



Can Artists Make Great Places?

**On behalf of Arts & Business and the Commission on
Architecture and the Built Environment**

**Charles Landry
Fred Brookes**

September 2006

Can Artists Make Great Places?

Contents

Foreword.....	1
Summary	1
Questions and strategic dilemmas	2
Introduction	3
Can artists make great places? Part 1 – the cultural context	5
Disappointing places	5
The sensory landscape	7
Knowledge of culture.....	9
Place making at its best	11
Thinking like an artist.....	15
Can artists make great places? Part 2 – artists and places	17
What is different about artists?	17
Licensed transgression	18
What is it like to be an artist in this context?.....	19
How artists work.....	20
How to work with artists.....	23
Conclusion	24

Can Artists Make Great Places?

Foreword

This paper draws together an argument about how the making of places can be enhanced by recognition of the role of cultural literacy, and in particular by the engagement of artists in the processes of the built environment.

The reader will find two explicit voices, one dealing with the broader philosophical argument and the cultural context, the other with something of the specifics of artists' experience in tangible programmes and projects.

Summary

- The making of places is not working as well as it should be. This paper seeks to contribute to the continuing debate over how better places can be made.
- To make places better needs the participation of all the talents and insights which can be brought to bear, seeking ways of breaking out of the silo mentality which often prevails.
- The authors believe that artists and the arts can help make better places. We seek to set out the ways in which artists and artistic creativity can contribute to place-making, drawing on a range of evidence.
- Despite repeated reiteration of the essential underpinning role of culture knowledge and artistic thinking, these have had insufficient impact in urban development.
- The cities we have disappoint. Too many cities do not work. Is it because of too much focus on the hardware of the city, forgetting that what makes places is how people feel about them?
- We neglect our understanding of the emotions and of environmental psychology, and are unaware how cultural literacy and artistic thinking make a contribution to the good city.
- Artists make it their business to understand the sensory landscape, the emotional life of the city. Artistic training and insight can help people appreciate the psychological effect of environments on individuals.
- Intuition has low status in place-making, so people have to school themselves in accepting physical environments that conflict with their own instincts.
- Recognising our culture should shape how we create and make our places. Cultural literacy is the skill that will help us better understand the dynamics of cities.
- Art and the work of artists help the creation of places which contribute to social and economic ends. Artists add value in financial terms to developments and investments. The fact that such works can be made is an element of the wider cultural index of society's progress and success.
- At its best good place- or city-making leads to the highest achievement of human culture. Let us reintroduce the idea of *beauty*, a word long lost from our urban lexicon.

- There is something in the culture which mistrusts the concept of ‘artist’, while it does not mistrust ‘engineer’ or ‘architect’. There is a deep-laid suspicion of the self-expression, playfulness, cleverness and passion associated with artists.
- The role of an artist in a development project can valuably be that of licensed transgressor. Because the artist does not come from a background of regulation, validation, standardisation and control, they open situations up in potentially creative ways.
- There is evidence that the introduction of an artist into the routine dialogue of planners and developers created fresh areas of discourse. Engineers found the challenge of striving to achieve an artist’s vision a stimulus. Architects seemed to see artists as rivals or competitors, and as potentially dangerous practitioners who needed to be controlled.
- From the artist’s perspective, local bureaucracy appeared impersonal, formal and detached from the social and political reality of the outside world.
- Artists had to recognise that, working in a public context, the artist has to be prepared to be answerable and accountable in ways which do not prevail in the private sphere of personal creativity.
- Artists are creative, in that they can make something out of nothing. They can also make something out of something else. These ways of thinking and working are by no means the sole property of artists, but they are particularly good at them.
- Artists, at least some of them, deal in the realm of emotion. The capacity of artists to be literate in the emotional realm is valuable to other place-making professionals.
- Artists’ ready accommodation of uselessness can be difficult for those other professions to assimilate, whose principal purpose is to improve the lot of humanity by making useful things, like roads and buildings.
- The capacity of an artist to enable people to discover their own ideas and to find ways of expressing them has proved valuable.

Questions and strategic dilemmas

- What qualities and characteristics make a great place?
- What skills are need to make great places?
- How can the divergent ways of thinking and working of bureaucrats, technocrats and artists be brought effectively together?
- What is it about artists that makes a difference to shaping, creating and making places?
- Is to be utilised as a creative thinker what an artist wants to do? What do artists want their role to be? Where will they have most impact? Who has the skills?

Introduction

Arts and Business(A&B) and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) have different aims, but they come together in their joint desire to help great places to be created. A&B believes artists are important in diverse ways and CABE is aware that many things that make places work are intangible and often related to how people think and address problems, shaping how places are conceived and designed.

A&B and CABE came together and jointly developed an initiative called *PROJECT – engaging artists in the built environment*. Its purpose was to engage artists, public agencies and the private sector in a range of initiatives that were to have a positive impact on place making. PROJECT provided financial assistance to pay artists fees to support collaboration between artists on one hand and design, planning and construction professionals on the other. It is one of the first projects of its kind. The Home Zones initiative sponsored by the Department of Transport, which seeks to make better streets and living environments has fostered some similar collaborations between engineers, local planners and artists. This paper draws on evidence from these and other schemes.

Both A&B and CABE have been aware of the welter of evidence of different kinds concerning the wider impact of arts and culture in regeneration, especially going with the grain of local cultures and involving artists. Many outcomes of taking cultural issues seriously have been measured including:

- how confidence to express needs and concerns grows;
- how economic impacts are created by trading cultural products and fostering tourism;
- how social capital can be built by bridging communities and including excluded groups thereby increasing the local quality of life;
- how behavioural and attitude change can be fostered thereby increasing motivation and will to achieve;
- how community perspectives can be voiced and participation encouraged; how a sense of self can be strengthened and diversity can be acknowledged;
- how urban and rural environments are better cared for by working with local cultural attitudes.

Focusing on the arts as a key expression of culture the measured outcomes include:

- the surprisingly large size, scope and scale of the not-for profit arts sector and commercial creative or crafts industries;
- the role of these groups in physically regenerating neglected areas and establishing new uses for old industrial buildings;
- how their presence has created more vibrant cultural quarters especially in cities;
- how refurbishing cultural heritage helps foster a development dynamic so increasing the economic value of the area and how this in turn increases inward investment prospects;

- how also a focus on these sectors fosters new business creation and employability in general;
- how festivals and events encourage tourism and change the image of places;
- how cultural facilities beyond reflecting the pride of a place also can help personal development, skills enhancement, social cohesion and community empowerment, to achieve this impact their programmes need to be outreach oriented;
- how engagement and participation in the arts increases educational attainment and capacity in non-arts spheres;
- how artistic appreciation can increase standards of design and create better public space.

The evidence spectrum embraces statistical fact and collective common sense. In the past there were more contentious assertions of the value of art and culture that needed to be examined and substantiated by research and statistical evidence. This has now largely happened. There is a growing range of methodologies to test out the validity of claims of the value of art and culture in urban development. There are still some gaps, but these are known.

Importantly they were aware that the evidence for the value of art or culture more generally is not all statistical, nor should it be. As Daniel Yankelovich, the renowned American market researcher helpfully reminds us: "The first step is to measure whatever can be easily measured. This is okay as far as it goes. The second step is to disregard that which can't be measured or give it an arbitrary value. This is artificial and misleading. The third step is to presume what can't be measured isn't really important. This is blindness. The fourth step is to say that what can't be easily measured really doesn't exist. This is suicide!" The attributes of culture, art and creativity are often lie outside the methodology of measurement and valuation.

The succeeding sections of this paper explore these issues in greater depth looking first at the wider context within which the involvement of artists fits.

Can artists make great places? Part 1 – the cultural context

For the last 25 years there have been vigorous discussions about the value of culture and the arts or artistic thinking in shaping, making and creating great places or cities to live and work. Why has this question arisen? Why would people think artists or their thinking can help make great places? 'Culture matters', 'culture counts', 'culture is not a luxury' we increasingly hear. We also hear 'the arts are important', 'the arts add distinctiveness', or 'the arts add value'. That a recognition of cultural issues and artistic interpretation lies at the heart of successful integrated, sustaining urban or place development now borders on common sense. Without reference to culture or the insights drawn from understanding the arts, a good appreciation of the senses or emotions and environmental psychology we now know, much development has contributed to the destruction of many cities and led to badly implemented renewal or new-build programmes.¹ Yet despite the repeated recognition of the essential underpinning role of culture knowledge and artistic thinking it still has had insufficient impact in urban development thinking.

Disappointing places

Increasingly people are asking what is missing for making a place work and it is because the cities we have disappoint. Too many do not work as a fine, webbed whole, although there are urban delights in parts – a well-crafted building, an occasional housing estate, an uplifting icon, a buzzy retail centre or a comforting small park. Too often we turn to the past to look for urban features we like. This might be the sweeping crescents of Bath, the streets of York, the lanes of Brighton, London's Regency squares, a village neighbourhood like Hampstead, the market hub of Norwich, a piece of public art like the Angel of the North or the gardens of once grand houses. People usually refer to the older fabric and not the new when they talk of places they like. There are too few examples from today. Yet it is estimated that over 60% of the urban fabric changes within a lifetime. So making most of the new feel as good as we do about the old becomes a central question.

What went wrong? Have we all lost the art of city-making? Is it to do with us or our addiction to cars, our love of asphalt and our blindness to pollution? Or is it down to forces beyond our control? The fact remains that when the attempt is made to replicate the principles of those places we like, the rules often forbid it. For instance, the intimacy we might try to create is seen as a safety problem, because a fire engine cannot drive down as it needs at least twice its own width, or a turning circle needs to be extra wide just in case an articulated lorry comes your way so making a physical setting lose its sense of place.

¹ UNESCO. The Mexico Declaration on Cultural Policies, 1982. The World Faiths Development Dialogue (WFDD), Cultures, Spirituality and Development, 2001

Cities and the built environment professions

When we think of who makes places or cities the first people we think of are in the built environment professions: architects, planners, surveyors, civil engineers, property developers, highway engineers. It is these professions that largely shape the urban environment. And we have increasing expertise in the technical aspects that make up the city, a neighbourhood or a building: the qualities of materials, heating and ducting systems, air circulation, sound- and damp- proofing, road-building methods, the carrying capacity of new engineering structures, demographic prediction, spatial modelling. We can speed-build with new techniques. Scientific studies on every conceivable microscopic aspect multiply and proliferate. We go down narrow funnels, increasingly separating the parts from the whole. We consider feasibilities, we cost, we predict, we project plan, project manage, review, assess, monitor, evaluate. Yet still we seem to have lost the plot. Somehow it does not hang together and we seem no closer to better places or cities. Is it because we focus too much on the hardware of the city and forget that what makes places is how people feel about them?

Rarely do we think of the professions concerned with softer issues when thinking about making places and these can range from social development workers to business people or from economic specialists to historians, anthropologists, social scientists and artists.

Neglecting common insights and expertise

The city comprises both a hard and a soft infrastructure. The hard is like the bone structure, the skeleton, while the soft is akin to the nervous system and its synapses. One cannot exist without the other. In contrast to the vast research, expenditure and expertise accumulated on the physical aspects of place making there is very little common knowledge about the softer aspects. Yet this knowledge is available if one looks hard enough.

What are the aspects of place-making that get lost in the gaps between the professions and who is responsible? Within these gaps there are skills, expertise, knowledge and insights. Some solutions have been offered in response to a series of crises of confidence in the main built environment professions. They have been attacked from various quarters about what they have done to places and how they were doing it over the last 30 years. Urban design emerged as a discipline which sought to put the fragments together again as a 'means of giving coherence and continuity to urban developments.' Urban design highlights the need for collaborative working too, but still remains largely a physical discipline.

The expertise and insights of many 'softer' domains are missing in considering how to create good places. There is a lack of sensory appreciation, we have forgotten how to sense the city viscerally. We neglect our understanding of the emotions and of environmental psychology and are unaware that a discipline called cultural literacy exists and let alone that artistic thinking may make a contribution to the good city. That leaves aside the insights of people who understand social dynamics. Critics will complain, 'Oh not another thing to consider. We've only just absorbed sustainable

communities, diversity and gender issues.’ Yet these concepts are merely enlightened common sense. There are two basic approaches: embedding this knowledge as a consideration within existing disciplines through adapting training programmes or with the help of experts; and specifically bringing in experts as part of a team.

The sensory landscape

Importantly it is artists who make it their business to understand the sensory landscape, the emotional life of the city, the effect of the physical environment on well-being and the need to understand how culture drives the shape and life of a place. They might ask: What do things look like? What colours do you see? How far can you see? What do you smell? What sounds do you hear? What do you feel? What do you touch? The city is an assault on the senses. Cities are sensory, emotional experiences, for good and for bad. But we are not accustomed to articulate in this way. Smelling, hearing, seeing, touching and even tasting the city are left to travel literature and brochures. It taxes our vocabulary as we are used to describing the city in an ‘objective’ lexicon deprived of sensory descriptors. The city is discussed in barren, eviscerated terms and in technical jargon by urban professionals as if it were a lifeless being. In fact, it is a sensory, emotional, lived *experience*. The city is more than hardware. How often do strategic urban plans start with the words ‘beauty’, ‘distinctiveness’, ‘love’, ‘happiness’, ‘excitement’, as distinct from words like ‘bypass’, ‘spatial outcome’ or ‘planning framework’?

We thus experience the city at a low level of awareness. We do not sufficiently recognise, let alone describe, the *smellscape*, *soundscape*, the visual spectacle, the tactile texture and taste. This impoverished perceptual mindscape, operating with a shallow register of experience guides us through narrow reality tunnels. The primary overwhelming paradox for those who care for places and cities is this: our capacity to perceive is shrinking at precisely the moment when it needs to increase. By diminishing our sensory landscape, we approach the world and its opportunities within a narrow perspective. By being narrow we do not grasp the full range of urban resources or problems at hand, their potential or threat, let alone their subtleties. We do not connect the sensory to the physical and work out how each can support the other.

The city as an emotional experience

Emotions drive human life. They shape our possibilities, determine our reactions to situations and our outlook on the future. Yet have you ever read a city plan or project plan that starts with the emotions or even refers to them? ‘Our aim is to make citizens happy.’ ‘We want to create a sense of joy and passion in our project or city, to engender a feeling of love for your place.’ ‘We want to encourage a feeling of inspiration and beauty’. It is rare to find such sentiments in the context of urban discourse. Yet it is odd that emotions which are perhaps the defining feature of human existence are absent in discussions of city-making. Instead prevalent, interchangeable words and concepts proliferate in a barren, unemotional language that is performance-driven – strategy, development, policy, outcomes, framework, targets – and

feels hollow and is without a reference point. A challenge for planners, developers, project managers or city leaders is to describe the aims for their city without using any of those words.

Just as we can test a person's feelings system, perhaps every place-making project should start with 'How does it feel?' rather than 'Does it meet a particular specification?' The latter is not about the human condition. If one can tap into emotions, places can become more sustaining and sustainable. One of the main ways that artists look at opportunities is to ask questions about 'how things feel' and their effect on the emotions. A trivial example can explain: darkness engenders fear, but stark sodium light which seeks to dissipate fear actually makes us more fearful as it sharpens the contours between dark and light. It feels cold and external. Soft light that feels welcoming is a better solution. High-rise blocks can make people feel diminished as overwhelming structures can feel outside a person's control, thus engendering fear and a cold, external feeling. It makes a person feel less powerful. It takes away the sense of identity with which we manage the world.

Attachment and belonging are fundamental human needs. The brain, it appears, is hardwired to need a dimension we can call the spiritual – some high-order symmetry. It is a common cross-cultural response that triggers a sense of possibility and wholeness. Much of this knowledge is intuitive. Intuition, although decried as unscientific, in fact requires a highly developed sensibility, which comes from reflecting on a range of experiences. Intuitively, people seem to know what kind of places work and they vote with their feet as these become popular. They might not be able to explain why, as their intuition is insufficiently self-conscious and thus untutored. Because intuition has low, nearly no, status in place-making, the populace who use places have to school themselves to accept physical environments that conflict with their own instincts rather than trusting their own judgements. By neglecting the capacity for people fundamentally to trust their own judgements badly-made places infantilise them.

The psychology of environments

Environmental psychology measures the effect of the physical and social environment on the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities. The discipline has a rich history stretching back over 50 years, yet is largely absent in discussions on making good places. The vast evidence it has gathered includes the harmful effects of ugliness, whether this be a building, the use of cheap materials, bad urban design or townscape planning. Equally it reflects the restorative effects of beauty, even though what beauty and ugliness is, will be context-driven and subject to debate. Additionally it has looked at the impact of signage clutter and information overload; the disorienting effects of confusing urban environments; the influence of height on the senses; feeling overwhelmed by the townscape, especially when the sidewalks are too narrow; the impact of heaviness or clunkiness of buildings; the negative consequences of seas of endless asphalt, wide roads and turning circles or sprawl; how mental geography determines a sense of wellbeing and thus the effect of people feeling cut off by roads, barriers and obstacles; feelings about dirt and rubbish and the subsequent lack of care

people have for their environment; the repercussions of noise and car dominance.

Knowledge of culture

Cultural knowledge is now becoming recognised as being as important as general literacy, numeracy or computer skills – without them we cannot operate well in this world of diversities and differences. Not having cultural knowledge about one's own culture or one's city and that of others would be like moving blindly through the world or trying to speak without a vocabulary. Cultural literacy is the ability to read, understand, find significance in, evaluate, compare and decode the local cultures in a place. This allows one to work out what is meaningful and significant to people who live there. We understand better the lifecycle of the city in motion. We understand more what we see, feel, smell and hear. Artistic training and insight can help people appreciate the psychological effect of environments on individuals.

Culture is who we are, the sum of our beliefs, attitudes and habits. It is seen in customary ways of behaving such as making a living, eating, expressing affection, getting ahead or, in the urban context, behaving in public places. Some customary behaviours have evolved over generations such as the passeggiata, the evening stroll in Italy or Spain. If taking a stroll is culturally important we have to ensure we create spaces that make this possible. Each culture has its codes or assumptions by which it lives and there are expectations underlying those customary behaviours and they differ from Totnes, to Nottingham or Fort William. They differ too depending on our background or how old we are.

Recognising our culture should shape how we create and make our places, from the physical level from the design of street furniture, to icon buildings, to how we feel about ourselves and the place we live in. So the scope, possibilities, style and tenor of physical, social and economic development in a city is culturally determined. What we call the culture of a place, a village, a city, a region, a country is the residue of what has stood the test of time. It is what is left and deemed important after the ebb and flow of argument, the fickleness of fashion and negotiation about what is valuable has passed. Culture is the response to circumstance, location, history and landscape. Its values leave tangible marks. In contrast to more reverential times when many buildings spoke as if to say 'come to our hallowed ground' today we seek to be more democratic in intent and the buildings respond to this spirit of the times through quality and design. They invite and entice, they are more transparent in style. This is reflected in the materials used, perhaps granite in one and glass in the other.

The arts as an index and an instrument

Culture more generally, but we are speaking here about art specifically, is often seen as needing to create a case for public investment on the grounds that it can help achieve public policy objectives, indexed against statistical evidence. It is rather rare to hear the argument made that the level of artistic

activity, the scale and scope of public engagement with art and the standing in which art and artists are held, are indexes of the quality, sustainability and success of places, communities and societies. Government's current enthusiasm for evidence-based policy has led to vast efforts being put in to developing the myriad of performance indicators against which public agencies of all kinds are required to report. Very little of this effort has been devoted to the development of indicators which tell of the artistic achievement and engagement of society, or the extent to which art reflects the quality of the lives of the citizens.

Over recent decades, the arts, at least in the UK, have widely, though far from unanimously, accepted the imperative of economic and social policy as a big influence over artistic practice. The reasons for this are too large and complex to go into here, but the effect is evident. Great emphasis has been laid on the use of the arts as an instrument to achieve public policy objectives. With the big public policy objectives, economic growth, reduction of crime, creation of employment, health and education improvement, goes the big public purse. If the arts want some of that the money, they have to demonstrate, or at least argue, that what they do serves these objectives. Furthermore, as the style of government has moved progressively towards managerialism, and the setting and evaluation of output targets, arts funding agencies and arts organisations have followed, seeking the ways to align their cultural objectives with the more material ones of government.

There is a problem here. There is a great deal of evidence that the arts can and do contribute to the economy, employment, personal and societal welfare, and the mitigation of many kinds of social ills. It would have been surprising had this not proved to be the case, though much effort has been spent in trying to demonstrate it in a way which convinces government. Equally, it is evident that the achievement of these kinds of economic and social benefits is not actually what the arts set out to do. The instrumental use of the arts, while often very effective, is not their reason for being.

There is another way of looking at the part that the arts play in relation to public economic and social policy, and that is as a measure of the success of those policies. Understandably, given their complexity and difficulty, the achievement of economic and social policy objectives come to be seen as ends in themselves, but this is a short-focus view. The point of achieving economic growth is not that everyone shall be rich, but that everyone should lead a better life. This is not to enter into the argument over whether growth is a good or bad thing, only to remember that pursuit of wealth for its own sake is an arid endeavour.

It would be well to keep in mind that the object of economic policy is to achieve a better life, and that the expression of the 'betterness' is to be found in the arts and culture. In this view of things, it is not the arts which are the instrument of economic policy, but the other way round.

How does this relate to artists and place-making? In three ways. Art and the work of artists can and do help the creation of places which encourage free and liberal intercourse between people, so contributing to social and economic ends, places which embody excitement, pride, love and other

desirable emotions and so help build social and personal confidence and a sense of belonging.

Secondly, artists can add value in financial terms to developments and investments. The quality and distinctiveness which artists can bring to projects can contribute directly to the bottom line.

Thirdly, the fact that such works can be made, embodying the imagination, skills and aspirations of artists, is itself an element of the wider cultural index of society's progress and success.

Place making at its best

At its best good place or city-making leads to the highest achievement of human culture. Our best places are the most elaborate and sophisticated artefacts humans have conceived, shaped and made. The worst are forgettable, damaging, destructive, even hellish. For too long we believed that place or city-making involved only the disciplines of architecture and land-use planning. Over time, the engineering, surveying, valuing, property development, and project management joined the pantheon. We now know that the physical alone does not make a city or a place, the art of city-making involves all the talents and disciplines. These include:

- understanding human needs, wants and desires;
- generating wealth and bending the dynamics of the market and economics to the needs of a place;
- urban design, circulation and movement;
- trading power for creative influence so the power of people is unleashed.

The list could go on: community endorsement, creating healthy environments, creating inspiration, and celebration. Most importantly perhaps the art of city-making involves creating a place that tells a story about itself. Indeed many argue that modernism has made us lose the capacity for buildings to tell stories. Together, the mindsets, skills and values embodied in these arts help make places out of simple spaces.

Looked at so the places or cities are interconnected wholes and the artistic sensibility is interwoven throughout. Places cannot be viewed as merely a series of elements, although each element is important in its own right. When we consider a constituent part we cannot ignore its relation to the rest. The building speaks to its neighbouring building and to the street; and the street helps fashion its neighbourhood. Infused throughout are the people who populate the city. They mould the physical into shape and frame its use and how it feels.

Acknowledging the broader skills base

The Egan Review² and others remind us that nearly all of us are part of making great, sustainable places even though there are core professions, whose full-time job it is, associated professionals, whose impact is great, and the wider public. The review also outlines a set of generic skills, behaviours and ways of thinking that are requirements for moving forward, such as 'inclusive visioning', team-working, leadership and the ability to manage processes and change. These skills are not discipline-specific and some backgrounds such as the artistic are adept at developing these skills. The review lists over 100 jobs cutting across several dozen professions. The first group includes those whose primary concern is planning, delivering and maintaining places and sustainable communities, including the built environment professions as well as the elected and appointed decision-making classes, politicians, members of regeneration partnerships, agency leaders and infrastructure providers. The second group consists of those whose contribution is very important such as the police, health professionals, community development workers, retailers, facilities managers. The third wider public group includes those whose active engagement is important such as local residents, the media and school children.

In a meeting of international city leaders, three conditions for success were identified: knowing where the place is going - a vision which is recognised and shared; widespread leadership, 'leadership by the many, not by the few'; and measured risk-taking. These kinds of approaches, coupled with Egan's agenda and the newly established Academy for Sustainable Communities have begun to impact on the development community and professions. Seeing the world through a sustainable communities prism reshapes goals and priorities, and helps discover how to get there. It has increased the awareness that greater consultation of needs and wants is required. It has shifted attention to soft infrastructures and given these fields renewed credibility and legitimacy. An effect too has been to consider the physical spaces in between – the public realm, an issue that the urban design community has paid much attention to. It is simply under-valued.

It is beginning to address the 'natural' tendency of professionals to act tribally as a means of asserting their self-identity which can make professionals become entrenched in silos. Knowledge and specialism silos can ossify without proper communication to outside learning and development as there is little discussion and challenge of assumptions. Such silos see the world from their own point of view. It becomes difficult to see bigger-picture opportunities and strategies. Criticising silos is not the same as saying we should all know a little about many things without deep knowledge of a particular subject. Instead it implies that more important, higher-order forms of thinking, understanding, knowledge, interpretation and behaving exist that should shape how the silo works. This will make silos more porous and permeable and give them the lifeblood they need to develop and expand. Sensitive artists have been good at broadening these horizons. The play of similarities and differences between insights is central to good place-making

² www.odpm.gov.uk/index

and the differences should be exploited as they enlarge the whole. The best professionals know the other silos well and allow themselves to be influenced by other insights.

The Egan Review has provided an excellent launch pad to see things more in the round, but still the arts or artists receive the most cursory mention even though within the generic skills the review mentions there are many areas where the positive role of artists is acknowledged. For example 'inclusive visioning', 'breakthrough thinking', 'team building' or 'conflict resolution and mediation'.

Thinking in the round

We now have a greater understanding of the connections between things. For centuries we have been splitting knowledge and insight into fragments, boxes and segregations. From this have grown many inventions and innovations, albeit moving along a narrow furrow. The evaluation of everything from a perspective of specialism and narrowness is a defining characteristic of contemporary society

Ecological awareness and environmental distress have revived an interest in seeing connections and holism. It has refocused attention on chains, loops, cycles and feedback mechanisms. Transferred to places and cities it has made us see connections between different domains: the environmental, social, economic and at last also the fourth pillar of sustainability, the cultural. For far too long, the cultural has been neglected. It is cultural literacy that in fact helps us understand where a place has come from and what is important to its people and has meaning to them. It helps us understand the present and thus possible futures too. If a place is culturally confident rather than self-effacing, it is much more likely to take the necessary risks to move ahead. (In fact the cultural should be seen as overarching, as it determines how other areas are conceived and perceived).

Since most opportunities or problems are inextricably interwoven, experts need to take account of each other. Yet ordinary citizens are also experts, they are certainly *the* expert of their own concerns and what they want. 'Taking account of' should not be seen as a marginal add-on once the basic decisions have been made. The list of urban issues is well-known and extensive: choosing shelter at varying standards and sizes; rubbish and waste removal; maintaining roads and walkways; work, from the capacity to move around in cars, bikes or public transport, the ability to earn money in varying places of work, from offices to factories; the ability to shop in differing types of outlets; to have fun; to be artistically challenged; the availability of facilities for health or social care; spaces to relax and reflect, meet people and interact; spaces to avoid noise, to escape into natural surroundings.

Which of these factors are more important? Clearly the built fabric is important, it sets the frame and provides the setting within which the city conducts its business. Not every structure works. It affects the rest of the urban system negatively if it is ugly and projects itself as if it were saying 'No'. For the city to work well requires more than the simply utilitarian, although the practical and functional remains key, inspiration too is required to motivate.

This reintroduces the idea of *beauty*, a word long lost from our urban lexicon. A simple device may be for cities to ask themselves, 'Is this beautiful (and practical) enough for us?' Addressing how people feel about their city is not 'just another burden we have to bear' but tangibly affects the value and longevity of property, and reduces maintenance costs.

Professional defensiveness

However open-minded the professions are, it is in their interest to claim and guard special knowledge and specialist knowledge is needed. Often this is translated into technical codes, standards, guidelines and directives. This is not to decry the specialist, but to avert the tendency for particular professions to feel they are the 'top dog' of city-making. Architects, it is argued, feel they have the monopoly on three-dimensional design. Planners might see themselves as 'the kings of the process' because they know the steps to the agreed plan. And surveyors might consider themselves the arbiters of every kind of value.

In arguing for integrated thinking and cross-cutting team work, a sustainable response to the challenge must be a cultural one arising from the heart of the professions' values and purpose, rather than an add-on approach which mimics a changed mindset. Integration is about mutual respect and the ability of the various team members to be full and equal members of a project. Integrated working implies allowing others to comment on or even rewrite the script or rules of a project. This does not displace the architect, engineer, planner or other professional. Rather it invites them to rethink how their gifts and experience can be opened to genuine partnership within an honest, reflexive conversation.

There remains a misalignment between the challenges and tasks of place-making and the types of expertise and thinking we apply to it or give legitimacy to. The primary faultline lies between the dominance of hard and soft infrastructure professionals. In the hierarchy, the built environment professions are deemed to be on top. There is a need for more cross-connections between planners and historians, developers and sociologists, and surveyors and health professionals or artists and property developers. Each profession has its value, but none fosters key elements of the combined qualities of thinking required for place-making: holistic, interdisciplinary, lateral; innovative, original, experimental; critical, challenging, questioning; people-centred, humanistic, non-deterministic; 'cultured', knowledgeable, critically aware of the past; and strategic.³

In getting across the changing landscape of planning and associated disciplines it is useful to re-conceptualise the new requirements. For example, to create good places or cities we need good observers, explorers, galvanisers, visualisers, interpreters, contextualisers, story tellers, revealers, information gatherers, strategists, inspirers, critics, agenda setters, processors, facilitators, consultants, translators, analysts, problem-solvers, decision-makers, procurers, managers, makers, constructors, builders,

³ This list emerged based on discussions with Franco Bianchini

brokers, mediators, conciliators, educators, arbitrators, implementers, evaluators, appraisers, presenters. And then in addition, the classic disciplines associated with urban development like design, planning, valuing and engineering come into play. The terrain is large and many people will have a combination of these skills and not everyone will have all to the same degree of intensiveness.

There are two processes involved: new skills that are a core part of place-making and other skills or dispositions that aid effectiveness and leadership that apply to any domain.

In sum we need to *think* differently in a more rounded way in order to see the connections between things; we need to *perceive* the city as a more comprehensively sensory experience so understanding its effect on individuals; we need to *feel* the city as an emotional experience; and we need to *understand* cities culturally. Cultural literacy is the skill that will help us better understand the dynamics of cities. We need to *recognise the artistic* in all of us, it can lead us to a different level of experience.

Thinking like an artist

The domain of the arts in place-making is undervalued. The dominant values and attributes that are responsible for the malaise of the modern world, narrow conceptions of efficiency and rationality, are almost *diametrically opposed* to the values promoted by artistic creativity.

The prevailing worldview is characterised by phrases such as goal, objective, focus, strategy, outcome, calculation, measurable, quantifiable, logical, solution, efficient, effective, economic sense, profitable, rational, linear. It is the contrast between this and the alternative worldview that gives artistic creativity its power.

The arts are at the core of culture and the quintessence of the arts is artistic creativity. Human beings in all societies throughout history have expressed artistic creativity. What is unique about artistic creativity? What are its distinct attributes? What human values does it embody and share with others, so that it is capable of having deep significance for individuals, communities, and even, over time, for history? Can the arts, 're-anchor humankind', 'knit together what has been rent apart'?

Expression is an important part of artistic creativity. What is it that is special about artistic activities: singing, acting, writing, dancing, performing music, sculpting, painting, designing or drawing, in relation to developing cities? Participating in the arts uses the imaginative realm to a heightened degree. The arts have wider impacts by focusing on reflection and original thought, they pose challenges, sometimes they want to communicate. Turning imagination into reality or something tangible is a creative act, so the arts more than most activities are concerned with creativity, invention and innovation. Reinventing a city or nursing it through transition is a creative act so an engagement with or through the arts helps.

Engagement with arts combines stretching oneself and focusing, feeling the senses, expressing emotion, self-reflecting and original thought. The result

can be to broaden horizons, to convey complex ideas and emotions iconically with immediacy and depth, to nurture memory, to see the unseen, to learn, to uplift, to anchor identity and community or by contrast to stun, to shock by depicting terrible images for social, moral, or thought-provoking reasons, to criticise, to create joy, to entertain, to be beautiful. The arts can even soothe the soul and promote popular morale. At its best art on occasion can lift into a higher plane beyond the day to day that people call spiritual. This highlights the role of the arts in tapping potential.

The arts help cities in a variety of ways. First with their aesthetic focus they draw attention to quality, and beauty. This should affect how urban design and architecture evolve. The use of imagination and lateral thinking are among the valuable things the arts can offer other disciplines such as planning, engineering, social services or to the business community, especially if allied to other emphases like a focus on local distinctiveness. The arts challenge us to ask questions about ourselves as a place. 'What kind of place do we want to be and how should we get there?' Arts programmes can challenge decision makers by undertaking uncomfortable projects that force leaders to debate and take a stand. For example an arts project about or with migrants might make us look at our prejudices. Arts projects can empower people who have previously not expressed their views, so artists working with communities can help consult people. For example a community play devised with a local group can tell much more than a typical political process. Arts projects can simply create enjoyment.

Can artists make great places? Part 2 – artists and places

What is different about artists?

Artists differ from some of the other people with whom they come in to contact in development and regeneration projects in structural as well as psychological ways. Engineers, planners, surveyors and architects each have professional associations which control, or at least have a powerful influence on, training, qualification, standards of professional practise and discipline. These professional associations are long-established, credible bodies which are recognised by government, public authorities and the private sector companies with whom they work. They both uphold the standards of the work of their members, protect the standing of their professions and can exercise sanctions against members who fail to meet standards or are negligent.

Artists have no such support. To take an example, the Royal Academy is a national association which selects its members on grounds of quality of work, but does not operate in a parallel way to, say, RICS, in setting standards, steering the development of training of new entrants, and rarely exercises its power to exclude members on account of falling standards. There are local artists societies, the most notable of which is perhaps the Royal Birmingham Society of Artists, which promote the work of members and provide exhibition, retail and educational services in their localities. But these are in no sense equivalents of the nationally-recognised professional bodies. Artists mostly operate in a very raw open marketplace, where the recognition of standards, establishment of reputation and commercial value is determined by a complex of forces, too confused to be described as a system, in which private sector entrepreneurs, national funding bodies and institutions, the media and curators all play a part.

One of the conclusions of the evaluation of PROJECT was that, where artists are engaged as part of a development or regeneration team, they should be employed on the same terms as the other professions involved. This conclusion arose from the experience of several of the artists involved in PROJECT schemes that their role and position was unclear, that there was no management structure able to ensure that their input was effectively applied, and that they were paid less than the others involved.

There is little point in suggesting the creation of a national 'governing body' or professional association for artists. There is no evident demand for such a thing and little prospect of its being able to bring such a disparate and transgressive lot of practitioners together in an agreement on shared standards and practices. Nonetheless, there are at least two initiatives which are relevant to the case of artists involved in making places. The National Artists Association, which works to protect artists' intellectual property, and AN the artists information company, which has developed codes of practice and guidelines for commissioners and artists.

The lack of 'professionalism' perhaps goes some way to answer the recurring question, why is it that artists have always to justify themselves, whether as

professionals engaged in development or, indeed, as practitioners at all? There is something in the culture which mistrusts the concept of 'artist', while it does not mistrust 'engineer' or 'architect'. The backing and official recognition of a professional society is part of the answer, but there is probably a deeper-laid suspicion, in Britain at least, of the self-expression, playfulness, cleverness and passion associated with artists. In recent times, as the current cult of celebrity has grown, (a very few) artists have benefited, if that is the word, from an unprecedented degree of fame, but it is not clear that this has reduced the level of suspicion, quite possibly the reverse is true.

Licensed transgression

Something which both PROJECT and some of the Home Zone projects revealed is that the role of an artist in a development project can valuably be that of licensed transgressor. Because the artist does not come from a background of regulation, validation, standardisation and control, because they 'do not know the rules' or do not choose to observe them, they open situations up in potentially creative ways. For example, the dialogue between developers and planners is in the normal course of things a very constrained one. In so far as planning is a regulatory system, as much to prevent things from taking place as to encourage, exchanges between the two sides are mostly restricted to issues of legislation, planning guidance, policy implementation and the regulatory framework. There is little room for conversation about what does not fall within the framework of regulation. An artist in the mix often brings in to the discourse ideas, ways of thinking or proposals which do not easily fit in to the standard framework. This can be taxing for all concerned, and sometimes the door is firmly closed. One of the PROJECT schemes was to enable a landfill company to utilise an internationally-known land artist to produce designs for the landscaping of completed landfill sites, to create new and interesting landscape features. The response of the planning department concerned was that only proposals which rendered ex-landfill sites inconspicuous were allowed under policy, and that no alternative could be considered. Door closed.

In other cases, the artists' proposals opened doors, and obliged a conversation between planner and developer which stepped outside the narrow boundaries which normally govern their discourse. In these cases, the extended range of the conversation, outside the usual constraints, was greatly valued by both planners and developers, and brought a freshness and a different sense of purpose to the relationship which both felt was beneficial them.

From another perspective, licensed transgression is no transgression at all, and there was a sense of frustration on the part of some artists that, however their ideas and creativity was engaged, the economic and regulatory imperatives would always prevail, and that the capacity of artist in this situation to achieve any lasting change was very limited.

What is it like to be an artist in this context?

Relations with other professions

The PROJECT scheme threw up some evidence of the way artists are perceived by other professionals involved in projects. While the numbers involved were not large enough to be entirely statistically reliable, it was possible to draw a characterisation of attitudes. The response of local government planners who were drawn in to the involvement of an artist was without exception positive. It is in the nature of regulatory system that one of its major functions is to say no, to prevent things from happening. The routine dialogue between developers and architects (wanting to do things) and planners (wanting to stop them, or wanting them to do something else) is conducted mostly on the very limited ground defined by the legislation and what is a fairly traditional practice. The introduction of an artist into this otherwise routine dialogue created fresh areas of discourse. The planners found this stimulating and exciting. By and large, engineers were very positive in their response. Seeing themselves able to do anything, the engineers found the challenge of striving to achieve an artist's vision a stimulus, and welcomed the introduction of some 'soul' or spirituality into their technical and functional work. Architects more often seemed to see artists as rivals or competitors, and as potentially dangerous practitioners who knew less than themselves, had not had the necessary training and professional discipline, and needed to be controlled.

Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy exists for reasons of accountability and transparency, at best, though the best is not always achieved. The PROJECT programme supported some schemes which illuminated the relationship between the artist and the bureaucracy which is sometimes an uncomfortable one. In one case, for example, the artist's involvement was managed between two local authority departments which had different organisational cultures. From the artist's perspective, the bureaucracy appeared impersonal, formal and detached from the social and political reality of the outside world. It took a long time to achieve anything. The artist needed to learn to be accountable in an unfamiliar way, and had less control over the work than in normal artistic practice. Deadlines of projects were controlled elsewhere, and major decisions, including cancellation or suspension of projects, were made from above without warning. It was necessary to modify projects and practices to fit this very unfamiliar situation. The artist's response was to become less personally involved and precious, to wind down the ambitions of the project and to work largely outside the bureaucracy. A consequence was to further reduce access to decision-making meetings and structures, and the artist's view was that much less was achieved as a result than could or should have been.

Within the bureaucracy the artist's involvement was ultimately recognised as a positive contribution to the programme. It was in some ways difficult to sustain the strategic role which the artist was intended to have in the overall approach

to regeneration. An artist who does not produce art can seem an anomaly with no tangible definition within a council structure where job roles are very explicitly defined. Awareness of the place for an artist in a regeneration programme was initially limited since the officers involved had no previous experience of involvement with artists. While at first it was not clear why an artist should be acting in an essentially administrative or strategic role, with time the value of this approach was understood and appreciated. Eventually, both artist and officers recognised a shared learning experience.

Mindset

Compared with the other professional categories involved in the PROJECT scheme, relatively few artists reported a change in mindset. There is some evidence that, while recognising the flexibility and creativity of artists, there is alongside that a lack of understanding of other ways of thinking and working, a kind of Nelsonian closed-mindedness. For those artists that did experience a change of mindset, the principal factors of change were to do with their experience of the lack of control which comes with collaboration in a major project. Expectations of timescale had to be revised, often drastically, as a result of dealing with the sometimes grindingly slow pace of development projects. Artists are generally self-motivated and self-managing in their creative practice. Involvement in a development in some cases tested their organisational and management skills severely. In the studio, an artist is in the position to direct and validate their own creative decisions by whatever criteria they choose, and are often highly self-critical as a consequence. In the context of a large collaborative project, artists experienced challenge directly to their artistic ideas and propositions from practitioners from different backgrounds. In PROJECT, artists in this position generally found the capacity to reconsider and revise without necessarily compromising their personal and creative integrity. Artists had to recognise that, working in a public context, the artist has to be prepared to be answerable and accountable in ways which do not prevail in the private sphere of personal creativity.

How artists work

Alongside consideration of whether artistic thinking, thinking like an artist, is valuable as a skill to be learned by other professions, it is relevant to look at something of the spectrum of artists ways of thinking and working. There are positive and negative aspects to be considered.

Artists are creative, in that they can make something out of nothing. They can also make something out of something else. A completely original idea is a rarity, but the capacity of artists to have them is demonstrable. More frequent, but no less creatively valuable, is the ability to rework existing concepts in new ways, to combine and recombine ideas, to bring together concepts and things which are otherwise distant, to recognise the potential which lies in accidents and errors, and capitalise on them. Creativity in thinking and working are by no means the sole property of artists, indeed creativity is an

essential part of any and all of the professional practices which are engaged in place-making, but at best artists are particularly good at them.

While artists can bring originality and fresh connections to a project, there is a corresponding downside. Artists often proliferate, can be fascinated by what's difficult at the expense of what is achievable, be mercurial and more ready to follow a new emergent line of development than stay with something which already seems boring. Pig-headedness and self-centredness, while not the sole preserve of artists, are not unknown in the creative community.

Emotion

Artists, at least some of them, deal in the realm of emotion more readily than perhaps, say, developers and engineers. Again artists have no prerogative, and the passion which other professionals feel and which drives their practice is not to be belittled, but artists often work to create an emotional response in the recipients of what they do, sometimes as the principal purpose. The capacity of artists to be literate in the emotional realm is valuable to other place-making professionals in several ways.

People respond emotionally to places, as much as (or more than) they respond with other faculties. Being able to bring to place-making practitioners who have real expertise in working with emotion and have the ability to understand and frame interventions which act in the emotional sphere, can make it possible to plan and build with awareness of the emotional context which a place will create for those who use it.

Practicality

Artists, or some of them at any rate, are artisans, practical workers who make things. So are engineers and architects, and there can be a connection between them, a kind of guild or fraternity feeling among people who make things. Artists, however, are distinctive in that they make things which are not utilitarian, which are useless. This ready accommodation of uselessness on the part of artists can be difficult for those other professions to assimilate, whose principal purpose is to improve the lot of humanity by making useful things, like roads and buildings.

From another perspective, there is evidence of a problem when an artist is placed in the position of being a creative thinker contributing to the development of a project, rather than as a maker of things. In one of the PROJECT schemes, the local authority planning and development people were initially nonplussed by the idea that the artist involved was not going to make any art. This apparent contradiction, within the setting of a compartmentalised organisation with strictly defined job descriptions and practices, meant that the artist had no foothold in the structure with which they were meant to be working.

Creative thinking

Some artists in the PROJECT scheme were able to contribute as 'creative thinkers', either by talent or by good management (or both). Others undertook public art projects more or less in the conventional way which PROJECT had been set up to challenge, either by desire or by default. In some cases there was an agreed changeover between the two roles. In others it seemed that the projects, or the artists, did not fully understand what they were there for.

The artists' input into PROJECT schemes was highly valued by the other professionals involved, whether as creative thinker, critical friend or maker of things. The highly self-critical character of artists, and the absence of externally-validated criteria and practice, led to the artists' contribution and achievement in these projects being valued less by the artists themselves than by the other professionals.

Artists working in these circumstances need support to enable their contribution to be as effective as possible. More, and more structured, contact between PROJECT artists working in different locations would have been appreciated, and would help to provide peer support.

Is it surprising that on the whole, artists are much better able to describe their experiences in meaningful terms than many of the other professions involved? Even artists who profess to be ill at ease writing down their experiences or responses proved to be much better at doing so than the other professionals who were involved.

In some cases, artists involved in PROJECT found themselves ending up doing something quite different from what they had originally envisaged, or from what they believed they had been hired to do.

In one very large and complex project, the artist had proposed that their role would be to work creatively within the programme of development, in a way which would be critically reflective of the political and power structures involved in the process of a major, high-profile, high-budget scheme. In the event the artist's planned contribution had perforce to be subsumed by the need for practical help to the client in understanding the approach to a building and how to communicate effectively with the developer.

This is a pragmatically creative response to circumstances but also means that sometimes artists are not utilised for the principal strengths.

Artist as interlocutor

This role of artist as interlocutor has many dimensions, and has been noted in many different contexts. The capacity of an artist to enable people to discover their own ideas and to find ways of expressing them proved very valuable. Artists found an important function in PROJECT as creators of channels of communication between the different interests involved. Internally, within a development team, artists helped to illuminate the objectives of clients and communities of users to themselves first of all, and then helped them to find the means to convey their needs and ambitions to developers and architects.

Externally, artists facilitated community consultation and input into projects, and had a role in defusing potential objections. There are several kinds of value in these ways of working with artists. The better that a client or community can communicate what the needs of a particular project are to the professionals responsible for carrying it through, the better the final outcome is likely to be. Artists have skills in creating and facilitating many kinds of media of expression and communication. The expression of a client's requirements or the needs of a community might be well explained in a text, but a visualisation, a group of stories, a film or a photographic essay might do the job better. The process also runs in the other direction. Artists have been shown to have a valuable role as intermediary between local authorities and developers on one hand, and communities and residents on the other. It goes without saying, of course, that not all artists can do everything, and projects need to choose their artists carefully, and to use professional assistance in doing so, to ensure that there right match of skills and experience is secured.

How to work with artists

For the engagement of an artist in the process of a development to be effective in the way that was envisaged by PROJECT, the first thing that is necessary is that they be appointed early. Despite that PROJECT had earnestly sought to ensure early engagement, it was a frequent reflection by people involved, in all capacities, that earlier involvement of the artist would have enabled the project to work better. PROJECT took steps to work pro-actively, identifying potential opportunities and offering artist input at the earliest stage, though the application process inevitably slowed things down. To determine more specifically how early is early enough, a further piece of research might be required.

Management

It should scarcely need saying (but it does) that the process of engaging an artist in a project needs to be attentively managed. It has to be borne in mind that, while planners, developers and architects have routine ways of operating together, artists step into this milieu often from a very different tradition of practice, and may well find it taxing to find the right way to relate to the process of a development.

Willingness

At key gateways somebody has to be ready to countenance the kind of experimental approach PROJECT has promulgated. The landfill example quoted above is an example of how much of an obstacle the planning system can be. In other cases, for example the lack of agreement between a developer and their contractor over implementing an artist's proposal, revealed the kinds of places bottlenecks occur.

Forward planning

One of the factors revealed by the PROJECT research was the difficulty of ensuring that the input of an artist involved in the initial planning of a development was able to be sustained along the often lengthy line of communication between masterplan and final product. Many contractors, authorities, organisations and individuals are involved in carrying through a development programme which may be set on a long timescale, decades in some cases. This problem was addressed in one PROJECT-supported regeneration programme for an area of housing by creating a Public Art Guide. The artist engaged in the initial stages of the project produced the guide⁴ which details its purpose, who it is aimed at, the rationale of the approach to artistic involvement in the scheme, and an explanation of the kinds of projects which can be envisaged. The guide also provides guidance to organisations seeking to commission specific works, examples of public art projects elsewhere, and much useful reference information. It is a kind of supplementary planning guidance document, though conceived and produced in a more user-friendly fashion.

Conclusion

Artists bring some valuable capacities to place-making projects, and some baggage. A less law-abiding kind of creativity than some of the other professions, reflection and self-criticism, ability to act as interlocutor between silos, emotional and cultural literacy, tenacity, along with some wilful blindness, egotism, proliferation, low regard for the constraints of efficiency, obstinacy.

The practical projects we have looked at in acquiring evidence for this review, principally PROJECT and some Home Zones, showed how diversely artists can contribute to the making of places. We are concerned here to point to ways in which the best can be made of the potential which we consider has been amply demonstrated. Under what conditions does it work best?

In conclusion, therefore we draw together three key points from the preceding discussion:

- the importance of 'inclusive visioning', team-working, widespread leadership, and the ability to manage processes and change which are highlighted in the Egan review;
- making measured risk-taking possible through licensed transgression;
- the creation of an environment in which mutual respect and trust can develop so that all the talents necessary for such complex enterprises can be deployed to best effect.

These are of course not specific to the issues of place- and city-making which have been considered here, but they form a framework in which some necessary conditions for success might be met.

⁴ Barton Hill Public Art Guide, David Cotterrell 2006

For the benefit of an artist's input to be realised, it is necessary that they and the other professionals involved are clear about what the artist's role is and what they are expected to do. The ability of an artist to contribute to the 'inclusive visioning' of a particular project is potentially great, but they can only contribute effectively to planning and developing a project if they are in place early enough.

Artists are not necessarily team players, and the management of teams in which an artists was involved was clearly lacking in some of the projects we looked at, making less of the potential value of their input. Capacity has to be made in a project to ensure that the artist's involvement is managed and supported

To make the best of the ability of an artist to bring fresh approaches and original thinking to a particular situation, the issue of 'licensed transgression' needs to be understood and embraced. The role of 'court jester' which artists are sometimes asked to take can be highly creative and liberating to others involved, but it is not what every artist wants to be.

Mutual respect and trust are engendered by equality of esteem, frankness and some sense of shared values or aims. When artists are working in a development milieu and expected to contribute their professional expertise and creativity, they should be engaged on the same terms as the other professionals involved.

If artists can be re-integrated into the making of places and cities, we think that there are many benefits, as the discussion earlier in this paper has outlined. If the range and scope of the benefits of artists' engagement in the built environment had to be summed up, we suggest that the key word is pleasure. There is more pleasure to be had from places which bear the mark of art and artists, than from those which do not. We are in favour of pleasure, and we commend to the reader the idea that artists bring more pleasure to places.

Charles Landry

Fred Brookes

September 2006