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About the RSA

The RSA (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce) believes in a world where everyone is able to participate in creating a better future. Through our ideas, research and a 30,000 strong Fellowship we are a global community of proactive problem solvers. Uniting people and ideas to resolve the challenges of our time.

About the British Council

The British Council builds connections, understanding and trust between people in the UK and other countries through arts and culture, education and the English language.

We help young people to gain the skills, confidence and connections they are looking for to realise their potential and to participate in strong and inclusive communities. We support them to learn English, to get a high-quality education and to gain internationally recognised qualifications. Our work in arts and culture stimulates creative expression and exchange and nurtures creative enterprise.

Project partnership

This project has been developed as a partnership between the RSA and the British Council to test the hypothesis that heritage is a largely untapped, collective asset for inclusive social, economic and environmental change with significant potential to better support sustainable, equitably distributed growth and to enable the development of inclusive place-based identities.

The RSA has played a key role in developing the inclusive growth policy agenda in the UK. The RSA Inclusive Growth Commission reported in 2017, and has been followed by a number of projects which continue to build on this expertise. The RSA also has a strong presence in the heritage sector, particularly with the Heritage Index (2015, 2016 and upcoming in 2020), and the Networked Heritage project (2016), which called for heritage organisations to focus on their social impacts and to become better networked, both within the sector and their place-based communities.
The British Council is currently leading Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth (CH4IG), a pilot action research programme that explores ways in which local culture can improve lives, socially and economically. Using cultural heritage as a tool to create inclusive growth is a new concept, put forward in a British Council report⁴ to share findings from a sector consultation and international research. The pilot takes this research into practice, with the key ethos to work in a people-centred, responsive and detailed way, with and across societies, sectors and geographies. The three participating overseas countries—Colombia, Kenya and Vietnam—have developed approaches which are distinct, unique and relevant to their context. Projects are community-led, devised and managed with partners on the ground, sensitive to local issues and customs. The pilot is gathering evidence of the benefits of promoting local heritage; looking at how and whether it can bring prosperity and well-being to everyday life.

This shared interest in the relationships between heritage and inclusive growth has provided the opportunity for the two organisations to collaborate after recognising an opportunity to develop a strong conceptual basis for the idea of heritage for inclusive growth, as well as providing insights and inspiration for what this looks like in practice.

This report presents RSA research around what heritage for inclusive growth looks like in a UK context, and recommendations for how to progress with this approach, with reflections and responses from the British Council drawing on the insights emerging from the global Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth programme.
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Introduction

When this project was first developed by the RSA and the British Council in early 2019, we intended to publish our findings in spring 2020. At which point in time, an impending global health crisis such as Covid-19 seemed unimaginable.

As lockdown and physical distancing restrictions are eased, economic forecasters now predict an extended period of economic distress. The scaling back of protective measures, such as the job retention scheme in the UK, are likely to drive a significant increase in unemployment. The associated risks of which include rising inequalities and scarring effects on already disadvantaged local places.

Alongside the pandemic, we have also seen a resurgence of the Black Lives Matters (BLM) movement. The global response to the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis has been widely hailed as a watershed moment in our collective progress towards dismantling structural racism.

With problematic historic monuments functioning as flashpoints for BLM protests, it has also created an unprecedented and widespread level of engagement with issues around heritage, identity, place and belonging in our public conversation.

Protest and debate about examples such as the monument to slave trader Edward Colston in Bristol highlight how current day inequalities are experienced as deeply rooted in the histories and heritage of our local places and the people who live in them.

Recent months have made the fatal implications of inequality more visible. Those in the most deprived areas and people of colour are impacted by higher infection and fatality rates of Covid-19, while people of colour experience higher levels of police violence.


Far beyond ‘being in this together’, society continues to be divided along the lines of entrenched social, economic and environmental inequalities, which are unevenly distributed between and within places.

For those impacted directly, the reality of this is not new. But greater visibility and awareness has made it increasingly untenable for those not affected personally by structural inequalities — often including those in decision-making positions — to continue to overlook and not prioritise effective responses.

This report makes the case that heritage for inclusive growth provides one such effective response. It provides a powerful and timely model for addressing social, economic and environmental inequalities while also recognising the cultural, symbolic and emotional factors which shape the identities and experiences of individuals, communities and places.

There are some high-profile examples of places which have taken a heritage- and culture-led approach to economic development and placemaking, such as Hull and Liverpool in the UK. But traditionally, heritage and economic development decision making takes place within different local siloes.

In a series of eight case studies we explore how different local stakeholders have brought these areas of policymaking and practice together with some evidence of beneficial outcomes. Our conclusion is that there is much greater scope for drawing together heritage, diverse local identities and economic development.

This is an opportunity to address the interaction of economic and cultural or racial inequalities by exploring more holistically inclusive strategies.

Communities want their voices heard and identities valued. Whether black communities in wealthy but unequal cities with colonial legacies such as Bristol, or poorer white working-class communities in post-industrial towns, whole communities continue to experience persistent disadvantage.

This highlights the need to better account for the historical legacies which shape different forms of current day disadvantage. The vacuum left by not grappling with these issues has often been filled by discourses which pit different groups against each other, rather than critiquing structural inequalities.

With the triple challenge of public health, racial and economic inequality there is an urgent need for localities to develop their heritage, community engagement and economic development strategies in parallel.

We define heritage for inclusive growth strategies as locally developed plans utilising and supporting the heritage assets and activities within a place to create sustainable, equitably distributed growth and to enable the development of inclusive place-based identities. In the following pages, we explore what these strategies might look like.

We outline the key elements of such an approach and how localities can explore its opportunities. If effectively enabled and supported in the coming months and years, collaborative approaches between the heritage and economic development sectors have a vital role to play in the recovery of local economies and communities.

The research for this project and the drafting of the findings was completed prior to spring 2020, so the case studies and insights do not reference the global public health crisis caused by Covid-19 or the Black Lives Matter protests. However, in these challenging times the argument for better utilising the potential of heritage to support a range of inclusive growth outcomes is even stronger.

Our hope is that the case studies, approaches and models explored in this report contribute to the aspiration to build back a better, more equitable and sustainable economy and society.
Aligning heritage and inclusive growth

In recent years, the inclusive growth agenda has had a significant impact at both national and local levels across the UK. The RSA Inclusive Growth Commission defined inclusive growth as “broad-based growth that enables the widest range of people and places to both contribute to and benefit from economic success”.

Concepts of inclusive growth challenge the conventional economic wisdom that all growth is good growth, instead advocating for more nuanced and holistic approaches which also account for social and environmental impacts, and more equitably distribute the benefits of growth.

Inclusive growth recognises that our wider wellbeing and economic security is not only a function of our income or employment status but also perceptions of our ability to shape our lives, our interactions with others and also our sense of place and belonging.

Alongside new ideas about inclusive growth, there has been a growing recognition across the heritage sector of the importance of heritage being better used to support a range of social, economic and environmental outcomes. The RSA’s own Heritage Index, for example, has mapped heritage assets across the UK with a view to supporting local stakeholders in putting them to greater use.

Complementing the intrinsic value of heritage, this emphasis on the instrumental potential of heritage is becoming more widely embedded in strategic priorities across the sector while concepts such as ‘cultural heritage capital’ are developed in its support, though this is still relatively new ground.

While there is no universal heritage, heritage itself is universal — we all have heritage and it belongs to everyone. But in the UK and elsewhere, we are also at a point in time when popular narratives around heritage, place, belonging and identity have become increasingly problematic, sometimes hijacked by those with far-right nationalist agendas around immigration.

At the same time, these narratives obscure and marginalise the heritages of minorities and people of colour. We make the case in this report that heritage has a vital role to play in responding to this increasing polarisation in our public discourse and within our communities themselves.

Key to this is establishing a more inclusive narrative about the value that a sense of place, community and belonging has for everyone, and the importance of centring space for a plurality of heritages and voices within this.

Recent decades have seen a growing focus in the UK heritage sector on the wider social and economic potential of heritage, and there is an established body of literature on the role of culture in driving economic outcomes, particularly in an international development context.

However, neither within the UK or globally, is there a consistently adopted conceptual or theoretical approach, nor embedded practical models, for what heritage for inclusive growth looks like in practice — that is sustainable growth spanning a holistic range of social, economic and environmental outcomes within a place which can be realised or optimised by heritage-led interventions. And our UK engagement through this project indicates that in the economic development profession in particular there is relatively little understanding of the importance and potential of heritage in this regard.

For these reasons, inclusive growth is a valuable lens to apply in the heritage context. It is a live agenda that speaks to stakeholders across a range of sectors, particularly those broadly aligned with economic development. It also highlights the importance of strategic, integrated approaches to delivering social, economic and environmental outcomes through more sustainable and inclusive forms of growth. As such it can function as a tool for tackling both historical iniquities and current inequalities.

---

7 RSA (2017) op cit.
9 As a still very emergent idea ‘cultural heritage capital’ here is taken to be broadly equivalent to the more established concept of ‘natural capital’.
From the outset, this project, in partnership with the British Council, has sought to explore the relationship between:

- Different types of heritage, ranging from historic buildings and natural landscapes to cultural practices
- Place identities and affinities, and how these can be experienced in an uneven fashion, and
- Inclusive growth.

The British Council has been pioneering in this field in developing its own Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth pilot programme to explore these issues in three overseas contexts. The programme has been informed by work to establish some principles surrounding heritage and inclusive growth and a theory of change which identifies some of the interventions, approaches and outcomes one might expect.

This current report has been led by the RSA and builds on the emerging body of work led by the British Council. It is intended to lay more of the conceptual groundwork concerning heritage for inclusive growth while also highlighting existing innovative heritage-led interventions in the UK that are already delivering inclusive growth outcomes.

The RSA is recognised for its longstanding expertise around inclusive growth, as well as for its contribution to the heritage sector, particularly in relation to the production of the RSA Heritage Index. As such, the RSA has led on the production of this report with the intention of asking challenging but constructive questions from a position that is aligned with but outside of the UK heritage sector itself.

Working from the perspective that heritage is a largely untapped, collective asset for social and economic change, with significant potential to better support inclusive growth and the development of inclusive place-based identities in local communities, we have reviewed existing literature and engaged with heritage sector experts to develop a ‘heritage and inclusive growth ecosystem’ which brings together a number of interrelated elements into a single conceptual framework. This is introduced in chapter 1.

In chapter 2 the report then sets out the eight case studies from across the UK that we have explored to test the hypothesis that heritage is a largely untapped, collective asset for inclusive social, economic and environmental change with significant potential to better support sustainable, equitably distributed growth and to enable the development of inclusive place-based identities, using the ecosystem model. These are organised thematically with examples driven by museums, regeneration initiatives, whole area approaches and by local communities themselves.

Rather than providing a fixed route map, the case studies and ideas in this report are intended to provide insights and inspiration for communities, policymakers and practitioners. Some of these insights are drawn together in chapter 3 as we consider how the case study material speaks to some of the key facets of inclusive growth and place.

Chapter 4 outlines the RSA’s recommendations and next steps for this area of work, calling for a combined response which integrates the development of a set of heritage for inclusive growth indicators, a programme for practitioners to share best practice, and for the government to support these approaches by integrating more holistic criteria for project evaluation into their funding mechanisms.
In chapter 5, the British Council responds with reflections based on their international experiences around cultural heritage for inclusive growth.

The explicit focus of this report is how the dynamics between heritage and inclusive growth play out in the set of UK-based case studies. As such, the detail of many of the resulting insights and recommendations are specific to the UK. However, as highlighted by the British Council’s response reflections, there are parallels and lessons which can be both learned from and applied internationally, with particularly clear alignment between the opportunities associated with heritage for inclusive growth, and delivering outcomes aligned with the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

We have always understood the intrinsic value of heritage to a rich and open society but the emerging opportunities for heritage to make a greater contribution to people’s lives, their communities and places—both in the UK and globally—are now only beginning to be more fully understood, and have significant potential to be accelerated and scaled up. This is just the beginning of that further conversation.
What is heritage?

Among policymakers and the public alike, heritage is understood as an integral part of both our cultural landscape and our cultural economy.

On the one hand, heritage is recognised as shaping a sense of who we are both individually and collectively. At the same time there is an extensive body of evidence for, and growing recognition of, the economic benefits of heritage — particularly in relation to gross value added (GVA), jobs created and tourism. Research from Historic England shows the heritage sector generating £31bn GVA and 464,000 jobs in England in 2019.

But how does the way that heritage shapes our identities impact the wider benefits it can deliver, and how do we recognise and broaden these benefits — economic as well as social and environmental, to develop more equitable local communities and economies?

To begin to answer these questions, we must understand the complexity and opportunity encapsulated in the term ‘heritage’.

Heritage was traditionally understood as human-made objects, sites and buildings inherited from the past. But recent years have seen this expand to also include natural and intangible forms of heritage.

UNESCO defines intangible heritage as “traditions or living expressions inherited from our ancestors and passed on to our descendants” and it is now widely acknowledged that there are subjective elements of heritage which can’t be captured by purely material definitions.

A distinction is now widely made between ‘tangible’ and ‘intangible’ heritage. However, these are expansive categories and this piece of work has adopted the six heritage domains identified by the RSA Heritage Index:

- Historic built environment
- Museums, archives and artefacts
- Industrial heritage
- Parks and open space
- Landscape and natural heritage
- Cultures and memories.

As many of our case studies demonstrate, tangible heritage assets are more than the sum of their physical parts — they function as repositories of meaning, memory and experience in the present. While intangible heritage might have no physical subject, tangible heritage is always much more than a physical structure in this sense.

Underpinning all of this, there are many organisations giving a platform to underrepresented groups and subversive heritage narratives which must be recognised by any inclusive approach to heritage policy and practice.

As heritage practice across the UK suggests there are always multiple heritages — ‘established’ heritage, but also working-class heritage, black heritage, South Asian heritage, place-based heritage etc.

Much work is being done to address the historical erasure of many of these perspectives. In recent months, this erasure and the normalisation of exclusionary heritage narratives has found itself at the heart of debates around the relationship between historic and contemporary socio-economic inequalities and racism as part of the Black Lives Matters movement.

This is powerful testimony to the centrality of history and heritage to contemporary social challenges and lived experiences, and the importance of developing heritage-led responses to address these issues. Because heritage practice has the potential to perpetuate injustices and inequalities, there is a moral imperative for heritage activity to address these.
It is now broadly accepted that there is no single, established heritage. But changing the culture and practices across the heritage sector in ways which effectively address such historical precedents is an ongoing project, as highlighted by the work of initiatives such as Don’t Settle, profiled as part of this research.

**Given that we want to use heritage for inclusive growth, as a tool for tackling historical iniquities and current inequalities, we must acknowledge that heritage can be an instrument of power.** But heritage interpretations are fluid and always up for negotiation. It is important that heritage practice promotes ongoing negotiation over the meaning and significance of assets in the present, not simply preserve and celebrate the past.

**Fundamentally, we cannot completely depoliticise heritage decisions. But heritage decision-making can become more proactive and inclusive.** This was the insight that drove the RSA’s previous work on Networked Heritage, which called on heritage organisations to be more open, better connected and to remove barriers to public participation. Citizens can also be producers, participants and co-commissioners of heritage.13

However, if a heritage organisation operates in ways that are paternalistic or stifle participation through restrictive definitions of heritage, then the decisions made will never be truly inclusive. This is why the National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) have eschewed rigid definitions altogether: “heritage can mean different things to different people. It can be anything from the past that you value and want to pass on to future generations”.14

We can create typologies that help with classifying heritage assets and activities, but these should be based on an account of heritage that actively invites communities to take part in an open conversation.

Actively involving diverse communities in both defining and shaping their local heritage is an integral first step towards more equitably distributing the established economic benefits of heritage such as employment and skills opportunities, or the added value and wealth it can build within a place. And it must also underpin any attempt to generate a broader set of inclusive heritage-led outcomes within a local place.

**Heritage for inclusive growth: what’s the case?**
In the UK, a move in the heritage sector in recent decades towards social and economic impact, has been largely steered by a concerted shift in NLHF strategic funding priorities.\textsuperscript{15} Building on this, we believe that there is scope to develop a systemic approach which brings together heritage, economic development and a wider range of inclusive outcomes—not only economic, but also social and environmental.

Crucially, this systemic approach has the potential to provide the basis of local heritage for inclusive growth strategies which utilise the heritage assets and activities within a place to support local economic development and community wellbeing.

The RSAs established body of work on the inclusive growth agenda makes the case for a new approach to economic policy making that combines economic, social and environmental policy in order to reduce inequality and deprivation, in turn driving a different, more holistic understanding of growth.

We argue that it is this form of holistic growth that actually matters to people and places. It recognises and contributes to a sense of place and belonging as well as the economic needs of current and future generations.

In this regard, particularly in light of the challenges to be faced in the coming months and years to ‘build back better’, the concept of inclusive growth provides a valuable basis on which to develop integrated heritage-led approaches.

To support this, we have developed a heritage for inclusive growth ‘ecosystem’ model, to account for the context in which both heritage and socioeconomic development investment and practice takes place.

This model provides the basis from which to test the hypothesis that heritage is a largely untapped, collective asset for inclusive social, economic and environmental change with significant potential to better support sustainable, equitably distributed growth and to enable the development of inclusive place-based identities.

The term ‘ecosystem’ has been used to emphasise how the relationships between the key elements are reciprocal and coactive, rather than linear and causal.

It is intended to function as a key reference material that:

- Draws together the key theoretical and conceptual groundings spanning heritage, inclusive growth and place
- Facilitate further examination of the relationships and mechanisms between these elements in practice—how they work and who benefits.

For policymaker and practitioners, a more detailed account of the key elements and conceptual underpinnings of the model can be found in Appendix 1.


Case study approach

Eight case studies were identified to test the hypothesis that heritage is a largely untapped, collective asset for inclusive social, economic and environmental change with significant potential to better support sustainable, equitably distributed growth and to enable the development of inclusive place-based identities. The heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model has been utilised as the critical framework for examining this existing practice.

An extensive long list of potential case studies was collated through a literature review, collaboration with the British Council, engagement with the project advisory group, through the RSA Fellowship and via a call for submissions using the ideas platform Wazoku.
Key criteria considered included geographical spread, location type, local economic structures, type and scale of intervention and intended outcomes. From the long list, it was identified that most examples could be grouped into key categories, each reflecting the original impetus or source of energy for the intervention in the first place: whole place-based, museum-led, community-focused and regeneration-led.

We argue that heritage for inclusive growth provides a valuable model for heritage and economic development policymakers and practitioners to collaborate and work together on an integrated way at both national and local levels.

To support this, the categories of interventions identified provide a valuable typology of existing practical approaches which align with heritage for inclusive growth principles. We suggest that policymakers and heritage and economic development practitioners take these as a starting point when thinking about the heritage assets and activities in local places, and what heritage for inclusive growth strategies and combination of delivery models would be best suited.

- **Whole place-based:** Led from a strategic level, usually by a local authority or local enterprise partnership (LEP), these interventions cover a large area—be that a town or city, county or subregion. Economic development is often the key driver that catalyses the approach at inception.

- **Museum-led:** Museums are key heritage institutions and spaces embedded in communities everywhere. These interventions cover a range of approaches that utilise their assets and expertise and engage with their communities to support inclusive growth outcomes to go beyond the traditional remit of collections and conservation and functioning as anchor institutions in their local places.

- **Community-focused:** This category covers a diverse range of interventions, including those that are driven directly from the ground up, or others which are delivered by organisations using models which respond directly to needs articulated by their community, or which are built on participatory models.

- **Regeneration-led:** The historic built environment is one of the most widely visible elements of our heritage, resulting in a number of interventions which draw on the historical character and heritage of a local place to revitalise the physical environment, community and local economy.

A set of case studies was selected to reflect approaches from across these categories.

Some case studies had the potential to align with more than one category. Those ultimately selected were chosen to also reflect a geographic spread and range of local contexts, as well as for the degree to which they were taking innovative or interesting approaches to delivering outcomes that align with the five domains of inclusive growth: livelihoods, wealth, voice, future sustainability and esteem and wellbeing.

The place and community specific nature of heritage necessitates a tailored approach. The case studies are not presented for direct replication in other places. Instead we present them as practical examples of approaches which have been taken, challenges which have been encountered, lessons learned and what can be achieved. They are intended as inspiration and provocations to action, rather than a set of fixed blueprints.
Whole place-based case study: New Anglia LEP, Norfolk and Suffolk (England)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>LESSONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place based, cross-sectoral heritage for inclusive growth infrastructure facilitated via the local enterprise partnership | • Longstanding integration of heritage into local strategic approach to inclusive growth  
• Broad recognition locally of how culture and heritage sectors can drive social, economic and environmental outcomes | • How to bring together local heritage and economic development sectors and professionals  
• Focus on when there is energy for action and change  
• Collaborate to build infrastructure with limited resources |

**Background**

The New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) covers both Norfolk and Suffolk. As is the case with many LEP footprints, this is a geography which crosses administrative boundaries and brings together places with have their own distinct identities, albeit with a number of shared characteristics.

Located in East Anglia, both counties include a combination of rural areas, inland market towns and coastal towns, including Felixstowe in Suffolk, the UK’s biggest container port. The economic centres of each county are Norwich and Ipswich.

There are contrasts between the degrees of affluence and disadvantage experienced by citizens across the area, with pockets of affluence, often driven by the area’s proximity to London and Cambridge and employment in high-skilled sectors, while other areas—particularly coastal towns such as Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth—include some of the most deprived areas in England.
The populations for Norfolk and Suffolk are 903,700 and 758,000 respectively. Both counties have older than average populations, with this projected to grow in the coming decades.

With the Norfolk Broads National Park and Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the area is rich in natural heritage, as well as industrial heritage associated with agriculture and fishing, and historic buildings and monuments in towns across the area, some of which are among the oldest in the UK.

Today, key growth sectors for the local economy of Norfolk and Suffolk are energy, life sciences, tech and digital, advanced agriculture, financial services, transport and logistics, construction, advanced manufacturing and engineering and the visitor economy. The latter is recognised as being built around the heritage and culture assets in the two counties.

What is the approach/intervention?

New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership is one of 38 LEPs across England. They are private sector-led partnerships between local businesses and local government and play an important role in supporting local growth, employment skills and infrastructure, and securing national funding and investment, through working across administrative and sectoral boundaries. Established in 2011, it is widely recognised that many LEPs initially struggled to establish their roles locally effectively, with significant variation continuing with regards to the performance of different LEPs across the country.

New Anglia LEP is an example which has been successful in establishing an effective model of collaboration and learning across Norfolk and Suffolk. The LEP has an explicit focus on inclusive growth that will increase local wages and improve local living standards and educational attainment for everyone. Inclusive growth is a guiding priority for the local economic strategy and the local industrial strategy, both led by the LEP.

In recent years, inclusive growth has become an increasingly common priority in this context, but where the New Anglia LEP is more unusual is the way in which the instrumental, economic benefits of heritage and culture have been recognised and valued since it was established.

A New Anglia Cultural Board was established to work with, and broaden the reach of, the LEP from the start. It brings together key local stakeholders from across the public, third and private sector. Today it continues to develop local approaches to how the organisations and individuals in the sector across Norfolk and Suffolk can support inclusive local investment and growth. An emphasis is placed on the role of heritage tourism, particularly that which enhances and builds on a strong sense of place, and which draws visitors across a wider area, to a range of different types of heritage assets and activities rather than creating unsustainable concentrations of visitors around a small number of more traditional heritage assets.

While the LEP itself receives funding from the Local Growth Fund, the Cultural Board is unfunded, relying on the goodwill and shared recognition of the organisations involved of the benefits of collaborating in this way. The local council officers responsible for arts and heritage development work for both Norfolk and Suffolk county councils provide administrative and co-ordination support to the board as part of their roles.

What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?

The key outcome to date of this approach is the visibility and value attached to the role that heritage has to play in more inclusive approaches to local economic development.

Local heritage practitioners do not need to advocate for heritage to be included in economic development strategies — the case has already been made and been credited for making a significant contribution to revitalising the cultural life of the region, and the benefits this has had for a growing visitor economy.
In recognition of the potential to take this further, the LEP is a partner in Collaboration: Place: Change, a programme that intends to create a model for place-based leadership development across the local arts, culture and heritage sectors to develop the skills for delivering social and economic change in Norfolk and Suffolk.

The LEP's coordinated approach is effective in enabling collaborative working not just at the strategic board/LEP level, but also supports those on the ground to maximise the benefits that heritage and culture can have for local communities and the local economy. Practitioners work on a range of projects which realise both the instrumental and intrinsic value of heritage, in ways that are mutually complementary.

For example, work such as the Deep History Coast, a partnership in North Norfolk focused on developing a sense of place rooted in the area's geology and archaeology to drive regeneration and tourism programmes, as well as projects such as The Grit in Lowestoft. The latter was a poetry project that engaged with local school students using local heritage to build a sense of pride and reduce place-based stigma and low levels of aspiration among those from families which had been particularly impacted by local economic decline in recent generations.

Other key projects the LEP has secured funding for include StartEast, a business development programme for arts, heritage and culture businesses and Look Sideways East, a programme for developing the visitor economy across Norfolk and Suffolk.

**How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?**

As a whole-place based approach, the New Anglia LEP approach recognises the value and potential for all types of tangible and intangible heritage to contribute to improved social and economic outcomes in the sub-region.

This is largely due to the mixture of urban, rural and coastal areas in Norfolk and Suffolk, and the histories that have shaped them. The LEP is also explicit in the value of heritage activities, not just physical assets, particularly with regards to wellbeing.

The approach is more advanced than most places in the extent to which heritage is an integrated part of the local economic development system and infrastructure, but there is also a recognition locally that they are still exploring how to go further.

The planned leadership programme was developed in recognition of this and has significant potential to be a leading example of how whole place-based inclusive growth practice can be developed and embedded across local cultural/heritage sector and economic development systems.

What is already apparent from the LEP's approach to date, however, is that local heritage can be utilised to support a range of inclusive growth outcomes both directly and indirectly.

When indirectly, this is often achieved through building an, often hyper-localised, sense of place in relation to the heritage of the area and the people that have lived there. In the case of The Grit project, the young people involved experienced improved esteem and wellbeing benefits, as well as developing skills and confidence that make them better equipped to enter the workforce in the future, with the potential for much longer term benefits associated with livelihoods.

The New Anglia approach to increasing tourism, can be seen as having a more direct relationship with livelihoods—driving growth in local jobs and businesses. The LEP is particularly focused on working with local authorities, employers and others to ensure that new jobs are fairly paid and good quality, though this is a well-versed challenge with few established solutions.

However, the explicit emphasis on driving tourism through the unique culture and heritage of the area, does appear to have the potential to deliver a range of higher quality jobs in these sectors.
It also draws on the unique character of a range of places in the sub-region, which has the potential to spatially distribute tourism activity more sustainably, and can be seen as enabling a form of temporary ‘elective belonging’ in visitors, who are encouraged to meaningfully engage with the heritage and culture of the place they are visiting and the people that live there.

What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?

The New Anglia approach is a powerful example of how an LEP, as a key local economic development stakeholder, can play a decisive role in embedding heritage-led approaches to inclusive growth.

**Bring together heritage and economic development stakeholders.**

LEPs are well positioned to play a unique convening and facilitating role between local private, public and third sector stakeholders spanning both economic development and heritage. Crucially, the approach in New Anglia was successfully embedded at an early stage as key local economic development leaders and stakeholders had strong pre-existing beliefs in the value of heritage. This high-level buy-in was instrumental to the success and longevity of the approach.

**Engage widely but focus on where the energy is.**

Engaging widely across administrative and sectoral boundaries as much as possible, and as early on as possible is important. However, particularly in the early stages interest in heritage-led approaches are not universally held and it is important to invest time and effort in places where there is appetite and energy, which in turn helps to provide proof of concept and build momentum among others.

**Collaborate to build infrastructure with limited resources.**

Momentum is essential in building the far-reaching, collaborative relationships which a more holistic, whole-place based approach to heritage and inclusive growth can be built upon, particularly when there are limited resources to support the governance infrastructure which must be developed to sustain and embed the approach in the long-term.
Background

Dundee, the fourth largest Scottish city, has a proud history of industry, trade and exploration. Located on the east coast of Scotland, it has long been a key connection point for Scotland to the rest of the world, whether that be through travels to mainland Europe; the scientific voyages of discovery of Scott and others; or as the global hub for the jute trade. Indeed, the city was known for the three ‘Js’ — jute, jam and journalism — which served as the largest parts of Dundee’s industry.

Like many communities in Scotland, Dundee suffered from economic hardship due to the decline of some of those key industries. Initial recovery was stimulated through the arrival of US companies such as Timex and NCR; and recently through the strength of Dundee’s two universities (Abertay University and the University of Dundee), and their respective global roles in areas such as computer games and design. Indeed, Dundee has the highest proportion of students in its population than any other European city other than Heidelberg.
Most recently, primarily due to the interventions and programmes discussed below, Dundee has developed a global reputation as an exciting and creative small city, with recognition ranging from designation as a UNESCO City of Design in 2014 (the first and only city with that title in the UK) to the Wall Street Journal in 2018 listing Dundee at number five on its list of worldwide hot destinations. This surge in interest and appreciation for the city stands in contrast to its previous denigration and offers an opportunity for a renewed civic pride for Dundonians in the impact their city is having.

**What is the approach/intervention?**

Dundee's resurgence has been rooted in place-based regeneration, centred around the riverfront area. Started in 2001, this £1bn 30-year plan aims “to transform the City of Dundee into a world leading waterfront destination for visitors and businesses through the enhancement of its physical, economic and cultural assets.” The area encompasses a variety of usages and resources, but critical elements are the cultural assets of the city, both historical and newly developed.

V&A Dundee, the first V&A to be opened outside London, has been the biggest development within the city, opening in 2018. Crucially, it has not simply focused on economic growth, but has also developed a substantial outreach programme, to try to engage the wider population of the city. With its identity as an 'open museum', the V&A Dundee has looked to ensure that all exhibitions are of global significance, but also offer local opportunity.

Dundee has a wealth of historical infrastructure, much of it rooted in the city's industrial heritage. Discovery Point and Verdant Works are two sites managed by the Dundee Heritage Trust (DHT). Discovery Point is a place of scientific importance, particularly in relation to British Antarctic studies, the South Georgia Heritage Trust and the history of the whaling industry. Verdant Works, on the other hand, is a former jute mill which details the history of the industry and its importance to the city. Both sites are seeking to reconnect with the history of Dundee, in particular in relation to the heritage of environmental studies and impact and DHT is working with the Tay Cities Deal to access funding for initial development. DHT properties currently offer around £2.5m in positive economic impact to Dundee, welcoming over 250,000 visitors and delivering learning to over 6,000 local school children.

A key factor in Dundee has been the recognition that different sites are interconnected to each other—in a small city, it is important to maximise tourist numbers, and their visits to each of the sites rather than just one. This means that for significant opportunities, such as the forthcoming 200th Anniversary for the HMS Unicorn, one of the six oldest ships remaining in the world, there is collaboration across different venues, despite different management, and with the city council. Collaborations can involve major employers (such as the publishers DC Thomson) and also national bodies such as the Heritage Lottery Fund and Historic Environment Scotland. Dundee City Council provides core funding to a range of the city's heritage institutions, on condition that the assets commit to reaching out across the city and its residents.

Dundee is on a journey. Stretching back over the past few decades, this has seen investment in assets such as the DCA (Dundee Contemporary Arts), the redevelopment of the McManus: Dundee's Art Gallery and Museum and Dundee Science Centre; through recent activities such as the opening of V&A Dundee and the proposed development of the West Ward Works (on the former DC Thomson printing site); onto ideas which are currently being developed for the future.

**What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?**

The fundamental desire behind the strategy of re-development in Dundee is to drive the regeneration of the city, with global recognition, for the economic and cultural benefit of its residents. Given Dundee's experience of industrial strength and decline, there is an understanding, and valuing, of the city's heritage, and a commitment to making use of it for a bright, inclusive future.

---


Dundee shows how investment in heritage and culture can accrue economic benefits far beyond these sectors. The global interest in Dundee's vibrant cultural sector has increased the attractiveness of the city as a place to do business, spurring investment from companies (from within and without the UK) who wish to be associated with the city's dynamic brand.

Analysis of V&A Dundee's success in its first year shows the museum has had significant economic impact, worth £21m to Dundee, and £75m to Scotland as a whole, considerably higher than estimates had been:19 370 local jobs were created, plus more across Scotland during the design and building phase of the museum. Given the significance of tourism to the city (around £10m per month), the global visibility and attraction of V&A Dundee offers a clear boost to the sector.

The cultural and heritage venues of Dundee have been proactive and committed to engaging residents, however there is also a tension between balancing the attraction to a global network of tourists and locals. Sometimes in a city such as Edinburgh heritage assets can be seen as not belonging to residents of the city but being focused on external markets.20

How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?

Dundee's approach has been primarily driven by a focus on the physical and industrial heritage of the city, both in revitalising and repurposing existing assets; and in the creation of new resources. This has allowed the city to harness the pride of its industrial past, but with a powerful narrative of how this can underpin a successful future.

Recognising the importance of place, as a whole city but also for different areas within it, is key in a small city of only four miles across. Technically, nowhere is far away, but the Kingsway, a major roadway cutting through the north of the city, is a key barrier. Those south of the road are well connected into the city's resources; whilst those north can feel disconnected.

The cultural and historical significance of this needs to be accounted for when planning activity and resources, to ensure that these communities do not become left out of the city's success and pride. Particularly when the approach to regeneration places a strong emphasis on place-based identity — what it means to be Dundonian. To experience a sense of belonging and benefit from the changes under way

In relation to livelihoods, the cultural and heritage sector contributes to the labour market of Dundee, both directly in terms of staff in the various venues; and more widely in the hospitality/tourism ecosystem.

Assets such as the V&A Dundee make a significant impact into the economic growth of the city, and therefore into wealth in the widest sense. The attractiveness of the city in terms of global awareness of the city's brand due these assets and activities is a draw for investment, to the benefit of the wider population. This is about more than just money though, and the sector boosts the shared wealth of heritage and cultural belonging that Dundee possesses, through this increased investment.

In terms of inclusive voice, heritage stakeholders in Dundee are committed to connecting with local people, as evidenced by the extensive use of volunteers, educational and outreach programmes, and co-created programmes such as the forthcoming Assemble residency at the V&A Dundee, or the proposed Climate Change Gallery at Discovery Point.21

Dundee's venues are keen to ensure Dundonians do not feel disconnected from their heritage, which requires regular engagement and listening with local people, businesses and politicians. More can be done, but as one contributor highlighted, the focus is “creating exceptional and unexpected opportunities” for the citizens of Dundee.


Dundee is a proud city but has suffered decline and hardship in its history. The celebration of the city’s industrial heritage and creative future is a source of esteem and pride for Dundonians, and a chance to truly set it up as a global leader and hub. Traditionally, Dundonians were often the harshest critics of their own city, yet now they are well placed to become passionate ambassadors for the place they call home.

**What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?**

Leaders in Dundee emphasised several key lessons or examples for other cities and communities who might look to learn from Dundee’s success.

**Be proactive.**

Some cities with established international reputations and pedigrees can, to an extent, expect opportunities to come to them. Dundee is not such a city. Instead, the investment and opportunities which have occurred in the city have been due to the proactive work and constant effort of the council, organisations and civic leaders to drive the city forward.

**Investment in culture and heritage benefits other sectors.**

By investing in culture and heritage, the attractiveness and profile of Dundee increased; this brings investment and business in other sectors.

**Constantly re-engage with the public.**

The relationship with the people of Dundee is critical to its success. The public have to feel the assets are theirs, and so need constant, authentic opportunities to engage, participate and co-create. This has to happen as ideas are being developed; as they are being delivered; and once they are in place. Local cultural sensibilities are critical, and all partners need to be aware of them.

**Spread the benefits.**

There is a danger with large scale regeneration that citizens feel they are not benefitting them. The cultural and heritage venues of Dundee have been proactive and committed to engaging residents, however there is also a tension between balancing the attraction to a global network of tourists and locals. Sometimes in a city such as Edinburgh heritage assets can be seen as not belonging to residents of the city, but being focused on external markets. In Dundee, redevelopment has taken place across the city, with investment into new schools and community hubs, yet these resources are often not seen as connected to the regeneration by those using them. The focus on the Riverfront development is a sensible one and offers great opportunities for economic and cultural development; but it is imperative that this is not at the expense of the rest of the city.

**Value every step of the journey.**

The re-imagining of a city, particularly one that has suffered economic decline, is a long process, and each step of the journey matters. Some interventions get more attention, but they build upon the success of the other work.

---

Background

Mid and East Antrim is a local council borough in County Antrim, Northern Ireland. Covering inland and coastal areas, the two main urban centres are Carrickfergus and Ballymena.

The population is around 137,000, representing 7 percent of the population of Northern Ireland. This is projected to grow significantly less rapidly than for both Northern Ireland and the UK as a whole.

Demographically, the population of the area is predominantly white (99 percent); 19 percent of the population is from a Catholic background while 73 percent is from a Protestant or other Christian background. The area experienced sectarian tension and violence during the Troubles, with both the IRA and loyalist groups having a presence in the area between the 1960s and 1990s.

The area is rich in a number of different types of heritage assets, ranging from the Coastal Causeway Route, industrial heritage sites and the Norman castle at Carrickfergus.

In recent decades, economic restructuring and the decline of traditional industries such as textiles and manufacturing have led to challenges for the local economy in terms of the number and quality of jobs in the area. Redundancies due to the closure of large employers in recent years require up to 6,600 replacement jobs.

Today, agriculture, forestry and fishing is by far the largest sector in the local economy (30 percent), followed by construction (12 percent) and retail (9 percent). The vast majority of local businesses (90 percent) are microbusinesses employing up to nine people, with only 10 large businesses with over 250 workers.

What is the approach/intervention?

Mid and East Antrim Borough Council was formed through the merging of three smaller, pre-existing borough councils. The museum services within the authorities also merged and extended their remit beyond collections and preservation to consider local heritage in the broadest sense, and how it can also be utilised to support sustainable investment and growth.

There are four museums run by the service, and the service’s position within the council as part of the economic development directorate encourages an emphasis on cross-departmental and sectoral working to develop more sustainable approaches to area planning and economic regeneration through tourism, to realise the wider value of local heritage assets and activities.

A key driver was the need to develop opportunities to grow employment as a result of the loss of large employers in the area, combined with a sense that the area was not maximising its potential with regards to heritage tourism. The area is located between Belfast and the Giants Causeway, with the former attracting 9.5 million visitors a year, and the latter 1.5 million. However, only 7 percent of international visitors to Northern Ireland visit Mid and East Antrim.

The service sees the visitor economy as a key opportunity area, while also having a strong legacy of community engagement work that centres the voices and heritages of local communities and citizens.

Two projects that exemplify the approach being taken by the service are the Carnlough Heritage Hub and the Shaped by Industry, Shared with Pride cultural tourism project which grew out of it.

Opening in 2018, the Carnlough Heritage Hub received £58,200 funding from the National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) to transform space in the old town hall in the coastal village of Carnlough. Focusing on natural and industrial heritage, the project provides a space used by the local community that also supports the sustainable growth of tourism to the local area.

The Shaped by Industry, Shared with Pride project grew from a discussion at a workshop in the hub, during which local people explored how to raise awareness of the heritage of the Causeway Coastal Route to increase local tourism. This placed an emphasis on a more experiential approach which centres the voices and stories of local people while also personalising the journeys and experiences of visitors.
Between August 2018 and December 2019, a council-led partnership between Carrickfergus Enterprise, Big Telly Theatre Company and a wider range of local tourism businesses secured NLHF funding to develop immersive performances at four industrial heritage sites along the Causeway Coastal Route.

The heritage sites were promoted by local tourism businesses, with short participatory theatre performances taking place that enabled visitors to experience what life was like for a range of different people throughout the history of the places and their industries.

**What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?**

The opening exhibition in the Carnlough Heritage Hub outlined the area’s industrial history and culture, providing information to support guided and self-guided tours in the village and the surrounding area. With support from the museum and heritage service, and the Mid-Antrim Museum at the Braid Arts Centre in nearby Ballymena in particular, community volunteers played a key role in the development and delivery of the project.

These local people researched local heritage sites and archives, engaged with the wider community to raise awareness and encourage participation, delivered public talks and tours, and appeared in a short film to promote local tourism based on local heritage.

The hub has been successful in activating a strong volunteering base and in drawing in visitors from across the UK and further afield, as well as being popular with local visitors and functioning as a well-used community centre for local residents.

A key objective of Shaped by Industry, Shared with Pride was to demonstrate the value of strengthened connections between the industrial heritage sites and local tourism businesses. Through this process, local volunteers developed a range of skills—particularly around marketing.

The heritage sites built their capacity to build relationships and collaborate with the local business sector and each other. Local tourism businesses built a much stronger awareness of their local heritage sites and how developing a sustainable model to continue the performances beyond the life of the project would have long-term benefits for their businesses and local tourism more broadly.

The four sites that took part are now the first Northern Irish members of the European Route of Industrial Heritage, a pan-European initiative highlighting the legacy of industrial heritage.

Crucially, the heritage-led approach to driving tourism is characterised by its dual emphasis on the voice and stories of local people and places, and providing a more authentic experience for visitors to meaningfully connect with the places they are visiting. This has economic benefits for local tourism businesses, as well as enabling local people to better connect with, promote and experience pride around their place-based heritage and identities.

**How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?**

While this is a museum-led intervention, the collaborative approach emphasises wider heritage assets such as local industrial heritage, natural heritage and cultures and memories, taking heritage activities out into the community and co-producing them with local people.

It is an example of how exploring local heritage and how it shapes a place can enhance a sense of pride and belonging within the local community, while also mobilising this in order to project a distinct sense of place outwards in order to attract visitors to a number of places and local businesses that are not well known tourist destinations. This enables local people and small local businesses to engage with visitors in a way provides more authentic and meaningful experiences, while also being sustainable and esteem building for the local community.
In relation to livelihoods, the local authority’s strategic priorities around economic development, tourism and jobs growth have informed the approach. While volunteers have developed a range of skills this involvement is unlikely (and not generally intended) to lead to paid work. Similarly, while local businesses have reported a positive impact, many of these are micro businesses employing a small number of people, with many being arts or food-based passion projects which also require the business owners to have other sources of income.

While there are still clear benefits in terms of sustaining a range of small businesses, increasing participation and building esteem and wellbeing among local communities, there are questions as to whether the approach can grow to a point that it delivers a significant numbers of secure, well paid jobs for local people.

In terms of sustainability, the approach can be seen as an example of how to support heritage-led tourism that is sustainable in a number of ways. By distributing tourism to places which do not have high concentrations of visitors, local communities can meaningfully engage with and benefit from those that do come, while also avoiding problems associated with over-tourism, such as physical erosion of natural landscapes and heritage sites, shortages of housing for local people due to second homes and short-term lets, and the loss of amenities that serve residents.

What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?

The key lessons from Mid and East Antrim are:

Museums can support the development of a more authentic, sustainable, community-focused and spatially distributed tourism offer.

Mid and East Antrim demonstrates the value of broadening the remit of local authority heritage officers from one focused primarily on collections and preservation within museums, to a broader role which encompasses how local museums can engage with broader local heritage and with economic development colleagues to drive a range of wider social, economic and environmental outcomes.

In this example, this broader remit and more facilitative approach has focused on developing a more community-focused, spatially dispersed tourism. This is a model which is more sustainable for, and connected with local communities, with a range of economic and social benefits for local citizens, businesses and visitors which could be replicated elsewhere.

Greater integration between local authority heritage officers and economic development and other opportunity areas:

As well as demonstrating the value of more closely aligned local authority heritage and economic development functions, this example raised questions around how this could go further. How else can local heritage officers and practitioners be embedded in wider local authority functions and decision-making processes — particularly other parts of economic development portfolios around planning and regeneration, or more widely around health and wellbeing, and adults and children’s social care?

Heritage is often cited as a key asset or driver in regeneration and planning approaches at a local authority level, but the voices and expertise of local heritage officers and other practitioners are rarely centred in the final projects or decision-making processes. Similarly, the wellbeing benefits of engaging with heritage are now widely recognised, as is the potential for heritage organisations to play a greater role in supporting local authorities with the challenges they face around growing demand for social care service, and alleviating pressure of local health services through innovative social prescribing models. In this sense, the lessons from Mid and East Antrim also point to a model of cross departmental and sectoral collaboration around heritage for local authorities to deliver a wider range of inclusive growth outcomes.
MUSEUM-LED CASE STUDY: St Fagans National Museum of History, Cardiff (Wales)

Background

St Fagans National Museum of History’s purpose is to celebrate the heritages and cultures of Wales. However, from an inclusive growth perspective, the physical location of the site and its context is key to understanding the potential for socio-economic and environmental outcomes, which by their nature are often place-specific.

The museum is located on the outskirts of Cardiff in south Wales. The surrounding area was the centre of the coal and iron industries through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with Cardiff growing to be a major port and centre for the coal trade.
In part due to historic in-migration of English speakers during industrialisation, and a following period during which Welsh speaking was discouraged, there are fewer Welsh speakers in south Wales compared higher concentrations in north and west Wales, though recent years has seen a growth in Welsh speakers across the board due to renewed recognition of the language as part of the nation's cultural heritage.

Today, the population of Cardiff is estimated to be 364,000. With a history of migration associated with the area's industrial history, post-war immigration and a large international student population, Cardiff has a relatively diverse population (84.7 percent white, 8 percent Asian, 2.4 percent black), particularly in comparison to other parts of Wales.

People living in Cardiff have higher mean weekly earnings than in Wales as a whole, with fewer adults with no qualifications, and a higher proportion of adults educated to NOV4 level and above. However, as is common in post-industrial cities, these figures can obscure inequalities within and between different areas of the cities. A third of households are living in poverty, with this unevenly distributed across the city — ranging from 9 percent to 47.9 percent in different parts of the city.

**What is the approach/intervention?**

The site sits within the 100-acre grounds of St Fagan’s Castle, which was donated to the nation by the Earl of Plymouth in 1946, with the museum opening two years later in 1948. It includes over 40 buildings collected from across Wales and reconstructed on site to reflect a broad range of periods, uses and architectural styles including Iron Age roundhouses, ironworker’s cottages, a prefabricated bungalow, and a pre-Reformation church.

As a working museum, it is used to keep livestock and practice a range of craft, heritage and land management skills. There are demonstrations and introductory courses for visitors and participants.

Inspired by Scandinavian open-air museums, it was the first of its kind in the UK. With its focus on the everyday lives and culture of ‘ordinary people’ throughout Wales’ history, it represented a radical departure from more conventional museums with their focus on collections of objects and artefacts which predominantly represented the history and culture of the wealthiest and most powerful people in society.

The museum is part of Amgueddfa Cymru — National Museum Wales, a Welsh Government funded body which runs the seven national museums across Wales. Governance and strategic functions are centralised within this body, in close collaboration with operational staff at each location, and with key partners in their local communities.

In 2016, the museum embarked on the biggest redevelopment project in its history, which was taken as an opportunity to improve the physical assets of the site and to refresh the organisation’s strategic approach to how the museum could work in more inclusive, representative and participative ways, informing the wider practices of Amgueddfa Cymru into the future.

This included building on recent work to develop more participatory approaches and emphasising the original ambition of the museum’s founder, Dr Iorwerth C. Peate, “not to create a museum which preserved the dead past under glass but one which uses the past to link up with the present to provide a strong foundation and a healthy environment for the future of their people.”

Another influence on the later development of St Fagan’s was Welsh cultural theorist, Raymond Williams, who asserted that ‘culture is ordinary’; that it is something created by and for everyone, which is a principle that has also shaped the museum’s current approach.

---


Crucially, these foundational principles also chime with the current Welsh national policy context in which the Well-being of Future Generations Act (Wales) 2015 has been celebrated as leading global example of how governments can legislate for public bodies to act in the interests of more inclusive and sustainable decision-making and engagement with citizens.30

Completed in 2018, the £30m project was largely funded by the National Lottery Heritage Fund and the Welsh Government. Crucially, the museum stayed open throughout the project, with the redevelopment itself becoming a programme of co-curation, with public participation in decisions about how the museum should be developed — in terms of its physical assets and displays, as well as activities.

What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?

Building on previous work as part of the Our Museum initiative, funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation to embed more participatory methods of engaging with local communities, there was a renewed effort to diversify the museum’s volunteering base to reflect a more representative mix of ages, backgrounds and ethnicities.

Key to empowering a wider range of citizen’s voices through the Our Museum project were partnerships with organisations to enable key socio-economically marginalised groups to volunteer. These included The Wallich, a homelessness charity; NewLink Wales, a substance misuse charity; Innovate Trust, a charity providing supported living services for people with a range of needs; and Diverse Cymru, an equality charity. The benefits for participants are improved confidence, a sense of ownership and the development of new skills and knowledge.

By the end of the overall redevelopment project, around 3000 volunteers had been involved and 120 public and third sector partners had been involved in 10 participatory forums, which have continued to work with Amgueddfa Cymru on their wider work since the completion of the project.31

In addition, relationships with key partner organisations have grown from providing a route in for a wider range of volunteers, to more embedded relationships where they are also involved with adult learning and apprenticeship programmes, and in some instances have taken on gardening spaces within the museum which they use for working with volunteers with particularly complex needs.

When putting the contract for the construction work out to tender, the museum asked for responses that outlined how the winning contractor would deliver wider social value to the local community and economy through the project through a community benefit plan.

As a result the winning bidder, Kier Group, developed a strong local supply chain, worked with local schools, provided a number of work placements and supported apprenticeships, as well as facilitating volunteers to work on site, and to hold ‘tools down’ days in which the wider public could see the work and get involved. The work placements in particular were targeted at disadvantaged young people in the local area.

---


How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?

St Fagan’s is itself a museum, but it also draws on the historic built environment, industrial heritage and cultures and memories of Wales in particular.

The museum’s approach to providing a range of construction skills and employability opportunities through the redevelopment process demonstrates how a public heritage organisation can use a social value approach to procurement to support inclusive livelihoods.

Inclusive livelihood has also been supported by working with community partners to reach marginalised groups and people with complex needs. Those involved have built skills, experience and confidence required in the workplace.

For some, this is a vital step in a longer-term process of moving towards work readiness and paid employment.

The emphasis on social value through the redevelopment procurement process supports local community-based wealth. While the winning bidder was a national company, the emphasis on developing a strong local supply chain demonstrates how heritage organisations can move towards becoming anchor institutions in their local economies, which focus on how to retain the benefits of their spending within the local area, rather than letting it ‘leak out’. 32

Widely associated with the ‘Preston model’ in the UK, this approach is further developed among schools, universities and hospitals but has potential among heritage institutions with significant spending power, with historic buildings that require spending on maintenance, or through larger capital projects to expand and develop their facilities.

The museum’s approach to the redevelopment as co-curation programme demonstrates how heritage institutions can utilise periods of organisational change to empower a wider range of voices in decision-making processes. St Fagans’ work has been informed by the participatory museum approach, which advocates for engaging people as “cultural participants, not passive consumers”. 33

St Fagans focuses on national, rather than locally place-based identity and esteem. However, there is a sense that the former is shaped by the latter, and vice versa. Notably, there is a confidence and ease in the idea of a heritage-based approach to national identity formation in Wales, which is difficult to imagine in English or Northern Irish contexts in particular, where a sense of national identity is more fraught or ambiguous. This highlights how even within the UK, public discourse and widely held notions of what it means to be from a place, and how this relates to a sense of national identity, varies considerably.

What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?

Museums as anchor institutions.

St Fagans is a nascent example of how larger heritage institutions can begin to think of themselves as anchor institutions within their local economies. In St Fagans’ case, they have leveraged funding for a large-scale capital project to maximise wider social and economic benefits in the local area through their procurement practices. To do this, heritage sector professionals must ensure they have sufficient technical knowledge and understanding of how to effectively build these wider requirements into tenders in ways which maximise the opportunities accounted for in the Public Services (Social Value Act) 2012, while also not falling foul of wider procurement regulations.

32 These principles align with community wealth building approaches. In the UK, much work on this is being led by the Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES).

Collaborative cross-sector relationships to reach marginalised groups.

In terms of St Fagans' approach to broadening and diversifying their audiences, and taking a more participatory approach, developing strong collaborative relationships with a range of partners who work with diverse communities, supporting disadvantaged or marginalised groups is essential. In order to effectively embed these relationships and ensure they are sustainable, formal partnership arrangements should be in place, as well as collaborative one-to-one working relationships. This ensures that the partnerships in place serve a shared purpose, bringing together different expertise to better meet community needs. A number of staff should be involved in maintaining and developing the relationships, rather than relying on one person, with full handover procedures in place when key staff members leave, to ensure that partnership working does not stop when key individuals move on from either partner organisation.

A value-led approach is key.

The importance of the Welsh policy context, in which the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act and inclusive growth are both key agendas at a national level must also be considered. This has created conducive conditions and a value-driven consensus at both national and local levels which have enabled St Fagans to take innovative approaches.

While this may not be immediately replicable at a national level in all other parts of the UK, particularly given the limited bandwidth in Westminster due to Brexit, the importance of a value-led approach is something which practitioners and policymakers elsewhere would be wise to centre in their approaches, working to build a values-driven team with a shared vision, at both strategic and operational levels.

COMMUNITY-FOCUSED CASE STUDY

Don’t Settle

Birmingham and the Black Country, England
Community-focused case study:
Don’t Settle, Birmingham and the Black Country
(England)

Background

The Don’t Settle project is working with several heritage, arts and academic partners across Birmingham and the Black Country.

Birmingham is England’s second largest city, with a population of around 1.1 million people.\(^{34}\) Originally a medieval market town sitting close to the geographical centre point of England, Birmingham was well positioned to grow into one of the industrial, commercial and logistical hubs of the UK.

As one of the first manufacturing towns in the world, it was at the epicentre of the industrial revolution. Playing a central role in the development of the country’s canal and rail infrastructure, the city was a manufacturing powerhouse and became well known for its car industry in the 20th century.

Birmingham is more ethnically diverse than London and is soon expected to become a majority minority city.

The Black Country is a sub-region of the West Midlands and sits to the west of Birmingham. It covers the areas of Wolverhampton, Walsall, Sandwell and Dudley and also has a population of around 1.1 million people.\(^{35}\)

Due in part to the proximity to Birmingham, the region also underwent significant industrialisation, with the air pollution associated with local foundries, factories and steel mills widely credited with giving the area its name. This contributed to a shared identity which still holds sway in the area long since the decline of the industries which shaped it.

While the Black Country and the places within it have identities that are distinct from each other and from Birmingham, there is a strong shared heritage across the region, and extensive economic and infrastructure ties which inform a looser, but still relatively distinct West Midlands identity.

What is the approach/intervention?

Don’t Settle is part of NLHF’s Kick the Dust programme, which was set up in 2018 as a pilot grants programme to test new approaches to engaging young people with heritage. It aims to embed diversity and long-term organisational change in the organisations involved.

The Don’t Settle project received £696,700 of funding and was launched as a three-year project in February 2019. It is led locally by Beatfreeks, a socially driven collective of creative companies based in Birmingham, which is guided by a Youth Steering Committee as well as a board of directors.

The project has focused on the discrepancy between the diversity of citizens in communities across Birmingham and the Black Country and the much less diverse range of stories and perspectives reflected by the heritage organisations intended to serve them. If local heritage is to function as an inclusive, collectively owned asset, then this is something which needs to change.


To tackle the discrepancy, Beatfreeks are working with local young people of colour and key organisations across the region to present a wider range of stories, broaden heritage audiences and get the young people they work with directly involved in decision making in the sector.

They are doing this across four strands of work:

The first is a curator programme for young people of colour that works with the Birmingham Museums Trust, Chance Heritage Trust and Roundhouse Birmingham to curate programmes which tell the stories and experiences of diverse communities as part of the history of Birmingham and the Black Country.

The second is a governance programme that works with the same organisations to create youth engagement structures within their governance arrangements. The aim is to shift power structures and empower young people of colour to co-design and be part of decision-making processes within heritage organisations.

The third is Lunar Campfires, which draws on the history of the Lunar Society—an exclusive group of 18th- and 19th century intellectuals and industrialists at the heart of the Midlands Enlightenment movement. In contrast, Lunar Campfires is an inclusive model of open discussions which are co-designed with the participants and tackle a range of topics such as colourism and the relationship between language and identity. The events are open to all, and mainly hosted at Soho House, which was built by Matthew Boulton. Boulton was a Lunar Society member as well as a famous and celebrated local industrialist who is less well known for the significant investments and business he received from slave plantations overseas.

The fourth is a programme of research with Birmingham City University to discover and highlight unheard and neglected local stories and histories, and to develop young people's research skills.

What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?

The overarching aim of the project is to empower local young people of colour to change the voice of heritage in Birmingham and the Black Country through the arts, research and governance.

The four strands of work are designed to empower young people of colour to engage, challenge norms and champion multiple stories that better reflect their local communities. This is to enable them to participate in reshaping organisational systems in the heritage sector, and to embed a practice-driven approach that builds organisational diversity and resilience.
At the end of the first year of the project, young people involved have reported a range of positive outcomes around:

- The development of their own skills and confidence
- Their understanding of heritage
- Being listened to by the organisations they have worked with
- Being able to influence decisions being made.

As a result of the programme, Birmingham Museums Trust is planning to establish a youth engagement structure as part of the organisation’s governance, with the intention that this provides a developmental pipeline for young people to take up positions on their Board of Trustees in the future.

How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?

The Don’t Settle approach largely draws on local museums, archives and artefacts, and cultures and memories to work with heritage organisations to better meet community needs. As part of this it also draws on the historic built environment and industrial heritage of Birmingham and the Black Country.

Don’t Settle strongly aligns with inclusive livelihoods by actively developing the skills of young people of colour, who are hugely underrepresented in the heritage sector workforce. This ranges from curation and research skills, to strategic leadership skills — opening up development pathways at a number of levels and embedding this in formal structures.

It is also a particularly powerful example of a more radical and particularly effective approach to empowering marginalised voices and increasing participation of under-represented groups within heritage spaces and their organisational functions and structures.

It goes beyond lighter-touch approaches to engagement and consultation, often focused primarily on diversifying audiences, to involve young people of colour directly in both strategic decision-making, and co-designing and co-evaluating projects. Crucially, it also involves opening up heritage spaces for conversations and dialogue around challenging subjects which are of relevance to the daily lives of the young people involved.

It is through the above approaches to building skills and confidence and enabling the young people to participate and have their voices heard, that the project also feeds into wellbeing and esteem for those involved. This includes more diverse local audiences who are more engaged with their local heritage assets due to the inclusive stories being told, and how these represent and connect them to the history of their place.
What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?

**Key lessons from Don’t Settle include:**

**Inclusive workforces, at all levels, are essential for moving from tokenistic diversity to inclusive and equitable organisations.**

A more diverse workforce, across all levels is a prerequisite for genuine engagement with more diverse audiences. Heritage organisations need to reflect representative ranges of perspectives and stories in order to speak to these audiences. To avoid tokenism, diverse perspectives and voices need to be embedded in organisations themselves.

Don’t Settle has been ambitious and bold with this and is a powerful example of inclusivity in practice in a heritage context. The model of establishing a youth board to work alongside, and to provide a progression route onto non-executive boards has applicability across the cultural and third sectors more broadly. Particularly as these sectors increasingly recognise the unsustainability and missed opportunity of boards dominated by the affluent, pre-dominantly white, middle class.

**Don’t be afraid to ask the difficult, uncomfortable questions.**

The Lunar Campfires approach asks important questions around how heritage organisations are complicit in upholding cultural narratives which push the visibility and experiences of minority groups to the margins.

The lesson is to not shy away from the difficult questions that many heritage sites and organisations rightly find challenging, particularly how celebrated historical figures and heritage assets often have associations with the slave trade, or with the spoils of empire. Ignoring this reality will function to alienate local communities that are increasingly diverse and with roots in places, or even with family members, that were on the sharp end of these historical realities.

Making these stories visible is an essential part of how we acknowledge colonial histories and move towards developing more inclusive narratives relating to both individual and collective identities which encompass a range of heritages.

There are difficult and often uncomfortable conversations to be had, requiring a high degree of self-reflectiveness at both an individual and collective level within heritage organisations.

To be successful, commitment and shared values among those leading and delivering the project is needed.

**This is a long-term process.**

In the case of Don’t Settle, a lot of groundwork had been done through previous projects. In one case, a partner organisation spoke about how an earlier project to present a plurality of historical perspectives received more negative responses from more traditional heritage audiences.

Some visitors felt that they came to museums and heritage sites “for historical fact and truth”, and were not comfortable with an approach which challenged the assumption that it is possible to present a single, objective interpretation of our history. Facilitating a recognition that heritage spaces are not, and have never been, neutral or apolitical spaces is essential to inclusivity, but a long, incremental journey for some.
Welsh Streets

Liverpool, England

**Background**

Dating back to the 12th century, the evolution of Liverpool as a major port and industrial centre saw the city grow in size and wealth through the Industrial Revolution.

Today, the city has a population of 494,000, with the wider city region totally 1.5 million people.36

It is renowned for its culture and heritage, often upheld as an example of how post-industrial places can draw on these assets, and the sense of pride in a place, to turn around declining fortunes and reputation.

The Welsh Streets are an area of Victorian terraced houses in the Toxteth area of the city, known for riots in the early 1980s which erupted out of tensions between the local black community and Merseyside Police’s use of stop and search.

Community-focused case study: Welsh Streets, Liverpool (England)

**APPROACH**

- Community-focused regeneration of heritage housing stock in response to resident-led resistance to demolition

**OUTCOMES**

- Heritage of local area maintained
- Longterm investment in build to rent model
- Secure and sustainable homes for residents

Key Inclusive Growth Taxonomy domains:

- Livelihoods
- Wealth
- Esteem and wellbeing
- Future sustainability
- Voice

**LESSONS**

- How developers can be commercial and community focused
- Refurbishment is a key response to the challenges of sustainability and supply of housing stock
- Forward planning required to minimise displacement of existing residents


However, designed by a Welsh architect, the houses were built by Welsh labourers to house Welsh workers who were moving to the city for employment, and as such, the area can also be seen as emblematic of a city whose rich heritage and culture is intricately tied to the movement and integration of people from other places — whether that be the city's large Irish population, or the longest standing black community in the UK, dating back to the early 18th century.

As the birthplace of Ringo Starr, and a location used for the popular drama Peaky Blinders, the area also has strong associations with the popular cultural heritage of the city.

The neighbourhood conditions of the Welsh Streets declined through the latter part of the twentieth century. Over time, around two thirds of the houses were transferred to social landlords. In the early 2000s the area was earmarked for demolition by the city council, with a view to redevelop the land with new, but fewer, homes. This was part of a national response to declining neighbourhood conditions and the oversupply of older housing in many ex-industrial cities, particularly in the North of England.

What is the approach/intervention?

Demolition plans were controversial among local residents. Some, tired of the poor conditions in some of the properties were keen to see the area demolished, but many were resistant, citing the impact on fragmenting the local community, high costs, environmental impact and the destruction of a unique part of the city’s built heritage and the sense of identity many residents drew from it.

A resident campaign group — Welsh Streets Home Group — was set up to challenge the demolition. A prolonged period of uncertainty followed, during which time they worked closely with a number of local and national architectural heritage and civic organisations to provide evidence in support of the heritage significance of the area.

The original national funding for demolition was removed, but the houses were cleared of residents and the city council remained keen to press ahead with alternative funds.

However, the revised demolition and rebuild plans were finally blocked in 2015 by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government following a public inquiry, on the grounds that it would come at too high a cost to the tangible heritage of the local built environment, and specifically the intangible cultural heritage of the area’s association with The Beatles.

The community’s resistance ultimately resulted in the council developing refurbishment plans. However, their existing housing partner did not have the expertise to deliver the kind of works required, and conventional developers were not interested in taking on a project which offered low short-term returns on investment. An alternative approach was developed in partnership with Placefirst, a small, commercial but socially focused residential build-to-let company with experience refurbishing similar sites, albeit on a smaller scale.

Placefirst’s approach focused on high quality, environmentally sustainable design and construction, that responded to the needs of the local community and its heritage. By taking a long-term build to rent approach, they are able to provide good quality rental homes as a secure alternative to home ownership and invest in building strong communities within a place.
In contrast to the high churn and insecurity that characterises much of the private rental market, having a low turnover of tenants is central to Placefirst’s model.

Beginning with a pilot of 25 properties to test their innovative approach, it was successfully scaled to a total of 209. Placefirst are now developing a further 74 homes, including new builds and refurbished properties, with plans for Liverpool City Council and their housing association partner to provide ‘affordable housing’ alongside this.

Ringo Starr’s birthplace is currently used as a show home and is not suitable as a family home due to the number of visitors to the site. Placefirst has plans to turn this into a short-term holiday let to fund further community initiatives such as a community garden, community event space or low-cost working spaces.

What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?

As a result of the community-led resistance to demolition, the heritage and historic character of the Welsh Streets has been maintained. The exteriors of the houses have been sympathetically restored, while the interiors were extensively remodelled to improved energy saving and environmental standards, and with lower carbon emissions and particulate pollution resulting from refurbishment than with demolition and rebuild.

An emphasis on supporting the local supply chain resulted in 80 percent of subcontractors coming from within 3 miles of Liverpool, ensuring a high proportion of the council’s investment built wealth within the local economy.

Some of the properties were merged to create larger, family homes that are often in short supply in the rental market. The original alleys and yards were combined into communal gardens, while the boundary fences between private gardens were all kept to waist height to encourage interactions between neighbours facilitate the growing sense of community.

Some of the original residents have returned — the first family to move in were a blended family who have lived in the area previously but could not afford to buy a property. However, the nature of the planned demolition and removal of residents in accordance with the original demolition plans meant that many longstanding members of the community have settled elsewhere or have not been able to return due to the lack of social housing.

Early indications are that the new community of new and old residents is establishing a strong collective identity and pride in the place, however there remain lessons to be learned regarding the disruption that all works — demolition or refurbishment — have on communities, and particularly the socio-economically disadvantaged when there is insufficient funding to replace, or enhance, the social housing offer.
How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?

The Welsh Streets is an example of how the historic built environment, alongside the culture and memories of a local place can be of huge significance to a local community, as evidenced by the resident who led the campaign to prevent demolition.

For those members of the community, the sense of continuity and belonging embodied in the Welsh Streets as a place, was a powerful driver to action. They had no guarantee that their efforts would be successful, nor that they would necessarily have a home in the area in the future if it was refurbished, in what is a powerful example of the emotional and psychological importance of heritage and place to wellbeing and esteem at both individual and collective levels.

Placefirst’s emphasis on supporting local employment and supply chains is another example of how heritage-led construction works can support livelihoods in the local community and retain investment by supporting local businesses, a key element of building community wealth. Crucially, construction is a sector which provides relatively high pay, provides opportunities for skills development and progression, including for those with fewer formal qualifications, in a sector in which there is a high demand for workers due to skills shortages.37

The houses have been refurbished to high energy efficiency standards, which makes them affordable and sustainable heritage homes for current and future residents, while the choice to refurbish rather than demolish significantly reduced the carbon cost and air pollution created by the project. For the local council and Placefirst, this was the first project of this kind at such a large scale, and therefore has the potential to inform future projects, embedding and scaling this sustainable approach.


Citizen voice and participation was clearly the catalysing factor for the approach taken on the Welsh Streets, and Placefirst continued to engage with local people through the development process. While the outcome is clearly a victory for community-led action and an example of how people can coalesce around a heritage built environment to make their voices heard effect real change, the project was ultimately overseen by the local council and delivered by Placefirst, rather than being a participatory model with residents directly involved in decision-making processes.

What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?

It is possible for regeneration partners to be both commercial and community focused.

Welsh Streets is a prime example of where social, economic and environmental benefits are mutually reinforcing. The innovative approach taken by Placefirst is a powerful example of how a private sector body can take a socially driven and values-led, but still fundamentally commercial, approach to delivering housing. In this sense the case study is a powerful counterargument against ingrained assumptions that commercial viability and wider social, economic and environmental outcomes are at odds with one another.

Placefirst’s emphasis on a long-term rather than short-term investment model is key to this, and is a lesson for how private sector partners can contribute to place making and community building, rather than centring short-term investment which extracts wealth from local areas and drives churn of residents, preventing the development of embedded and connected communities.
Refurbishment of heritage housing stock is key to developing more environmentally sustainable solutions to our housing challenges.

Welsh Streets exemplifies how, from both a heritage and an inclusive growth perspective, refurbishment of heritage housing stock is a viable alternative to demolition which can deliver not only high-quality housing that meets local needs, but also a wider range of benefits to the local community and economy.

There are numerous community-led campaigns ongoing across the country fighting the demolition of their neighbourhoods, with many of these groups highlighting the heritage significance of their places and the sense of belonging that is integral to their communities. The success of the Welsh Streets provides an example for local councils able to take a refurbishment approach in many such instances.

The importance of thinking ahead to minimise the displacement of existing residents, their community ties and their intangible heritage.

In the case of Welsh Streets, the original plan to demolish the heritage housing stock meant that the neighbourhood’s regeneration grew out of adversarial origins. It resulted in the clearing out of properties prior to Placefirst's involvement in developing refurbishment plans. This, combined with a lack of social housing provision, resulted in the displacement of a significant proportion of original residents. Other areas should look to mitigate this in the interests of ensuring that refurbishment projects of heritage housing stocks are as inclusive as possible and maintain a local area's intangible, as well as tangible, heritage.
Regeneration-led case study:
Growth Lancashire (England)

Place-based business support and economic development company with a growing focus on heritage-led regeneration

OUTCOMES

- Increased employment and skills development
- Increased public and private investment in local economy
- Repositioning and emphasizing the value of local heritage

Key Inclusive Growth Taxonomy domains:
- Livelihoods

LESSONS

- Significant opportunities to repurpose heritage assets for new uses
- Strategic partnerships should underpin regional inclusive growth
- There are further opportunities for inclusivity

Background

The historic county of Lancashire can quite rightly lay claim to being the birthplace of modern industrial capitalism. Coal, cotton and climate conspired to make Manchester and Liverpool 19th century centres for global trade with its famous mill towns of Preston, Blackburn and Burnley to the east and fertile Lancashire plains to the west producing diverse agricultural produce to feed burgeoning urban populations.

Lancashire has a population of nearly 1.5 million people and growing at a steady rate, with Preston and Lancaster growing more quickly than the national average. In recent decades there has been a growing South Asian population, particularly concentrated in some of the former mill towns, but the more rural parts of the county are characterised by a relatively ageing population.

Since 1974, Manchester and Liverpool cut adrift and so now the ceremonial county comprises Lancashire County Council and its 12 districts together with the unitary authorities of Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool.

Political boundaries aside, Lancashire’s proud industrial heritage still dominates the skyline with giant brick-box mills and tall chimneys standing proud in every town and, together with the surrounding rural areas, attracting a visitor economy worth more than £4bn to the regional economy.

What is the approach/intervention?

Growth Lancashire is a business support and economic development company. It is owned by several Lancashire local authorities and operates across the county of Lancashire. Its role includes supporting businesses to grow, caring for and developing Lancashire’s heritage assets, promoting Lancashire and securing and delivering external investment. The company has developed over the past 15 years through various phases. It began in 2004 with a focus on housing market renewal but in 2010 became the vehicle for the delivery of government regeneration and business support funding. It was renamed Growth Lancashire in 2016 with a geographical remit for the whole county and with an increasing focus on heritage.

Although much of the company’s focus is on providing business support through Boost, Lancashire’s business growth hub, conservation and heritage-led regeneration is a growing area of activity and expertise.

Growth Lancashire works with several local authorities including Preston, Chorley, South Ribble and Blackburn with Darwen, to provide heritage and conservation services as part of local development management processes. Growth Lancashire is also commissioned by private clients on particular schemes with a view to bringing heritage assets back into use or changing existing uses of old or historic buildings.

For example, Growth Lancashire has supported Pendle Council and Barnfield Construction in the redevelopment of Brierfield Mill, a huge 380,000 square foot former cotton mill built in 1832. The redevelopment not only involves the restoration of architectural features but also its conversion into a multi-use facility including offices and a workshop hub for small

businesses, a residential quarter of apartments, and leisure facilities in the form of a climbing wall, indoor sports pitches and a soft play area. Named Northlight, its marketing materials draw heavily on its industrial heritage as it seeks to breathe life into an area better known for recent industrial decline:

“A new revolution is taking place in its former mills and waterways, breathing energy into its landscape and creating a new kind of buzz through innovation regeneration—fresh air, fresh outlooks and a fresh take on modern lifestyles”.39

Growth Lancashire also tries to encourage a more strategic approach to the role of heritage-driven regeneration across the county, in giving it more strategic profile and generating capacity and expertise locally. It has carried out conservation area appraisals, exploring the economic case for investment in key buildings and assets, but has tended to be more demand-led as a resource to local authorities, in particular to maximise the opportunities found in their local lists of heritage assets.

What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?

Growth Lancashire's annual report boasts of high levels of business support, growing employment in the region and improvements in the median weekly wage. As regards heritage, the focus is primarily on its contribution to the local economy through the attraction of public and private investment, in particular heritage-led regeneration schemes.

The approach is mainly demand-led, in that Growth Lancashire doesn’t have any particular strategy or theory of change as demand from local authorities and private clients has tended to grow. Most heritage projects are site specific and so there are limited links made with wider local economic strategy. These responsibilities are left principally to the local authorities and the local enterprise partnership, so projects are evaluated against their delivery more than their wider economic or social impact.

However, there is a clear and implicit understanding that Growth Lancashire's heritage work is about making a contribution to improving perceptions of the county and repositioning its ‘decaying legacy’ with a sense that the county can provide good quality employment opportunities and a great quality of life for its residents. There is also a clear recognition that heritage investment can have both economic and social outcomes even in those heritage assets that may not have the profile of large, converted mills.

There is enthusiasm to carry out more proactive and strategic development work, particularly as part of Lancashire's county-wide bid to become the UK's City of Culture in 2025, an initiative being led by partner agency Marketing Lancashire. There is also a concern to support local authorities do more to see heritage as a vital element of their local economic development plans.

Crucially, Growth Lancashire is a unique public-private partnership which is beginning to exemplify ways in which project-based heritage regeneration can lead to a more profound social and economic transformation.

How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?

At present, Growth Lancashire has focused mainly on its historic built environment, its industrial heritage and its museums. The fact that its heritage work takes place in the context of wider economic development means that there is a strong focus on livelihoods and some projects are monitored in terms of the number of jobs they have created or safeguarded. Growth Lancashire also works with the University of Central Lancashire in Preston to support teaching and provide placements to students on relevant courses.
As regards considerations of **wealth**, heritage assets are largely seen and developed by Growth Lancashire as private assets, even where there is public investment involved. From a planning perspective there is a consideration of the value of an asset to the wider community, and local authorities are keen to see heritage assets brought back into use for the benefit of the wider area. However, our research suggests that developers often do not look at the bigger picture beyond the market viability of their investment, indicating an opportunity to improve the range of inclusive growth outcomes delivered.

The picture is similar as regards **voice** and community engagement. Planning requires some community consultation, but this is not generally undertaken by Growth Lancashire as a core part of their business. Heritage enthusiasts have exercised some concern about certain assets being bought and repurposed in ways that are not considered to be in keeping with their historic value. While one view expressed in the research was that Lancashire’s large Asian communities perceive this kind of heritage as not being open or relevant to them.

As such, there is scope for further consideration about how approaches such as Growth Lancashire could effectively engage with diverse local communities to build more inclusive communities around these heritage assets, as well as spreading the economic benefits they bring to a more inclusive range of local people.

There is an increasing focus though on **sustainability** and environmental issues. Growth Lancashire works with developers and local authorities to consider the environmental standards of different schemes. It has also, for example, developed new services concerning the protection of trees and the encouragement of tree-planting schemes. Once again though, it sees the primary responsibility for issues of local sustainability lying with local authorities.

As described above, a key aspect of Growth Lancashire’s role is to celebrate Lancashire’s heritage as a driver for inclusive growth. Local authorities and other local stakeholders are concerned with how **places** are perceived and people are very proud of being Lancastrian, which is tied up with their sense of place and industrial heritage but also pride in the fact that there continues to be a lot of manufacturing to this day.

**What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?**

**Industrial heritage can be repurposed for contemporary use.**

Growth Lancashire demonstrates the opportunities to be found in repurposing industrial heritage assets for contemporary uses. For a county which is often characterised as having many challenges and so-called ‘left-behind places’, heritage assets represent important sites for new jobs and enterprise, a high-quality residential offer and leisure and tourism opportunities.

**Strategic partnerships are key for regional inclusive growth.**

Growth Lancashire also shows the value of nurturing and building expertise, providing services on behalf of local authorities to a wide range of stakeholders. Operating across local authority boundaries and at a sub-regional level allows local initiatives to grow capacity and allows for a more co-ordinated approach. Growth Lancashire represents a solid foundation upon which a more strategic approach to more inclusive growth can now be built.
There are opportunities for the approach to be taken further in terms of inclusivity.

Growth Lancashire has established a strong economic case for repurposing industrial heritage. But this remains a challenging process and there is a need for greater proactivity in terms of ensuring these benefits are inclusively distributed. Fostering linkages between business development support and heritage development represents a huge opportunity for more inclusive livelihoods. More thinking about how heritage assets might foster community engagement and become, in some cases, community assets could address issues of empowerment and cohesion which are key to changing perceptions of the county. And there is clearly scope for a more evidence-based approach and more long-term assessment an evaluation of impact.
Regeneration-focused case study:  
Margate Townscape Heritage Initiatives  
(England)

### APPROACH

**Two townscape Heritage Initiatives:**
- One focused on a historic commercial and leisure area.
- One an area of historic residential and hospitality heritage assets.

### OUTCOMES

- Heritage assets restored and preserved
- Vacant retail spaces brought back into use
- Sustainable, higher quality housing meeting a wider range of economic, social and environmental needs
- Improved perceptions and sense of pride in local area

### LESSONS

- The symbolic value of making visible improvements to decaying heritage assets
- Innovative approaches to refurbishment can address multiple challenges as the same time
- Equitably distributing the benefits of regeneration remains challenging

### Background

Margate is a coastal town in Kent, England. With strong maritime associations, it was a point of exchange of people, goods and cultures for several centuries. It also grew to be one of England’s leading seaside resorts.

With the decline of the tourism industry in British seaside towns and wider economic restructuring, Margate reflects many of the challenges associated with coastal towns in the UK.

Today, the population is around 54,000. Located within the Thanet district, the population is 90.4 percent white at a local authority level. There is below average educational attainment, low median income levels, and high unemployment rates.

Two of its five wards are among the 10 percent most deprived in the country. Margate Central and Cliftonville West are the locations for both of the town’s Heritage Townscape Initiatives. At around 30 percent, Cliftonville West also has the highest concentration of black and minority residents, with half of these having moved to the area from Eastern Europe and Poland.

For the town’s built heritage assets, the latter decades of the 20th century were largely characterised by changing use and growing disrepair. Historic hotels and guest houses were converted into houses in multiple occupancy (HMOs) and retail spaces experienced underoccupancy, reflecting the experience of declining high streets across the UK.

In recent years, Thanet received media attention as the constituency in which Nigel Farage, then leader of the UK Independence Party (UKIP), stood for election. The area has been a flashpoint for coverage around Brexit, British identity, immigration and a rise in hate crimes.

However, this time has also seen significant investment in Margate. Heritage tourism has been boosted by the reopening of the Dreamland amusement park, while the opening of the Turner Contemporary art gallery has been widely credited with driving a surge in the local cultural and creative sector.

Increasingly hailed in the media as one of the best, most affordable or trendiest towns to live in Britain, the changes being seen in Margate are welcomed by many, but the growing profile of the town as a desirable, creative place to live and visit has also brought concerns around gentrification, and ultimately who benefits from the investment and changes in the town.
What is the approach/intervention?

Recent decades have seen a number of heritage and culture-based interventions intended to support the physical, economic and reputational regeneration of Margate.

The Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI) is NLHF’s grant programme for the regeneration and repair of the historic build environment in urban areas for the benefit of local communities, and Margate has been successful in delivering two projects through this funding stream.

**Margate Old Town THI**

The first of these was the Margate Old Town THI. Carried out between 2003 and 2008, this scheme is considered locally to have been pivotal as an early heritage-led regeneration initiative in the town. Margate Old Town is the historic commercial and retail area of the town, which had experienced significant decline in the condition and occupancy rates of the buildings in the area as the economy of the town suffered, shopping habits changed and commercial interests shifted their focus away from the historic centre towards out-of-town retail spaces.

With a budget of £1.2m, the THI was funded jointly by Thanet District Council (TDC) and NLHF. It was led by the local council, but with significant collaboration with local residents and business owners, particularly through the Margate Town Action Group. It allocated funding for the repair and refurbishment of historic buildings in the area, ranging from small repairs to more drastic works required on some of the properties to bring them into use.

**Dalby Square THI**

The second THI in Margate, the Dalby Square project was a jointly funded by NLHF and TDC.

An area of significant historical importance, it was originally designed as the centre piece of Margate’s ‘new town’ built in 1870. Many of the original buildings were hotels and guest houses catering to the affluent tourists of the period. But recent decades had seen most of these businesses close, with buildings converted into low-quality, poorly maintained HMOs as well as care homes and hostels.

In 2015, the neighbourhood was the fourth most deprived in England, out of 32,844 areas, and was negatively perceived both by residents of the square and others living locally.

THI funding was used to work with residents, property and business owners in the square to repair and refurbish the buildings with a view to improve neighbourhood conditions, provide high-quality housing and develop a stronger, less transient community.

One particularly interesting example is number 12A, formerly the Innsbruck Hotel. The property was bought by Kent County Council as part of their programme to buy existing properties and refurbish them into high quality housing to address local housing needs and improve neighbourhood conditions. The THI contributed financially to enable the project to address the interrelated challenges of climate change, housing shortages, decline of heritage assets and an aging population.

The result was a multi-generational home refurbished to high sustainability and conservation standards, bringing together a family of six, including key workers, that had previously been split between lower quality accommodation in three separate households. Kent County Council is not a registered social landlord, so the property is rented privately to the family through a specially created company.
What are the intended and/or delivered outcomes?

**Old Town THI**

The Old Town THI resulted in 55 buildings repaired and 33 buildings reused, creating 60 jobs. Vacant buildings fell from 31 to four, with 78 percent of buildings being judged as good condition. New businesses moved into the area, including some opened by people who had grown up locally and moved away but felt that the Old Town presented an opportunity for them to return and start a business in their hometown.

It developed an improved built environment, invigorated the Old Town’s economy and renewed a sense of place and pride in the area—particularly in relation to the impact of new businesses and the growing artistic community.

It is seen to have laid much groundwork for wider heritage and culture led regeneration in the area, such as the adjacent Turner Contemporary, and a similar THI in neighbouring Ramsgate.

Older and incoming residents and businesses in the new town have developed a cohesive sense of community. However, the spaces and opportunities created are not widely accessed by more socio-economically disadvantaged groups or migrant residents from the wider community, who are not widely targeted by, or represented within, the local businesses or cultural offer.

**Dalby Square THI**

The project aimed to “create a cohesive, stable area which values its built heritage and sees it as an asset, not a hindrance”.

Owners that received a grant indicated that they could, or would, not have made the investment in their properties independently, and all felt that the scheme preserved the heritage of the area through the conservation of the buildings involved. Local residents also reported an improved sense of safety.

While the scheme did not directly address factors that contributed to the levels of deprivation in the area, such as access to good work and long-term unemployment, 45 percent of residents did report that the scheme made them feel more proud to live there than before.

Community organisations reported higher levels of community engagement, but the extent to which it helped develop a more cohesive and inclusive sense of community is not clear cut. Only 40 percent felt that the area is somewhere that people from different backgrounds get on well, with only 20 percent thinking that the scheme made it easier for this to happen.

In the case of 12a Dalby Square, the family that moved into the property experienced a range of benefits including reduced household costs from improved energy efficiency and pooled resources across the household; an increase in mutual support, informal care; closer family relationships and drastically improved living conditions compared to their previous accommodation.

How does the approach tell us about the relationships in the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model?

Both Margate THIs were primarily concerned with heritage assets that make up part of the historic built environment of the town. A primary driver in both instances was the potential of improvements to the built environment to not only preserve and conserve the buildings, but the impact that a revitalised commercial area and regenerated residential square could have on the perceptions of, and local people’s sense of attachment to, the two places.

In this respect, both THIs have taken a regeneration-led approach to improving wellbeing and esteem by making physical changes to places that had experienced significant decline and were perceived negatively by both residents, people in the wider area and visitors.

---

This is a strong example of the interplay between an improvement in physical condition and the impacts this has on individual and collective wellbeing and esteem. In the case of the Old Town, it has been noted that since the works local property owners are significantly less likely to ignore restrictions on changes to the buildings which undermine their heritage value, indicating a deeper personal investment, sense of pride and recognition of the intrinsic value of the area’s built heritage.

In terms of livelihoods, both projects supported employment for construction workers, some with specialist built heritage skills, and in the instance of Dalby Square expertise in sustainable design and construction.

There is no data for the number of jobs or new businesses created as a result of the Old Town THI, but a high number of commercial buildings re-entered use, and local anecdotal evidence suggests that this created a number of new jobs, largely in small locally owned businesses.

12A Dalby Square is particularly interesting in that it highlights the potential to deliver benefits through the sustainable refurbishment of heritage housing stock to provide a multi-generational living environment that also effectively responds to an aging population.

It also enables the family to build and retain more wealth by combining their living costs. They save on previously duplicated utilities and goods but make the most significant savings on the amount of rent they were paying to their multiple private landlords before moving.

What key lessons for heritage and/or economic development practitioners, or recommendations for policymakers, emerge from this case study?

Key lessons from Margate include:

The symbolic value and power to catalyse change through investing in heritage high streets.

Investment in the rejuvenation of a heritage high street, which sits at the symbolic heart of a well-loved but declining and increasingly stigmatised area can be powerful. It can transform the immediate area and catalyse investment and improvements in the surrounding place in the longer term. The opening of the Turner Contemporary in Margate would have been considered an outlandish impossibility prior to the changes the THI played a key role in initiating.

Innovative refurbishment of residential heritage assets can tackle multiple big challenges:

Reusing and refurbishing existing buildings is an essential element of how to respond to the climate crisis, and Dalby Square shows how innovative repurposing of buildings can also better meet our social and economic needs. Large buildings like this are well suited to conversion for multi-generational living, not just being split into flats.

As more people live in private rented accommodation throughout their lifetimes, it is becoming important to develop models which mitigate the worst, wealth extracting tendencies of the private rental market as it currently stands.

The number 12A approach, in which a local authority makes a long-term investment in the refurbishment as a private landlord for multigenerational households, warrants further exploration. There is potential for a cultural shift towards multigenerational living and strengthened neighbourhood communities to offset the demands on social care associated with an aging population.
This model should not be used to enable continued underfunding of social housing or social care services. However, it could provide an alternative to extractive, short-term profit maximising private landlords that characterise the worst elements of the private rental market, and disproportionally impact those on lower incomes living in poor quality housing.

*It is challenging to equitably distribute the benefits of heritage-led regeneration.*

There are limits to regeneration-led approaches to growth, and the extent to which this can be truly inclusive. There are many economic, social and environmental benefits from regenerating the physical environment. But just because there is no intention to exclude more disadvantaged or minority groups from these benefits, this is not a guarantee that they will benefit.

Groups with more economic, social and human capital are best positioned to make the most of the opportunities such as opening new businesses. These people and businesses make an invaluable contribution to their community and economy, but one that cannot be assumed to reach and feel relevant to everyone.

Places like Margate have many citizens experiencing the sharpest end of long-term economic decline, destabilised identities and lack of opportunity. Many of these are from established white working-class communities, but they share many of these challenges with minority and migrant groups who also face increasingly hostile narratives which scapegoat them for these same problems.

In this sense, places such as Margate teach us that for heritage regeneration approaches to be truly inclusive, they also need to proactively target, involve and build in the needs of these groups from the start.
Insights and analysis

The case studies point to what heritage for inclusive growth can look like in practice. But they also highlight how this is still a nascent approach. Even in places such as Norfolk and Suffolk with a more developed collaborative, whole-place approach to heritage and economic development and an explicit link made between heritage and inclusive growth outcomes, there is a sense that there are still many untapped opportunities and lessons being learned.

But the examples are varied in their approaches and the types of places which have taken them — ranging from large cities, to coastal towns and more dispersed rural and urban areas. In this sense they provide a valuable range of insights and examples to inform and inspire the development of heritage for inclusive growth strategies in a range of different places.

The heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model has provided a valuable critical lens through which to understand:

- How heritage interventions draw on a range of types of heritage
- How heritage and a sense of place inform each other in practice
- How heritage led interventions can deliver a range of inclusive growth outcomes
- Example mechanisms and approaches for driving positive change.

It is unlikely that the approach taken in any of these one places will be immediately replicable and transferrable to another. As highlighted by many of the case studies, the nature of heritage is that it is specific to a local place, and each has different needs and priorities with regards to inclusive growth.

In addition, the existing institutional and community relationships required to deliver heritage driven inclusive growth outcomes will vary between places, with some being further ahead in this respect than others. All of this needs to be factored in when developing local strategies and delivery models.

But taken both individually and in combination, there are a range of insights emerging from these case studies which are relevant to both heritage and economic development practitioners and professionals at a local level, as well as strategic decision makers, policymakers and communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>DWELLING</th>
<th>ELECTIVE BELONGING</th>
<th>MULTIPLE ATTACHMENTS</th>
<th>SYMBOLIC &amp; COLLECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Anglia LEP, Norfolk and Suffolk (England)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee, Scotland</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid and East Antrim Museum and Heritage Service (Northern Ireland)</td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Fagan’s National Museum of History, Cardiff (Wales)</td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Settle, Birmingham and the Black Country (England)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Streets, Liverpool (England)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Lancashire (England)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margate Townscape Heritage Initiatives (England)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Appendix 1 for an overview of the four dimensions of place contained within the Heritage for Inclusive Growth Ecosystem model)
The importance of understanding, coalescing around and developing a stronger sense of place is a common thread running through all of the case studies, standing as testament to the powerful potential associated with heritage-led intervention for inclusive growth in this respect.

However as demonstrated here, the extent to which different interventions engage with the different types of place attachment identified by the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem varies significantly. In part, this is to be expected—for some interventions or projects it may well be more appropriate to focus more on some elements of place attachment than others.

A small number of case studies such as this cannot be taken as fully representative of all heritage-led activities and interventions for inclusive growth. However, existing research on the role of place supports the indications from this work that there is potential for heritage for inclusive growth approaches to further embed considerations of multiple place attachments (see Appendix 1).

There is a clear opportunity here for more interventions to consider the diversity of local communities and the role of multiple place attachments, alongside forms of attachment focused specifically on that place.

Many local people within a place will always have direct or inherited attachments to other parts of the UK and the world. Exploring how to build local place-based identities, which hold space for and are strengthened by these multiple-place attachments, is something which heritage-led approaches to inclusive growth may be uniquely positioned to do. The potential to build bridging forms of social capital can underpin strengthened local communities and economies for the future.

Livelihoods

Inclusion in the heritage sector workforce

Within the heritage sector, taking tangible and effective steps towards developing more diverse and inclusive workforces is becoming more widely recognised as an essential priority.

The Don’t Settle approach highlights how the sector can put in place skills and development pathways for young people of colour to enter the heritage workforce. Recent years have seen the Black Lives Matter movement, numerous campaigns challenging the uncritical representation and reproduction of colonial heritage within our institutions and local places43, and growing demands for the repatriation of objects and artefacts in museums.44 In this context, the implications of a homogenously white heritage sector workforce cannot continue to be ignored.

However, it also raises further questions for heritage organisations when looking at the diversity of their workforces, and how different marginalised groups and voices are represented, as well as how they intersect and are represented at all levels.

For example, gender balanced boards are increasingly held up as the gold-standard in representation. It is a start, but if everyone on that board is white, from an affluent background and able-bodied, that organisation is not well positioned to recognise, value or meet the needs of a diverse community or audience. And by definition, it cannot be truly inclusive.

These are longstanding challenges, and the sector is not alone, but given that heritage organisations tell the stories of our people and places, it is imperative that a wider range of voices and perspectives are centred and that the heritage workforce provides livelihoods for an inclusive range of people.

---


Tourism-led jobs growth:

Many of the case study areas have experienced significant economic restructuring and decline in recent decades, particularly around traditional industries that provided high numbers of skilled, well-paid jobs.

The economic potential of local heritage is often framed in relation to the opportunity to drive jobs growth around tourism, such as in the hospitality sector. However, from an inclusive growth perspective, this can be problematic. Jobs in these sectors are often seasonal, insecure, poorly paid and with little or no progression or development opportunities. As such, they are not equivalent to the jobs that have been lost in these areas.

Case studies such as the Margate Old Town and the approach taken in Mid-Antrim highlight how different heritage-led approaches can encourage tourism that supports small local businesses.45

The growth in heritage related micro-businesses and freelance work can be positive in the extent to which it diversifies the types of jobs in the local economy. These also often provide a way for individuals to work on ‘passion projects’ which enhances wellbeing and provides an income.

However, these businesses tend to employ a small number of people. There is a high failure rate among small businesses, with low levels of security and resilience, and often low turnovers which require people to have additional sources of income. As a result, it tends to be those with access to capital who are able to take the financial risks associated with starting a business.

For these reasons, we suggest that it is often the contribution new small businesses make to the character and vibrancy of a place, and the benefits this has for a sense of community wellbeing, pride and esteem, and appeal to visitors, rather than a sole focus on the creation of a high number of good jobs, that is their key contribution to inclusive growth.

Heritage construction jobs creation

Construction, including heritage crafts and sustainable building, is a key area where heritage-led interventions for inclusive growth have the potential to support skilled employment with stronger progression and development pathways.

By taking an explicit focus on local employment and supply chains, and providing apprenticeship opportunities, through social value procurement approaches, local employment can be supported through the refurbishment or maintenance of heritage assets. This applies to heritage institutions that invest in large capital programmes or maintenance works, as well as local authorities and their heritage regeneration partners.

Wealth

Heritage as non-financial, collective wealth

An insight which has emerged from across a number of the case studies is the extent to which local heritage assets are often conceived of as collectively owned assets or wealth, even in instances when they are not directly publicly or community owned. The key characteristics of heritage assets that function in this way are:

- **Accessibility:** the heritage asset is open to all in the community
- **Symbolic significance:** a recognisable, and widespread emotional attachment
- **Practical value:** purposes or uses with broad appeal.

This form of heritage wealth is closely tied to people’s sense of place-based identity and attachment. Such places often attract a range of different groups from across their local communities, but it remains the case that it is the most socio-economically or culturally marginalised people in a place which access them the least.

The opportunity here is twofold: firstly, for the custodians of these assets, or communities that are active within them, to consider how to increase the accessibility, symbolic significance and practical value of the asset to these groups; and secondly, to explore how these heritage assets can be used to create space for different groups to actively engage with each other around the heritage of the place, what it means to different people, and if there is a role for it to play in developing more inclusive place-based identities.

**Heritage-led wealth building**

In relation to how heritage can be used to boost the wealth within a local area, there is clearly potential for heritage-led regeneration and tourism to support local business growth and the wealth contained within the local economy. Heritage organisations prevent wealth from ‘leaking out’ through unsustainable and extractive investment and business models.

However, there are well-versed risks from an inclusive growth perspective that are associated with regeneration, namely the exclusion of poorer citizens from sharing in the benefits or displacing longstanding residents. There is also a risk that wealth created, particularly associated with property values, is captured by developers and lost out of the area.

These are big challenges which have no single solution, but heritage-based approaches should take place specific steps to mitigate these issues where possible. These might include building in provisions for social and affordable housing or developing programmes to ensure that diverse community members are well positioned to take up opportunities to start new businesses.

Similarly, growing recognition of over-tourism as a challenge experienced by popular tourist destinations indicates how the amount of tourism required to boost the number of businesses and jobs so as to have a significant impact on the wealth of a place, may also have unsustainable impacts on local infrastructure and the place’s social fabric.

However, an approach which warrants further exploration for the UK heritage sector is the extent to which heritage organisations can function as local anchor institutions.

Anchor institutions are rooted in their communities and they maximise their contribution to, and play a strategic role, in the local economy — whether that be as an employer or as a purchaser of local goods and services. St Fagans’ procurement approach to their refurbishment works demonstrates a key way forward. Heritage institutions could also look to embed more local procurement approaches into their day to day operations.

**Voice**

Most of the case studies included in the report involve a medium to high degree of engagement, participation or co-creation with local citizens. In some instances, this is a core part of their design or purpose, indicating a widespread recognition of the importance of citizen voice, particularly for heritage organisations looking at how to better connect with, and meet the needs of, their local communities. However, what this research has not been able to establish is whether this can be demonstrably linked to a higher degree of wider civic engagement, highlighting the need for further research in this area.

Citizen voice can contribute to inclusive growth in different ways — be that building individual confidence and self-efficacy, developing more sustainable and authentic tourism offers or by simply listening to local voices and responding to what they ask for.

And our case studies show how it is the more radical, participative and co-creative approaches to engaging with local people that build the strongest, furthest reaching relationships within their communities.

It can be challenging for heritage and economic development organisations and their partners to embed more radical, participative and co-creative approaches into how they work. Fundamentally, this is a question of power and control.
It requires organisations and professionals to ask challenging, sometimes uncomfortable, questions of themselves and to make fundamental but rewarding changes to the ways in which they work.

**Sustainable futures**

**Heritage and a sustainable built environment**

Several of the case studies, particularly those relating specifically to the historic built environment and regeneration demonstrate how heritage can be a driver of more environmentally sustainable practices.

We are at a point in time when the urgency of the climate crisis is becoming increasingly apparent and widely recognised. At the same time, there is a widespread shortage of good quality, affordable housing and places across the country are looking for ways to reinvigorate their declining highstreets and neighbourhoods, which have suffered from changing shopping habits and underinvestment.

The reuse and regeneration of traditional housing stocks and commercial centres using the most up to date sustainable building methods provides a key opportunity. If heritage, economic development, regeneration and sustainable design and build stakeholders work together locally work in innovative ways, they have the ability to address some of our most pressing societal challenges in a practical, impactful way.

**Heritage and the climate emergency**

However, a consideration highlighted by the research, is the way in which none of the places we looked at place a strong focus on understanding how resilient their heritage assets are in the context of the climate emergency. This is a complex, under researched area and different types of heritage assets and different places are likely to be impacted in different ways.

But for local places to develop long-term, sustainable approaches to how they utilise their heritage for local benefit, it is imperative that they work to understand if and how their heritage is at risk, and what preventative or mitigating steps can be taken at a local level.

The realisation that well-loved local heritage might be lost in the future is a difficult fact to face but is not one that can be ignored. It is also important to recognise that early action in this respect is key, and that the urgency of the situation also has the potential to mobilise people and catalyse change, at both a hyperlocal and global level.

In addition, there will need to be conversations and processes of negotiation around how those assets which do survive, particularly in relation to the historic built environment, may well be cumulatively impacted by environmental regulations requiring adaptions or devices which some may consider as undermining their heritage value.

**Esteem and wellbeing**

All of the case studies demonstrate in various ways the centrality of heritage to a sense of place and local identity. In many, there is a strong emphasis placed on the role that heritage has to play in reclaiming a sense of pride and esteem in places often characterised as ‘left behind’.

This is a problematic term, in that it implies a neutral process, rather than recognising that geographical inequalities are the direct consequence of poorly managed economic restructuring and chronic underinvestment. Which themselves have resulted from political decisions made by governments of all political stripes in recent decades. In this sense, these places have not been left behind, they have been held back.
However, these places often have rich local heritage, with potential for communities to activate around this to push back on stigmatising narratives—which are also often at least partly internalised within communities themselves—to establish renewed place-based identities and boost individual and collective sense of purpose, confidence and wellbeing.

Some of the case studies in the report are examples of this approach. But there remain challenges around how inclusive and broad-based these processes are.

Creating space for a diversity of heritage narratives is emerging as a key approach and is undoubtedly an essential element of building more inclusive place-based identities. However, this is just the first step.

Within local communities and across politics and the media, our public discourse around identity, immigration, belonging and power has become increasingly polarised.

Dominant narratives about the value of a sense of heritage, belonging and identity have been largely monopolised by the increasingly far right. But all places and people have heritages. And having a sense of connection to the place that you live is of value everyone.

These things are not the preserve of white British-born populations, but there is a significant number of increasingly vocal people who believe this is the case. They are often those that have been hard hit by economic restructuring, and the resulting loss of the identity-shaping traditional industries, communities and gender roles which this brought about.

The reality is that all places have been shaped and enriched by the movement and exchange of people and culture spanning millennia. And our communities are going to continue becoming more, not less diverse and they can be all the richer for it.

In this context, it is imperative for heritage-led approaches to go further and explore how to respond with a more inclusive narrative about the relationships between heritage, place and belonging.

Creating spaces for more diverse voices and stories is the first step in this, but the key is to bring differing perspectives into dialogue. This requires the development of new heritage focused, facilitative approaches that are not afraid of addressing incompatibility or conflict but also capable of drawing out parallel experiences or shared values which diverse groups within communities can begin to coalesce around.

The challenge will be to do this in ways which recognises the real challenges and sense of loss experienced by traditional white British communities, while refuting the inclination of some within those communities to scapegoat minority and immigrant groups. Crucially, this must be navigated in a way which values and makes visible the voices and experiences of these groups without falling into tropes around assimilation, or one-sided labour and compromise. For new place-based identities to be inclusive, they will need to be porous, flexible and hold space for difference.
Guiding principles for systemic heritage for inclusive growth practice

Previous RSA work profiling global examples of wider, non-heritage interventions for inclusive growth identified six types of systemic interventions that can underpin inclusive growth, as well as the shift in mindset that each of these requires, see table below.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>TYPE OF SYSTEMIC INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic, social and environmental impacts of policy are considered separately</td>
<td>Economic, social and environmental impacts are considered together</td>
<td>Policy integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the quantity of growth (number of jobs, pound amount of investment)</td>
<td>Emphasis on the quality of growth (eg growth distribution, job quality)</td>
<td>Quality jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical investment in communities distributed in an inequitable manner</td>
<td>Equitable investment in people and places as a combined means to inclusive growth</td>
<td>Equitable infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, private and philanthropic resources distributed in a widespread, scattershot, one-time fashion</td>
<td>Public, private and philanthropic resources distributed in a concentrated, coordinated and sustained fashion</td>
<td>Coordinated, long-term investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-down, non-participatory decision-making on policies impacting communities</td>
<td>Inclusive policy setting that leverages the talents, voice and experience of local residents</td>
<td>Shared decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth building opportunities restricted to top income earners</td>
<td>Wealth building opportunities for people of color and low income</td>
<td>Widespread financial security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The insights from the case studies clearly align with these six: policy integration, quality jobs, equitable infrastructure, co-ordinated long-term investment, shared decision making, widespread financial security.

Again, the case studies in this report cannot be assumed to be wholly representative of all activities on the ground, however our wider engagement around this piece of work also supports the argument that policy integration is an essential starting point for any local area looking to develop a heritage for inclusive growth strategy, with outcomes aligned with the other types of systemic intervention building on this over time.

47 Shafique, A et al. (2019) op cit.
Given the emergent nature of heritage for inclusive growth approaches, it is perhaps to be expected that widespread financial security is the type of systemic intervention which more are yet to align with, given the ambition and long-term nature of delivering associated outcomes, as well as the extent of interactions with wider economic factors in particular.

However, the case studies in this report highlight several opportunities and potential approaches that can align with systemic interventions of heritage for inclusive growth. Heritage-led approaches can account for the roles of place, identity and esteem and wellbeing. These fundamental cultural and psychological factors are integral to building stronger and more resilient local communities and economies, and are often overlooked by conventional approaches to economic policy making and local economic development strategies.

This research, with its specific focus on how the heritage and economic development sectors can work together to deliver inclusive growth outcomes at a local level, has highlighted two guiding principles for how to approach systemic heritage-led interventions in particular.

1. Heritage gatekeepers > heritage facilitators

Recent years have seen a growing recognition of the need for heritage sector organisations to move away from functioning as heritage ‘gatekeepers’ towards functioning as heritage ‘facilitators’. This is already reflected in the strategic priorities of and day-to-day work of organisations across the sector. However, some of the innovative approaches in this research show that pushing this principle further towards more radical approaches of co-production, co-curation and co-evaluation, with community members involved in decision-making structures has significant potential to drive inclusive growth outcomes.

A crucial element of this, highlighted by the research, is the importance of values-driven, action-focused leadership which effectively and equitably brings together specialist, professionalised expertise and diverse citizen voices. Implementing these approaches can be challenging and requires a vision and commitment founded on values embedded widely among those involved, especially those in key leadership roles.

It requires strong leadership which is not afraid to tackle uncomfortable or difficult questions through this process, but to do this in a collaborative way which is also proactive in ceding space and control to community stakeholders and partners in order to embed more participatory models. Crucially, this requires a fundamental shift away from traditional top-down, centralised leadership towards a model of leadership that:

- Distributes control
- Convenes diverse stakeholders
- Acknowledges and addresses power imbalances between stakeholders
- Effectively facilitates inclusive dialogue and action.
2. Long-term approach to cross-sector collaboration

At a national level, the heritage sector is well networked and increasingly collaborative, but the departmental silos in Westminster are a well-known barrier to the kind of cross-sectoral working which this research endorses. However, the recent announcement that the government plans to reinstate the cross-departmental Heritage Council later this year is a welcome development with the potential to embed collaborative thinking around heritage among key policy and decision makers at a national level.

At a local level, the extent of relationships between the heritage and economic development sectors varies. Building on previous insights from RSA’s Networked Heritage work, this research highlights the importance of recognising that effective collaborative relationships and the infrastructure required to support them takes time to develop. It will look different in different places and evolve and build momentum over time.

Through this process, a focus should be placed on collaborating to:

- Identify and develop shared values and language between stakeholders who may not have a history of working closely
- Develop and embed long-term systemic interventions for heritage-led inclusive growth.
Next steps: RSA UK-based reflections

Attention among policymakers, institutions, communities and businesses alike is now turning to the question of how to recover and rebuild from the Covid-19 pandemic. At the same time, there is growing evidence of little appetite among the public to return to the ‘old normal’.49

In combination with ongoing uncertainty regarding Covid-19, Brexit and the impact of the Black Lives Matter movement in recent months, there is a growing recognition that we must respond by rebuilding an economy which is equitable, resilient and cognisant of planetary resources and the impact of climate breakdown.

This makes it all the more important for those working at a local level to explore how to drive practical change in their places. To not only make tangible improvements to the lives of people across the country, but also to shape a progressive, action focused agenda from the ground up.

To support and enable this, the RSA proposes to work with its extensive Fellowship and wider networks of leaders, practitioners and communities to explore the potential of two strands of work to support the development and embedding of heritage-led approaches to inclusive growth:

1. Heritage for inclusive growth indicators

This work has highlighted that there is a lack of data that can be used to build an evidence base of what does and does not work in terms of heritage-led approaches to inclusive growth.

We propose convening strategic stakeholders and practitioners across the heritage and economic development sectors to extensively scope out:

- What data currently exists
- What data would be useful, and to who
- How to standardise reporting and evaluation criteria
- How to embed use across sectors, at all levels.

2. Heritage for inclusive growth practitioner accelerator programme

A cohort of both heritage and economic development practitioners to enable change to be driven by those working on the ground, leading by example and informing, rather than waiting for or responding to, directives and agendas set by central government. The approach would emphasise peer-to-peer and action learning around:

- Putting the heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model into practice, exploring and optimising the dynamics between its key elements through live projects
- Key insights/recommendations outlined in this report
- Participants identifying key challenges and opportunities from their localities/areas of work for collaborative examination and solution development with the wider cohort.

Potential workstreams include:

- **Place-based**: working closely with an innovative local authority and/or LEP partner on a whole-place focused approaches to utilising heritage for inclusive growth

- **Anchor institutions**: working with heritage institutions such as local museums to explore the extent to which they can function as anchor institutions within their local places, supporting inclusive growth through community wealth building approaches in particular

- **Sector workstream**: working with one or more major heritage asset custodians/owners to explore how they can better support inclusive growth and public value in a range of communities.

**System wide recommendations**

These collaborative, practitioner-led approaches are crucial to building on the work that is emerging around heritage and inclusive growth. But in particularly challenging times for both the heritage and economic development sectors, it is also essential to recognise the structural and practical limitations faced by those looking to realise the potential of heritage to release a wider range of economic, social and environmental benefits.

As such, this research has identified the upcoming review of the Treasury’s Green Book as a key opportunity for central government to embed a more holistic approach to project evaluation, which would have far reaching benefits for projects seeking to deliver a holistic range of inclusive growth outcomes in the heritage and economic development sectors, and beyond.

**Key recommendations and principles in this respect are:**

- Create a broad evaluation framework which facilitates a shift towards capturing intrinsic value, such as the concept of ‘cultural heritage capital’. Moving beyond this narrower, capitalist conceptualisation of value is key to realising a full range of inclusive growth outcomes in relation to heritage and beyond

- Create a pathway for appraisal and evaluation which enables practitioners and their projects to evolve their evidence collection and analysis over time. Developing more qualitative analysis as an initial stage, and progressing towards more quantitative metrics, such as those proposed by the heritage for inclusive growth indicators.
British Council perspectives

Cultural heritage has long been seen as a route to honouring, celebrating and sustaining a sense of identity that stems from the past, but it also enriches our daily lives, aids our understanding of the present and can help shape our shared future.

The British Council’s recent work on cultural heritage protection has highlighted the value it can create for communities that live close to, practice and share in cultural heritage, while also contributing to social and economic development.

In 2016 the ground-breaking Cultural Protection Fund was established through a partnership between the British Council and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS).50 Its commitment to a people-centred approach has revealed the extensive impact of cultural protection. It was the work of that fund that prompted a wider investigation into the transformational value and power of cultural heritage.

This work moved beyond cultural protection towards a focus on the promotion, championing and reimagining of cultural heritage as a contemporary driver of inclusive growth and led to the establishing of our current Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth programme (CH4IG).51

With pilot projects in Colombia, Kenya and Vietnam, CH4IG is exploring cultural heritage for inclusive growth as a global concept with local solutions. In addition to the activity taking place a further key element of the programme is to continually develop understanding of the concept itself, which has resulted in this collaboration with the RSA to additionally explore and learn from emergent approaches in the UK.

---


51 British Council (2018) op cit.
This has been a new area of focus for the British Council and has been a source of valuable learning, informing new approaches and ways of working in a cultural relations context. Impacts and evidence from the programme will be shared in the coming months, but there is strong alignment between the insights of the CH4IG programme and this piece of work by the RSA, strengthening the case for a more widespread, strategic approach to delivering inclusive growth outcomes through an integrated approach to inclusive growth and heritage.

**The approach**

Despite the difference in contexts, this work highlights approaches that are common to both the CH4IG global programme and the UK case study sites in this report.

From a British Council perspective, this strengthens the case for embedding approaches for cultural heritage to contribute to authentic inclusive growth through the following ways:

- Taking a flexible, locally-led and long-term approach collectively across society to explore a new kind of growth through cultural heritage
- Ensuring participation, inclusion and crucially local ownership is at the heart of the work
- Operating in a people-centred way, to authentically meet and address the needs and aspirations of local communities
- Supporting heritage institutions, organisations and practitioners to create innovative mechanisms which enhance the socio-economic value of cultural heritage
- Mobilising cross-sector interventions to build and diversify heritage workforces, enabling cultural heritage to play a more active role in achieving truly inclusive growth
- Focusing on collaborative, mutually beneficial and sustainable solutions which respond to need and utilise the expertise, ambition, talent and skills within a place in an inclusive and equitable way
- Meeting people where they are and allow the space and time for the work and relationships to develop organically
- Celebrating different perspectives and build on individuals’ sense of purpose to create a shared vision.

**One size does not fit all**

As with the UK case studies in this report, our CH4IG work has demonstrated there is not a standardised approach for interventions which use heritage for inclusive growth.

The implementation of CH4IG across a range of geographies has required working from divergent starting points. This necessitates being responsive to local needs and appetite, sensitive to complex place-specific issues, and working together to explore sustainable models.

This has been managed through a carefully structured, multi-layered intervention which is responsive and contains diverse ‘live’ approaches, underpinned by key shared principles.

The notion of ‘learning as we go’ has been integral to this. We have incorporated an action research methodology to ensure a continuous feedback loop between theory, delivery, wider practice, emerging insights, listening, learning and continually adapting as the work progresses.

A tailored approach recognises cultural heritage as a community asset. It also encourages flexible and non-linear responses in the context of wider holistic connections. Recognition of the space-specific dynamics fit well with the inclusive growth outcomes in the RSA’s heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model.
**Action research**

Integral to our action research approach is collaborating with a range of partners and stakeholders to understand and develop the concept, theory and practice for the relationships between, and opportunities around heritage and inclusive growth.

This has included working with partners such as the RSA to identify insights emerging in the UK context, as well as exploring synergies with international initiatives. This has enabled us to identify and learn from best practice, assess the benefit it can bring across a number of sectors and understand the opportunities this presents in a cultural relations context.

The rich insights and inspirations in this report, combined with the advice and support from UK stakeholders through its development, will be invaluable as we look towards further development of this work and continuing advocacy for the transformation potential of cultural heritage.

It has also highlighted the cultural relations opportunities for further exchange, learning and collaboration. As a result, the British Council regards heritage and inclusive growth to be a valuable opportunity for building meaningful international connections, relationships and learning, with a view to support and strengthen the role of cultural heritage as a catalyst for change in a range of global contexts.

**Looking to the future**

We consider cultural heritage for inclusive growth approaches to have the potential to make a significant contribution to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which is important to factor into any future adaptions. As an example, CH4IG is relevant to several of the SDGs — cutting across goals relating to poverty, inequality, sustainability, upskilling and cultural diversity. With its focus on inclusive growth, the programme may help to reduce poverty for the communities which it is working with.

The Covid-19 public health crisis is described in the introduction as an 'era-defining event'. It has affected communities across the world, revealed the fragility of systems, global networks and disrupted the flow of ‘business as usual’. It has exposed vulnerabilities around the mass movement of people, which is so costly financially and environmentally. This enforced hiatus provides a moment for reflection, to consider whether systems are fit for purpose and an opportunity to think collectively at how we might ‘build back better’.

As we look for a new normal together, there is a clear need to ensure it is more human, more sustainable and more inclusive. This not only requires a different relationship between the local and global but also prioritising ways of generating value without consuming ever more resources. Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth was piloted before the current crisis; however, it offers an approach that is locally engaged, globally connected and could be a key building block for our better shared future.
RSA Conclusion

Since the global financial crisis in 2008, local economies and communities have continued to suffer from stagnant productivity, low-quality jobs, chronically underfunded public services and growing inequality.

In the UK context, the focus on Brexit over recent years at a national level has dominated parliamentary time and national bandwidth, leaving limited capacity to engage with other pressing policy agendas, even for those high on the public agenda such as the strain on the NHS and the climate crisis.

Uncertainty around post-transition Brexit arrangements and the impact this will have on our economy, social fabric and environment continue, but Covid-19 and Black Lives Matter have had an undeniable impact on the public conversation about what kind of society we want to live in, and what kind of economy we want to rebuild.

Sufficient funding for the NHS and other public services, responding to the climate crisis, addressing social inequalities and reckoning with the legacies of colonialism are now all foregrounded as priorities in this public conversation.

While there is much uncertainty about the future, there is no question that the coming months and years will be a challenging time. But this period of unprecedented change and disruption also provides an opportunity to make the changes needed to shift to a much more inclusive economy and society.

This research has highlighted how heritage has often been an underutilised asset with regards to broader policy agendas such as economic development. The case studies show the power of combining values-driven leadership and genuine community engagement. And they demonstrate how heritage for inclusive growth approaches can provide a holistic model for local areas when responding to the combined challenges they now face.

Crucially, heritage for inclusive growth has an important role to play in helping rebuild the more equitable, sustainable and resilient local economies and communities that are being called for, now even louder than ever.
Appendices

Appendix 1

Heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem model: conceptual basis to inform policy and practice

The ecosystem model has been developed in collaboration with a wide range of key stakeholders. This overview is designed to provide heritage and economic development practitioners with a more detailed examination of the key elements within the model, and their conceptual underpinnings, to inform the development of place-specific heritage for inclusive growth strategies and interventions.

What are inclusive growth outcomes?

In recent years the inclusive growth agenda has gained significant traction locally, nationally and globally. The RSA Inclusive Growth Commission defined inclusive growth as:

"broad-based growth that enables the widest range of people and places to both contribute to and benefit from economic success. Its purpose is to achieve more prosperity alongside greater equity in opportunities and outcomes".52

However, as the inclusive growth agenda has become established, our ongoing research on the emergent practical application of its principles has revealed that the language of inclusive growth is often adopted while traditional economic development strategies are simply rebranded with no meaningful shift in strategic approach, values or outcomes on the ground.

In response, the RSA developed an Inclusive Growth Taxonomy to outline four key domains of inclusive growth interventions and outcomes: inclusive livelihoods, inclusive wealth, inclusive voice and inclusive futures (see p 23).

52 RSA (2017) op cit.
This previous work revealed how superficial shifts towards inclusive growth language, but not practice, is more often than not the result of working within entrenched systems, underpinned by long-held, self-perpetuating values and practices.

Crucially, the hypothesis of the current piece of research — that heritage is a largely untapped, collective asset for inclusive social, economic and environmental change — points to an approach which can provide an account of the roles played by place, identity and belonging in improving outcomes for citizens and their places by disrupting and reimagining some of the entrenched cultural barriers to change.

These factors are usually overlooked in conversations and strategies regarding economic and spatial development but are crucial to addressing the inequalities and increasing polarisation experienced by many citizens and communities. As a result of our research for this report, we have incorporated the fifth domain of inclusive growth — esteem and wellbeing — to the taxonomy in order to recognise and draw out the potential outcomes associated with this.

The term 'ecosystem' has been used to emphasise how the relationships between the key elements are reciprocal and coactive, rather than linear and causal. It highlights the extent to which heritage assets and activities can be harnessed to support inclusive growth, which crucially aligns with wider economic, social and environmental wellbeing, beyond more narrowly defined economic development outcomes.

In this report we have argued for the importance of heritage, place and identity and how they can underpin both economic activity within a local area and a greater sense of wellbeing.

Direct economic returns may not always be on a grand scale, but here we frame broader wellbeing — including a sense of place and belonging — as integral to building long-term resilience within places and their communities.

The ecosystem model has been tested and iterated with input from heritage and economic development leaders and practitioners and has tested positively against the case studies undertaken as part of this work.

The heritage for inclusive growth ecosystem and our associated call for a more systemic approach aligns with a model of change that has been developed at the RSA, which we summarise as thinking like a system and acting like an entrepreneur.

On the one hand, we see heritage as an integral part of the local systems which generate social and economic outcomes, thinking like a system. Feelings of attachment, belonging, solidarity and agency which can be fostered by heritage are part of what makes places inclusive. Also, as the case studies that follow in this report highlight, the way we do heritage can be more or less inclusive in its focus, method and aims.

On the other hand, acting like an entrepreneur means adopting an agile and opportunistic approach to change; this means we should think not only about the change we want but the change may actually be possible in any given context at any time. Heritage and the associations it can generate can sometimes provide unique opportunities to connect people with issues, feelings and possibilities. By thinking of heritage and inclusive growth together we can better identify these moments and encourage local decision makers to grasp the opportunities for wider change they may present.

While many of the elements contained within the RSA Inclusive Growth Taxonomy will be familiar to those working within the heritage sector, the intention here is to draw out the key considerations with most relevance when working collaboratively beyond the sector with a focus on inclusive growth and local economic development.
There are a number of key beneficiary groups for heritage-based interventions for inclusive growth which have been identified. These have been categorised as follows:

1. **Citizens and communities** — the people and communities within the local areas that the intervention/activity takes place. Diversity in terms of protected characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, age etc and equity in terms of socio-economic and spatial distribution are key considerations.

2. **Heritage sector organisations and practitioners** — these can be local, national or global organisations with a range of roles within the sector, and the individual practitioners that work within them.

3. **Local public sector**
   a. **Commissioning and service delivery** — spanning a range of public bodies and statutory and non-statutory services. The following have been identified as key areas of interest in terms of how heritage-based interventions for inclusive growth could support better outcomes and reduce demand: GP services, adult social care, mental health services, adult learning and skills provision and schools. (NB: local authority funded museums and archives will span categories 2 and 3)
   b. **Policymakers** — those setting policy at a local level, with a particular focus on those leading on policy relating to the service areas listed above and economic development policy and strategy.

4. **Local businesses** — businesses spanning a range of industries and expertise which may be involved in, or benefit from, heritage-related interventions for inclusive growth. Key areas of interest include workforce and skills, capacity building and community wealth building approaches.

5. **Local third sector organisations** — organisations in the local third sector, again with a range of expertise and which may be involved in, or benefit from, heritage interventions. Some of these could be heritage organisations.

6. **National policymakers** — national level decision makers whose work is informed by evidence of local practice and outcomes.

**What are the key opportunities associated with heritage assets?**

This research highlights that heritage can achieve a wider range of inclusive growth outcomes primarily through (i) nurturing esteem and wellbeing and (ii) stimulating economic development in places and communities.

**Social, cultural and economic benefits of heritage — nurturing esteem and wellbeing**

‘Esteem’ refers to a cluster of related concepts, including belonging, identification, confidence and pride. Heritage can stimulate pride in place by creating perceived links between present day residents and residents from the past. Heritage makes places look and feel distinctive. It creates a reassuring sense of continuity through time — which is important given that change is occurring more rapidly than ever before.

Built heritage can be a point of reference for past experiences, preserving a sense of place attachment even in times of rapid change. Intangible heritage can be the basis for shared understandings, shared meaning and group mythologies, all of which contribute towards shared identity and group solidarity or ‘bonding capital’.53 These are the non-market intrinsic benefits of heritage.

There are some related instrumental benefits that come through engaging with heritage or participating in heritage activities—predominantly higher levels of social capital. Heritage can enable interactions which create social capital through involvement in heritage activities, the sharing of knowledge or perspectives about the past and even through unrelated interactions at heritage sites (areas rich in heritage tend to have higher footfall than areas less rich in heritage). The social networks that form can reinforce place attachment and have knock on effects for wellbeing and economic resilience.

Historic England's 2020 Heritage Counts audit emphasises the extent to which heritage is a source of national and local pride, enhances our connection with place, promotes collective identity and belonging and is important for our health and wellbeing.54

These are important benefits, but how can we ensure this strengthened identity is inclusive of disadvantaged and minority groups? Intangible heritage, given its nature, can be resistant to debate and negotiation. But when explored critically, heritage practice can itself be a catalyst for addressing inequalities in access, participation and representation of marginalised groups within society, through the scrutiny of received narratives and promotion of new ones.

The more people actively participate in heritage, the greater the benefits in terms of bridging forms of social capital—and the more widely these benefits are spread.

**Economic and instrumental benefits of heritage**

Individuals who participate actively in heritage activities have the most to gain economically, but whole communities can benefit from good heritage policy.

The most commonly cited economic impact of heritage relates to tourism: tourists tend to visit historic places and they spend money on their visits. Districts rich in heritage also tend to have higher property prices.

Although this might have negative impacts in terms of affordable housing, the revenue stream from property tax can in theory be used to mitigate the problem.

Heritage sites often employ people from the community and heritage preservation is a highly labour-intensive job. As such, local heritage organisations such as place-specific museums can be reconceived as ‘anchor institutions’ in local economies—by definition, they are unable to relocate. It’s also true that external businesses and start-ups tend to relocate to heritage-rich areas. These causal mechanisms have powerful knock-on effects for the local economy in terms of spending and buying power.

Anti-gentrification policies can reduce the risk of community displacement. This is important for communities and for their heritage. Since intangible heritage often vests in people rather than built artefacts, the breakdown of communities precipitates the breakdown of heritage. Even tangible heritage can fade away without the active stewardship of a historic community. When managed well, heritage itself can stimulate proactive and resilient communities and in so doing creates the conditions for its own endurance.

Heritage is a proven economic asset that can simultaneously deliver wellbeing benefits to a community.

But there are well-documented drawbacks to some of these forms of economic development. While heritage can be an underutilised asset, it is also true that successful neighbourhood regeneration projects have often benefited from some of the mechanisms listed above. But pursuing potentially problematic models of growth and relying on post-hoc policies to mitigate the most damaging effects is not in itself going to create genuinely inclusive growth. Heritage can also support different models of development in which a wider group of people can participate and benefit.

---

Historically in policy debates, the intrinsic and instrumental benefits of heritage have often been cited in opposition to one another. Those who insist that heritage is an intrinsic good have often come up against those who—perhaps in order to attract government funding—highlight the instrumental economic benefits of heritage to the economy.

While leading organisations in the heritage sector now widely articulate a recognition of the value of both, there can indeed be friction between the two agendas in practice. For example, how historic conservation can drive gentrification and displacement of communities, which undermines esteem and inclusive place-making. Heritage that is marketed towards conventional tourism is unlikely to generate authentic place attachment in the local community. These tensions might account for the absence of a shared framework for the measurement of heritage’s market and non-market impact.

However, the intrinsic and instrumental benefits of heritage need not be mutually exclusive. With the right encouragement, intrinsic and instrumental benefits of heritage can support one another in a dialectical fashion.

Heritage creates a sense of place, belonging and continuity. It can be the solution to the identity gap that exists at the heart of many place-making strategies. In turn, inclusive economic development creates resilient communities. Engagement with heritage, growth of social networks and place attachment reinforce one another in a virtuous cycle and place-making can yield widespread economic benefits for communities and individuals. Local heritage institutions might be exemplar anchor institutions—the source of sustainable capital flows within a local economy. The intrinsic and instrumental benefits of heritage are both maximised through community participation and interaction.

When viewed more holistically, we argue that the intrinsic and instrumental benefits of heritage reinforce and strengthen one another. Prioritising one over the other is a false binary that misses a breadth of opportunities this dynamic has to offer.

What is the role of place?

Heritage can be “both a condition of social action and a form of social action: if heritage can be a form of cultural capital and a way of connecting people with each other and the environment that surrounds them then the promotion of heritage or involvement in heritage can be considered to be a form of social action”. Inclusive participation is key to making sure this social action is progressive and directed towards socially just outcomes, while also reflecting a growing interest in the importance of place for our individual and community wellbeing.

Physical factors such as housing, transport and the environment, together with issues such as community safety and local services are all instrumental in creating good places but there is growing evidence that concepts such as ‘belonging’ and ‘place attachment’ are important too.

Philosopher Simone Weil said that “to be rooted is the most important and least recognised need of the human soul”. Higher place attachment is associated with higher life satisfaction, better social capital and higher overall wellbeing. Heritage clearly has a role in both physical and psycho-social dimensions of place.

Local place attachment and identity has also become all the more important in a globalising world. In psychological terms, some argue that all things ‘local’ stand in opposition to the abstract, universal and global. Others that local identities are sometimes constructed as a defensive historical reaction to otherwise globalising social relations. But the global and the local do not need to be perceived in opposition. Indeed, rather than standing above the local, globalisation can be conceived as “the infinite multiplicity of global relationships, all constituted in various forms through particular local configurations”. Globalism is a “progressive sense of place” which sees cities as networks of “mobility, flow and everyday practice”, according to Doreen Massey.

While Arjun Appadurai sees contemporary neighbourhoods, far from being static or passive, as constituted by a unique combination of daily practices, gathered from all over the world, but which together develop symbolic boundaries and neighbourhood identities.61

Whether we adopt a defensive or a progressive account, the importance of place and locality in a globalising world is vital to an understanding of our individual and collective identities and its impact on our wider wellbeing.

Given its importance, there is clearly value in understanding how and when place attachments are formed and to consider the role of heritage assets in supporting this process. For the purposes of this, we have identified four different types of place attachment which are by no means mutually exclusive.

1. Dwelling

Perhaps the most obvious form of place attachment comes with the time spent in a particular place, and the experiences and routines which link familiarity with the physical surroundings. This is referred to as ‘dwelling’ and can draw upon inherited identities and a sense of nostalgia about the place’s role in the past and the extent to which it pertains to today. It has also been linked to the individual’s need for a sense of continuity and to the preservation of group identity.62

The role of heritage for this type of place attachment is critical. Heritage assets — tangible or intangible — will be fundamental to local identity and the importance of continuity for psycho-social wellbeing. When heritage assets are threatened or lost, this might cause lasting damage not only to the physical fabric of a particular place or neighbourhood but also to its collective wellbeing. The loss of housing, local services or industry, as well as more conventional heritage assets, has a lasting effect on a local sense of place.

2. Elective belonging

Nostalgic ideas of dwelling and belonging might seem marginal in an era of mass mobility and migration but in fact there is considerable evidence to show that place attachment can be just as strong, sometimes even stronger, even for relative newcomers to a particular place.

‘Elective belonging’ — the deliberate choice to live in a place that perhaps represents a particular lifestyle, identity or social class — can be a powerful determinant of place attachment.63 This can be a much more active form of attachment and is closely associated with our psycho-social need for distinctiveness and the sense of self-efficacy.

While heritage may appear less important to this form of place attachment, the heritage identity of a place might be precisely the reason why newcomers choose to move and form an attachment with a particular locality. Place history or family history can be vital in developing and sustaining a sense of elective belonging.

3. Attachment to multiple places

In an age of mass mobility many people develop and sustain deep attachments to more than one place. For many migrants, these multiple attachments are often considered as positive and enriching, rather than problematic.64

Sometimes, attachment to multiple places is supported by the sense that different places hold similar characteristics. Particular cities or even specific neighbourhoods, rural communities or towns are said to have ‘settlement identities’. Again though, heritage is important in that it can support historical narratives about the similarities between places, sustaining a sense of continuity and belonging.

Digital media can also be important in sustaining multiple attachments. It helps to maintain connections with a wide range of settings and even visit and experience virtual places.

This can support a sense of continuity and self-efficacy and amplify a sense of self-esteem and distinctiveness. The extent to which heritage is supported, indeed amplified, through digital media could play an important role in developing multicentric place attachment.

4. Symbolic and collective attachment

Most forms of place attachment assume a physical connection in and with a particular place, but it is also possible to form place attachment with the idea of a place. Digital media can have an important part to play in generating this sense of particular place. A football team or even the experience of a film or TV show might also be instrumental in nurturing such symbolic or collective attachment. Clearly, heritage assets can be very important in this regard.

Interestingly, symbolic attachment can operate at wide spatial scales. Place attachment might be assumed to occur at a relatively small scale: a home, a street, a neighbourhood or village or town—places where one can develop and sustain a physical presence and network of meaningful relationships with people and places. But for some people it is possible to develop physical attachment to several places and neighbourhoods in a single city—perhaps different places where they live, work and socialise—attachments to multiple places as described above.

But people also form strong attachments to the idea of regions and nations which speak to our need for continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy, but where it is impossible to be physically present or simultaneously present in the place which is the source of such identity. This symbolic and collective attachment is therefore derived almost entirely from a narrative about the place, which in turn is likely to be driven by a strong sense of collective history or heritage.

The apparent crisis in our sense of collective identity at many spatial scales between the local and the global can be seen as a key element in the rise of ethnonationalism in many countries in recent years. The extent to which heritage has either supported or challenged such narratives is therefore key to any study of a more inclusive economy.
The RSA (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce) believes in a world where everyone is able to participate in creating a better future. Through our ideas, research and a 30,000 strong Fellowship we are a global community of proactive problem solvers. Uniting people and ideas to resolve the challenges of our time.