PLANNING FOR THE ARTS - AN URBAN RENAISSANCE?
A Critique of Arts Policy and Town Planning and their Relationship

Volume II

Graeme L. Evans

PhD Thesis

CITY UNIVERSITY
Department of Arts Policy & Management

July 1997
## CONTENTS

### Volume II

| Postscript | The National Lottery and Planning for the Arts | 3 |
| Appendices | Economic Impact Studies of the Arts and Culture | 23 |
|            | Space for the Arts: Mechanisms for Implementation | 27 |
| III        | Survey of Arts and Urban Regeneration in London Boroughs | 28 |
| IV         | Islington Arts and Cultural Industries Survey Data | 36 |
| V          | Islington 1991 Census | Islington Visitors Map | 41/2 |
| VI         | Members of the Arts and Urban Regeneration Group | 43 |
| VII        | Planning Artists Workspaces in North America and Europe | 44 |

| Bibliography                          | 50 |
POSTSCRIPT - THE NATIONAL LOTTERY AND PLANNING FOR THE ARTS

Since the research and analysis undertaken for this thesis was completed, the National Lottery was launched in Britain and has run its first year, grossing nearly £5 billion and raising nearly £1 billion for the five 'Good Causes' including the Arts. Whilst the impact on recipient sectors: Arts, Heritage, Sport, Charities and the Millennium Fund, and public spending on these areas of social and cultural provision, is too soon to assess (Evans and White, 1996), comparisons with Lotteries established in other countries offers some insight into the likely impact in terms of subsidiarity and additionality, in what was: "Of all Tory nationalizations the most blatant and bizarre" (Jenkins, 1995 p.220). The significance of this additional source of capital funding for the Arts has already been noted earlier in this thesis, against a prolonged period of restriction on public capital spending by local authorities and cessation of the Arts Council's own 'Housing the Arts' fund in 1985.

The notion and consideration of 'planning' for this new capital funding and investment in arts facilities is largely absent, however, since applications cannot, strictly, be solicited or directed by distribution bodies such as the Arts Council. The opportunity both to democratise the distribution of Lottery funds, and to apply fundamental local, regional and national planning standards, approaches and typologies of provision, as reviewed in this thesis, have arguably been lost under the Lottery legislative and fund allocation systems. These issues are therefore discussed in the following paper written by the author, drawing in part on findings from this thesis (Evans, 1995a and b).
Graeme Evans
University of North London

3rd International Arts Management Conference, City University, July 1995

THE NATIONAL LOTTERY & PLANNING FOR THE ARTS:
REASSERTION OF THE HEGEMONIES

Abstract

This paper assesses the introduction and likely impact of the National Lottery on cultural provision in
the United Kingdom. A commissioned study of proposed capital projects and events looking to
Millennium and other Lottery funds in London, and comparatives elsewhere, is the starting point for
a critique of provision and funding between the arts and sport and the absence of policy and planning
consideration in the Lottery grant process and of arts planning norms.

The reassertion of a hegemonic subsidy system is also analysed in terms of the divergence of
socio-economic participation in the arts and heritage-based activity, in contrast to the likely purchasers
of National Lottery tickets. The evidence gathered indicates that the beneficiaries of Lottery proceeds
will be concentrated in London and regional capitals; in major flagship projects and in the arts and
heritage organisations whose participants are predominantly drawn from 'higher' socio-economic
groups. The paper concludes that a golden opportunity to democratise the Lottery distribution process
and the fulfillment of long-laid leisure plans appears to have been lost under the current Lottery legis-
lative and agency structures.

(This essay is drawn from a longer paper: The National Lottery: Planning for Leisure, or Pay Up and
Introduction

When the last state Lottery was held in Britain in 1826, churchmen breathed a sigh of relief. They had long claimed that lotteries were encouraging the poor to waste their money. In 1808 a select committee of MPs had concluded that as a result of the Lottery and illegal gambling on its outcome: 'idleness, dissipation and poverty are increased, domestic comfort is destroyed, madness often created' (Litvonov & Tomkins in The Economist, 5th November 1994:25-6). As the winner of the highest public gambling prize disappeared on holiday to escape the pursuing press and ponder his £17 million fate, the moral debate continued amidst fringe interests spawned by the National Lottery, from Camelot's inadequate distribution system and bottlenecks, the BBC's rating and programming rationales for the Lottery game-show, to the less publicised institutional beneficiaries of 28% of the gross Lottery proceeds. The Sports, Arts, Heritage, Millennium and Charity boards established to receive their equal shares and distribute capital grant-aid foresee a remission in leisure provision and 'good works' and much-needed injection to flagging infrastructure and facilities, not witnessed since the cultural and recreation amenities and educational institutions endowed by the Victorians and the municipal expansion of sports and arts centres in the 1960s and early 1970s (Henry, 1993).

The National Lottery and the Millennium Fund

National Lottery departments have been established in Arts and Sports Councils in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales, with directors, PR & marketing and administrative personnel, supported by professional assessors and officers in regional boards and councils. The Millennium Commission, a new creation chaired by the Heritage Minister, will be charged with disposing of an estimated £1.6 billion of Lottery income on capital projects, celebratory events, festivals and bursaries, timed, largely opportunistically, to coincide with the end of the century. Demand for Millennium funds is likely to exceed supply, as our recent study of schemes in Greater London revealed (Craig & Evans, 1994). Six years before the fin de siècle, over £6 billion of capital projects and events are planned in London alone, substantially exceeding the likely national fund available from the Commission. This includes a number of high profile, flagship cultural projects and a predominance of arts, heritage & cultural venues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Millennium Capital Projects Planned - by type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums/Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity/Guilds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Value £6,596 million

Organisation type: Public 35%; Voluntary 42%; Private 23%

Plans elsewhere in the UK also reflect this dominance with major cultural projects and international venues, both conversions and new-build, from sports stadia, opera houses, museums and galleries, theme parks to environmental clean-up and transport routes.
Table 2. Major Millennium Capital Projects in the UK (£10 million+)
(i refurbishment, ii new-build)

**London**
- Albertopolis i
- Alexandra Palace i
- English National Opera i
- Greenwich Waterfront ii
- Great Western Railway Preservation i
- Hackney Empire i
- Institute of Contemporary Arts i/ii
- Kings CrossMillennia i/ii
- National Maritime Museum i
- Royal Opera House i/ii
- Shakespeare Globe Trust i/ii
- South Bank Complex i
- Southwark Environment Trust ii
- Tate at Bankside i
- Wembley Stadium i

**Other UK**
- Birmingham - Technology Campus i
- Cardiff - Opera House; Botanical Gardens; Museum of Welsh Culture ii
- Chatham - Architecture Centre ii
- Chester - Performing Arts Centre ii
- County Durham - Clean up of coastal zone i
- Edinburgh - Architecture Centre ii
- Glasgow - City of Architecture (1999), Millennium Tower ii
- Newcastle - Arts centre i
- Manchester - Olympic Sports Stadium ii
- Salford - Performing Arts Centre & Lowry Art Gallery i
- Sandwell - Digital Theme Park ii
- Sustrans - 5,000 miles of cycle routes i

The low number of community-based Millennium projects at this stage reflects, in part, a lack of awareness, co-ordination and confidence by local authorities, but also a shortage of vision or identification with the Millennium opportunity, or a clear consensus on what is 'of the Millennium' (Millennium Commission, 1994). The slowness of local authorities to plan for the Millennium in terms of capital and celebratory projects is in contrast with forecasts of the likely source of Lottery grant applications, of which 75% are estimated to come eventually from these same authorities (MD, 1994). The ability of local councils to provide leverage and partnership resources, including land, buildings, redirected grant-aid and in kind support such as relief from rates and other financing, is likely to put them at an advantage to all but the larger independent organisations. This may leave the more marginalised and under-capitalised community groups; typically those most disadvantaged in resource allocation, in the Catch-22 situation of being unable to match Lottery funding of between 25% and 35% of total project costs, or to establish operational viability for a new scheme: "Lottery money may be of limited benefit to many organisations whose financial problems relate to current revenue funding as much as new capital investment" (Leisure Consultants, 1995: 8). Black and Asian arts groups have already been weakened during the period of regional arts reorganisation (Wilding, 1989) with disproportionate reduction in revenue funding and their 'asset base': "We shall see a nationwide repetition of the situation in the early 1970s when most of the leading black arts organisations in London had their funding withdrawn. Many 'mainstream' organisations on the other hand, were protected and secured" (MAAS, 1993: 1). Unless scarce revenue funding and capital resources are directed to such groups, therefore, Lottery distributions may fall short of agency and local authority target group and
equity goals, despite the proclaimed access and participation conditions stressed in published Lottery grant application criteria.

The lack of involvement in Millennium plans by religious organisations is also surprising, given the date's significance to Judao-Christians, however pragmatic reasons explain this: the Church of England's Diocesan Review expects a major rationalisation of churches (Craig & Evans. 1994: 27), suggesting that the Millennium may be more of a pagan event than religious festival. As churches and castedrals are sold off, or go the way of museums and heritage 'visitor attractions', by charging for entry, Archbishop Carey whose Canterbury cathedral seat has recently introduced discriminatory charging, has been prompted to seek general tax support for the upkeep of churches and to declare: "I'm not in the business of being a museum director" (1994). One of his nineteenth century predecessors, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, in fact held the post of a trustee of the ill-reputed National Lottery until its dissolution.

The windfall to be provided by Lottery funds should not, however, be understated in terms of the capital investment needs of the fabric of arts, heritage and sports facilities, from the leaking roofs at the National Theatre and the V & A Museum, to the refurbishment of Wembly stadium. The importance to local authority amenity investment is even greater, following the relentless decline in council capital spending and encroaching financial controls (Local Government Housing Act, 1989 and see Byrne, 1994), as well as the run-down of traditional urban programmes reflecting the switch from social to economic criteria, including leisure amenity (Henry, 1993). Since 1980, capital spending by local authorities had declined by over 55%, whilst overall revenue spending had managed to resist the combined effects of ratecapping/standard spending assessments (SSA), the centralisation of business rates (UBR) and the ring-fencing and delegation of core expenditure areas, such as housing, community care and education:

Table 3. Local Authority Expenditure in G.B. at constant 1986-87 prices (Source: CIPFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>7552</td>
<td>6171</td>
<td>4285</td>
<td>4354</td>
<td>5174</td>
<td>4872</td>
<td>4152</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>28113</td>
<td>28729</td>
<td>29313</td>
<td>30076</td>
<td>32379</td>
<td>32836</td>
<td>32239</td>
<td>30940</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning for Leisure?

The distribution of net Lottery proceeds equally between the five 'good causes' is a convenient, if arbitrary choice and avoids the political risk (accusations of favouritism, preferential treatment) involved in the value judgements that would be required in order to justify a biased or targeted allocation. Definitions and demarcation between these recipient causes are also not fixed: prospective applicants such as the National Museum of Sport in Liverpool may look to sport, heritage and Millennium funds, but risks falling foul of all of these (Pinney, 1994). This level playing field policy can also be justified in terms of 'equal opportunity' between arts, sports, heritage, charity and the Millennium, if not in terms of assessed or planned 'need'. This is seen, for instance, in the divergence between arts and sports resource allocation.

Since 1984/85, the Arts Council of Great Britain has ceased to fund capital projects, which it had done since Jennie Lee's Policy for the Arts (1965) established the 'Housing the Arts Fund': "Centres where light entertainment and cultural projects can be enjoyed...to provide additional amenities (restaurants, lecture rooms) at existing centres" (Lee, 1965). Arts Council feasibility and incentive funds have included an element of capital expenditure for winning clients under competitive 'challenge' schemes, but these have been short-lived and are now effectively superseded by Lottery expectations. The contrasted position of arts and sports in public funding and capital needs is also reflected in the disparity of revenue funding, when agency and local authority support is considered. As shown below (Table 4), the lowest spending English region (South-West) funds sports & recreation to a higher level than the
highest spending region (Greater London) does on arts & museums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4. Local Authority Funding of the Arts &amp; Museums v Sports &amp; Recreation in England &amp; Wales, 1992/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Arts &amp; Museums</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sports &amp; Recreation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest spending region (Greater London)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lowest spending region (South-West)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: CIPFA Leisure & Recreation Statistics, 1992/93; Census - OPCS, 1991)

Even when national Sports and Arts Council funding is incorporated, public sports funding is more than twice that of the arts in the UK: £25.01 versus £10.85 per capita. This imbalance can also be analysed in terms of key factors surrounding the post-war welfare system and evolution of arts and sports provision in the UK (Sinfield, 1989; Coalter, Duffield & Long, 1986).

Cullingworth (1979:157) points to the unspecified nature of 'leisure' in town and country planning consideration by stating that: "Amenity is one of the key concepts in British town planning, yet nowhere in the legislation is it defined". Further, Wilson (1988:18) points to the resistance to the notion of planning leisure at all by stating that: "leisure cannot be equated with education, medicine and shelter as a state function because there is an inherent contradiction in the planning which the welfare state must depend on the one hand and the freedom necessarily entailed in true leisure on the other". Nevertheless the policy and planning framework for the arts and for sport reveals a fundamental divergence which has contributed to their differential funding base and provision profiles:

1. Sports & recreation activity has benefited from prescriptive norms of provision, based on spatial and population standards, such as playing fields, (6 acres per 1,000, NPFA 1971); open space (GLC, 1976), sports centres, golf courses (Sports Council, 1972, 1977, 1978) and cf. Planning Policy Guidance Note No.17: Sport & Recreation (DoEn, 1991) and Veal, 1982:

   "Planning for Sport [Sports Council, 1968]...is acknowledged to have transformed the availability of facilities and opportunities to participate in sport at a local level...by proposing the levels and standards of facility which should be provided by urban communities" (Stark, 1994:13)

2. No equivalent planning norms exist for arts and cultural provision, despite isolated attempts through newtown (Veal, 1982), rural planning (TRRU, 1982) and more recent arts plans (GLA, 1989; SAB, 1990).

Prior to taking up appointment as the second Secretary of the Arts Council (1950-63), W.E.Williams published an article, 'Are we building a new culture?' (1943 in Pick, 1991) in which he foresaw a Great Britain 'covered with a national grid of cultural centres' and expounded some notion of arts planning:

"Instead of our present dispersal of the Public Library down one street, the art gallery (if any) down another, the Workingmen's Club somewhere else...let us plan the Civic Centres where men and women may satisfy the whole range of educational and cultural interests between keeping fit and cultural argument. Let us so unify our popular culture that in every considerable town we may have a centre where people may listen to good music, look at a painting, study...join in a debate" (Williams, 1943 quoted in Pick, 1991:23).

When in office during the 1950s, however, Williams' egalitarian thoughts were subsumed by the Arts Council's Charter objective of pursuing excellence in the professional arts: "[Williams] argued forcibly for the need to concentrate on raising standards, believing that too great an emphasis on spreading would lead to the diffusion of mediocrity" (Shaw, 1983:7).
Even Keynes' plea for distributive diversity was short-lived; his 'Death to Hollywood' (cf. Adorno, 1943) speech at the Arts Council's inauguration: "How satisfactory it would be if different parts of the country would walk their several ways...Let every part of Merry England be merry in its own way" (1945, in Pick, 1991:108), soon gave way to a metropolitan elitism in the arts and a rejection of planning. His reaction to Mary Glasgow's (Secretary General of the Arts Council, 1946-50) 'Plans for an Arts centre' was "who has foisted this rubbish on us" (Stark, 1994:12).

An absence of provision norms also lowers expectations of what is the right level and of community 'rights'. Accountability may also be weakened if no provision standards exist to be measured: the draft performance indicators for leisure provision under the Citizens Charter (Audit Commission, 1993) cover all forms of recreation, play and museums, whilst live arts provision is not mentioned - the absence of norms and targets appears to maintain the arts in their peripheral position.

3. From its incorporation in 1946 the Arts Council has not supported amateur and folk arts activity, and this has been replicated through regional arts associations and boards:

"The roots of the absence of a national policy for participation in the arts can be found in the decision of the Arts Council, shortly after it was founded, to focus exclusively on the professional in the arts" (Stark, 1994:8)

In contrast, the Sports Council's Corporate Plan (1993-7) allocated over 20% of their £50 million grant in aid specifically to the support and development of sports participation.

4. The government's first major review of leisure participation, Planning for Leisure (Sillitoe, 1969) in fact only considered sport and outdoor recreation activity (although ballroom and folk dancing was included), and this reflects the then divide between 'leisure' and arts & culture in both academic and policy analysis, as well as in public administration. Whilst the "corporate management ideology" (Henry, 1993:21) saw the creation of leisure service departments in metropolitan areas, which combined parks, swimming pools, sports centres and community centres, the arts were often the exception: "It [was] not unusual for functions such as arts or libraries to remain outside an otherwise comprehensive leisure department" (Steele, 1983:16-17).

The equating of arts planning with equalisation, epitomised in the Glory of the Garden' (Arts Council, 1984) and Lane's Every Town should Have One (1978) continues to draw critics; "Liverpool is not London" (Pick, 1991:81) and 'more means less' (Amis, 1979), however the support for a range of arts planning standards is also felt, alongside calls for mandatory provision: "The creation of a statutory responsibility [of local authorities] would ensure that people are not denied arts opportunities merely because of where they live" (Arts Council, 1993b:40); and from a community development perspective:

"It means establishing not necessarily direct provision but the obligation to ensure that there is adequate provision...using a wide variety of providers, and encouraging the sharing of resources" (Brinson, 1992:74).

5. Sports and recreation facility and grounds management, notwithstanding arms length contract and DSO management, rests predominately in council ownership, whilst arts provision, reflecting both tradition, inheritance and the absence of norms noted above, has operated at arms length of local authorities, relying on grant-aid and premises (Audit Commission, 1989) as well as on voluntary support (Brinson, 1992; Hutchison & Feist, 1991).

The importance of local authority support of theatre buildings is, however, indicated by the proportion of capital funding for their development and improvement. In 1991/2 over 85% of such funding came from local authorities, a remarkable proportion given the capital funding crisis, already noted, "but this source can no longer be considered safe" (Theatres Trust, 1993:3).
Exceptions here are libraries, some local museums and art galleries with the latter often bequeathed to councils and parishes from Victorian city fathers and patrons. Municipal theatres and arts centres have also escaped the extension of compulsory competitive tendering (CCT) for the time being, although in anticipation there has been a rush for trust-status and voluntary contracting-out: contract specifications increasingly operate between grant-aiding councils and local arts organisations (Craig & Evans, 1992).

One impact of continued revenue grant diminuition and capital spending controls has been the run-down of arts buildings, as maintenance budgets are cut and repairs deferred (Arts Council, 1993a). Over two thirds of urban arts centres are located in second (and third) hand buildings, from redundant churches, town halls, to swimming baths and factories (Hutchison & Forrester, 1987). Furthermore, the separation of commercial from subsidised theatres; only the latter will be eligible for Lottery grants, makes little sense given the history and inheritance of Edwardian, Georgian and Victorian theatres and music halls (Pick, 1985): "Commercial, self-financing and subsidised theatres form an essential part of cultural industry, which needs to be seen as indivisible. Their activities should be mutually supportive. They prosper or starve together." (Theatres Trust, 1993:6). A similar argument could be made for professional football clubs and the financing of external demands for all-seater stadia and there may be an opportunity for the Theatres Trust and Football Trust to act as 'charitable brokers' for Lottery capital funds in these cases of 'heritage' commercial venues, although Wembley's rejection by the Millennium Commission perhaps weakens this prospect. However the prospect of hundreds of 'heritage' theatre buildings being refurbished and re-opened through Lottery funding with little consideration of local or strategic planning or demonstration of their viability and demand, suggests that conflicts between 'Friends'/Trustees, architectural interests and those of local and regional funding agencies (the former in their landlord and planning role) are likely.

Given the likely demand from local authorities for Lottery capital funds, three scenarios can be drawn:

i. Capital funds are sought for upgrading and new facilities, based on council provision - largely sport, recreation, museums and libraries (reactive - shopping list approach);

ii. Capital funds are sought for major flagship projects on council and town centre sites and for mixed-use, public-private partnerships, from venues to arena and public realm schemes (opportunistic - town & city imaging);

iii. Local authorities act as co-ordinating brokers to secure maximum amount of Lottery funds for a range of project types: arts, sports, heritage, community facilities, based on a strategic plan (enabling - planning/needs-led approach).

Two overarching issues arise from the Lottery funding opportunity. The first is the fact that grant requests cannot be solicited by awarding bodies. No planning or needs approach can be operated, officially, although the pressure on distributory boards to favour project types and locations already earmarked, or subject to national or parochial political pressure, may be irresistible. Strategic and corporate plans developed by regional arts boards and councils cannot easily be fulfilled if investment is made on an ad hoc, reactive basis. Regional (GLA, 1989; SAB, 1990) and local arts plans (VAN, 1994) have also been the basis and catalyst for local and regional strategies for arts development and investment, despite the absence of a national arts plan or cultural policy. Following two years of developing a National Arts and Media Strategy, the Arts Council's A Creative Future, on its own admission, was a "Statement (of) an agreed policy framework rather than a strategy in the technical sense. It answers questions 'Where to?' and 'Why', not.. 'How'?") (Arts Council, 1993b:2). A year later, the National Lottery is now presented as the panacea and means to deliver public arts investment and to fulfill 'strategic' plans, but again no arts plan (or norms) can operate under the passive Lottery application system.

From a recent survey of councils in England (VAN, 1994), 30% of a sample of 270 local authorities had not undertaken a development plan for arts and support facilities, however 60% were in progress or had completed an arts plan within the last 3 years and a further 10% intended to do so next year. The implications of a capital-led expansion of facilities, whilst revenue support is not eligible for Lottery
funding (in exceptional cases, endowments may be funded for arts, sports and Millennium projects to support the increased costs of the new/extended facility), is leading to reluctance by some authorities to play the Lottery game and risk raising expectations and false hope of new funding. On the other hand, councils with relatively low levels of leisure and arts spending and facilities are using the Lottery opportunity to prepare arts development plans for the first time and lever funds in order to attract Lottery grant-aid.

Cultural Democracy or Hegemony rules

The notion of cultural democracy and subsidiarity in the distribution of Lottery proceeds also seems to have been deliberately ignored. The adoption of centralised Arts and Sports Councils and Heritage Commissions to administer Lottery grants has given these beleaguered institutions previously under attack from central government, a new lease of life, following a close run campaign for their dissolution, or at least a radical rationalisation and devolution of their functions and powers. The hegemonic system of leisure intervention and subvention has been able to continue unchallenged as a result of the indirect 'tax' windfall provided by the Lottery.

The classic Gramscian definition is applicable to the British system of state support of the arts (Hutchison, 1982), heritage and sport: 'culture', through the agency structures (arts, sports and heritage councils) and through extension, to the new Lottery boards. Hall, Britain's 'principal Gramscian thinker' (Davey, 1995: 1994) identified the Thatcher hegemonic momentum as 'authoritarian popularism' (1988) and later affirmed that 'hegemony is not the same as incorporating everybody, making everybody the same... it is the construction of a collective will through difference' (1991: 58). This atmosphere, in which the concentration of symbolic and cultural power ('capital', Boudieu, 1984) reasserted itself was also recognised by the New Left: 'The combination of Conservative hegemony and ineffectual opposition has led to a progressive de-politicisation and passivity in public life' (Renewal, 1993 in Perryman, 1994: 6).

This position has been seen most clearly through the overtly political appointments to national and regional arts, heritage and sports councils and of their senior executives, mirrored in the round of appointments to Lottery boards and commissions (below). The appointment of professional grant assessors by Lottery boards has effectively completed this closed circle, ensuring, in Hall's words again: 'total social authority...winning and shaping consent so that the power of the dominant classes appears both legitimate and natural' (1977 in Hebdige: 366).

Recipient organisations of Lottery grants will be largely represented by the established providers: local authorities, schools (the well-heeled/grant-maintained), existing arts, heritage and sports organisations and agency 'clients': individuals and commercial groups will not be eligible. The scope for new organisations to bid for Lottery grants will be limited; little chance of zero-based budgeting here, which might address gaps in provision, unmet need and aspirations, non-traditional artforms, or unrecognised cultural expression (eg. minority, religious groups, folk and amateur societies: Brinson, 1992: Hutchison & Feist, 1991).

The most stark consequence of this reinforcement of the hegemonic agency system is that Lottery sales and distribution represents the poor giving to the rich (Gorz, 1989). Indeed if this state-sponsored money-raising venture was taxation, it would be regressive. The majority of Lottery tickets are expected to be purchased by socio-economic groups C2, D and E (Saathi and Saathi, 1992 quoted in Litvenov and Tomkins, 1994), representing higher proportions of disposable income and who, in Professor Roger Scruton's view, are not suitable to win such life-changing sums: 'an obsession for people who were not properly equipped to deal with it... Huge jackpots have a habit of falling into the laps of people who lack the competence to cope' (in Pilkington, 1994: 2-3). The Muslim community have frowned on the £17 million winner, an Asian Muslim: (tabloid headlines included - 'We're Hindi Money'; 'Vinda Loot'; 'The Happy Chap-ati'), since gambling is against the Koran: 'It is sad and rather painful that the first person to win such a large sum is...a Muslim. We would prefer that our people excelled in better things...like business or education' (M.Ghuayasuddin, Muslim Institute, in Johnson, 1994:2).
The profile of participation (more often attendance; passive rather than active) in the arts and heritage organisations to be rewarded with Lottery grants, continue to be represented by socio-economic groups AB and to a lesser extent C1 and the higher educated (including students).

Table 5. Attendance by Socio-Economic Group (100=Population Average - BMRB, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums*</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stately Homes*</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Galleries</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*In last 12 months)

Participation data on leisure activity is also limited, for instance General Household Surveys (GHS) and Target Group Indices (TGI) underestimate participation by the young: under-16 year olds are not included, and do not fully measure informal, 'hidden' and unstructured activity: "Being a member of a choir, taking part in a community play, making pottery, performing in a carnival or religious festival, or being on the planning committee of an arts centre would be...invisible" (Brinson, 1992:73). The subjective nature and over-simplification evident in national survey samples renders comparison and analysis problematic, however the above market data is borne out by broadly comparative participation in the arts:

Table 6. Participation by Socio-Economic Group (Source: GHS, 1990; Arts Council, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Group</th>
<th>Arts and Crafts</th>
<th>Top 5 Activities</th>
<th>% Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 D3</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Painting/Drawing</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impact of formal, institutional activity (vis school, gallery, theatre) in contrast to informal participation (youth & community, cultural groups, amateur) could also provide some clues to a Lottery funding policy which could more successfully enable a sustained increase in leisure participation and arts development. Evidence from the USA and Canada suggests that in the case of the performing arts, it is the informal setting and experience which has the most positive impact on subsequent adult participation, irrespective of family income, status and educational attainment (Morrison & West, 1986). The institutional continuity presented by the Lottery capital distribution system and criteria would appear to cement the divide between high and popular, professional and amateur, excellence and participation, competition and fun & entertainment.
New money for Old

Another aspect of the Lottery’s introduction is the prospect of additionality and substitution: how far will Lottery receipts be additional to existing government spending in these areas and how far will Lottery monies substitute for current spending. The government have stated, slightly opaquely, that they do not ‘foresee’ the replacement of public subsidy with Lottery proceeds.

The impact on other forms of gambling from Lottery ticket sales may be varied: in countries with established lotteries, betting on horseracing has not reduced (Home Office, 1992) and indeed the traditional public ‘no loss’ form of gambling, premium bonds, has benefited from the raising of prizes to £1 million. When the premium bond jackpot was raised to this level in 1994, bond sales in the year were greater than the combined sales for the previous five years and in November 1994, the month the Lottery was launched, premium bond sales increased by £24 million, or 25% over the previous month. In 1994/5 Premium Bond sales grossed £1.8 billion making them the largest contributor to the National Savings. This may suggest, as Lottery sales have so far indicated, that latent demand for national, low-stake:long-odds, but large prize gambling, is greater than anticipated.

From initial market research on the impact of the Lottery on football pool entries (Home Office, 1992), less frequent and ‘casual’ pools entrants were most likely to switch to Lottery tickets. In the first twenty weeks since the Lottery’s launch, the three main pools operators claimed that takings were down by 15% to 17%, prompting the government to relent on pools TV advertising and in reducing the pools betting levy from 37.5% to 32.5% of gross income. As well as liberalising the restriction on the rollover of unclaimed weekly pools income, in line with the National Lottery, bingo hall-chains have had their combined prize limits raised from £10,000 to £25,000.

The pools companies had previously pre-empted the government in a move designed to stall the Lottery’s introduction by establishing the charitable Foundation for the Arts & Sports, which has been providing grants to voluntary organisations since 1992 (£68 and £70 million in grants to arts and sports organisations in 1993 and 1994). Again ahead of government, the Foundation has proposed to switch its funding to revenue and project grant-aid, in a challenge to the Lottery’s legislative restriction to capital funding. The national Arts and Sports Councils are to advise Lottery applicants for small grants ( < £5,000) not to apply to their Lottery boards, but to the private Foundation, however one of the Foundation’s three financial backers, Vernons Pools have withdrawn from the voluntary agreement to contribute 5p in every 105p staked on the pools, leaving the Foundation’s future in doubt.

The charity sector also anticipates substitution from local and street/household donations to Lottery tickets. Over £36 million a year is forecast to be ‘lost’ this way with 5% of charitable donors expected to switch or reduce their contributions (NCVO, 1994). These fears have been fuelled by the initial impact on charitable donations: in the first twenty weeks, individual donations to charities had dropped from 81% to 67% of the population, an estimated loss of £71 million (NOP, 1995). Street collections and local raffles have also been hit; these are down from 32% to 23% and 23% to 17% respectively over this same period and this is before the introduction of Lottery scratch cards, which directly compete with local charitable lotteries. This leaves the National Lottery Charity Board, a new distributing agency, the task of either attempting to replace this lost funding, a huge circular exercise, or again exercising hegemonic power in redistributing these funds that once were targeted and charitable, but now become an indiscriminate gambling tax.

Experience in countries where lotteries have been established for several years also shows that government promises have not been kept, with evidence of initial additionality (total growth in public spending on ‘leisure’) followed by substitution (public funding reduced). The latter is most acute during times of public spending constraint:
Table 7. Revenue Sources of Arts Funding Agencies (1985=100) (Schuster, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>W.Australia Arts Dept.</th>
<th>Irish Arts Council</th>
<th>Arts Council of New Zealand</th>
<th>Arts Ministry of Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although year on year variations can be volatile, arts funding in these cases has been generally stable and over time the overall level of subsidy has increased, although lottery share of growth has increased faster than tax revenues. In the USA, some state lotteries have actually taken over state tax support entirely (Massachusetts Arts Council: Dipko, Hauser-Field & Love, 1993). The scope for political interference in Lottery fund distribution and budget manipulation is clear, however: "as turnover rises, more interest is shown by politicians fighting for their own particular policies, tax authorities and other(s) who feel that they should receive part of the spoils" (Carpenter, 1994:19). The Irish case, above, where Lottery receipts have substituted for tax revenues, has also raised problems: "I accept that the overall funding has increased since the introduction of our national Lottery...But what started out as a Lottery for sport and culture has become a Lottery for the politicians" (Pat Hickey, President of the Olympic Council for Ireland, op.cit.).

Hegemony or the Peoples Choice?

The distribution of Millennium funds, conservatively estimated at £1.6 billion by the year 2000, might also reflect popular preferences, as the former Heritage Secretary has urged: "the support of schemes for the 'man or woman on the street'" (Millennium Commission, 1994) and from a recent National Opinion Poll (in Litvonov & Tomkins, 1994) only 8% of respondents thought that refurbishment of a national theatre or opera house is 'an excellent or very good cause', particularly when compared with medical research or help for the elderly and disabled (85% preference). This sentiment is not shared by the new Charity Lottery Board who have made medical research a low priority for support.

When arts and cultural spending is considered locally, however, the support for public funding is significantly more positive, despite budget competition for stressed statutory social and public services. In a MORI poll carried out shortly before the recent metropolitan borough elections in 1993, 55% of all respondents backed local council spending on the arts, compared with 15% disapproving; 62% considered that arts facilities and events play an important part in creating a sense of local pride, while 56% believed the arts improve the quality of life (MORI, 1993). The search for sites for public amenities should be a process of collective choice; Teitz (1968:35) argues that "public determined facilities have a role...in shaping the physical form of cities and quality of life within them". The present Lottery system of resource distribution falls short of this basic objective.

The political dominance of major flagship projects (vis Greenwich Waterfront, Kings Cross Millennium, Royal Opera House, Albertopolis, Tate-at-Bankside) and other city arts centre, gallery and museum
refurbishments, looks set to claim a disproportionate share of Millennium, arts and heritage Lottery funds: "the [Lottery] will have failed dismally if it gives advantages to a handful of national monuments and nothing more" (Theatres Trust Annual Report 17, 1993/4:22). In London, 10 mega-projects are seeking 95% of Millennium and other Lottery funds (Craig & Evans, 1994), which, if awarded, would exhaust the combined Millennium, arts, sports and heritage grant potential to the year 2000: "How many have bemoaned the lack of vision in this country, have said that the grands projets adorning France could never happen here? The Millennium Commission is your opportunity to create our own great landmarks" (Brooke, in Millennium Commission, 1994:6, my emphasis). Quite who is being addressed here is unclear and given the reassertion of the hegemonies through the Lottery agency system, popular requests are not being sought - 'pay up and play the game and leave the rest to us' is the party line. The eleven trustees of the National Heritage Memorial Fund, distributors of the 'heritage' Lottery proceeds, consist of landowners, bankers and businessmen: one lives in a castle, one in a Grade 1 listed building and two others have family homes bequeathed to the National Trust. The Millennium Commissioners comprise one Earl, one Knight, a QC, two CBEs, two government ministers, and a professor of Astronomy (also television producer and co-author of the Halley's Comet Pop-Up Book).

Unlike the arts and sports allocations, heritage and Millennium Lottery funds will not be allocated on a national population basis between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, suggesting, as our London Millennium Study indicates, that the distribution of 'heritage' Lottery proceeds will be concentrated in the metropolis, on the high arts and cultural heritage and reflect the make-up of the decision-making distributory boards, favouring their members' own 'great and good' causes.

A golden opportunity seems to have been lost by the new Lottery system, which could have addressed this failure of the public/merit good and equity distribution system (Le Grand, 1982; Lewis, 1990). Greater public involvement in the Lottery grant distribution process would inevitably come up against matters of practicality and run counter to the powerful arguments of the dominant (New Right) institutional public choice theorists (see King, 1987; Dunleavy & O'Leary, 1987). The introduction of the National Lottery has, however, come at an extreme point in British public administration and at a low ebb in liberal democracy (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987), with highly centralised taxation and resource allocation systems, which the hegemonic Lottery structure has emulated. This has left the distributing agencies exercising their choices and deciding: "whether to accommodate people's preferences, or instead to try and change what people want...the circumstances conditioning their choices are themselves determined within the political process...choices heavily influenced by structural, institutional and environmental factors" (Dunleavy, 1991: 256-7).

Sennett (1986) in his longer view of The Fall of Public Man, sees this 'dislocation having ruined politics by tricking us into believing that issues of power and the allocation of resources can be dealt with in terms of trust and warmth' (H.Cox, introduction to Sennett, 1986: xvii). Public trust in the Lottery distribution system will need to be earned, rather than 'bought' and a more democratised allocation system might reduce the risk of market failure and the thankless task of pleasing some of the people some of the time.

Lottery capital funds for leisure will still be dwarfed by the total capital spending by local authorities, however its centralised and undemocratic function also runs counter to calls for subsidiarity and accountability in service and amenity provision (viz. Citizen's Charter, above; Treaty of Union, Maastricht, 1991 and see European Urban Charter, 19924): "Let voters decide about Mozart - The successor to the Community Charge should meet the cost only of services that can reasonably be allowed to vary widely in local character...it might include most environmental and recreation services...Within such bounds, each local authority should then be left, unfettered to coax voters into paying for whatever it favours-a new concert hall or meditation classes" (Sorting out the town halls, The Economist, April 20th 1991: 18).

Ironically it is the USA, source of contemporary institutional and individualistic public choice premises (Dunleavy, 1991), that provides a model of local state and dedicated transient visitor taxes which can be supplemented to finance new public and cultural amenities, or for infrastructure such as airports, through a democratic/fiscal process at state, county and city levels. In the UK, exasperated by central
control of local spending (Byrne, 1994), tourist taxes are tentatively suggested as a source of local revenue to maintain heritage and invest in cultural management and new facilities (Tourist Tax "Green Paper", Association of Metropolitan Authorities, 1993).

The exploration in the USA of the power of communications technology and media in the democratic process (and in the UK, see Mulgan, 1991 and 1994), particularly amongst interest groups, and the development of inter-active communication and home shopping, presents a mechanism which might combine with the networked British Lottery ticket purchase system. Given the high penetration of TV ownership in British homes (98%: Leisure Consultants, 1995) and a prime-time public service broadcast, the scope for a media-linked expression of public choice over Lottery proceeds can be presented, complementing the celebratory game-show which currently only focuses on one side of the Lottery equation.

A weekly user-pay 'referendum' could also operate through the Lottery ticket and verification process, allowing participants, if they wish, to indicate their preferences for Lottery proceeds between the good causes and Millennium projects, (in time, this could be achieved in a more sophisticated way from the armchair, through inter-active cable TV networks, the 'online Lottery'). This might ensure not only a measure of cultural democracy and genuine participation beyond the thrill of the gamble itself (Bruce & Johnson, 1995), but a more equitable distribution geographically and in terms of recipient activities and projects nationally.

The introduction of the National Lottery has been long-resisted in the UK and it's uniqueness: neither taxation nor charity, begs a more radical response to public choice and resource allocation processes. Without such intervention, however, the outcome of the capital injection provided by the National Lottery risks perpetuating an inert culture, or what Handler (1987) sees as an "ushering in of a 'postmodern' global society of objectified culture, pseudo-events and spectacles" and Horne; "a fabricated public culture that purports to be the culture not only of the rulers, but of all the people" (1986:184).
Footnotes:

1 The British Museum Act of 1753 gave provision for a Lottery to raise funds for the housing of Sir Hans Sloane's collection. The British Museum is now seeking £50 million from Lottery funds for its latest building plans. Under the 1976 Lotteries & Amusements Act, all lotteries (including foreign lotteries) were unlawful, except licensed small, private and society/club lotteries and Local Authorities were licensed to raise funds through lotteries for local projects. Dedicated lotteries have also been used elsewhere in order to fund targeted projects, such as the Sydney Opera House.

2 Based on conversations held between December 1994 and February 1995 with Directors of Leisure and Community Services at Cambridge City Council, the second highest non-metropolitan city arts spender and the London Boroughs of Haringey (Labour-controlled) and Bromley (Tory-controlled); ranked in terms of arts spending 12th and 19th out of 33 London boroughs (CIPFA Leisure & Recreation Statistics, 1994).

3 It is estimated that 50% of the population will spend an average £2.50 to £3 a week on Lottery tickets. Consumer spending on magazines, drinks, sweets and cigarettes is likely to be hit; players are unlikely to dip into their savings to finance Lottery spending (Fiona Stewart, Henley Centre for Forecasting, Business in Sport & Leisure-annual conference, London, 1994 and see Leisure Consultants, 1995 Vol.2:8).

4 In recognition of both citizenship and duties, the European Declaration of Urban Rights under the European Urban Charter adopted by the Council of Europe on 18th March 1992, included Cultural Rights of access and participation (8) and the 'harmonisation of functions' (11) "where living, working, travelling and the pursuit of social activities are as closely interrelated as possible."
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The following list of means and mechanisms for implementing the initiatives is not intended to be a catalogue of all possible measures. It is indicative of the kind of methods local authorities could usefully employ. Equally important, they do not exclude one another. To be effective it may well prove necessary to put together a combination of measures to meet the needs of a particular building, site or area. Among the broader aims of economic and environmental improvement is the specific aim to protect vulnerable community facilities and starter businesses and allow them to realise their potential benefits to the economy, the environment and the well-being of an area in the longer term. Some measures are “planning led” while others are the responsibility of other local authority services.

- Designation of ACE activity quarters where land uses in classes D(1) and D(2) and other related land uses will be expected to be predominant.
- A “percentage for the arts” scheme laying down a minimum, to be used in negotiations, including planning gain.
- Including provision for ACE activities in planning briefs for redevelopment or refurbishment.
- A presumption against the loss of existing ACE facilities to other uses.
- Listing buildings or groups of buildings, or declaring small Conservation Area to include ACE areas.
- Establishment of Community Development or Social Property Trusts to provide capital and revenue support for ACE activities, especially a variety of small managed workspaces.
- Agreements under Section 106 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act to ensure an ACE activity component.
- Direct council or joint council and private sector initiatives to support or promote specific ACE activities.
- As part of local authority disposal of assets, the provision of council premises for ACE activities at turnover or profit related rents. (This might be helped by merging the planning and property portfolios).
- Maintain a register of private and public short life properties suitable for ACE activities.
- Develop an arts plan and a leisure and tourism strategy for the Borough, together with neighbouring authorities.
- The provision and marketing of the above.
- Negotiate with public transport operators to improve services in association with ACE activity development.
- Ensure schools and especially colleges provide courses for skills needed by local ACE activities and that liaison is established between schools/colleges and potential employers.
- Provision of display space for local arts and design colleges in public buildings or in open sites in town centres/shopping malls.
- Establish neighbourhood or town centre consultative committees representing the local authority, arts organisations, the community and local businesses to promote the whole range of ACE activities at the local level.

CONCLUSION

Arts, Culture and Entertainment are an established and growing part of the London economy. They are vital for London’s future prosperity and make a substantial contribution to the capital’s environment and to the quality of life for those living, working or visiting London. The new planning system for London and especially the UDPs being prepared by each Borough during 1991 provide the occasion and the means to plan for ACE in the urban fabric. This opportunity should not be missed.
Appendix III

Borough Arts and Urban Regeneration schemes - Detailed Responses to Survey (Chapter 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Initiatives (1987-1990)</th>
<th>Officers/Departments</th>
<th>Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Projects and “Shopping List”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BARKING & Dagenham | The authority has a policy of providing local community halls managed by groups of local residents. *One more hall has been provided recently, in Barking. The building was originally a church hall. It was bought by the local authority and refurbished, and a management group of local residents has been set up with officer support. | Community halls section, town planning, architects and policy and review services      | Private contract for refurbishment of hall including performance facilities, kitchen, toilet, committee room and decoration.  | * New heritage centre in Barking Town Centre  
   * Existing Valance Museum at Dagenham to be developed  
   * New multi-purpose hall envisaged  
   * Refurbishment of existing Broadway Theatre                                                   |
| BARNET             | * An application to develop an art gallery, The Bow House, 35 Wood Street, Barnet was received in 1987. It involved the change of use of a basement to an art gallery to be used for private exhibitions.  
   * As a result of an adjoining office development, the Old Bull Arts Centre received additional revenue funding from the borough to replace expiring MSC/CP funding. | Planning, Libraries and Arts                                                            | Greater London Arts, London Association of Arts Centres, developer                                 | None                                                                                         |
| BEXLEY             | No Return - Arts spend ranking 16 (out of 19 CIFPA returns)                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                        |                                                                                        |                                                                                               |
| BRENT              | Arts spend ranking (no CIPFA return, past position 1 - 1991/2)                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                        |                                                                                        | * Willesden arts and library complex, cinema - council owned facility;  
   * Wembley stadium area regeneration and public realm projects; Harlesden City Challenge proposal. |
| BROMLEY            | * New Crystal Palace hotel/leisure centre to open with 10-screen cinema  
   * Crofton Halls (leisure centre)  
   * Beckenham Leisure Centre: arts centre/cinema conversion                                                                                                       | Developers involved in both financing projects and in construction.                  |                                                                                        | * Mural painting  
   * First Festival of Arts for Bromley (FABB) in 1990                                          |
| **CAMDEN** | * A campaign to develop the Diorama as an arts centre  
  * Several commercial and independent galleries have opened in the last borough eg. Submarine Gallery  
  * Video projects have relocated within the borough eg. Retake, Sankofa, Aphra.  
    Planning and leisure officers and currently working together on a per cent for art scheme. Goods links developing between leisure, planning and transport. Links with the economic development unit have been less productive.  
    There is now an education officer within the arts division, whose brief includes discussion of possible use of former ILEA premises.  
  | Minimal input from officers, although Grants Unit worked with valuers to identify premises and provided some of the capital costs.  
  | * Kings Cross proposals: library, arts centre, studio/workshops  
  * Storage space for theatre  
  * Per cent for art policy  
  | NB. Arts and crafts space and gallery facilities and a commitment to a per cent for art have been agreed for a major development in Finchley Road.  
    Leisure department plans to produce a policy on the cultural industries in Camden. |
| **CITY OF LONDON** | * Broadgate Arena, part of the extensive Broadgate development near Liverpool Street station. This is an open space used, in the summer, as a multi-purpose performance space for theatre, dance, movement, music and other events. In winter it is transformed into an open-air ice rink.  
    There are several artworks in public spaces at Broadgate. The arena straddles the boundaries of the City of London and the Borough of Hackney.  
  | Planning  
  | Developers  
  | No such list included in the local plan, but a chapter on leisure and recreation includes policies for the arts and entertainment facilities and the Corporation is pledged "to support the increased provision of art, cultural and entertainment facilities".  
    This inclusion of references in the proposed unitary development plan to the provision of public art as part of development schemes is under consideration, as is an Arts Audit and Plan. |
| **CROYDON** | * Funding has been agreed for a £25m multi-arts complex to be built in the centre of Croydon: Clocktower arts, library and museum complex  
  | Planning, Libraries, Chief Executive  
  | None listed |

---

1 The City is already the leading English local authority in financial support of the Arts, through its provision and funding of the Barbican Arts Centre - the largest local authority multi-purpose arts centre in the world - and through its funding of resident companies: the Royal Shakespeare Company, London Symphony Orchestra and other music companies, the Guildhall School of Music and Drama - the only higher education establishment still in local authority hands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Responsible Bodies</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>No Return. Arts spend ranking - no CIPFA return</td>
<td></td>
<td>None listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Enfield  | * Millfield Theatre, Silver Street, Edmonton opened in 1983. It is a small community theatre linked to a new branch library. The new facilities adjoin the exiting arts centre, Millfield House  
* New 12-screen multiplex planned (commercial-UCI) at Picketts Lock Leisure Centre, in Lee Valley Regional Park (opening in 1993)                                                                                   | Architects, Arts and Libraries, Planning | None listed                                                                 |
| Greenwich| No Return. Arts spend ranking - no CIPFA return                                                                                                                                                    |                    | * Greenwich Dance Agency - conversion of Old Town Hall (council-owned, joint GLA-council funding); Greenwich Cinema, independent cinema, council-owned site |
| Hackney  | * Hackney Empire. The council gave a grant to enable the management of the Empire to acquire the building.  
* Hackney Museum. The Council established a museum to preserve and exhibit the social history of the various communities in the borough.  
* Cultural Partnership - arts and media centre developed with assistance from the borough and the MSC Community Programme.  
* Hoxton redevelopment - Circus Space to relocate from Islington, Film resource centre.  
* City Challenge bid: Dalston area (successful)                                                                                   | Economic Development, Planning | Refurbishment of Empire carried out with DOE urban programme monies. Reinstatement of domes undertaken by Mecca (previous owners). Money to replace the statue came from the London Heritage Board. Film and Circus Space developments; British Film Institute and developers, Glasshouses Ltd. |
| Haringey | * Tottenham Green Centre - New Leisure Pool, Library and Arts facility.  
* Selby Centre - Refurbished, redundant school - performance space, office/studios.  
* Wood Green - Alexandra Palace - Urban Design Action Team, Spouters Corner (possible Arts Centre).  
* City Challenge bid: Tottenham area (unsuccessful)                                                                                   | Urban Design Group, URBED, Haringey Arts Council | None listed                                                                 |
| HARROW         | * Elliot Hall. This project included the renovation of a listed building to provide accommodation for the Harrow Arts Council. Also, performance space, rehearsal room and a studio for the visual arts and crafts. There is a bar and social area. The project was funded as part of a package for the redevelopment of a larger site, including a Sainsbury's store.
* Headstone Manor. This involved the restoration of a medieval listed tithe barn as a museum and heritage centre, administered by a joint group of the council, the Arts Council and the Heritage Trust. This is the first phase of a larger project, which includes the restoration of a manor house and relocation of timber-framed farm buildings and a brick granary. | Harrow Arts Council, Harrow Heritage Trust, local business sponsorship, GLA. At Headstone Manor, English Heritage was involved in an advisory/legal capacity. |
| HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM | * Developments at Riverside Studios, including a cinema, which was supported in response to the closure of commercial cinema houses in the borough.
* A music studio was also supported by the authority and GLA because of the lack of affordable studio facilities, and in recognition of potential recording talent in the borough. | Finance, Planning, Leisure, Economic Development, Arts, Environment |
| HAVERING       | No Return. Arts spend ranking 12 out of 19 CIPFA Returns. |
| HILLINGDON     | * 33,000 sq ft building as part of Section 52 agreement. Contains a gallery area in the centre of the building, suitable for multi-purpose art or craft exhibitions. | Planning, Leisure, Estates and Valuation, Building Design. There was a working group, but the Borough Librarian acted as project leader for the central library aspect of the larger development. Developers |
|                | * arts information and tourism centre
* multi-purpose performance centre
* art gallery
* implementation of public art strategy | An arts strategy is to be developed. |
| **HOUNSLOW** | No Return. Arts spend ranking - no CIPFA Return. |  |  |
| **ISLINGTON** | * Holloway Odeon, major refurbishment of run-down three-screen cinema into the first local five-screen cinema in London.  
* University of North London. The Holloway "Rocket" Theatre. Refurbishment of Victorian Theatre into music/dance venue promoting black arts.  
* Islington video project. Relocation of video studio from bus company to temporary premises in area youth office.  
* Corner Theatre: small theatre above Hen and Chickens pub.  
* Rosemary Branch: small theatre above Rosemary Branch pub  
* Jazz Cafe: a new music venue on the ground floor of a terraced Edwardian house. The terrace is owned by English Heritage and discussions are underway to expand the existing premises into an arts centre  
* Powerhaus: conversion of pub and small music venue, The Pied Bull, into a medium-sized music venue.  
* Conversion, by the Town and Country Club, of the Thatch (a night club) into T&C2, a medium sized music and cabaret venue. | Planning, Arts, Legal, Licensing, Policy, Recreation. | None at present, although the arts officer is currently making proposals to the planning department for the 1990 borough plan. | * Treaty Centre - Library and theatre complex - council-owned planning gain (office/retail centre) financed.  
* Proposed reclamation of British Gas site, Brentford for museum/theme development  
* Commissioned (with funding from Greater London Arts) an arts and employment study from University of North London.  
Most Islington venues have spent heavily on upgrading and refurbishment during this period, not least to deal with new licensing demands eg. Almeida, King's Head, 'Little Angel' and Sadlers Wells Theatres. |
| **KENSINGTON & CHELSEA** | * Annual environmental award scheme to give to new or refurbished buildings of outstanding merit.  
* A number of privately owned galleries have been refurbished.  
* Media Industries development to be promoted in North Kensington/Ladbroke Grove area  
* City Challenge bid: North Kensington area (successful) | Planning (for development control only) | Private list of arts facilities formally identified in plans or strategies as needing development or support: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KINGSTON UPON THAMES</th>
<th>* 1987 refurbishment and redevelopment of existing Granada cinema to provide a leisure and entertainment complex comprising two cinemas, cafe/bar, restaurant and night club.</th>
<th>Planning, Engineering</th>
<th>Developers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAMBETH</td>
<td>No Return. No CIPFA Return.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWISHAM</td>
<td>* Refurbishment and adaptation of a hall within the council-run Lewisham Theatre complex. Undertaken in the process of redecoration and repairs and renewals programmes. * Employment of artist to work on redevelopment of Lewisham Town Centre. Paid through per cent for art scheme.</td>
<td>Arts and Leisure, Architects</td>
<td>1986 arts report identified the desirability of: * an arts resource centre (for equipment loan scheme, information service and graphic design facilities) * wheelchair access to arts buildings * exhibition gallery/visual arts centre * facilities for exhibitions in other buildings * cinemas * &quot;homes&quot; for other projects currently in inappropriate buildings * 300-seat performance venue, particularly for dance * rehearsal and working spaces including craft/artists studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERTON</td>
<td>* Education arts centre located in former school premises. This provides multi-cultural education through performance and visual arts.</td>
<td>School inspectorate</td>
<td>Grant aiding bodies only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* There are plans to provide an arts and entertainments complex linked to a restored Wimbledon Theatre. Other potential developments are within the commercial sector and include multi-screen and museum provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NEWHAM | * ACME artists studios, Carpenters Road, Stratford  
* Delphina Studios. E15  
* Negotiations with the LDDC to secure an arts infrastructure for the southern part of the borough  
* City Challenge bid: Stratford area (successful) | Economic Development, Planning, Leisure. Leisure will be more involved in the building of an exhibition space as part of a new arts and leisure centre opening in 1990 | * Visual arts exhibition spaces and workshops  
* Media centre (print, desktop publishing, film, video production and exhibition)  
* Recording and rehearsal studios  
* Arts venue for Newham docklands |
| RICHMOND UPON THAMES | * Gaumont cinema. Site redeveloped for offices, conditional on new 150-seat cinema being included in the development. Small cinema due to open shortly.  
* Orange Tree Theatre. Fringe theatre over pub relocated to adjoining site of old school/hall/garage as part of office/residential development scheme. Theatre to move to new site in 1990.  
* Richmond Theatre. Authority has joined with owners to form a trust to administer theatre.  
* Old Town Hall, Richmond reopened as reference library, tourist centre, local studies centre, museum of Richmond, coffee shop with small gallery and 120 seat recital and lecture space.  
* Sculpture by Kevin Atherton commissioned for new civic offices from percentage of capital costs. | Planning and Engineering involved in cinema and Orange Tree developments. Libraries and Arts staff are now involved in discussing programming and marketing with the venues. Finance, libraries and arts consulted over plans for Richmond Theatre. Old Town Hall proposals worked through from consultation by architects and library and arts staff. Public art commission involved architects, libraries and arts | Developers, private architectural practice for civic centre.  
* Continue revenue support for the Orange Tree Theatre  
* Widen access to the arts  
* Survey all available space, with a view to recommending changes of use |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTHWARK</th>
<th>Planning, Arts, Economic Development, Architects</th>
<th>LDDC, developers, community groups, trusts, London Association of Arts Centres</th>
<th>List is currently being prepared. It includes a percent for Art strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Many B1(^2) use class conversions to gallery, studio, workshop spaces, where offices have had development control input and cultural/workshop uses have been retained or built-in to office developments ('mixed use')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Small community theatre facility purchased by the authority and leased to Umnoa theatre company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Lavender Docks Pumphouse - arts and heritage centre renovated with capital from LDDC, which has also funded initial revenue costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The Spike - Peckham Resettlement Centre. Feasibility study commissioned to develop the building for arts groups, community artists etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* City Challenge bid (unsuccessful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SUTTON | No Return. Arts spend ranking 6 out of 19 CIPFA Returns | | |

| TOWER HAMLETS | No Return. Arts spend ranking - no CIPFA Return | (major cuts/proposed to arts facilities - Whitechapel Gallery, community arts, Half Moon Theatre) | |

| WANDSWORTH | No Return. Arts spend ranking 10 out of 19 CIPFA Returns | | |

| WALTHAM FOREST | * A small art gallery has been established in a former park changing room area. It enables a local art group occasional use for exhibitions and workshops | Recreation, Libraries and Arts | * The need for an arts centre has been approved in principle and further accommodation strategies are under consideration. * Exhibition space for local artists (focus on William Morris and Changing Room Gallery, above) |

| WESTMINSTER | No Return. Arts spend ranking 1 out of 19 CIPFA Returns | | |

\(^2\) B1 - Change of Use of light industrial/workshop premises to offices
## APPENDIX III

### SURVEY DATA - ISLINGTON ARTS & CULTURAL INDUSTRIES
(Chapter 8 & Evans, 1989)

#### LIST OF CATEGORIES & TYPES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A PERFORMING ARTS | 1. MUSIC  
2. DRAMA  
3. DANCE  
4. ENTERTAINMENTS (NIGHT CLUBS, CINEMAS, DISCO)  
5. THEATRES  
6. CLOWNS & JUGGLERS  
7. DISC JOCKEY  
8. ENTERTAINMENT AGENCIES  
9. PUB THEATRES |
| B VISUAL ARTS | 1. PAINTING/DRAWING  
2. SCULPTURE  
3. ARTS SUPPLIERS/STATIONERS  
4. LIBRARIES  
5. COMMERCIAL ART  
6. GALLERIES  
7. SCHOOLS |
| C CRAFTS | 1. SILVERSMIHKS  
2. JEWELLERY  
3. WOODWORK/FURNITURE  
4. METALWORK  
5. GOLDSMITHS  
6. WEAVING  
7. CERAMICS/POTTERY  
8. TEXTILES  
9. ENGRAVERS |
| D LITERARY WORK | 1. PUBLISHERS  
2. MAGS  
3. NEWSPAPERS  
4. BOOKS  
5. LIBRARIES |
| E PHOTOGRAPHY/MEDIA | 1. PHOTOGRAPHY  
2. FILM  
3. VIDEO  
4. RADIO & TV  
5. T.V.  
6. T.V. & VIDEO |
| F GRAPHIC DESIGN/PRINTING | 1. PRINTERS /LITHO  
2. PRINTERS / STATIONERS  
3. GRAPHIC DESIGN  
4. INTERIOR DESIGN  
5. BOOKBINDERS  
6. PRINTERS /REPRO  
7. PRINTERS /TYPESETTING  
8. FASHION DESIGNERS |
| G MUSEUMS | 1. MUSEUMS |
| H INDIVIDUAL/SOLE TRADER COMPANY | 1  
2 |
J DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS
1. SERVICES
2. VENUES
3. RETAILERS/REPAIRERS
4. DISTRIBUTION/SUPPLIERS/WHOLESALE
5. CONSULTANTS
6. AGENCIES/PROMOTERS
7. EDUCATION/COMM. SCHOOLS
8. MOBILE Co's
9. LIBRARIES

K DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS
1. MANUFACTURES
2. DESIGN
3. ADMINISTRATION
4. ILLUSTRATORS
5. PACKAGING/PRODUCTION
6. RESTORATION/POLISHING
7. SPINNING PRESSING PLATING
8. CARVERS/TURNERS
9. FAIRS & EXHIBITIONS

L CRAFTS
1. PICTURE FRAMERS

M DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS
1. STUDIOS
2. BROADCASTERS

N COMMUNITY CENTRES
### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF ARTS & CULTURAL FIRM/ORGANISATION:

#### MAIN CATEGORY BY POST CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUBCATEGORY - A - BY POSTCODES

**PERFORMING ARTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUBCATEGORY - B - BY POSTCODES

**VISUAL ARTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUBCATEGORY - C - BY POSTCODES

**CRAFTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Literary Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Photography/Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design/Printing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Types by Postcodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPANIES & INDIVIDUALS BY POSTCODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>N16</th>
<th>N19</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>N7</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>WC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDIVIDUAL**

**FIRM**

### CATEGORIES BY TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1991 Census Local Base Statistics - 100%

#### People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black Caribbean</th>
<th>% Black African</th>
<th>% Black other</th>
<th>% Indian</th>
<th>% Pakistani</th>
<th>% Bangldeshi</th>
<th>% Chinese</th>
<th>% Other Asian</th>
<th>% Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>133,601</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Position (Residents Aged 16+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Position</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Working</th>
<th>% Unemployed/Gov't scheme</th>
<th>% Students not working</th>
<th>% Permanently sick</th>
<th>% Retired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>10,123</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commonwealth/Pakistan</td>
<td>16,859</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean NCW</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India/E. Africa/Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa NCW (remainder)</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean NCW</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East NCW</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of NCW</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of World</td>
<td>9,344</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recent Movers (Persons living at a different address 1 year before Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movers</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% UK born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21,575</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% UK born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>122,378</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>10,123</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commonwealth/Pakistan</td>
<td>16,859</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean NCW</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India/E. Africa/Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa NCW (remainder)</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean NCW</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East NCW</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of NCW</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of World</td>
<td>9,344</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Size</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>29,261</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>22,449</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Persons</td>
<td>10,559</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Persons</td>
<td>11,957</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households and Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 children</td>
<td>55,476</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>8,944</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>6,336</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ children</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lone Parents - Households and Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>5,852</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Type</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households Spaces</td>
<td>79,950</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with residents</td>
<td>74,226</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Accommodation</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New, never occupied</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under improvement</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main residence</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation not used as main residence</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Housing Tenure (of Households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>35,781</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association</td>
<td>7,864</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupier</td>
<td>19,815</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented unfurnished</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented furnished</td>
<td>6,368</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented with job/business</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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While every attempt has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information in this guide, neither the publisher nor the authors accept liability for any errors or omissions which may have been made.

The information contained in this Town Guide, and Angel can provide, may be subject to change, even during normal office hours.

THEATRES AND CINEMAS
1. Almeida Theatre
2. Xing's Head Theatre
3. Little Angel Marionette Theatre
4. Hen and Chickens Theatre Bar
5. Old Red Lion Theatre Club
6. Sadler's Wells Theatre
7. Alan Badley Theatre
8. Noctot Theatre
9. Tower Theatre
10. Screen-on-the-Green Cinema

CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION CENTRES
11. Marx Memorial Library
12. The Brewery (Whitbreads)
13. Flusiness Design Centre
14. Central Conference Centre
15. City University
16. North London College
17. University of North London
18. Honourable Artillery Company
19. Pembury Gallery
20. Ikon Gallery
21. City and East London College
22. London School of Economics
23. New Barbican Hotel
24. London Ryan Hotel
25. Royal Scot Hotel
26. Holiday Inn
27. Camden Guest House
28. Parkland Walk Guest House

ART/CRAFT GALLERIES
29. Tadema Gallery
30. York Gallery
31. Decorum Gallery
32. Patricia Kleinman
33. Intaglio Gallery
34. Barnsbury Gallery
35. Hardware Gallery
36. Judith Lasalle Gallery
37. Barbican Gallery
38. Atlantic Antiques
39. Candid Gallery
40. Crafts Council
41. Gallery Duncan Terrace
42. St Pancras

HOTELS AND GUEST HOUSES
43. New Barbican Hotel
44. London Ryan Hotel
45. Royal Scot Hotel
46. Holiday Inn
47. Camden Guest House
48. Parkland Walk Guest House

MARKETS
49. Camden Passage Antiques Market
50. Chapel Market
51. Kentish Market
52. Whitecross Market

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND AMENITIES
53. Finsbury Library
54. Central Library
55. Granada Memorial
56. Thomas Paine Memorial
57. Dick Whittington Statue and Cat
58. Camden Town Hall
59. Mount Pleasant Post Office
60. Museum of the Order of St John
61. Arsenal Stadium/Conference Centre
62. South Sports Centre
63. Finsbury Leisure Centre
64. Westway Chapel and Museum
65. Great London History Library
66. Society of Genealogists
67. Freightliners Farm
68. Islington Tennis Centre
69. Brassica Gallery
70. Atlantic Antiques
71. Camden Market
72. Gallery Duncan Terrace

HOTELS
73. New Barbican Hotel
74. London Ryan Hotel
75. Royal Scot Hotel
76. Holiday Inn
77. Camden Guest House
78. Parkland Walk Guest House

GUEST HOUSES
79. New Barbican Hotel
80. London Ryan Hotel
81. Royal Scot Hotel
82. Holiday Inn
83. Camden Guest House
84. Parkland Walk Guest House

TOURIST INFORMATION
85. Angel Information (moves 1993)
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Appendix VII

Planning Artists Workspaces in North America and Europe

1. Introduction
Experience of the consideration, planning and protection of artists workspaces and studios in other cities - in the USA, Canada and elsewhere in Europe - reveals a greater planning approach to that existing in the UK, despite the development of managed work space organisations in London and other cities. The property-led regeneration cycle is however evident in these cities, as it has been in London. The following therefore reviews artists work space development and planning consideration in North America - Toronto, New York and Philadelphia, and in European 'capitals' of Berlin and Paris.

2. Toronto, Canada
In Toronto, the exploitation of planning and zoning laws and procedures has facilitated the development of artists' studios in former industrial buildings (Artscape, viz ACME studios in London), and the creation of live-in studio housing (eg. Arcadia, Beaver Hall developments) using specific planning zone categories for this purpose (Stephen-Wells, 1991). The more integrated cultural planning approach adopted by the city of Toronto has permitted both a wider degree of both community and artist consultation than has so far been attempted in London (Evans, 1996). Whilst the fluctuating cycle of commercial property development is just as apparent in this 'world city' (SDR, 1990; Hendry, 1985), planning protection and targeted capital investment by the city and metropolitan government has ensured greater security for practising artists and given them more control over their own destiny (Toronto Arts Council, 1988). There has however been some negative reaction according to graffiti reproduced in the Toronto Arts Council's report: "Artists are the storm-troopers of gentrification" (TAC, 1988 inside cover). The regeneration of Toronto's waterfront in the 1980s has followed the now familiar pattern of creating visitor attractions, shopping malls and recreational activities ('Harborfront'). However gallery and arts centre developments have been provided as a form of 'planning gain' creating further opportunities for craft and visual artists to establish work-residence accommodation, with the benefit of sales outlets for their work. Some such studios are partially 'open' in design allowing visitors to observe production in progress and to commission work directly from the artist or craftsperson personally.
3. USA - New York and Philadelphia

The story of artist loft gentrification and commercialisation over recent years in New York is described in Sharon Zukin's seminal study of 'Loft Living' (1988): Commenting on this experience, Ken Worpole argued in 1991:

"Unknowingly the artists were used by developers and real-estate agents to create an ambience and a buzz in Soho and other downtown industrial areas, which was then capitalized over their heads through the rise in property values. In short, the artists whose activities had created a desirable place to live in, displaced themselves in doing so. They could no longer afford to live in the neighbourhoods they had revitalized" (p.148).

The New York experience therefore paralleled similar property regeneration movements in London Docklands, although greater use of 'fair rent' (used in social housing, but not work space, in the UK - administered by housing associations and trusts) gave some protection to resident artists. In other American cities the cycle has similarly been played out, with artists unwittingly acting out the role of footloose 'storm troopers' of the property developers, not by choice nor benefiting from the longer term regeneration of the run-down areas or redundant premises into which they initially move. The desire to gain security and put down roots has been the motivation behind the work space developments noted here. However, mechanisms such as planning measures supporting and protecting residential artist communities are still the exception and in practice interventions which do occur are often unplanned.

For example, in Philadelphia artists have already been displaced from recently gentrified industrial workspaces, parallelling the New York and Clerkenwell experience. Security ultimately depends on ownership. In Philadelphia an artists group, the Greene Street Artists Corporation and the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Trust secured vacant industrial premises with a grant from the Pew Charitable Trust ($260,000) in order to create new accommodation with long-term security. In this case the interest of the Trust and charitable funds was key to this studio-housing development. The value of combined living-working premises for this group of artists could not be understated. As one tenant commented:

"Personally, I see that we will no longer be paying three rents each month and traveling back and forth between work, studio and home every day. We will be
building equity, and will have the freedom to invest substantial improvements to our studios. We will be consolidating our art careers into one home address and phone number...and enjoy contact with the other artists in the group" (Fisher, in PHPC, 1992 p.3).

In Philadelphia the intervention of local architects also led to the creation of a Foundation which aims to encourage public input to the design and planning of the city and to inform local citizens about planning and design issues. The Foundation sponsors symposia and panel discussions about issues affecting the quality of Philadelphia's physical planning and urban design, ranging from the height of city centre buildings, density standards and pedestrian activity, through to cultural development and facilities and historic resources: "By encouraging the dreams and ideas of design professionals, artists and the general public, a provocative dialogue about the physical form of Philadelphia was begun" (Cowan and Gallery, 1990 p.43). In Massachusetts a similar initiative: Boston Visions was developed, again by the city's architects, while in California a similar City Visions programme took place in San Francisco, supported by the National Endowment for the Arts.

3. Berlin, Germany
Another city undergoing major and rapid development is the newly unified Berlin, whose historic and traditional cultural centre lay in the former German Democratic Republic. New public and commercial office and hotels developed very rapidly in most cases inevitably placing a strain on existing usage and capital values, and the situation has been complicated by reversionary land settlements relating to pre-Communist (and in some cases pre-Nazi) land ownership claims (Evans, 1994c). In his recent "No Art, No City", Kotowski comments:

"Land prices and commercial rents have skyrocketed in the congested areas of the new Federal Lands - most noticeably, but not only in Berlin. The consequences for the fine arts are catastrophe there: workrooms for artists are becoming prohibitively expensive. Arts is threatened: no studio, no art." (1993 p.1).

Typically in Berlin, artists themselves have developed a co-ordinated response, as a defence against the loss of the infrastructure they see as necessary to support creative practice, rather than the city or federal government, or cultural agencies themselves. The "creative city" argument has been to the fore in this: "As regards its reputation as a cultural metropolis, Berlin largely relies on its visual artists. They are important for the urban
quality of Berlin" (Kotowski, 1993 p.4).

As in the other major cities around the world already discussed, the estimated 4,000 to 5,000 visual artists in Berlin are currently threatened by rent increases and a chronic shortage of space (which pre-dated unification): "one thousand studios were lacking in the western part of the city...several hundred cases of eviction from studios housed in commercial buildings must be assumed every year" (Kotowski, 1993 p.4). From investigations undertaken by the Berlin Senate, commercial premises renting from 12 to 15 DM per m² (unheated - approximately £0.50 to £0.75 per square foot) are no longer available, while studies by the Studio Commissioner showed that a rent of 7 DM/m² (approximately £0.30 per square foot) is the maximum most artists can afford to pay (op.cit.). Recommended responses to this problem include investment in new studio developments and accommodation (live-work): "the cultural infrastructure must likewise be included in the planning of major investment projects in Berlin on the same level as the social infrastructure" (Kotowski, 1993 4.1). Special residential forms of 'studio flat' are to be included in the City's First Promotion programme for new housing, with a target of 200 artists workplaces over the first five year period.

Strategically, the Kulturwerk des BBK ('Cultural Institute of the professional Association of Visual Artists in Berlin') sought protective clauses in the structural plans of the länd of Berlin and direct artist representation on the committees considering major investment projects (viz Toronto and Los Angeles), and the transfer of artist-occupied premises as 'special assets' to a 'Development Company for Cultural Areas'. The BBK rents, leases and where possible, purchases property and studios for letting to artists at controlled rents (cf. ACME and Space Studios in London): over sixty studios and apartments in four large complexes are managed in Berlin. Planning law was also looked to, in order to protect the change of use of studios, as sought without success in Clerkenwell or other UK cities: "Cultural infrastructure, in particular for visual arts, must be a self-evident part of urban planning, publicly subsidized housing construction and urban renewal supported by public funds" (Kotowski, 1993  p.6). The rationale for public intervention is stated again by Kotowski:

"In view of the structural magnitude of the problem it will be necessary for the public promotion of studios to ensure without restriction, to the benefit of all
professional artists whose financial situation does not allow them to survive in the free commercial-rent market. The public promotion of studios and the public allocation of studios are of basic importance for the cultural infrastructure." (1993 p.4:4):

4. Paris - a cultural haven?

Finally, given the strength of France's commitment to cultural policy and urban regeneration, it comes as no surprise that the response of Paris to the infrastructure needs of artists is both comprehensive and interventionist. The City uses public land for the erection of housing units, including some 'ateliers-logements' or artists-residence studios, with building regulations specifying minimum ceiling heights, storage areas and separation between living and workshop areas. Over 1,000 such units combining studios with living accommodation were built in Paris between 1977 and 1992 by which date the annual budget allocation to this programme of fr22 million. More basic studio accommodation is also planned, aimed at offering cheap premises for first-time artists. In addition to this building programme, two major cultural complexes provide studios for artists in residence; the Cité Internationale des Arts (265 studios - minimum two months, maximum one-year residency), with shared central facilities such as an engraving workshop and rehearsal rooms (annual subsidy fr2.65 million, 1993). The Cité is jointly supported by the City and State cultural departments, offering artists the opportunity to work, exhibit and establish contacts with Parisian artistic communities, on subsidised terms. The second, at La Ruche-Seydoux Foundation (72 studios) was created in the late-nineteenth century by the sculptor Boucher, again with city government revenue funding (Berger-Vachon, 1992). Short-life properties turned over to temporary studio use include the Hôpital Ephemère, which took over the former Bretonneau Hospital and converted it into studios, pending conversion into a geriatrics centre (and cf. in Gothenburg, Sweden - hospital to studios conversion: 'The Epidemy of Arts', Konstepidemin, 1993), and various 'open-door' studios across the city (source: Berger-Vachon, 1992):

| City of Paris's total number of studio-flat combination units | 1,071 |
| (30% of them built since 1977) | |
| Government-owned studio-flat combination units within the City of Paris | 309 |
| Number of studios built annually | 20 |
| - until 1985 | |
| - since 1985 | 45 |
| Pending applications for studio-flats | 500 |
| Total | 1,925 |
The rationale for Paris' involvement in studio premises for artists is pragmatic and taken for granted: "As an international artistic capital, Paris has and attracts thousands of plastic artists, who may stay there permanently, temporarily, or for long periods" (Mairie de Paris, 1993 p.1). Support for the arts through systematic state intervention and patronage dates back to the Ancien Regime, with subsidies available for individual artists in the form of the Prix de Rome, and with the foundation of institutions such as the Comédie Française and the Paris Opera. The city's 'ateliers-logements' are intended for painters, sculptors and engravers living in France. Eligibility follows a housing allocation system: applicants must prove that they have applied for housing to the town hall or arrondissement, or the central housing department for those coming from outside of Paris. Two 'consultative artistic committees' led by contemporary artists, curators and administrators meet twice each year to consider applications for studio premises, which give their opinion on the applications. A similar artistic 'jury' selects applicants for the Cité Internationale des Arts. Grant-aid is also available for the costs of converting other premises into workshop studios. The city's policy also targets specific groups for assistance: for example artists over the age of sixty five have a number of housing units created for their use; another example of targeted cultural policy in France is seen in grant-aid for women wishing to establish a leisure business (Evans, 1993b). All of these measures are underpinned by a plan-led approach: "Paris still the city which places the greatest faith in the planning system to create and enable the city and its region to progress harmoniously towards a new millennium" (Burtenshaw, Bateman and Ashworth, 1991 p.267).
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