing Cultural Planning Partnerships which include the voluntary, private and public sector".

<sup>2</sup> Section 8. p 183

<sup>3</sup> Ibid p 185

Section 8.5 on Cultural Planning also discusses the Creative Industries and the role and potential of IT in relation to Cultural Planning. The idea of digital cultural access mentioned in the report is important, and the benefits that are cited – from social inclusion, enhanced education provision, and support for tourism, are sound.<sup>4</sup> However, although the benefits of a digital approach to the implementation of Cultural Planning are extremely important, there is no mention here of “the digital divide”, and no recognition that for many these technologies are not being taken up, for reasons of cost and skills amongst others. However, the emphasis placed on the capacity of these technologies to assist in the Cultural Planning agenda is not misplaced. Innovations, such as the National Repository and Cultural Resource Archive, should be applauded. If this approach was adopted, not only to the digital production of culture, but also to its consumption, with such initiatives as broadband access for all, it would be even more successful.

Finally the idea of establishing a cultural think tank (or some kind of national or regional observatory) would indeed greatly assist in the monitoring and collecting of the data needed for the Cultural Planning approach to develop. In fact, one weakness of this document lies in the lack of attention paid to the necessity of gathering relevant cultural data, and of its monitoring, to the successful implementation of Cultural Planning.

## **Comments**

In the Commission’s report Cultural Planning occupies a key space as a new approach to a broader understanding of the value of culture, but also as a mechanism for delivering entitlements at local level. The problem with the report, however, is that it makes contradictory statements about whose responsibility it is to practically deliver on the ground. For example, the recommendation to set up **Cultural Planning Partnerships** is supported by a statement which expressively calls for local authorities to take the lead in ‘establishing’ and ‘servicing’ those cross-sector partnerships. This would make sense, given the local mandate for provision and decision-making that local authorities already have.

However, elsewhere, the report makes clear that – given the inadequate cultural provision and lack of status that culture has among some local authorities – the entire responsibility for decision-making (regarding Cultural Planning Partnerships) should not rest on local authorities alone, but should be shared within members of the partnerships.

### **So, if it is not the local authorities, who else should take the lead in setting up Cultural Planning Partnerships?**

The statements summarised above raise a number of issues, and show the complexity such a method poses in terms of implementation. At its simplest, Cultural Planning considers the role of culture in resolving broader community needs. Thus Cultural Planning is not the planning of culture (although cultural provision stocktaking may be part of it) but a process that finds the relationships between people and the way they live (culture) and uses that knowledge to inform the development of a community. In this way, culture is inextricably linked to community assessment and development.

This is where the report gets it right, and more precisely when it recommends that community planning be adopted as the ‘operational cornerstone’ for the delivery of culture

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid p 202

locally and nationally. The suggestion here is that there should be a strong linkage between the cultural and the community regeneration agendas, and in Scotland (at least in theory) the ground is ready for this link to be made.

The Scottish executive has identified its Community Planning policy as the main tool for addressing the regeneration of Scotland's disadvantaged communities. Its agency, Communities Scotland, is overseeing the process of local authorities developing Community Plans. These are intended to:

- ensure that local services are responsive to the needs and circumstances of the communities and individuals rather than the service providers
- ensure that the key service providers act in a co-ordinated fashion
- ensure that the community are meaningfully involved in the service development and delivery process.

Local Authorities have been given the lead role in establishing and facilitating the Community Planning Partnerships which will produce the Community Plans. In doing so they must ensure that key players, including the police, health services, community education institutions and the relevant community stakeholders, are part of the partnership process. The question at this point is:

**Could Cultural Planning Partnerships be the mechanisms in charge of the delivery of Community and Cultural Plans combined together? If yes, should the local authorities take the lead in setting up such partnerships?**

**Given that Scotland has both extensive experience of developing community plans and evidence on the ground of successful community cultural plans, it is reasonable to believe that the ground is ready for making a smart move at the highest level (the Executive) and now issue guidelines for the development of Community Cultural Planning Strategies, and for the piloting of related partnerships.**

## **VII. Feedback from the Consultation**

As mentioned earlier, this document was compiled through a mix of desk research and consultation with key stakeholders. Questions of implementation (along with discussion of the merits of Cultural Planning) occupied a large part of the debate. Feedback is presented under a series of headings organised in order of importance.

### **Community Planning and Cultural Planning**

Most respondents recognise that there is a need for merging cultural and community plans. The Cultural Commission report makes the argument for culture as an integral part of local development but deals only marginally with practical implementation. Most respondents accept that Scotland has been pioneering interesting models of Cultural Community Planning for some years, linking opportunities and need.

However, evidence on the ground suggests that in the absence of National Guidelines on how to merge Cultural and Community plans, it is difficult for both local authorities and community planning stakeholders to join up and achieve the best results.

Related to this, is the question of which part of the Executive should deal with joint cultural and community mechanisms? In England it was the DCMS that dealt with the new guidelines, and some respondents have suggested that in Scotland there should be a dedicated Culture Minister (with a Deputy in charge of Sport or Tourism) in charge of this task. However, the problem with this suggestion is that to avoid the fragmentation (and ghettoisation of culture), the Culture Minister will have to work closely with the Community Minister and with the arm of the Executive in charge of Regeneration. The point made here is that, first and foremost, joined-up thinking needs to take place at Executive level.

### **Need for National Guidance**

In relation to Cultural Planning Partnerships and Strategies, most respondents recognise that there is a need for clear National Guidelines to help local actors in preparing such strategic frameworks. Guidelines should also act as a safeguard and as a quality assurance in relation to the Cultural Planning approach and its expected outcomes. Some respondents suggested that current ROAs (Regeneration Outcome Agreements) may constitute a model of practice for such Guidelines.

At present each local authority is obliged to produce (in co operation with their Community Planning partners, including relevant geographical and thematic community representatives) ROAs which specify what the regeneration needs are, how they will be addressed, by whom, with what resources, over what timescale, and – crucially – how the community will be involved in the planning and review of the delivery process. The point here is that, in view of the merging of Cultural and Community Strategies, such a method could also be applied to the definition of cultural needs and aspirations at the local level. This would guarantee accountability, transparency and efficiency of delivery.

## **On the Cultural Planning Method**

Most respondents recognise the potential of such approach and point out that Cultural Planning offers a way of working with communities which can give back a sense of cultural pride and ownership. In addition they also point out that it can be instrumental in fostering meaningful involvement in mapping cultural resources, and that it can support social capital, civic participation and volunteering. However, most respondents recognise that Cultural Planning needs to be explicit in the community planning process. In particular, they see a role for culture in building stronger communities, health care, community safety, working and learning and the environment.

There is a need for a democratic 'bottom up' approach which is integrated in community planning and not just as an 'add on'. However, this will not work unless the local authority stakeholders are encouraged to find out what culture and the arts can offer in achieving results. All planning partners need to listen to community needs and priorities, and this is why Cultural Planning is useful as a framework.

Some respondents reason in the following way: community planning could take on and mainstream Cultural Planning, but it is not certain whether Cultural Planning can deal with sustainability and creating equal opportunities. On the other hand, if separated from the overall community planning process, Cultural Planning could be perceived as selective (elitist), with the risk of becoming more detached from communities. Cultural Planning can only work if it facilitates something organic and creative. However, creativity and organic change are difficult to reconcile within the kind of planning mechanisms currently available in Scotland. Strategically, there must be a commitment to spend money and time at local level, but also there is a need (at local level) to nurture people who can take responsibility for such arts-led cultural processes.

Cultural Planning can bring fun, real participation, and all the excitement of creativity, but it can be unpredictable and as such it demands a more open and less risk-averse attitude from policy-makers. Culture isn't fixed in time and cultural planning policy-makers need to be aware of all aspects of culture, including the contemporary.

Related to this is the question of the role that artists play in the delivery of Cultural Planning. A key ingredient in the examples mentioned throughout this document is the part played by artists in facilitating the process of problem-solving, and in delivering innovative ways of ensuring community involvement and participation. However, to be effective, Cultural Plans need to have artists involved from the start, and the quality of both process and product needs to be maintained throughout.

Respondents also debated the question of how far culture and the arts should be instrumentalised to other goals of government, such as economic development, urban regeneration, promotion of tourism, social inclusion, community development, education, health care etc – and how far they should be funded for their own sake. The general view was that it was self-evident that the arts could deliver in all of these areas, and had done so in the past. However, artists also need to be supported in developing their own creativity in imaginative, experimental and non-utilitarian directions. Thus Cultural Planning should not neglect the support and development of a key local resource: that of the arts infrastructure.

## **Training**

The issue of training was also raised by some respondents. In particular, if Cultural Planning is adopted at national level, there needs to be provision made for training those that will be tasked with the delivery of strategies on the ground. Planners, community workers, urban designers, but also officers and people at key levels of the organisations involved, need to gain a deeper understanding of cross-sector work. Community workers, for example, could receive training in dealing with community education, lifelong learning and capacity building. Planners could learn to become more open and creative in the way they think about the build environment and the sustainability of urban schemes. Similarly, housing managers could learn to think more holistically about the quality of life of residents. Artists could play a major role in ensuring the creativity and innovative aspects of Cultural Planning-associated training schemes.

## **Evidence Gathering**

Most respondents highlighted the need to have a mechanism for collecting, producing and disseminating the evidence of the practice of Cultural Planning. This is an issue also raised in the Commission's report, and in particular, the possibility of establishing a cultural think tank (an observatory) at a national level to gather information and evidence of practice is considered. This would greatly assist in the monitoring and collecting of the data needed for the Cultural Planning approach to develop. However, given that the National Cultural Planning Steering Group already exists (albeit on a voluntary basis) for the purpose of generating debate and exchange of information about Cultural Planning, it would make sense to 'formally' (Executive decision and funding) give this Group the task to test out the feasibility of piloting such an observatory in collaboration with a Scottish university.

In addition, should the Executive adopt the recommendation made in this document regarding the issuing of Guidelines for the amalgamation of Cultural and Community Planning strategies, the NCPSPG could offer their expertise and knowledge of the Cultural Planning method in further developing such Guidelines.

## **VIII. Next Steps**

This document – which includes both a response by the National Cultural Planning Steering Group to the Cultural Commission's report and proposals for the implementation of mechanisms capable of dealing with both cultural and community development – is intended as a useful step towards the creation of a debate at national level about the potential of creating a policy framework for the delivery of joint culture and community strategies. We have consulted with key people in the field and their response has been very encouraging.

However, now we need to enter the second stage of this debate by circulating this report among the interested parties, and by setting up, preferably in **January 2006**, a meeting of the key respondents in order to advance the proposals made in this report to the Executive. In particular, we would like to highlight for discussion the recommendations summarised below:

- Community Cultural Planning Partnerships should be the mechanisms in charge of the delivery of combined Community and Cultural Plans.

- Local authorities should take the lead in setting up such partnerships.
- The Executive should consider issuing Guidelines for the development of Community Cultural Planning Strategies and for the piloting of related partnerships. Current ROAs (Regeneration Outcome Agreements) guidelines could be a model of practice for setting cross-sector outcomes. The National Cultural Planning Steering Group could provide assistance in the development of such guidelines.
- The Executive should consider collecting and disseminating evidence already existing on the ground of the benefits culture brings to communities. In addition, the Executive could also consider giving the National Cultural Planning Steering Group the task of conducting a feasibility study for the creation of a Community Cultural Planning Observatory.
- The Executive should consider the development of a dedicated Cultural Planning training agenda aimed at developing interdisciplinary, cross-sector partnership building abilities among key stakeholders from the public, private and community sector.

## References

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. "Local Cultural Strategies: Draft Guidance for Local Authorities in England". London: DCMS, 1999.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport "Guidance for Local Authorities in England on Local Cultural Strategies". London: DCMS, 2000.

Department For Culture, Media and Sport "Leading the Good Life: Guidance on Integrating Cultural and Community Strategies. London: DCMS, 2004.

Grogan, David and Colin Mercer, with David Engwicht. *The Cultural Planning Handbook: An Essential Australian Guide*. St Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1995.

McNulty, Robert. "Cultural Planning: A Movement for Civic Progress". In *The Cultural Planning Conference*. Victoria, Australia: EIT, 1991.

---. "Culture and Communities: the Arts in the Life of American Cities." A study for the National Endowment for the Arts Policy, Planning and Research Division. Partners for Livable Places, 1992.

Mercer, Colin. "Brisbane's Cultural Development Strategy: The Process, the Politics, and the Products". In *The Cultural Planning Conference*. Victoria, Australia: EIT, 1991.

Partners for Livable Communities. *Institutions as Fulcrums for Change*. Washington DC: Partners for Livable Communities, 1996.

Partners for Livable Communities. *The Livable City: Revitalizing Urban Communities*. Washington DC: Partners for Livable Communities, 2000.

## Projects' Websites

Aberdeenshire Arts partnership  
[www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/arts/aberdeenshire/](http://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/arts/aberdeenshire/)

Antwerp City Council  
[www.antwerpen.be](http://www.antwerpen.be)

Australia Cultural Development Board,  
[www.ozco.gov.au/ccd/](http://www.ozco.gov.au/ccd/)

Bristol Cultural Development Partnership  
[www.businesswest.co.uk](http://www.businesswest.co.uk)

Capital City Partnership  
[www.capitalcitypartnership.org/](http://www.capitalcitypartnership.org/)

Dundee Partnership  
[www.dundee.gov.uk/partnership/](http://www.dundee.gov.uk/partnership/)

Fablevision

[www.fablevision.com/4](http://www.fablevision.com/4)

Highland and Islands Enterprise  
[www.hie.co.uk/](http://www.hie.co.uk)

Partners for Livable Communities  
[www.livable.com](http://www.livable.com)

Shetland Arts Trust  
[www.shetland-arts-trust.co.uk/](http://www.shetland-arts-trust.co.uk)

Turin European Office  
[www.segretariatosociale.rai.it/](http://www.segretariatosociale.rai.it)

## **Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank all of the following for their time and for their contribution to this report.

Jenny Attala, Scottish Arts Council and Scottish Executive

Paul Ballantyne, Communities Scotland

David Coulter, Scottish Enterprise

Phil Denning, Her Majesties Inspectorate of Education

Beatriz Garcia, Glasgow Centre for Cultural Policy Research

Liz Gardiner, Fablevision

Clive Gillman, Dundee Contemporary Arts

Sylvia King, The Public, West Bromwich

Lindsay McGregor, COSLA

Andy Milne, SURF

Ian Mitchell, Communities Scotland

Stuart Murdoch, Dundee City Council

Lilias Noble, Communities Scotland

Willie Roe, Highlands and Islands Enterprise

Rod Stone, VOCAL

Kate Wimpres, Edinburgh Capital City Partnership

Damien Yeates, Govan Initiative

**St Andrews Day 2005 – “The Cultural Matrix Reloaded”  
Consultees and attenders at the SURF Seminar held on 30/11/2005**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Sheena Wellington	Arts & Communities Scotland & Musician
Liz Thomas	Arts and Communities Scotland
Peter Evans	Audit Scotland
Kate Wimpres	Capital City Partnership
Beatriz Garcia	Centre for Cultural Policy Research
Susan Galloway	Centre for Cultural Policy Research
Russell McLarty	Church of Scotland, Transformation Team
Pat Petrie	Clackmannanshire Alliance
Alex Anderson	Community Development, South Ayrshire Council
Amie Rai	Creative Links Fife
Bobby Caldwell	CSV Media Scotland
Mairi Telford-Jammen	Dumfries & Galloway Council
Alan Thomson	Dumfries & Galloway Council Arts Association
Billy Gartley	Dundee City Council
Theresa Lynn	Dundee City Council
Clive Gilman	Dundee Contemporary Arts
Allan Moyes	East Dunbartonshire Council
Karen Shaw	East Dunbartonshire Council
Jennifer Curran	East End Social Inclusion Partnership
John Quinn	EDI Group
Liz Gardiner	Fablevision
Lee Stevenson	Faith in the Community (Scotland)
Grace McClure	Falkirk Council
Linda Brown	Falkirk Council
Paul Eames	Falkirk Council
Jim MacDonald	Falkirk Council Community Services
Lisa Paton	Falkirk Council Community Services
Andy Neil	Fife Council
Rachel Dawick	Fife Council
Kirsty White	Glasgow City Council, Cultural and Leisure Services
Niki Smith	Glasgow City Council, Cultural and Leisure Services
Robert Reid	Glasgow City Council, Social Work Services
Martha Wardrop	Glasgow Council for Voluntary Sector
David Fletcher	Glasgow Housing Association
Katherine Champion	Glasgow University
Jim Gardner	Govan Initiative Ltd
Roland Hahn	Hahn Practice
Ann MacSween	Historic Scotland
Margaret Wright	Imagine Scotland
Leslie Huckfield	Leslie Huckfield Research
Karen Hannah	Musician
Elizabeth Marriot	National Union of Journalists Glasgow, West of Scotland Freelance Branch
Pauline Gallacher	National Cultural Planning Steering Group

Marilyn Workman	Net-Workman
Oliver Chapman	Oliver Chapman Architects
Ian Cooke	Pilton Partnership
Rachel Jury	Poverty Alliance
Alistair Grimes	Rocket Science UK Ltd
Caroline Docherty	Scottish Arts Council
Paul Ballantyne	Scottish Centre for Regeneration
Fiona Garven	Scottish Community Development Centre
Jenny Attala	Scottish Executive
Helena Gillis	Scottish Museums Council
Gillian Staveley	Scottish Theatres Technical Training Trust
Andy Milne	Scottish Urban Regeneration Forum
Edward Harkins	Scottish Urban Regeneration Forum
Isla McAllister	SPARC Community Arts
Ralf Heckmann	University of Strathclyde
David Cook	Wasps Artists Studio
William Tunnell	William Tunnell Architecture
Greig Sandilands	