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Placemaking and quality of life as city concepts have evolved separately over the years, the latter over a much longer period, the former is still a comparatively young concept. Quality of life has been measured at a city scale for some time however it is less likely to be measured holistically on a neighbourhood scale and almost never at the planning, development, and regeneration stage of a new project. It is of course not possible to measure the quality of life of something that is not there yet, but it is nevertheless essential to understand how placemaking could work on a local scale in development and regeneration practice to enhance future quality of life. This is necessary now more than ever as the inequalities related to urban living continue to grow along with the size of world cities further exacerbating the problem. Fast and/or temporary interventions can often lead to long-term solutions and should therefore not be underestimated in their potential to be incorporated into development and regeneration practice. Introducing such flexibility and adaptability into planning policy and placemaking practice would further encourage such actions as urban environments ebb and flow from ‘slow’ cities to ‘one-minute’ cities, placemaking can encompass such a sustainable and resilient approach necessary to cater for such contrasts.

This thesis therefore examines, via an empirical analysis of four case studies within two different world cities, the variegated interplay between the concepts of placemaking and quality of life in development and regeneration practice. It does so by using a comparative mixed methods approach utilising semi-structured interviews, document analysis, survey analysis, social media and online data and field observations to explore the role placemaking plays in the effects of new development and regeneration projects on quality of life. This thesis assists in advancing discourse surrounding the meaning of placemaking and its role in development and regeneration particularly with regards to stakeholder engagement and community consultation. It also focuses on the link to quality of life through the ability to deliver new development and regeneration projects that seek to enhance a community’s quality of life. This culminates in an exploration in seeking an implementable, flexible, sustainable, and resilient placemaking approach that can be used in the planning process to secure such development and regeneration projects.

It is hoped that the conclusions and recommendations for action will be relevant to urban academics and practitioners and used or translated into relevant policy.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Motivation and Background

“There is a myth, sometimes widespread, that a person need only do inner work, in order to be alive like this; that a man is entirely responsible for his own problems; and that to cure himself, he need only change himself... The fact is, a person is so far formed by his surroundings, that his state of harmony depends entirely on his harmony with his surroundings.”

Christopher Alexander et al., The Timeless Way of Building, 1979 p.106.

The motivation for this research was borne out of three critical perspectives, which position this research within the broader field of urban science whilst also undertaking a transdisciplinary approach to incorporating and connecting urban planning, public administration and to a lesser extent social media studies. This study recognises that urban Quality of Life (QoL) is an ever-changing complex concept, not only globally but also within the UK, and within different urban city neighbourhoods. Indeed, it is predicated on the fact that most city authorities cannot differentiate most of their structural inequalities at different administrative levels let alone at a more granular neighbourhood/community level, this being a governmental challenge in constant need of addressing (Higgins et al 2014, Walton et al 2008, Howley et al 2009, Tesfazghi et al 2009).

As such, and within this context, the overarching aim of this research is to critique the existing measures that are used to assess city QoL. As traditionally conceived, these are almost entirely economically driven, and their data aggregated at a city scale, thereby systematically failing to account for local factors that play a significant part in lived experience of place or QoL. Moreover, issues surrounding regeneration, gentrification, urban resilience and densification, and their association with urban QoL, are generally not explored or recognised at the local neighbourhood level.

Placemaking, as an amalgamation of many prior urban concepts, can be seen as the continuous process by urban city stakeholders; be it policy makers, visitors, commuters or residents; to change or make use of a neighbourhood and/or defined area including but not limited to: the buildings, open spaces and infrastructure for leisure, education, health or work activities in an attempt to enhance the (urban) quality
of life for the benefit of all those wishing to make use of such neighbourhood/place in order to achieve clearly defined agreed outcomes within a set timescale.¹

Although the Placemaking concept is by no means a novel one its link to improving urban QoL by engaging and consulting with neighbourhood communities in a meaningful way is still an underdeveloped conceptualisation. Notably, Placemaking as a current concept in urban development is beset by many different definitions of what it constitutes with no quantified academic or established ‘best practice’ or ‘best in the field’ characteristics and attributes. It is important to note, however, that best practice will always be dependent on its ability to adapt to unique contexts and be applied specifically for such.

Overall, these principles are further inspired by a motivation to reverse the process of poor-quality development, gentrification and the alienation of communities and neighbourhoods resulting in an ever-increasing deterioration of the urban QoL - the ‘bad practice’ that most, if not all, stakeholders agree needs to change. In the past few decades, this agenda of reversing the ‘bad practice’ has begun to make its way through in some form or another into planning and policy practice in a growing number of cities worldwide, engendering an awareness and recognition on ‘how’ said agenda can be carried out (Creagh et al. 2020, Appleyard & Frost 2020, Building Better Building Beautiful Commission 2020, Hagerty et al. 2001, McCann 2002).

Finally, the assumption underpinning this research is that the achievement of a better QoL is dependent on more integrated and inclusive planning and policymaking that has as one of its core aims and strategies a successful, tried, tested and flexible Placemaking and community agenda. Although studies and reports on improving urban QoL and Placemaking through planning and policy are numerous there is a general lack of research on the role Placemaking has in enhancing local neighbourhood ‘perceived’ urban QoL (PQoL)² through the implementation of community engagement. The focus of this research and the interest and motivation then lies within this ‘knowledge gap’ that has been recognised as having very little academic literature and research devoted to it thus far (Palermo & Ponzini 2015, Yigitcanlar 2015, Gordon & Travers 2010, Higgins et al 2014, Howley et al 2009).

Placemaking can offer a solution to many of the issues surrounding urban city life since, if defined and implemented correctly it could provide a common ground for cities to improve QoL, PQoL and other objective and subjective measures at a large enough scale to have a significant impact. Throughout this

---

¹ This definition draws from many different definitions of the concept described at length by practitioners and academics to quantify it over the past decades (Bramberg & Frigo 2012, City of Port Philip 2018-2021, Eckenwiler 2016, Heller & Adams 2011, Sweeney et al 2018)

² PQoL differs from QoL as it is an individual self-assessment of one’s QoL instead of an objectively defined assessment based on a standard formula. It is meaningful to talk about QoL in this way to ensure that the subjective element is not ignored albeit it is within the context of an objectively defined concept as opposed to say the concepts of happiness and life satisfaction which are merely subjective.
research, the above ideas will be tested empirically to both highlight the areas where placemaking and its effect on QoL in cities is evident (and equally where it is missing from city urban planning and design frameworks) and to demonstrating the effect that common placemaking principles can have on improving PQoL.

The overall aim, using comparative case studies from London and Melbourne, is to analyse and find evidence that the implementation of placemaking initiatives and strategies at a neighbourhood level can enhance and sustain QoL/ PQoL.

To achieve this aim, three main objectives are to:

1) Unpack how neighbourhood connectivity can help improve PQoL by identifying the community stakeholders involved in Placemaking and finding solutions that foster their meaningful involvement and co-operation. This will focus particularly on forms of networking facilitated online and by social media sources.

2) Determine how issues of housing and other affordability (such as retail and leisure) and gentrification can act as barriers to inclusive Placemaking.

3) Illuminate how developers and regeneration experts are reimagining how they conceive of Placemaking to deliver more inclusive, sustainable urban environments with an improved PQoL.

1.2 Placemaking and Urban Development

It is important to note that the focus of this thesis is on Placemaking within the sphere of urban development and regeneration, the equally as important effects on PQoL of Placemaking in the management of spaces and places in urban city neighbourhoods are beyond the scope of this thesis. However, through implemented Placemaking strategies and interventions at the planning and development stage, urban development and regeneration projects are a way of setting up from the beginning a set of ideal ongoing and future practices for the management of places and spaces. This is crucial for the future success of Placemaking in the day-to-day management of neighbourhoods and cities to enhance their PQoL.

Now that the urban development and regeneration focus is clear it is imperative to define Placemaking within urban development and regeneration as distinctly different to Urban Design, Planning and Architecture. Unlike Urban Design, Planning and Architecture, Placemaking is not a discipline but an overarching ongoing strategic process combining a range of disciplinary and civic viewpoints (City of Port Philip 2018-2021, Duhl 2005, Lepofsky & Fraser 2003, McCann 2002, Shaw 2013). Throughout the case
study-based research, the evidence base of what Placemaking is currently considered to be - as well as perceptions of what it could and should become in the future - will be systematically gathered, reviewed, and assessed. This will help to unpick some of the issues and myths surrounding this term, which, is sometimes not seen as a valid and useful process (Hakansson 2017, Howley et al 2009, Klekotko 2020, Mouratidis 2017, Nielsen 2012).

For the Placemaking process to be successful, meaningful, and worthwhile within urban development and regeneration it needs to enable all stakeholders such as the community, the Council, and others (e.g., workers and visitors in a particular place) to have a real impact and recognisable contribution within a set and agreed timescale from the Urban Planning stage onwards (Pratt 2008, Shaw 2013, Lepofsky & Fraser 2003, Xerez & Fonseca 2011, Attia & Ibrahim 2018). In addition, Placemaking needs to respond to the scale and complexity of the given task in a commensurate way. Specifically, the Placemaking action and/or intervention cannot simply be a series of small scale ‘band-aid’ solutions, or the real issues will not begin to be resolved within ‘human’ timescales (Alvarez et al 2015, Beck 2009, Beza & Hernandez-Garcia 2014, Brunnberg & Frigo 2012, Jacobs 1961).

Since over 60% of the world’s population will be living and/or working in cities by 2030 (UN 2018) Placemaking is seen by many practitioners and advocates as a necessary tool to resolve and manage some of the issues brought about by such complex, diverse and developing communities. “Visions of ‘inevitable’ growth have been displaced (and job growth forecasts substantially moderated) in favour of an emphasis on quality of life, ‘placemaking’” (Gordon & Travers 2010 p. 8). As a process then, Placemaking differs from Urban Design, Planning and Architecture, which are all disciplines designed to specifically exclude some stakeholders, such as the community, until the professional Urban Planners, Designers and Architects have come up with their specific development and regeneration proposals. These proposals may then be consulted on with the wider stakeholders for final considerations before being put into practice with perhaps some minor tweaks. With Urban Design and Planning and Architecture, wider stakeholders - who are not the professional practitioners - are kept out of the initial planning stages for the main part. On the other hand, Placemaking as a process “is a genuinely holistic approach which seeks to give equal recognition to economic, environmental and social characteristics in

By ‘human’ timescales these would be defined as measurable progress within a generational cycle so that the same stakeholders continue to be engaged and focused and are able to see the results of their combined efforts themselves and not just something that may be achieved for another generational set of stakeholders. Timescales are important for Placemaking and urban development and regeneration outcomes as both must work together to achieve the best possible results in each timescale as mentioned in the above paragraph beginning with the urban planning process through to the placemaking, design and development stages.
the planning, development and renewal of our towns and cities” (Heller & Adams 2011 p.18). Although arguably this is also planning’s role, placemaking is carried out by everyone and for everyone and must include all stakeholders as equal partners in the role unlike the role of planning which is led by a city administrative department to allow projects to go ahead. Moreover, the continuity with which placemaking continues to lead on the management of the spaces and places it has planned through development and regeneration gives it a much longer-term perspective.

In examining Placemaking within urban development and regeneration it is also important to note the scale at which it best operates, which is a micro – neighbourhood, rather than a macro - metropolitan one. This is due to its aim of engaging all parts of the local community and stakeholders to affect change for ongoing improvement in development and regeneration (Shaw 2013, Tesfazghi et al 2009, Apparicio et al 2007, Alvarez et al 2015, Eckenwiler 2016). This would not be manageable or possible at a larger scale due to conflicting and polarising interests of multiple communities with some very different needs. Urban Planning and Design on the other hand tend to work on as large a scale as possible through Master planning or Zoning processes of entire areas regardless of how many different neighbourhoods and communities they include (Duhl 2005, Palermo & Ponzini 2015, Shaw & Montana 2014, Pacione 2003, Oakley & Johnson 2013)

Finally, when considering urban development and regeneration and the contribution Placemaking can and does make, it is important to understand the limitations of Urban Design and Planning in this process as “they often do not tap into the existing economic, social and cultural potential of the neighbourhood in which they land but rather are developed under a homogenous model in order to maximise build-out and profit with little consideration for integrating the community aspects in the place they land” (Nielsen 2012 p. 1). Antithetically, Placemaking has as one of its main objectives the local neighbourhood’s needs, both social and cultural, working within an economic environment, where, to succeed, any initiative and action must be economically viable and financially sustainable.

1.3 The Evolution of City Quality of Life Studies

Montgomery (2013) describes the ‘city’ as always having been a happiness project. City QoL studies have evolved in the past century from objective social indicators on a national and regional scale to numerous, varied objective and subjective metropolitan city QoL and liveability studies that aim to capture and enhance QoL internationally (Numbeo Quality of Life Index by City, Mercer Quality of Living City Ranking, Baldazzi et al. 1998, Ben-Chieh 1976, Blomquist et al. 1988). One can look back on Charles Booth’s London Poverty Map (1886-1903) as one of the first basic attempts at looking at City QoL at a
neighbourhood scale, in his case to argue that there were fewer poor people in London than was reported and he devised a poverty scale to demonstrate the level of poverty in which Londoners lived.

Figure 1: Charles Booth London Poverty Map 1886-1903

A few decades later, in 1929 President Hoover appointed a Research Committee on Recent Social Trends, which aimed to compare American cities to each other to set primarily economic targets for the welfare of citizens. Detailed statistics were collected and analysed for the first time at a city and country level, but it would not be until the 1960s that there would be further progress in the evolution of these measures into today’s City QoL, liveability, wellbeing, life satisfaction and happiness studies when the distinction was made that “increased life expectancy means an increased quantity of life; it still tells us nothing about its quality and the quality of the environment” (Blumenfeld, 1969 p. 30.). Beginning in the 21st century, a new focus in QoL studies can be observed. This was a shift from more objective, ‘top down’ initiatives to more inclusive ‘bottom up’ approaches as part of defining a city’s or urban area’s QoL. In Bristol this approach was discussed by McMahon (2002), where indicators were measured at five levels to provide a comprehensive analysis about QoL in Bristol’s neighbourhoods. These included community group indicators collected by the communities themselves about specific issues in their neighbourhoods.

The next interesting development in QoL studies was the obvious link between health and QoL and the introduction and use of smart technology. Duhl (2005) discussed how only 10% of health is a result of medical care and that the rest is a product of the environment you live in such as housing, transportation, pollution, and education. This is where well-being and life satisfaction terminology began to permeate QoL studies in earnest. At the same time as this there was a shift to using open software tools by communities such as Healthy Cities (Duhl 2005) and remote sensing and census data within a GIS framework to assess QoL (Li & Weng 2007). Finally, smart technology and “the smart cities model promises solutions to fuel sustainable development and a high quality of life with a wise management of natural resources, through participatory action and engagement” (Yigitcanlar 2015).
Although, as noted above, City QoL studies have been ongoing for well over a century in some form or another but their integration into successful urban planning and policy is still elusive (Cilliers et al. 2014, Gordon & Travers 2010, Hagerty et al. 2001, Higgins et al. 2014, Howley et al. 2009). Moreover, disparate private sector methodologies and rankings such as Mercer, Monocle, The Economist and Numbeo and numerous consultancy practices, such as The Quality-of-Life Foundation, (Nov 2019) are not overly helpful guides for city administrations to share best practice and learn from each other, since they do not tend to recommend policy and practice outcomes. The ISO standard 37120:2018 for ‘Sustainable cities and communities- Indicators for City Services and Quality of Life’ could potentially help in this regard if more cities signed up to its charter. Nonetheless, in academic discourse it is imperative to be aware of and analyse these private sector developments to ascertain their effectiveness and recommend possible solutions for improvement.

When analysing the urban QoL in a particular city neighbourhood it is not only important to factor in the objective and subjective ‘perceived’ QoL indicators but also the inter-related terms linked to QoL and their connotations. The relative importance of subjective measures over time within social indicators has brought about related terms to QoL such as well-being, life satisfaction, happiness, and liveability.

“Quality of life is a complex multifaceted construct that has numerous and often competing interpretations...The lack of a standard definition has led to the interchangeable use of the term quality of life with other concepts. For instance, life satisfaction, happiness, well-being, health status, standard of living and living conditions, are the most cited examples of concepts that are used interchangeably with quality of life. What is implied by quality of life varies according to the way the term is operationalised in each study. The exact definition of the term and the way it is used depends upon the research objectives and the context” (Kapuria 2014 p.460).

This thesis focuses on QoL and specifically PQoL to focus on the objective factors through an individual subjective lens. Other connotations were dismissed either due to their potential for ‘emotive’ or ‘temporal’ bias and therefore PQoL was settled on (Howley et al. 2009, Pacione 2003, Santos and Martins 2006, Walton et al. 2008, Gao et al. 2015). Inter-related terms such as liveability, for example, are important to consider as QoL in urban planning and policy practice is in various city administrations referred to in those terms and must be considered to holistically assess current practice and policy. Appleyard et al. (2013 p.62) go on to describe liveability as “an individual’s ability to access opportunities to improve their quality of life”. By this definition liveability is almost simultaneously a cause and an effect of quality of life by being able to provide the opportunity to enhance quality of life as well as being a result of it. Indeed, as Urban Placemaking and QoL have evolved as terms in recent years they have together become entwined with the notion of liveable cities, as Langsam (2013 p. 23) discussed “A liveable city, as the phrase has evolved, means a metro area with a quality of life that includes among its
amenities the arts and culture. Taking liveability to the next level, many urban planners are fostering ‘place making’ as a cornerstone of liveability.” It is therefore appropriate to include liveability when linking these concepts further.

1.4 Linking Urban Placemaking and Quality of Life

In looking to integrate exemplary urban development and Placemaking Practice to enhance City PQoL this thesis aims to create a joined-up principle to guide and inform urban development and regeneration best practice. It will draw on existing planning policy and design and empirical evidence, to propose several conclusions and suggestions for future research as well as possible recommendations and/or suggestions for planning and design policy and practice. This section will also explore the evolution of ideas that led to placemaking becoming a mainstream idea to fully understand its potential to enhance urban QoL. When referring to the working definition of Placemaking it is important to note that as a process, Placemaking has at its core the aim to enhance urban QoL through the various actions, strategies and interventions that are established to achieve this. The explicit link between Urban Placemaking and QoL is that the purpose of the Placemaking process is to achieve QoL improvements via effective practice. (Mouratidis 2017, Palermo & Ponzini 2015, Brunnberg & Frigo 2012, Gordon & Travers 2010, Howley et al. 2009). This link is inadequately recognised thus far in the theoretical and academic research fields and requires further exploration to establish appropriate and implementable placemaking strategies and interventions that will offer the highest impact. This thesis will explore this link further through mixed methods case study-based investigations. Moreover, the link between Placemaking and QoL can be, once established, used to guide Developers, as well as City Authorities, to incorporate not only economic aims but also concrete social well-being aims to enhance QoL. This thesis will aim to demonstrate how a shift in emphasis from Placemaking, predominantly based on enhancing economic well-being, to genuine Placemaking aims, tools and mechanisms that can foster long-term improvement in urban PQoL.

So why is placemaking so important in urban development and regeneration and how did it evolve? Why are urban planning and design not well-equipped as practices to deal with the exigencies placed on development and regeneration to enhance QoL for those living, working, and visiting them? Placemaking, unlike the formal practices of urban planning and design, is a way for the collective whole to do something about and be involved in a bottom up – rather than top down - approach. Placemaking can do this by engaging communities, groups of non-professional people together in actively seeking to change, shape and be involved in imagining a place’s future. Practically speaking these groups can collectively engage with professionals in urban planning and development to help guide and shape not only policy and plans but also day-to-day master planning and design activities. Of course, it is up to the
professionals to listen, take note and incorporate these ideas and suggestions into development and regeneration proposals. However, placemaking can and does actively empower groups and communities to engage in the act of urban planning and design by not having to wait for proposals and policies to be written before becoming involved.

Placemaking, of course, does more than add a bottom-up approach to traditional planning and design practices. It also adds a cohesive link to these usually rigid and separate practices (although many recent attempts, some more successful than others, have tried to modernise and change this). Placemaking also provides a singular framework through which these traditional siloed practices can work together. Finally, Placemaking allows more than traditional methods of developing and regenerating places as "the routes one takes, and our social and sensorial experience of these are also place-making practices" (Pink 2008 p.192) giving an added layer to the way planners, designers and architects can look at a place to incorporate ideas from such views and insights. This, of course, can only happen through effective two-way consultation and communication with local stakeholders, where their views are given consideration and are responded to.

Placemaking as an urban practice has been slowly developing since the 1960s when Jane Jacob urged cities to look at development, regeneration, and place management in a more human and holistic way. The term itself was first used by PPS in The Role of Transit in Creating Liveable Metropolitan Communities (1997). As a practice it has gained momentum since then as multi-disciplinary teams both in government architecture, design and planning departments, private developers and consultants have used it successfully according to their interpretations of its meaning. The issue, of course, has always been, that as a term - and consequently as an effective practice - it has often been viewed with cynicism. Some academics and professionals see Placemaking as a buzz term used to cover up and/or fix poor, and/or controversial urban regeneration and development. However, as this thesis aims to uncover, Placemaking itself, when carried out effectively, is a targeted practice that seeks to complement and enhance such development.

The key questions that are therefore critical to this research are:

1. Can common Placemaking principles be agreed upon to be implemented in urban areas?
2. Do the above-mentioned Placemaking principles affect QoL/ PQoL in cities and if so, how?
3. Is there a way of measuring the cost and benefit of city Placemaking and if so, what is it?
4. Are there several free and/or cost-effective common placemaking principles that can be applied and implemented in urban areas with a poor quality of life and indeed all cities to enhance their QoL/ PQoL?
Finally, the issue with the evolution of Placemaking as a practice is that as it is not a formal professional discipline (unlike urban planning, design/master planning or architecture) and therefore it is interpreted differently by urban specialists and scientists each giving their own meaning to it. “Known under many names, placemaking is a practice—really several practices—targeting neighbourhoods, parks and paths, features of landscape, housing developments, long term care facilities, and hospitals” (Eckenwiler 2016 p. 1944). From this broad definition it is therefore evidently a practice open to different and varying interpretations. However, one consistent aim of good Placemaking practice is aptly described by Palermo and Ponzini (2015) when they state that “town planning or urban design practices regarding the physical transformation of urban contexts are not sufficient; the challenge is to improve the quality of life and the resulting effects on a community’s well-being and empowerment”. Placemaking as a practice specifically uses tools in the pursuit of enhancing quality of life and this is the thread linking this thesis throughout.

1.5 Summary and Thesis Structure

Following on from this introduction the thesis is divided into ten chapters the next two forming the formal literature review and emergent themes as below.

Chapter 2, The Nature of Placemaking and Perceived Quality of Life, highlights how studies to date tend to look at these concepts and ideas mainly in isolation of each other, either focusing on the effects of Placemaking on the Built Environment and subsequent perceptions and effects of these by and on local communities or investigating QoL at a Neighbourhood level through several Built Environment factors such as walking distances to shops and local amenities, for example. Details on various metrics and QoL indices are unpacked and discussed in this chapter to fully understand how the field is problematised. This reinforces the need to link Placemaking and QoL as not only a conscious conceptualisation, but more importantly, the embodiment of exemplary Placemaking best practice in urban development and regeneration through a targeted approach to enhance urban PQoL. This chapter will therefore go into a detailed unpacking of Placemaking and QoL as concepts that have been used to frame city building and development efforts of the last 20 years or so, with the arguments that these terms and how they are measured rarely connect to each other.

Chapter 3, Communities and Neighbourhoods in Urban Development focuses on urban development and regeneration practices and implication through the urban Placemaking and QoL agenda. This chapter also in continuation from the previous chapter highlights that studies, policies and procedures have been conducted in isolation of each other either focusing on Placemaking practice or QoL aims. It does so by reviewing current Planning policy and practice and the participatory planning processes in urban
development and regeneration. The policy aims and objectives are further investigated not only from a public planning authority standpoint but also a private organisation’s and developer’s perspective, highlighting, in, the political and economic agendas that these policies and practices derive from.

Chapter 4 details the project’s methodology, establishing the research design framework and comparative mixed case studies method that was chosen. It goes on to outline the data and analytical strategy to justify the chosen methods that have been used in this project.

Chapter 5, *Quality of Life, and Placemaking Case studies*, sets out the rationale for choosing the specific case studies. It briefly gives a background to city QoL indices and rankings that helped to select consistently high-ranking world cities that could be used for the study, as well as cities that frequently ranked lower. It goes on to give a background to the chosen case study neighbourhoods, their socio-demographic characteristics, as well as a brief history of their notable cultural idiosyncrasies. It highlights their current positioning in academic theory and research pertaining to Placemaking and QoL in the context of urban development and regeneration. Finally, as all the case studies share the commonality of being waterfront/waterside locations, the concepts surrounding waterside placemaking and quality of life are brought to the fore.

Chapter 6, *Placemaking in City Planning and Policy for Quality of Life* investigates the theme through the chosen case studies the constraints that current Planning Policy puts on development and regeneration, making it challenging to implement and uphold Placemaking practice that can enhance local people’s PQoL. It highlights current issues surrounding administrative boundaries and their wider implications on identity and effective cross-boundary collaboration. It also focuses on the different top-down and bottom-up approaches used within the case study areas and their potential impact on effective Placemaking processes and PQoL. Finally, it deals with issues surrounding community and professional expertise when dealing with planning policy, placemaking processes and development and regeneration and how the lack of the necessary expertise impacts decisions made on past, current, and future results.

Chapter 7, *Accessibility for Sustainable Communities* deals with the theme of permanence and movement. Through the case studies, it demonstrates how moving around easily in a place affects people’s decision to spontaneously linger or return to experience them fully another time or venture into neighbouring places. It also explores not only the physical accessibility and effectiveness of resident consultation, but also, online accessibility and effectiveness to ascertain their strengths and limitations. Finally, this chapter examines the significance of local events and activities in Placemaking practice to establish its effects on PQoL.
Chapter 8, *Issues of affordability, Desirability and Culture* discusses these themes considering the effects of densification and gentrification through urban development and regeneration, the impacts of this on PQoL in the case study areas and how Placemaking strategies and initiatives can be and have been used. It goes on to explore the themes of desirable, inclusive, and diverse neighbourhoods and cultural history & heritage and fostering creativity. The role Placemaking has in achieving these outcomes, and how, in turn, this can enhance PQoL is analysed.

Chapter 9, *Developing a Placemaking Ideal to enhance Quality of Life* draws together the themes discussed in the previous chapters to define a credible Placemaking Ideal and Process that considers the working definition of Placemaking, and develops this into a process capable of achieving a better PQoL that can be applied to different urban places and spaces at the planning stage in development and regeneration schemes. In doing so this chapter first explores through the case studies the varying perceptions of urban Placemaking and QoL to identify a single definition and from it a process that can be applied universally. Having done this the public and private roles within Placemaking are scrutinised so that an effective partnership is defined whereby socio-economic interests in development and regeneration are embraced and respected in conjunction with the community to enhance PQoL for all those living, working, and visiting. Finally, this chapter brings this all together by discussing the possibility of a flexible, useful, and adaptable Placemaking Framework to enhance urban PQoL going forward.

In conclusion, chapter 10 discusses how the empirical findings and lessons from the case studies can aid in future implementation of the Placemaking Ideal explored in the previous chapter through development and regeneration practice and what this could potentially look like. It concludes by considering what the potential impact of good Placemaking practice could have on PQoL going forward and recommendations for further research to achieve this.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW PART I: THE NATURE OF PLACEMAKING AND PERCEIVED QUALITY OF LIFE

2.1 Introduction

The link between Placemaking and PQoL is not yet fully explored in academic discourse, particularly within the context of urban development and regeneration policy. Separately, Placemaking and PQoL are not novel concepts, and have been the subject of numerous scholarly writings and research, but seldom have they been investigated together. One result of studying Placemaking or QoL studies in isolation has been that their application in planning policy and development and regeneration discourse has been fragmented and underutilised. As discussed in Chapter 1, Urban Placemaking in development and regeneration practice can be defined as a continuous process that works best when it is integrated into the local fabric of community from the outset. QoL and especially PQoL because of this practice can then not only be monitored but also impacted in a way that it can be as good as feasibly possible and have the potential to grow over time. The role of Placemaking in policy practice over the past 20 years or so has been inconsistent, however the “increasing interest and importance afforded to the role of urban design in regenerating our towns and cities in recent years has coincided with a growing emphasis on quality of life, well-being and liveability among policy makers” (Beck, 2009 p.243).

A wider consensus on the utility of these terms’ conceptualisation and practical application is long overdue and, it is argued, will aid in the creation of more sustainable and resilient urban areas. Many have argued that when Placemaking is carried out effectively communities can become more resilient and their PQoL can be enhanced (Kent 2015). As Alvarez et al (2016 p.1) has noted “understanding the mechanisms that link people together is also essential to the study of social resilience” and the social value of place, neighbourhood development and QoL all depend to some extent on how well or not Placemaking has been carried out in these communities that enable all the people that live and work in a place to come together.

Within this context, the purpose of this first literature review chapter is to critically explore the academic research and theory to date surrounding the concepts and ideas on urban QoL studies and problematising the emerging field of urban Placemaking from both a policy and a private market perspective. This will investigate the common themes they share as well as how they are currently measured either via global city indices and/or other formalised standards. In doing so, the aim is to understand how these themes can be integrated and embedded into urban development and regeneration practices for the benefit of local communities. The remainder of the chapter is split into three sections.
The first part will focus on People, Places and Spaces in the City. This will entail analysing literature that first deals with what are commonly associated as the four key attributes of Placemaking in urban spaces; accessibility, uses, sociability and image, the first two being more objective in nature than the final two that are more subjective. Accessibility and uses as physical elements will be investigated within Placemaking literature to ascertain their importance, what they entail and their links, if any, to PQoL/QoL. This section will then proceed to examine the more subjective Placemaking strategies by analysing the literature that deals with sociability and image such as desirable places, including but not limited to culture and undesirable places inevitably and/or eventually resulting in the decline of those areas. Quality green spaces will also be highlighted as a key Placemaking theme in development and regeneration helping with QoL and certainly PQoL. Finally, urban stories and diversity will be covered as linked subthemes, where the literature looks at both story telling as a way of Placemaking and building community and a sense of place, especially in development and regeneration projects. The subthemes within this chapter will be explored from a Placemaking planning, development, and regeneration policy perspective to understand how much these issues have been discussed and used in tandem with QoL and PQoL research and public policy. Some of the different global city QoL metrics and indices will also be discussed to examine whether they include some or all the above-mentioned Placemaking elements and if so, how they then measure them.

The second section focuses upon the shared issue of Affordability that permeates much of the Urban Placemaking and QoL literature. Housing and retail affordability in city neighbourhoods will be explored and the effect this has on Placemaking and QoL highlighted. Within this context of affordability, various city indices and measurement tools are examined to ascertain their relevance and usefulness. Additionally, the literature that deals with displacement as part of urban regeneration, densification and gentrification will be investigated, to illuminate their impact upon both existing (poorer) local communities and incoming (richer) residents. From a developer perspective, the cost of integrating ‘good’ Placemaking elements into new regeneration schemes is further explored alongside the predominance of cheap, bland, ‘affordable’ new developments with low design quality.

The final section of this chapter will look at how the literature deals with issues of Time and personal views and how these are represented within the collective neighbourhood communities when looking at urban Placemaking and QoL. This is particularly important when looking at subjective and objective QoL measures, indices and issues surrounding methodology. Different terminology for related concepts to QoL are also discussed here, such as Happiness, Life Satisfaction, Well-being and Liveability and changes in perceptions over time, as well as how the literature deals with different stakeholder attitudes to urban change. This section will end by capturing the main points of literature dealing with longevity of places.
and spaces and the use of temporary and pop-up installations for the hosting of community or commercial events and how these impact upon QoL/PQoL. This chapter will conclude by providing a few critical reflections from the literature covered and provide the conceptual lens with which to view Placemaking and QoL in urban development and regeneration practice in the forthcoming chapters.

2.2 People, Places and Spaces in the City

Placemaking has become a popular discourse in recent years due to its inclusive process driven approach that aims to address, unpack, and resolve urban issues on a localised level with all community stakeholders. As one commentator noted, "Studies of Placemaking typically focus on street life. However, to secure public order and place capital, placemaking must do more than redesign streets, it must guide eyes and feet. To do so, it insinuates itself into private space, it monitors the poor and discontented, and it harnesses the memories and dreams of suburbanites" (Montgomery, 2016, p.788). In contrast to this, city-wide QoL surveys and indices do the opposite by not looking at the specific neighbourhood wide processes and interventions but only focusing on objective and subjective elements of urban life in isolation therefore only capturing generic data and not ways in which to address, unpack and resolve urban issues like the placemaking process aims to do. When looking at the literature that deals with placemaking practice in planning, development, and regeneration it is important to look at all the elements that placemaking purports to be made up of.

The "idea of placemaking emerged among urban professionals and scholars in the late 1950s" (Redaelli, 2016, p.389). The importance of placemaking can be seen in its intrinsic shared value as Ellery and Ellery (2019) explain when they define it as a “collaborative process by which we can shape our public realm” (p.242). They go on to explain how this placemaking process maximises shared value by stating that “More than just promoting better urban design, Placemaking facilitates creative patterns of use, paying particular attention to the physical, cultural and social identities that define a place and support its ongoing evolution”. Building on the definition adopted at the beginning of this thesis on p.8 that placemaking can be defined as “the continuous process by urban city stakeholders; be it policy makers, visitors, commuters or residents; to change or make use of a neighbourhood and/or defined area including but not limited to: the buildings, open spaces and infrastructure, for leisure, education, health or work activities in an attempt to enhance the (urban) quality of life for the benefit of all those wishing to make use of such neighbourhood/place in order to achieve clearly defined agreed outcomes within a set timescale”, it is clear that to achieve this a sustainable and diverse mix of uses and accessible spaces are necessary as well as utilising cultural and heritage assets and ensuring affordable, desirable and safe spaces. As this thesis continues to explore these elements, it draws upon case studies to highlight these themes; some, such as Kings Cross, spanning over two decades of placemaking planning, development
and management, was an almost pioneering approach when the concept was first developed in 2001 (Regeneris 2017).

The Place Diagram (PPS, 2009) in Figure 2 is widely used as a cornerstone of good placemaking practice both in the academic and professional spheres. Of the four key attributes (physical as well as non-physical) accessibility and uses stand out as being a practical objective attribute of Placemaking that planning, development and regeneration policy can easily adopt through appropriate consultation and implementation. The other two attributes (Sociability and Image) can be deemed as more subjective elements and therefore would require a more thorough, detailed, and appropriate consultation process before being implemented through specific Placemaking practice. However, all these elements are interlinked and therefore crucial when analysing the PQoL and QoL in newly developed and/or regenerated areas.

Figure 2: The Place Diagram, PPS, What is Placemaking? 2009

Attia & Ibrahim (2018), Brunnberg & Frigo (2012) and MPavilion (2017) have discussed how it is not only accessibility but also inclusivity that placemaking practice needs to deliver as part of new development and regeneration. This includes but is not limited to a place’s accessibility from neighbouring places and other parts of the city so there are key linkages for people and neighbours to be able to interact and
move about freely and easily. One such example of this that Attia & Ibrahim (2018) discuss in their paper is the waterfront renewal of Europe’s largest port of Rotterdam. The city authority was able to review their initial plans of providing affordable housing development on the site instead favouring a more holistic regeneration strategy that created a bolder vision for accessible infrastructure early on focusing on early investment in the connectivity of the area to the rest of the city. This was hailed as a success and seen as a catalyst for change in other neighbouring areas of the city also. Of course, much of the literature deals with accessibility of places (Hogan et al. 2016, Talen 2010, Appleyard et al. 2013, Attia & Ibrahim 2018) and it certainly is not a new concept that has been under-researched. Talen (2010) describes many of the accessibility attributes required of great places emphasising that “Specific site designs, such as better and more accessible public space, may promote some aspect of social interaction, and social interaction may eventually lead to some dimension of community” (p.181). Indeed, it is not placemaking per se that highlights this key attribute, yet it is the focus on collaboration and participation to come up with tailor made solutions for specific places that makes it stand out as pertinent. Moreover, the non-physical element of accessibility and what the internet can do to give a place an online presence that is easily accessible to many is another facet that is of importance in the Placemaking process. For example, “virtual communities and physical communities develop in close interaction, and both processes of aggregation are challenged by increasing individualisation of work, social relationships and residential habits” (Susser 2002 p. 394). This means that more bespoke and easily accessible placemaking interventions and strategies need to be implemented to fully address these challenges. Belk (2013) discusses this ‘collaborative consumption’ when looking at the online ‘sharing economy’ since it doesn’t involve individual ownership and can “focus primarily on contemporary sharing activity” (p1595). This means that Placemaking can take advantage of this and capitalise if used currently on creating a free accessible online presence that is shared and appreciated by people as well as in the physical domain. In turn, this can create much needed equity of accessibility and as such “local knowledge and social networks can be critical in determining the quality of access that deprived communities have to welfare assistance” (Mangen, 2004 p.132) and can therefore go a long way in protecting the most vulnerable communities in these urban areas.

Accessibility is seen in its most comprehensive form as a means of having access to opportunities that will enhance an individual’s QoL (Appleyard et al 2013). Placemaking needs to ensure that through its correct and proper practice urban planning and development provide accessible places to all. This means that different neighbourhoods, communities, and individuals will have different access needs and priorities that will all require to be met such as access to amenities being more important to younger people as but one such example (Howley et al 2009, Hogan et al 2015). In fact, the literature finds that age plays a big factor in people’s differing priorities when it comes to their urban environment hence the need for Placemaking to be an inclusive process that takes account of all these factors as well as the need for...
neighbourhood differences to be considered this being another factor the literature recognised as important and requiring more work (Duhl 2005, Florida 2008, Kamvasinou 2015). Those seeking employment opportunities in a city environment may find it online through bespoke platforms such as LinkedIn (Luca 2015) although Placemaking policy and intervention should try to ensure equal access to such opportunities in both the physical and online presence to create a sustainable place through development/regeneration projects for all those looking to work there.

De Lange & de Waal (2013) describe the city as having “become a hybrid of the physical and the digital…(an) inclusive form of engagement, responsibility, and stewardship” (p.1). Leung & Lee (2004) however, discuss the detrimental effects to QoL of too much online sociability and therefore Placemaking best practice needs to address this by linking the online & physical strategies and experiences such that people can and do access both in a balanced and beneficial way. Sociability is important also to encourage community groups and action and enthusiasm as Luke & Kaika (2018) discuss when looking at infrastructures of social reproduction in the Ancoats area of Manchester. This collective action can help to preserve conservation, heritage, history, and working-class populations in an area which is a key aim of Placemaking in new development and regeneration projects. Moreover, “national studies have found that only 4% of Americans use the Internet for neighbourhood-level interaction” (Masden et al 2014) which emphasises the need for traditional access to physical social interaction through Placemaking activities and efforts to go hand in hand with the digital interaction.

A mix of uses is key to successful Placemaking practice and enhancing PQoL and QoL in cities. This is again a well-established concept that Talen (2010), Kamvasinou (2015), NEF (2005), Ostendorf et al (2001) and even Jacobs (1961) found to be critical in encouraging inclusive communities especially in new development and regeneration projects. They all discussed how getting the right mix at the outset can go a long way in determining the PQoL and QoL in that area as well as the possible wider benefits of this to other neighbouring areas. Having a sustainable and diverse mix of uses also is key to accessibility since “accessibility is promoted through the physical design principle of mixed use. By creating a balanced mix of uses (e.g., both affordable and private market housing, shopping, work, recreation) within the same neighbourhood, accessibility to these uses is necessarily improved” (Talen 2010 p.181). The mixing of planning uses is also widely utilised in development and regeneration to raise “residential densities and re-zoning areas for mixed uses in an attempt to break away from the perceived sterility of residential-only” (Haughton 1997 p.191). This is also something that is echoed by Brdan et al (2015) when discussing the effects of Compact Urban Form and City Density on QoL “Compactness had a stronger affiliation to equitable spatial distribution of resources and was easily reachable…spatially mixed land use did not offer much variation, though the older wards had a higher affinity towards diverse land use...a compact urban form had a higher affinity towards better UQoL clusters and indicated higher probabilities of association
of compact urban form with improved UQoL” (p.64). However, it is also important to note that Mace et al (2007) and the worldwide city QoL indices emphasise the importance of a balanced mix of uses by each measuring these on a quantitative scale that play an important factor in determining the overall QoL of those urban areas (Numbeo 2020, Mercer 2020 and The Economist Intelligence Unit 2012 to name just a few).

The Economist Liveability Index for example used Cultural Assets as one of its Spatial Characteristics within its methodology however this was very one dimensional when looking at how Placemaking can contribute to this since it specifically used a UNESCO World Heritage Interactive map in the compilation of this which is just one of many desirable aspects of a city neighbourhood. However, the city QoL indices do help to strengthen the importance of both the objective and more subjective aspects discussed in this section since in some form or another these characteristics accessibility/connectivity, mix of uses/cultural assets and green spaces to name just a few are used to some degree or another within their methodologies and rankings. There is a growing mismatch between top-down general indexes and placemaking/QoL at a local/community scale. For example, Melbourne often tops the economist liveability index but the measures of this are not at all locally nuanced (The Economist 2019). This might help explain why p/m and QoL are often separated out not only in academic literature but also city policies and strategies regarding both.

Jacobs (1961), NEF (2005) and more recently Montgomery (2016) astutely diagnosed the problems associated with desirability of place and the cyclical nature of it eventually (if not appropriately safeguarded in perpetuity) becoming so popular that it creates its own decline by effects of gentrification and unaffordable expensive prices and rents. This is picked up again most recently by the Building Better Building Beautiful Commission (2020) where desirability and image are key aims in their report arguing that “Beautiful Placemaking should be a legally enshrined aim of the planning system” (p.2). There is a fine balance that needs to be struck which is why placemaking is best placed to deal with the complexities of the different attributes required to make great places work. Heller and Adams (2011) described placemaking as a process that brings together different disciplines such as urban design, planning, architecture, engineering and so forth to work in complete symbiosis to create places that enhance the QoL of those living, working, and visiting them. Desirable green spaces and places have very much been a large focus of both academic research and government policy and private sector attention in the past few decades and therefore this thesis will not focus on this specific research field. Suffice it to say however that it is well documented for example how green spaces affect both QoL and PQoL and how Placemaking policies and strategies help to achieve this in new development and regeneration projects (Li & Weng 2007, Hes & Hernandez- Santin 2020, Cilliers et al 2015, Montgomery 2016).
This thesis however will look more at waterfront placemaking and its link to and effect on QoL/PQoL as this has been researched to a lesser extent than green spaces and its links to placemaking and QoL and will be a feature of the research carried out in the case studies explored herewith. The literature points to issues of affordability (Ferguson 2019), gentrification (Montgomery 2016), desirability (Rawnsley & Spiller 2008) and heritage (Oakley & Johnson 2013) when looking at waterfront placemaking and QoL in development and regeneration (Attia & Ibrahim 2018). There are clear issues that are linked to some of the major themes explored elsewhere in this literature review that support Oakley’s (2011 p222) findings that “the delivery of waterfront renewal is characterised by planning that aims to enhance a place’s economic competitiveness through the restructuring of place and people and the privatisation of the waterfront through selling houses, business locations and leisure.” This is something that needs to be balanced carefully to ensure that waterfront placemaking can enhance QoL for all those living, working and or visiting such newly developed/regenerated areas without pricing any of these people out by becoming a feature only to be enjoyed privately by the few who can afford it. This issue of private and public spaces and the rights to their utilisation and enjoyment will be further explored in section 3.2 of this literature review.

Placemaking as a process is key to curating an image of place that will resonate with all facets of society, this resonates somewhat with “how the making of places and their meanings- a fundamentally political process- has been conceived in the geography-of-transitions scholarship and in the gentrification literature, highlighting how a multiplicity of actors, strategies and policies conjointly create and contest physical and symbolic place images” (Hakannson 2017 p.4). Placemaking can therefore address this issue within new development and regeneration practice to enhance PQoL within these communities. Over 60 years ago Lynch (1960) pioneered this process-driven approach to city design and planning in his book ‘The Image of the City’ recognising that people build their own images of the urban environment and therefore planners, designers and city authorities should ensure that these images enhance people’s experiences of the city by curating cities in a practical way such as enhanced lighting and paths that follow routes that most people would naturally follow etc. One of the pitfalls with any Placemaking practice of course is that the city image can and is often used to attract economic and inward investment due to the highly competitive nature of cities and although as Madureira (2013) notes it is something that needs to be well planned and managed to ensure a well-balanced outcome is achieved; disappointingly it all too often is not. Finally, in this regard Placemaking must have an overall co-ordinated bottom-up and top-down approach that links all the small interventions into an effective major aim and focus to avoid achieving a result that is “too disparate to have an immediately visible cumulative impact” (Mangen 2004 p.94). There is a danger otherwise that people will not engage with the individual Placemaking interventions and activities as the image they portray will not be strong enough to resonate with them.
Although culture (including but not limited to the arts, history, and heritage) is very much at the fore of urban discourse it is important to note that for a large part it is used to enhance a place’s economic potential and financial gain from a public policy perspective (Florida 2008). This is not to say that it is not necessary and indeed in Placemaking when it is incorporated correctly into the development and regeneration processes it can go a long way in enhancing the day-to-day experiences of communities (Cameron & Coaffee 2006, Langsam 2013, Madureira 2013). What is key is keeping that culture accessible and affordable to all which is where this study and literature review begins to come full circle as all the different elements already discussed come into play. Hall (2006) emotively described this issue as “the fence that surrounds every entertainment destination keeps out a majority that is too poor to be inside” (p.206). Truly affordable and accessible Placemaking policy and action therefore would help to resolve this problem. History and heritage are as much a part of culture as they are of Placemaking (Oakley and Johnson 2013). It is important to get this right at the outset of planning, development and regeneration or the opportunity will become if not altogether lost a lot harder to retrofit and PQoL and in turn QoL will be affected. As a result of less well thought out planning at times “gentrification has involved the appropriation and manipulation of an area’s complex social and cultural histories” (Harris p.236). Urban stories (although not yet conceptualised in this study) are also important as they draw on the community memory literature and are made from a number and a mix of all the above-mentioned elements. They are what contribute to bringing about a sense of place and community that helps to enhance urban QoL especially when looking at newly developed/regenerated places (Cilliers et al 2014, Hall 2006, NEF 2005). Both individual and community identity and memories are made of such urban stories. Moreover, such Placemaking policy must consider that “Each place, each culture is unique. Questions of societal norms, climate and tradition must all be considered” (Project for Public Spaces 2012 p.4).

Mpavilion (2017) sums up the literature discussed above stating that “Placemaking is for everyone. Anyone can help create meaningful and inclusive places that people want to be in. In fact, thriving and resilient cities depend on it” (online p.1). In short, inclusive Placemaking is important for PQoL and QoL since a lack of it would result in exclusive areas either for the extremely wealthy or the marginalised poor. This would bring about a loss of diversity that would essentially wipe out the qualities needed in a place for a sense of pride in a community that provides that high PQoL and QoL. This is highlighted by NEF’s (2005), report on Clone Town Britain where they note that “the death of diversity ...attacks our sense of place and belonging and therefore well-being” (p.5). It is therefore the responsibility of the planning system at the outset through its policies and procedures to provide an inclusive Placemaking process so that development and regeneration projects can create the right places for diversity and a high QoL to thrive and which “caters to a wide variety of people with different disposable incomes, social status, ethnic background, age, gender or, more generally, interests” (Kamvasinou 2015 p.203). This thesis aims to provide a framework to explore ways in which this can be achieved.
2.3 Affordability in Placemaking and Quality of Life Studies

It is telling that many of the seemingly ‘American’ city problems Jacobs (1961) wrote about in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* are still prevalent today in numerous cities across the globe. The complex relationship she described between slums, un-slumming, regeneration, money, and the lack of it or too much rapid investment into new areas is essentially still rife today when looking at city estates, neighbourhoods, and affordable housing issues within them. When it comes to the complicated relationship that affordability has with Placemaking and QoL it is important to look at it from the various perspectives of affordability to the Local (City) Authority, specific Developers and ‘end users’, be it residents, workers, or visitors. This is crucial since the literature doesn’t always look at all perspectives holistically but tends to focus more on one of these perspectives, notably property development. For example, the Savills World Research report of 2016 and the CBRE Global Research Report of 2017 both with a deliberate professional readership focus of private development companies and Local (City) Authorities emphasising the development cost of upfront Placemaking initiatives on a development cashflow and how it can be achieved (and be deemed as ‘affordable’ to the development process) through early investment and resultant higher sales values in subsequent property sales. Wetzstein (2017) further discusses how “market-friendly interventions dominate affordable housing discourses and policy” (p3162) and how ultimately there needs to be a shift and a redressing in the balance between this and the global urban shortage and inequality in the genuine provision of decent affordable housing. This is also acutely felt in urban centres where affordable housing provision is often side-lined as land is too expensive and financial contributions towards funding affordable housing elsewhere are negotiated in lieu of any actual affordable housing provision (Pidd 2018, Gabriel & Painter 2018). Moreover, what the CBRE and Savills research doesn’t address is the effect of Placemaking on the regeneration of existing neighbourhoods or newly developed ones with regard to affordability for the potentially rehoused ‘local’ populations or the seemingly gentrified newcomers into the new developments (Mace et al 2007). Some community-led groups have been known to act in “reclaiming the public spaces from which long-time residents had been directly or indirectly evicted…. many of whom had received compulsory purchase orders on their homes and moved to other parts of the city” (Luke & Kaika, 2018, p588 & 591).

Affordability for these ‘end users’ is therefore not only related to housing affordability but also crucially to having affordable local retail, transport, and services options to maintain as high a QoL as possible (Anacker 2019).

From a QoL studies perspective, housing affordability has long been accepted as intrinsically linked to QoL (Mee 2002) however, the “ambiguity of housing affordability has some relations with the subjective meanings attached to the Quality of Life that are produced, reproduced, altered and transformed which
makes housing affordability ambiguous or vexed" (Perera & Mensah 2019 p30). The various city indices also (Mercer, Numbeo, The Economist Intelligence Unit to name just a few) all look at affordability in the city in various forms, albeit indirectly. Numbeo for example, uses “an empirical formula which takes into account purchasing power index (higher is better), house price to income ratio (lower is better) and cost of living index (lower is better),” among others. These 3 indices combined do shed some light on affordability within these cities but again at an aggregated city level therefore missing the all-important granular neighbourhood level analysis that this thesis aims to highlight.

Affordability within Placemaking best practice is crucial to QoL. It is seen as important in all aspects of essential urban day-to-day life from affordable housing offers, to retail and community services and facilities. The English Liveability Index 2019 (Your Housing Group 2019) focused on Housing Affordability as a key determinant of QoL, where sustainable Placemaking should be able to provide affordable public and private spaces and places for all facets of the community to benefit from. The Clone Town Britain report (NEF, 2005) does however warn against bland identikit places that can be the result of sometimes cheap “affordable” development and regeneration. It emphasises that it should instead focus more on the formal planning obligations perhaps sought through the current S106 system that could provide for affordable local independently owned stores for example instead of national chains of shops which would affect local community spirit and potential QoL in these areas.

Sixty years ago, Jane Jacobs (1961, p270) warned that:

“Our present urban renewal laws are an attempt to break this particular linkage in the vicious circles by forthrightly wiping away slums and their populations and replacing them with projects intended to produce higher tax yields, or to lure back easier populations with less expensive public requirements. The method fails. At best, it merely shifts slums from here to there, adding its own tincture of extra hardship and disruption. At worst, it destroys neighbourhoods where constructive and improving communities exist and where the situation calls for encouragement rather than destruction”.

Although not directly talking of affordability as it is currently seen, Jacobs described the plight of poorer neighbourhoods receiving investment to demolish their existing urban fabric which she clearly admonished as not the solution and instead urged that working within existing neighbourhood communities to improve the built environment through Placemaking would work better, although admittedly this was seen as the more expensive and time-consuming option. Therefore, in many cases ‘gentrification’ is seen as making development and regeneration more affordable under these circumstances from a financial and economic viability private development perspective (sometimes also

---

4 In the UK planning system, a S106 agreement forms part of a suite of planning obligations including others such as Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and site-specific planning conditions etc.
from the public Local Authority’s perspective) and is often seen as an inevitable consequence that goes hand in hand with it (Hakansson 2017, Misra 2019, Montgomery 2016). Capps (2019) discussed the divide between higher earners coming into newly regenerated neighbourhoods and being able to afford more expensive amenities and accommodation than those people originally living and working in such areas. Capps was in effect describing that often, neighbourhood change occurs without direct displacement thus creating an immediate divide between existing and incoming residents (Harris 2011).

Gentrification evolves slightly differently depending on the original urban context however the factors that lead to it developing in any urban context are to do with the renewed desirability of such a place whether it be because of its central convenient location within a city, a great art/cultural scene and/or cheaper residential, office and commercial property or a mix of one or more of these factors as well as other potential ones (Shaw 2014, Cameron & Coaffee 2006, Harris 2011). This renewed desirability tends to lead to an influx of investment and high earners and spenders flooding into the area (Jacobs 1961, Lepofsky & Fraser 2003, Luke & Kaika 2018). The negative connotations surrounding regeneration mean that often it is blamed for causing gentrification however it is important to note that as Mock (2019 p.6) describes there are often other underlying issues that cause gentrification as it can be “more a symptom of neighbourhoods being sheltered, isolated or redlined from economic growth”. Whichever way gentrification evolves however, it almost certainly often causes issues of displacement and/or affordability for the poorer existing communities who either cannot afford to live there at all or suffer a lower QoL due to now living and/or working in what has more likely become a more expensive area (Misra 2019, Montgomery 2016, Moore & Bunce 2009). A way to combat this potential displacement of the poorer existing communities is something that is discussed by Attia & Ibrahim (2018) when looking at this very issue in Rotterdam and where “the City established a Mutual Benefit program to spread the benefits of the new development to poorer areas nearby” (p.318). Many other cities, such as those in the UK, have legal obligations set through planning policy that specify affordable housing numbers required because of obtaining planning permission to spread the benefits of new development and regeneration. However, these can often be negotiated out or down by the developers by demonstrating economic and financial viability constraints or other much needed benefits (NEF 2005, Luke & Kaika 2018, Pidd 2018).

The effects of development and regeneration on QoL are difficult to ascertain comprehensively since many of the city indices such as those mentioned above do not look at the granular neighbourhood scale but only typically a larger defined authority area such as a Borough or other equivalent and this does not help in identifying those hidden neighbourhood winners and losers (e.g., Capps 2019; Higgins et al 2014) and how affordable therefore a city truly is. As Higgins et al note, “It is possible that the housing metrics of ‘house price to income ratio’ and ‘affordable dwellings completed as a percentage of all new housing completions’ provide an indication of gentrification pressure when they move in a collectivist
unsustainable direction (i.e., unaffordable housing) and an indication of the relative QoL of each local area when they are considered in raw absolute terms (i.e., actual house price)” (Higgins et al 2014 p. 56). However, the local area defined by Borough analysis only, may show a higher QoL overall than is truly experienced at a neighbourhood level within those Boroughs and it is therefore important to note this when looking at effective and affordable Placemaking strategies with an aim to address and resolve this issue which this thesis will also focus on. There is also a large divide when looking at housing affordability in general between house sales prices versus their private rental prices which in many cases hide another layer of ‘unaffordable’ living to those not able to qualify for affordable housing or able to buy on the housing market and therefore forced into private rental leaving them living on or under the poverty line in many cases (Mee 2002). Again, this is where effective Placemaking strategies must aim to combat this at least in new development and regeneration practice.

Moreover, as Moore and Bunce (2009) noted, the public sector reliance on private investment is such that the issue of affordability is perpetuated in urban regeneration and development affecting the delivery and success of truly sustainable places and neighbourhoods since it creates higher land values leading to more costly developments. This further leads to “unchecked costs, market premiums and un(der)regulated design quality compliance (which) are among a host of concerns, complicating the aspirational intentions of policymakers dependent on the private delivery of the ‘public good’ of sustainability” (p. 601). This causes an imbalance in the provision of truly affordable new development and regeneration since profit and financial viability of such projects is the main driver to these private developers and investors. Having a more sustainable Placemaking policy and strategy that could address this whilst maintaining financial viability, would however redress this imbalance.

Feelings of and real displacement are inevitable when new communities are built to cater primarily for new higher-earning entrants. Attia & Ibrahim (2018) discuss how this displacement can be avoided if public sector control aims to find a solution to keep poorer existing residents; for example, in new regeneration projects by offering them an affordable (typically rented) home in the new development, whereas landowners and developers would typically prefer to pay expropriation compensation costs to achieve higher economic revenues from new ‘gentrified’ entrants to the development. Mee (2002) recognises these complex issues when discussing a particular neighbourhood of Sydney, paying attention to the fact that as general city growth through development and regeneration occurs, issues of affordability and QoL are played out differently in various city areas and need a specific neighbourhood solution to be addressed correctly.

Finally, as Fincher et al (2016) discuss, Placemaking is a highly politicised term which can be used to mask issues of affordability in development and regeneration by distributing or ‘relocating’ poverty (either
existing or soon to be pockets of poverty) to create a social mix that will better serve in an economic sense the developers of the newly developed or regenerated place. Placemaking can be used to mask such affordability issues by also focusing on small scale equitable interventions aimed at shifting focus from the larger scale more necessary interventions required for affordable housing, services, retail, and leisure opportunities. It is important to also not forget the issues that arise with affordability when looking at urban areas with large pockets of ethnic minorities as Montgomery (2016) discusses when looking at plcemaking and pricing out different parts of those communities many of whom are already living below the poverty line. For example, in his study of Detroit "Placemaking increased racial co-presence, but low-income residents had low priority in the planning of amenities for privatised space— for example, they could listen to live music at Campus Martius, but they could not afford its pricey bistro" (p.790). Affordability therefore is not only related to the cost of housing but also the cost of living in an area and being able to have affordable amenities, shops, and services to hand. This issue is of such a magnitude however that it cannot possibly all be studied within this thesis however it is important that it is recognised as being part of the larger problem when looking at development and regeneration and how Placemaking can affect QoL from inception and then as an ongoing process.

2.4 The personal and collective Lived Experience over Time

Both personal and collective long-term memory are important when looking at Placemaking and QoL (Castells 2002, Hall 2006, Montgomery 2016, NEF 2005). Recalling and celebrating (where appropriate) what a place was like and how its community evolved before it is redeveloped or regenerated helps to foster a sense of place attachment and enhance the social capital of such place. For the newcomers to an area (the so-called gentrifiers) a discovery of this through archives, stories and targeted Placemaking activity can also engender a sense of pride in a place and enhance the lived experience within it (Cassidy 2012, Pink 2008, Hall 2006, NEF 2005, Castells 2002). This section will therefore unpack the personal and community aspects of Placemaking and QoL over time, not only what came before but also newer short lived and temporary experiences and their impact on new development and regeneration. The personal aspects of QoL will also include other inter-related terms that similarly define the subjective element of urban living. Pacione (2003) has argued, it is imperative that personal views, are also considered when looking at city quality of life and not only how the city is objectively defined. Moreover, as Alexander (1979) and Talen (1997) explained, this is something that is so intertwined with a person’s state of harmony and happiness within themselves as well as their behaviour that it is important to understand how our urban surroundings affect us all. This is where Placemaking can and should play a significant role, when carried out effectively, in enhancing urban QoL since “quality is not an attribute inherent in the environment but is a behaviour related function of the interaction of environmental characteristics and person characteristics” (Pacione 2003 p20). Placemaking plays the role of facilitating this interaction
between environmental and personal characteristics and can therefore be pivotal in ensuring that new development and regeneration projects offer a high QoL once completed.

Over the past century city quality of life measures and indices as well as issues surrounding methodology have evolved into a deeper understanding of what constitutes urban quality of life although many different approaches have and still are being taken in this regard (Kahn 1994, Tesfazghi et al 2009, Cummins & Gullone 2000, Glaeser et al 2018, Gordon & Travers 2010). Although countless differing studies over the past several decades provide a wealth of resources most do not look at the impact that new development and regeneration have on city quality of life as well as what impact Placemaking activity and interventions within the development and regeneration process have on said QoL. There is of course a question of scale here as some measures of city QoL that are linked to new development are not undertaken at a localised neighbourhood level but only city wide (Zinkernagel et al 2018). Within this context it is also important to look at the interrelated terms associated with city QoL since the literature dealing with those again provides more insight and resources on this issue.

Looking at some of the interrelated terms with QoL, studies such as Hogan et al (2015), Mouratidis (2017) and Pacione (2003) have examined the impact of place on happiness across the lifespan in several major cities, identifying the spatial-temporal nature of subjective perceptions of urban city life. The issues here surrounding even the term happiness is that depending on when a person is asked about their happiness it could be different from one month to the next and even on a weekly basis and that could be linked to place perhaps because of the weather or changeable unpredictable events and/ or areas of one’s life. Lever (1999 p189) also recognised this when he noted that “it has been found that the degree of satisfaction with certain areas of one’s life is one of the most powerful statistical predictors of overall well-being. These areas include family, work, housing, surroundings, recreational activities, and the spiritual dimension, among others”. Other related studies such as Howley et al (2009) again demonstrate the use of such interrelated terms, in this case that of liveability is used when looking at city neighbourhood satisfaction, PQoL and the role those urban planners and designers have in considering these issues to achieve sustainable development and regeneration. When examining changes in perceptions over time when it comes to city neighbourhoods and places it is important to note people’s tendencies especially at the outset of a new development/regeneration project, for example, such as resistance to change as Attia and Ibrahim (2018) discussed when looking at a regeneration project in Rotterdam. They noted that engaging with local people early in the project helped change such resistance over time.

However, what these studies do not fully deal with is the subjective nature of many of these inter-related terms such as Happiness and Life Satisfaction that give a more temporary indication of QoL than is
perhaps necessary to help shape sustainable Placemaking best practice within new urban development and regeneration. Pacione (2003) does attempt to and goes some way in explaining that indeed Placemaking is a longer-term endeavour that cannot alone be shaped by measures based on subjective perceptions of QoL that tend to only take a snapshot in time rather than allow for long term requirements and changes. Therefore, both the objective and subjective nature that PQoL encompasses makes it the most sustainable way of analysing and assessing Placemaking in development and regeneration. This could be achieved through local planning policies and planning obligations such as s106 agreements in the UK for example, however, the aims and objectives must be such that after the development/regeneration project has long been completed the area can continue to have a high quality of life through long-term, sustainable, well-thought-out Placemaking policies and procedures (NEF 2005, Eckenwiler 2016, Healey 1998). This is extremely challenging since “The city image formatted according to an ideal of user and uses loses its heterogeneity, its edge, and the elements of risk, surprise, danger and excitement that derive from non-conformity to suburban middle-class values and norms and from aestheticized environments” (Madureira, 2013 p168). This is not just a developer issue of course but a result of not having such well-thought-out Placemaking policies and procedures that would guide away from the type of decisions where mono-functional building with poor design quality/clone towns predominate.

Only careful, fully integrated consultation with all facets of the community both old and new of all ages will be able to ensure these newly developed/regenerated areas will provide an ongoing high QoL/PQoL from the outset. Far too often it is only the professionals in city planning departments and those working for private developers that make the policy decisions in new development and regeneration and therefore it is their professional/personal vision that is written into these policies. This of course does not represent the rest of or even most of the community that will in the end live and work in these places whose personal perceptions will be paramount when looking at the longevity and QoL there. One recommendation put forward by Wills (2017) would be to “Create a dedicated role or team, such as a neighbourhoods link officer, tasked with auditing existing local neighbourhood groups/organisations and incorporating them into governance structures beyond the traditional consultation processes. The aim would be to require local involvement in all decision-making processes as standard practice” (p72). Such policy issues will be further developed in the following chapter 3.

Moving on to looking at the use of temporary pop ups and installations in placemaking practice Kamvasinou (2015 p187) discusses how there is a need for “reframing urban development as an incremental, organic and collaborative process”. This would enable temporary uses to come and go in a more organic, natural, and useful way. There is also an issue with temporary uses of abandoned spaces and derelict sites and “while shorter-term uses are common, longer temporary uses are more unusual
and relate to a blurred vision of redevelopment resulting from a set of deadlocks” (Andres, 2013 p.759).

When analysing this interplay of time and place, it is not only the temporary realm that the literature points to but also the effects of slowing down city life to help enhance quality of life as Mayer and Knox (2007) highlight in their study on the Slow City Charter. This looks at the (placemaking) interventions such as pedestrianised city centres allowing people to walk, stop and sit in a much more relaxed tempo and is another example of enhancing the longevity of successful places. It is important for longevity of a place to have built in flexibility from the outset. If a placemaking policy, action and/or intervention can be made to be moulded over the long-term use of a place then it can naturally evolve with the communities that helped to shape it in the first place allowing the constant necessary changes required to maintain a high QoL that was aimed for when the place was first developed/regenerated. This flexibility and collaboration in urban planning was discussed by Healey as far back as 1998 yet it is still widely not something that has been achieved which is another reason why this thesis has come about. In fact, the aim of New Urbanism, as far back as the 1980’s, was to provide more public spaces for events and social interaction to foster a greater sense of community and be able to keep this going over time with different events representing different holidays and seasons throughout the years. However, as Talen (1997) noted, providing an actual physical space is not necessarily what can automatically lead to such organised events and strong social ties. Placemaking, by contrast to this, aims to go much further by creating and fostering a collaborative and empowering environment where these places are activated, constantly and evolving with time, on different days of the week/weekends and the seasons, so that many different people can take ownership of and/or take part in organising such events “design space and install an atmosphere” (Tibaud 2014). This is when place attachment and sense of place can truly happen as a desirable outcome in newly developed and/or regenerated areas, especially if some such events can already be held before and during the development process which could also in turn help to counteract some people’s inevitable resistance to change and this thesis aims to shed further light on these aspects.

Temporary placemaking installations and events create different personal experiences at different times to all sorts of local people or those simply working, visiting, or passing through. Richards (2015) and Till & McArdle (2015) both emphasise that the quality of time in places where these temporary events are created help with identity formation, city pride, quality of life, sense of community, social cohesion, and ambition. They both highlight the benefits of and great potential of well-organised events in temporary installations. Moreover, temporary events and installations not only create a sense of place in the present but also help to recall a sense of place from a bygone era, to restore a community spirit or sense of cohesion with workshops, old photos and archives and stories on display (see for example, Cassidy, 2012). It is also worthwhile mentioning that 1st time or one-time visitors only such as tourists will still experience and contribute to placemaking activities and installations and should therefore be included when planning new developments since people all “construct personal narratives of the places they
encounter (and consume) that contribute to their identity creation” (Lew 2017 p. 452). In short not only the permanent communities, although of course they are and should always be the priority, but also temporary communities of people attending and/or visiting a place for an event or other purpose should be welcomed and planned for, such as tourists and visitors alike.

From a private sector perspective, the Savills World Research (2016) and CBRE Global Research (2017) papers highlights the benefits of events in placemaking when developing new places in establishing a sense of place and in turn being able to achieve greater land and sales values than new developments that do not focus on placemaking by making these places more desirable. The speed at which temporary installations and events can be created (and relative low cost) is of paramount importance in development and regeneration projects since these can sometimes last many years and therefore the creation of community and sense of place can be aided in this temporary and seasonal (therefore taking advantage of the weather) way. Of course, what both reports do not focus on is the inevitable issue (discussed in this thesis in detail in the previous section 2.3) of the effects of gentrification and affordability when prices are driven up.

Finally, it is important to note that the personal lived experience over time will only be enhanced if urban planning is truly a collaborative process from the outset as Healey (1998) points out “It is about fostering the institutional capacity to shape the ongoing flow of ‘place-making’ activities in ways which can promote long-term and sustainable improvements to material quality of life and to the sense of identity and well-being of people in places” (p. 1544). Therefore, the next chapter (3) of the literature review will focus on these planning processes and how they aim and should go about achieving this.

2.5 Summary

Although there are only three major themes in this Chapter, many related sub-themes that have been drawn out within these have also been identified which all contribute to Placemaking strategies and activity in development and regeneration practice. The major areas discussed are however all linked together by the fact that without these elements (effective communication, ease of connectivity, affordable housing, services and amenities, flexible short-term and long-term strategies), that are key factors both in Placemaking and QoL discussions, Placemaking and QoL would ultimately fail to achieve their purpose of raising people’s standards of living. Therefore, this thesis aims to connect these themes together by changing notions of how to assess Placemaking and QoL in development and regeneration. To wrap this section up then, firstly, this section dealt with the theme of People, Places and Spaces in the city unpacked some of the main issues stemming from the more objective themes such as accessibility and mix of uses and the suite of tools used in this. The literature that deals with how people interact in
different places and spaces has also been discussed in terms of the more subjective elements such as desirability of certain places and spaces via their sociability and image and their effect on Placemaking practice and PQoL such as the impact that culture, the arts, history, and heritage have on this. Decline was also discussed as a related subtheme to this since Placemaking needs to disrupt and break the cyclical nature of desirability and decline of places.

The next section highlighted issues of Affordability and how the current literature deals with these from a development and regeneration perspective when looking at Placemaking and its effects on QoL. Whilst all of the literature analysed highlighted the need for affordable places it did so from either a private and government perspective or from a local resident or community member perspective without examining how both could come together and provide both an affordable way to deliver great Placemaking in new development and regeneration and also to keep this affordable for the local residents and communities by providing plenty of affordable housing, services and community events and activities. Finally, the last section dealt with the Personal Lived Experience over Time. This included an analysis of the literature dealing with the impact of urban development and regeneration on City QoL over the lifespan and how change impacts this. As a related sub-theme, the other terms associated with QoL and their literature was analysed in an effort not to miss important research due to the interrelated nature of different terms used such as happiness, liveability, life satisfaction and well-being. It was important to note in this section the need to use both objective and subjective indicators to properly assess PQoL and QoL.

Some of the critical questions that have come out of this part of the literature review will be explored via the empirical chapters 5-9; these are:

- How can targeted communication and connectivity within Placemaking activity in development and regeneration enhance PQoL for those living and/or working in these newly developed/regenerated areas?
- Can Placemaking make any area feel “local” regardless of who is experiencing it, and can that enhance PQoL to those experiencing it?
- To what extent does the provision of affordable amenities, goods, services, and housing via Placemaking practice in development/regeneration projects enhance QoL for those living and/or working in such newly developed/regenerated areas?
- Do long-term flexible Placemaking strategies in development/regeneration projects affect PQoL?
- Can temporary/seasonal Placemaking activities in new development/regeneration projects affect PQoL?
The next literature review chapter will look at how these themes can be used to formalise placemaking strategy and city planning processes so that development and regeneration can be better informed from the outset and future proof QoL for all those that will live, work, and visit these newly developed and regenerated areas.
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW PART II: COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBOURHOODS IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will focus on the literature on Placemaking and QoL that has a particular emphasis on urban planning policy and development practice and the formal and informal consultation and participatory planning processes and their implications. The formal processes overall are those generated as a policy requirement whereas the informal ones tend to be those generated by the private sector to elicit a certain result in their favour or those driven by independent community groups. The literature pertaining to the policy aims and objectives of not only local government but also the private sector including private property developers will be investigated and their political and economic agendas will be analysed to ascertain where their policies and practices derive from. How planning and development policy and practice incorporates these or not will be analysed and if and how it is recognised that Placemaking strategy and policy can affect the outcomes, both physical and non-physical, to enhance QoL. The non-physical aspects of these elements that the literature focuses on are investigated, such as the online presence of place and placemaking following on from chapter two and how the internet is both an additional tool from a policy and strategy perspective to enhance a person and communities’ experience of place. The first section – Private and Public Spaces - will explore the current literature surrounding urban neighbourhood studies and the privatisation of public spaces and vice versa – and key issues related to Placemaking and QoL will be analysed. Traditional forms of communication will be explored alongside an emphasis on newer digital methods. The issues and problems surrounding ‘Digital Placemaking’ will be explored as well as social media’s role through the growth and use of Neighbourhood Facebook Groups, local and community Instagram pages and applications such as, Next-Door.

The next section will explore Participatory Community Consultation Practice from the perspective of stakeholder engagement through public policy with a particular focus on the issue of inclusive and exclusive spaces and places. The literature examined will explore how the private sector and specifically private developers deal with this from both a required policy practice but also as part of a specific agenda to rally up support for their planning aims and objectives. The motives behind the consultation practices will be discussed to see if Placemaking strategies are guiding these or not and if not, then how they could. The access to and interest in such consultation by all stakeholders required will also be analysed to ascertain how successful these consultation processes are. The traditional and more modern elements and methods that make up such processes will be discussed such as citizen science and online consultation through formal and informal portals and groups seen through social media and so forth. The
QoL indices will also be analysed as in the previous chapter to determine whether they measure local community engagement practices within their rankings.

Thirdly, the Participatory Community Consultation Practice section will focus on the literature that deals with local government development and regeneration policies and the Placemaking and QoL agendas within these. To better understand this the history of why and how this concept of participation in planning came about will be explored and how it has evolved during better and worse economic climates such as the 2008 recession. The literature will attempt to expose how inclusive and exclusive participation affects PQoL/QoL and how Placemaking practice can contribute to its enhancement. Both the subconscious and more deliberate attempts at participation will be discussed and how effective incentives to encourage people to participate are. As with previous chapters 1 & 2 the online element of participation will be explored, this time looking at what effect anonymity has on this, the added layer of surveillance and potential suspicion that can arise out of this. The last sub-theme in this chapter that will be reviewed is that of community spirit and collective activism and the role Placemaking has in encouraging and establishing this within new development and regeneration and how this can affect neighbourhood PQoL/QoL. This will then naturally flow into the final section in this chapter dealing with Digital Placemaking & Quality of Life Implications. The different literature nuanced focus in this final section will therefore analyse the effectiveness of the community consultation practice since the results of such practice are what matters most. Does the literature show that the online communication and the resulting participation is effective within the planning, development and regeneration processes and does it come from a placemaking and QoL agenda? To explore this the literature discussed will investigate digital stakeholder collaboration and participation and how this affects the actual decision-making process in new development and regeneration projects.

Finally, it is important to note that the overall theme linking all the sub-themes in this section is the cyclical nature of places and Placemaking since it is an ongoing process that needs to be achieved not only at the outset in the planning of new development and regeneration projects or there will be inevitable decline. However, the focus here is just on development and regeneration in the hope that if done correctly at the outset it will bring about a quality of self-renewal to each of those areas and bring wider benefits to other local areas as well as best practice examples to take on board. Therefore, policy and local government’s attempts to incorporate an element of true flexibility to allow for this will be looked at. This section will conclude the review of the literature pertaining to Placemaking practice within planning, development, and regeneration and QoL studies. It will have covered all different areas of the literature that deals with all these elements together or a combination of two or more to determine the links within leading research in this field. It will not be and does not attempt to be an exhaustive review of all the literature on each of the separate elements that make up this research focus since the key aim
of this thesis is to embed a single thread linking all these elements into a cohesive whole to enhance PQoL/QoL through Placemaking best practice in the planning, development, and regeneration process.

3.2 Defining the Local through Private and Public Spaces

As can be seen from the above image of Rathbone Square in London, the privatisation of public spaces is a recognised, contentious, and hotly debated topic in cities worldwide that comes with many issues surrounding responsibilities, regulations, rights, and ramifications (Carmona 2021, Lepofsky & Fraser 2003, Montgomery 2016). The image shows on the right-hand side the public entrance and exit at the far end of this privately owned public square that was completed at the same time as the new development that can be seen pictured in the image. On the left-hand side of the image however you see the rules and regulations that such privately owned public square imposes on the persons using it and passing through it. Hand in glove with this however, we also have and continue to experience a “publicisation” of private spaces that the same image above demonstrates which brings about some similar and other issues albeit from a different standing point. This can have the “potential for very significant public gain when handled correctly” (Carmona 2021 p15). Sitting in between these issues is also the growing use of illegal live-work spaces that blur the lines between private use and enjoyment of private property and the public use and enjoyment of things such as artists workshops and events and sales and services going on either behind closed doors or in private open areas. All these issues bring about a political economy of place particularly when looking at development and regeneration projects (Lepofsky & Fraser 2003, Harris 2011). In all this it is imperative that the local connection and identity is maintained in these private and public spaces regardless of ownership and size or there will be less buy in and ongoing use from the outset with the communities living, working, and visiting them. These spaces must attract people to visit, use and spend time in them much like “the oldest public open spaces in the city (which)are quite
important for both developing of urban memory and bringing together different social and ethnic groups” (Karacor 2016 p56). There is a way of being able to evoke the same identity as these old much-loved spaces if new development and regeneration projects are planned correctly from the outset and the public spaces are designed with this in mind notwithstanding their ownership.

Effective Placemaking practice can help to guide these issues to ensure that development and regeneration projects are not plagued by and do not incur the wrath or just sheer disinterest (if they are boring sterile spaces) of the public and local stakeholders by privatising spaces (possibly even formerly used and enjoyed publicly by all) only to be used by elite and wealthier minorities (such as introducing only expensive shops, restaurants and exclusive venues and events) as is often the criticism (Montgomery 2016). Something that is “rarely voiced publicly, but articulated privately by certain development interests, a counter argument claims that the privatisation of public space is often desirable and should be welcomed” (Carmona 2021 p8). Increasingly, new development and regeneration projects have managed to incorporate privately owned public spaces that are loved by most users, and this is something that exemplary placemaking is able to achieve for the benefit and enhanced QoL/PQoL of those it reaches. The issue here is of course that this is done project by project and not often able to be directed on a city-wide/urban area which can affect the quality, responsibilities, regulations, rights, and ramifications that is developed/regenerated in each place. This can result in some instances in less than desirable public spaces regardless of ownership (Moore & Bunce 2009, Bechtel & Churchman 2002, Shaw & Montana 2014). If public city-wide/local administrative authority all had tried, tested, and agreed placemaking policies for the development and regeneration of such spaces that were always required to be implemented then each project could benefit the local stakeholders equally regardless of where they are and who they are owned by.

The obvious pitfalls of city/urban administrative authorities not having the type of placemaking policies that govern how private-public spaces are developed/regenerated is that not only will there be inevitable inequalities in some or indeed many of them, but their ongoing management will suffer, and even bigger issues could develop further down the line affecting the QoL of those using, living and/or working in such places. It is great that for example there is a voluntary local charter at Nine Elms in London between the 5 different private owners governing the development and ongoing use of their shared public spaces where they have agreed on and drafted a text to safeguard all public and private stakeholder interests. However, this does not mean that it would necessarily always work as it is only voluntary, but also even if it does it would then be a shame that another similar place would not have to comply with these measures and again could choose not to follow such good examples. There is also the ever-growing concern that the privatisation of public spaces brings about undesirable side effects such as the presence of private security guards enforcing limited rights of entry and use leading to the gradual erosion of the
public’s democratic freedoms to public open spaces. The Guardian newspaper for example ran a few stories on this very subject in the past several years such as Garrett B’s 2017 article entitled “These Squares are our Squares, Be Angry about the Privatisation of Public Space”. Having placemaking policy that dealt with these issues would mean that in theory these problems would not arise and the benefits of feelings safer thanks to security guards and/or cameras being present would minimise any sense of a loss of freedom through being constantly watched and monitored.

In some ways the more expensive and exclusive and profitable a development or regeneration project is the more likely it is that the quality of the privately owned public spaces will be of a high standard and exemplary but the issue with this is again they may not necessarily be affordable and inclusive, and the less profitable cheaper projects may forgo altogether much needed quality public spaces. Often “private corporations and institutions own the buildings where the cross-block atria are housed; they also own and manage the spaces themselves. Just as the overall quality of the building affects its property value, so does the quality of the bonus space. Therefore, management practices are adopted to maintain that quality and protect the property value” (Huang & Franck 2018 p509). Top-down placemaking policy would address these issues and be able to balance them out through well thought out processes that would provide the less profitable cheaper projects with financial and/or incentivised aid to go specifically to creating quality public spaces and enforces inclusiveness on the more profitable expensive projects’ public spaces. These issues are of course also linked to gentrification which is examined in greater detail in the previous chapter 2.3. Suffice it to say that the profitability and affordability issues surrounding new development and regeneration and the private ownership of the public realm can lead to feelings of displacement of facets of the community that are not wealthy enough to be the incoming ‘gentrifiers’ and therefore feel that the local area is lost or of no worth and use to them (Garrett 2017, Moore & Bunce 2009, Montgomery 2016).

Increasingly, public urban spaces be they privately owned or not must be planned and developed with climate and disaster adaptation practice at the fore to create resilient and sustainable places and communities therefore expelling or at least greatly minimising local risks brought about by water, sun, wind, and/or ground conditions. The local context is a key factor in the planning and development of these practices and measures and the issue of private or public ownership should in no way affect this important and key aspect of placemaking best practice. Indeed, it is imperative that “community engagement must happen from the beginning and continue after the project is finished. As placemaking experts have noted for years” (Peinhardt 2021 p42). People will feel secure in these newly developed/regenerated public areas if they are aware of and know about the safety measures and protocols in place for climate and/or disaster events that could possibly take place such as floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes for example. Therefore, these measures and protocols need to be
incorporated at the planning stage through effective placemaking practice to find ways to involve the local community in their development. This placemaking practice is a sensitive process since “expectation is a factor that is associated to both the built environment and human environment, due to the relationship between a person’s preconceived anticipation and what they experience in a given space. Naturally, if a person expects to have the ability to ‘hide’ from intense sun exposure or higher temperatures, tolerance levels are decreased” (Nouri & Pedro Costa 2017 p364). This is another reason why placemaking plays such a crucial role in the planning, creation, and subsequent management of public spaces.

It is also briefly worth noting the value of private and public online spaces since, and as will be examined more in depth in chapter 3.4 on Digital Placemaking, many people and communities interact digitally through the planning and placemaking process of new development and regeneration projects (Cilliers & Timmermans 2014, de Lange & de Waal 2013, Brunnberg & Frigo 2012). As above there is value in either their private nature, such as closed Facebook Groups for example and the Nextdoor app or their public nature such as open Facebook Groups and Instagram pages (Kurwa 2019, Roos 2018). As with the physical spaces striking a balance in how these online spaces are created and managed for the benefit of all and therefore a high quality and accessible public online space should always be available for those who seek it or prefer it as well as the physical access to free computers and/or tablets to use in public buildings and libraries for those without personal private ownership of these (Belk 2013, Cassidy 2012).

In conclusion then as very aptly summarised by Carmona (2021 p28) “In the post coronavirus world, property investors will have to work even harder to attract clients to their developments and key amongst the amenities on offer will be (high quality) privately owned and managed public spaces”. Therefore, regardless and despite the ownership status of public spaces these will have to be planned, regulated, and developed, through placemaking best practice and policy, in a way that benefits all members of the communities they serve with the enhancement of their Quality of Life at the forefront of their agenda.

3.3 Participatory Community Consultation Practice

Section 3.2 discussed the broader academic literature on private and public spaces within placemaking, development and regeneration. Communication and connectivity and stakeholder engagement will be analysed in this section with regards to how inclusive or exclusive this makes spaces and places and how the literature deals with these topics considering local government development and regeneration policies and the Placemaking and QoL agendas. More broadly, Cilliers and Timmermans (2014) discussed 5 different participatory communication tools of which only 1 was based online, the workbench
interactive method. The other methods consisted of guerrilla gardening, extreme experience, meet my street and creative techniques - all tools that required people gathering in person even for short periods of time only to learn new skills, talk about their place and/or work together on local gardening projects etc. These tools highlight the need for face-to-face communication to enhance social capital and local connections. That is why even in some of the newest developed/developing large neighbourhoods one can still find printed copies of free local newspapers and magazines either home delivered or stocked in public places.

When analysing the literature devoted to communication and connectivity within urban Placemaking, several traditional methods of communication are evident. Looking at the traditional methods of communicating and connecting with city neighbourhoods in Placemaking practice, physical signage, advertising, news in print form, face-to-face contact, and citizen science as Nursey-Bray (2020) has advocated are all ways of engaging with individuals more meaningfully but also of ensuring that those without internet access have the necessary means to communicate effectively. For example, Ellery & Ellery (2019) highlighted the importance of effective signage when discussing the reactivation of Congress Square Park, Portland, in the early 2000’s so that the “general public could write on all (the physical boards & signs) to share their aspirations for the park’s future” (p. 241). Nursey-Bray (2020) very aptly presents and discusses the whole array of community engagement tools within Placemaking and their various benefits and pitfalls and highlights the need to engage citizens fully using the most appropriate strategies for a particular place and community.

The issue here, however, is that such studies typically only look at elements of more accidental Placemaking attempts and do not look at the PQoL effects on the communities involved. Moreover, Williamson & Ruming’s (2019) findings on an online city-wide campaign on participation did not delve into the perceptions of the communities that were engaged with this process and therefore did not analyse the in-depth dialogue that may have arisen because of this between individuals or groups in the local communities either through private online and/or face-to-face communication. The importance of this is that for communication and connectivity to be a successful element in the Placemaking process that enhances people’s QoL it is imperative that communities feel empowered, informed, and able to contribute and participate. As Palermo & Ponzini (2015) have further stressed it is important to use effective participatory methods from the outset in the planning and design stages. Overall, the academic literature devoted to effective communication and connectivity in Placemaking and its effects on QoL in development and regeneration is sparse and although there is a plethora of literature that looks at elements of this even with the most relevant of these publications it is debatable how they all link together in the way this study is looking at them.
The final element is the ‘local’ connection and how effective communication and connectivity help to define this. As the literature shows it is not only essential to communicate effectively with the community but building a sense of place and a sense of community especially in new development and regeneration is predicated on the ‘local’ factor and that means engaging with all the different affected communities as well such as existing residents, shop owners and possible incomers (Ng 2005, Hemphill et al. 2004, Lida & Timmermans 2017). Communities need to feel connected and not just be able to communicate effectively and therefore Placemaking needs to “offer the opportunities for sustained engagement that facilitates a deep connection to place” (Has & Hernandez-Santin 2020 p. 94). This deep connection to place among other things includes identity and this has a history as well as a present and future state. Oakley and Johnson (2013) and Cassidy (2012) describe this connection to place as being rooted in ongoing traditions and memories passed on through the generations of previous local communities to the present-day citizen, resident or not. This deep connection can be built through development and regeneration also by linking the connectivity of place through time, the roots of a place, its past, present, and future vision. This is an important element that must be communicated correctly and early in the development and regeneration process. Creative Placemaking can “embody, embrace, and express the soul of the place...contributing tangibly and powerfully to energising and animating neighbourhoods” (Hecht 2016 p. 6). Within local neighbourhood regeneration areas as well as new development areas, “developing a context within which there is sufficient appreciation, trust and communicative skill for different stakeholders to find their ‘voice’ and ‘listen’ to each other involves not merely careful design of specific communication arenas”, but also a “rich social infrastructure of positive relationships between governance, citizens, and companies” (Healey 1997 p. 1540).

It is important for successful participatory communication to occur that we begin “reframing urban development as an incremental, organic and collaborative process” (Kamvasinou 2015). Healey (1998) describes how Placemaking came to the fore in the planning debates during the 1970s where there was an "increasing realisation of the need for ‘consultation’ and ‘participation’ with the ‘public’" (Healey 1998 p.1537). It has since become important to developing and regenerating areas to secure as much buy-in as possible through early and effective participation that produces the best possible outcome so that all benefit from an enhanced PQoL/QoL. For example, recently published Living with Beauty report in England by the Building Better Building Beautiful Commission (2020) does go some way into advocating and encouraging a co-design process to build community spirit however it does not truly provide a framework of how urban areas can with the correct steps and actions achieve this. Not nearly enough best practice examples of how to achieve this have come about, however many have because of the most recent recession of 2008 since opportunities arose to encourage and activate places that were previously more profitable as private commercial or residential spaces and were then reimagined for community and more affordable uses thanks to effective participatory consultation processes (Shaw 2013 &
Kamvasinou 2015). “The most recent narrative...making use of the economic slowdown to introduce forms and practices...that until then were excluded, through a more participatory process than was previously the case” (Shaw 2013 p.2174).

Placemaking best practice therefore has at times arisen as a problem-solving exercise when economic profitability is not the key driver anymore and there is not enough academic literature that shows how this can be achieved not only through economic downturns but also in a buoyant economic climate. Such participatory processes are important as ways of finding creative and imaginative solutions if not permanently then as legitimate temporary community facilities and services that benefit the collective whole. The constraints that planning systems pose to this is that some lack the successful placemaking processes required for this to take place as Robin (2018) discusses when looking at the use of outline planning permissions as a way of circumventing meaningful participatory communication with local communities. "The very fact that principles of community participation and co-creation were so starkly absent in our research sites led us to question the deployment of placemaking by developers, planners, and governments in urban renewal programmes. Place-making in this context was language without deeds" (Fincher et al 2016 p.4). Ellery & Ellery (2019) do discuss in detail how participatory approaches can lead to citizen power and strong community engagement and there is a rich academic history of literature on this such as Arnstein’s 8 levels of participation (1969). However, in planning practice it is often difficult to see evidence of how these approaches have contributed to PQuL/QoL in new development and regeneration.

In more general terms, Pink (2008) discussed how collective participation in placemaking is more than just a conscious act that is pre-determined as a process to follow but also a sub-conscious act of togetherness and oneness as a community in a place even just the simple act of eating or walking together. This is important to note since it could with further analysis and definition of how to use such subconscious acts as inspiration for practice guidance and be one of the keys needed to unlock affordable and implementable placemaking strategies during buoyant economic times as well as downturns. Of course, whether this participatory communication is indeed conscious or subconscious it requires the “tools necessary to facilitate the ability for individuals to arrange shared information” (Brunnberg & Frigo 2021 p.123). Fincher et al (2016) emphasise that Placemaking professionals do have the tools necessary to implement such participatory communication however without the collaboration of all stakeholders this is simply not possible. At times engagement becomes difficult because of the rigidity of the planning system where “some parts of the planning process are highly technical and do not lend themselves to high levels of engagement and control” (Baker et al 2007 p.82) whilst conversely, as Kjartansdottir (2014) points out “participation in planning is often under too much control of the existing system and planning structure” (p.7). However, it is important to note that effective Placemaking strategy can help to provide
a framework within which the appropriate stakeholder engagement takes place at the appropriate stages of the formal planning and development processes.

Martin (2003) discusses collective neighbourhood activism as a form of placemaking to not only solve issues and problems that certain communities face and therefore form groups to tackle, but also to engage such communities on new policies and outcomes that would affect them all. It is important to note that in the context of urban development there may not always be active communities for every planning application site (such as on previously unused derelict industrial wasteland) and therefore it is important to engender and foster sustainable and achievable placemaking practices that would enable such participatory action for communities that can perhaps identify with such sites from memories and recollections. Co-Design Studio and The Neighbourhood project emphasise this by trying to suggest practical ways to get communities to participate, they go on to say that “It is important to provide some incentive to encourage participation and show you value input from the community” (Co-Design Studio & The Neighbourhood Project 2019 p.72). This is yet another sub-theme that can contribute to providing an effective solution that could enhance PQoL. Mouratidis (2017) and Hes & Hernandez-Santin (2020) do touch on elements of this however the link to effective placemaking practice as one way to enhance PQoL, or subjective well-being as Mouratidis describes it, is not explored fully.

As Williamson & Ruming (2019) & Robin (2018) discuss, there is a serious issue that real and meaningful stakeholder engagement is often pushed aside in favour of place marketing and branding activities although of course there are also many good examples of where engagement has worked well. All development and regeneration projects should however work well not just leading examples whilst many others continue to raise real issues of disengagement and are set up to eventually fail their communities. These issues are caused by the fact that many City administrations are under considerable pressure to engage with their communities and often do so at times superficially not only to comply quickly and efficiently but also to serve other economic and political agendas they may have at the same time, “the use of outline planning application...challenged community groups engagement, contributing to de-politicise the decision making process and limiting potential opposition to the scheme, while supporting the developer (and its investors) financial expectations” (Robin 2018 p.10). Moreover, private developers may use the guise of placemaking activities to push their development agendas further, ultimately for economic purposes such as raising the value of their developments (Robin 2018 & Savills World Research 2016). For truly sustainable neighbourhood development to take place effective public engagement is therefore key (Cilliers & Timmermans 2014, Alvarez et al 2015). This issue however is not fully explored in existing academic literature when looking at how this can and is resolved in some communities through effective and beneficial placemaking practice that has at its core aim the enhancement of QoL.
Stakeholder engagement needs to be inclusive and involve everyone in the community in a productive reciprocal process “the practice of placemaking is an inclusive and community-driven approach for the design of human spaces... quality of place also depends, to a great extent, on intangible qualities. The art of placemaking values not only the physical but also the social and even the spiritual qualities of a place” (Brunnberg & Frigo 2012). It can be both a top-down and a bottom-up approach and should be approached as such to be truly effective and worthwhile. It must also bring all local stakeholders together therefore not excluding any representative group of the community (NEF 2005, Wills 2017). The general academic consensus is that inclusive consultation can and does happen when the balance of power between local government and communities is more equitable (Woolrich & Sixsmith 2013, Lepofsky & Fraser 2003, Palermo & Ponzini 2015). Here, “local involvement highlights the need to mobilise extant communities, realising the skills and expertise of local residents so that they can play an active role in the place-making process shifting power away from central government to local communities, citizens and independent providers” (Woolrich & Sixsmith 2013 p.218). A great example of an inclusive engagement tool was introduced by the government in the Netherlands in 2005 in collaboration with Habiforum called the Workbench Method to facilitate a creative and inclusive planning process (Cilliers & Timmermans 2014). Figure 4 demonstrates the cyclical stakeholder engagement method that takes the different subjective spatial qualities of a place as experienced by the various parties involved (residents, professionals etc) and provides a development process that can incorporate these all from an initial phase to a vision that can be executed and finally be experienced for the benefit of all.

![Figure 4: The Workbench Method, Cilliers & Timmermans, 2014](image-url)
This approach is not only flexible and adaptable meaning it will always be inclusive and accessible, but it also provides a road map for communities to work together with authorities to ensure continuous participation and provide structure whilst building social capital. This can be built upon to include for capacity building something which Weissenborn et al. (2020) discuss in their report which argues that “when developing a place vision, councils and developers must consider how the vision can support the gradual development, and progressive in-sourcing, of skills into the community over time” (p.8).

Placemaking can then actively engage with the community in a way that can also consider employment and skills in the development phase by implementing such strategies at the outset and involving and including all demographics but also the appropriate needs of the specific place it will be developing/regenerating.

Conversely, as a process it can become exclusive when a lack of accessibility and procedural bureaucracy do not allow many disadvantaged and/or disengaged members of the community to participate. It is difficult to include these disengaged members of the community since they are more likely to not be interested in being involved regardless of the incentives, they are provided with however apathy is not a valid argument and there is a real need to find a way to engage these hard-to-reach groups which is where Placemaking can help to do so. Placemaking must therefore use effective strategies to at least engage a proportion of these people. Some methods discussed by Cassidy (2012) for example can bring communities back to a time that had been long forgotten but brings about fond memories for them using say digital archives such as old photos that recall the community as it once was, using material culture as a living museum and a way to entice more engagement.

For stakeholder community consultation to be inclusive it must use all the tools available in tandem, both traditional tools such as those discussed in a previous section 3.2 as well as more recent social media tools that will be discussed in the next section 3.4 (Cilliers & Timmermans 2014, Masden et al. 2014, Xerez & Fonseca 2011, Baborska-Narosni et al. 2016, 2017). There is also of course the issue that hard to reach communities are such because they don’t speak the local language well or at all and translation and funding for such in this case is important.

When planning policies enforce community consultation in their processes the result is often that of minimal compliance done as a tick box exercise to gain a planning permission rather than as an opportunity to make a difference to a new community’s QoL but also to enhance the value (economic and social) of new developments (Lepofsky & Fraser 2003, Hakansson 2017). When carried out in the spirit of minimal compliance engagement and consultation at best becomes an exclusive process that only benefits specific facets of the communities it serves. Much of the time it is the more privileged, wealthier, and more educated, giving a disproportionately important voice to professionals and higher earners, potential ‘gentrifiers’ who will benefit from the development (Robin 2018, Capps 2019, Jacobs 1961, Lepofsky & Fraser 2003). It is important to encourage best practice within placemaking processes.
that allow for organic and valuable community consultation. Pink (2008) suggested some ways of seeing this as more of an organic process by discussing “collective imagination” as “entangled individual imaginations, inspired by the same verbal discourses, written texts, phenomenological contexts and material reality” (p.183). Although some academic literature explores this issue, it is not fully analysed to the extent that it provides enough resource for successful and implementable community consultation placemaking practice.

It is also important to note that with regards to PQoL and QoL this concept is very much under-researched and even when looking at the world city QoL indices there is no measure of say level of satisfaction with political stakeholder engagement in cities so no way of tapping into such data. This thesis aims to also deal with this issue when looking at this being an integral part of the Placemaking process to go some way in enhancing people’s PQoL/QoL. Fahy & Cinneide (2006) argued that a more participatory democracy and governance would allow for more targeted and relevant quality of life indicators and emphasised the need to establish these on a neighbourhood wide scale not just a city one. Effective Placemaking strategy in development and regeneration could go some way in being able to capture and measure this at a more granular level. The importance of reciprocal opportunities for at least as much bottom-up community consultation as top-down processes would mean that the necessary in-depth communication could potentially be achieved. New approaches to citizen science are also another way of achieving this although much more time consuming and resource intensive (Nursey-Bray 2020). For example, de Lange and de Waal (2013) discussed how “citizen science offers specific advantages in building placemaking by engaging citizens in an active way and giving them ownership of the issue at hand” (p.95). More academic studies should analyse Placemaking processes that emphasise and demonstrate realistic ways of achieving these reciprocal opportunities within community consultation practice with the goal of enhancing QoL.

In concluding, it is important to understand that although much academic discourse is devoted to participatory communication it is not yet fully explored in the context of urban development and placemaking practice with the aim of enhancing QoL. Indeed, there is a stark difference between effective consultation and effective participation as demonstrated in these chapters, the two elements combined being the goal of exemplary Placemaking best practice in new development and regeneration projects. It is therefore still a developing concept worthy of more research being devoted to it.
3.4 Digital Placemaking & Quality of Life Implications

As Crang and Graham (2007) noted, the rise in electronic media in cities also creates the potential for a multitude of issues and problems and not just benefits relating to its use, interpretation, efficiency, and effectiveness. This is important to note when looking at social media and its use within Placemaking and QoL discourses and goes some way in explaining the more sparing attempts at academic analysis. However, there have been findings relating to the effectiveness of Social Media Facebook groups for example in bringing communities in new or marginalised urban developments together by giving them a means to meet and communicate online whereas they may not have had other easy deliberate opportunities without such groups (Baborska-Narosni et al 2017). Moreover, Chan (2014) discusses how multimodal connectedness contributes and/or affects QoL by examining relationships in a highly urbanised city environment as multimodal communication is more prevalent here. It is important to keep this in mind when analysing the literature in this context since such communication and connectivity is highly relevant and of such importance in dense city environments where the urban population is extremely multifaceted and intermingled with strangers all passing each other by or staying in one place.

The above-mentioned form of ‘Digital Placemaking’ can, if not communicated effectively, give rise to a sense of ‘Placelessness’ - a term coined by Edward Relph in 1976 to refer to a disengagement and disassociation with any sort of place - where the online urban dialogue gets lost and does not engage properly with the local area it is aiming to connect with. Studies as far back as Wirth (1938) and Fischer (1973) found that in dense urban environments people were already likely to transcend space and choose their social bonds outside the local area due to the relative ease of doing so or their specific interests “in the face of the disappearance of the territorial unit as a basis of social solidarity we create interest units” (Wirth 1938 p.23). Therefore, it is important for Placemaking strategy to be engaging and inclusive to encourage social ties within new development and regeneration areas for them to provide a good QoL/PQoL although Fischer (1972) noted that "interclass mobility disrupts primary relationships and social cohesion (p.200) meaning that Placemaking needs to be able to also transcend space to achieve all its goals. An example of such urban anomie or Placelessness can be seen with the recent rise of the Pokémon Go app and crowdsourced data where one could argue that people mindlessly navigate their way through urban places without truly connecting with them or communicating with others.

However, “Contemporary Placemaking is by necessity ‘digital’ due to the ubiquity of smartphone and the Internet, but it will continue to also demand skilful deployment of traditional Placemaking methods” (Toland et al. 2020 p.271). This instant connectivity therefore poses some threats that Placemaking best practice can combat and turn to an advantage as “the use of smartphones, social media and the Internet is thoroughly integrated into how we communicate, schedule and occupy our time, and navigate through
the contemporary city” (Toland et al. 2020 p.263). Some of these advantages can be seen with geo-referencing and geo-tagging of photos and locations of interest that are inclusive to all members of society who are then able to get to know an area of the city better and therefore communicate and connect in a more meaningful, in-depth way. However, the big question here of course is what happens to those who don’t have or want a mobile phone and issues of inclusiveness as well as data privacy and problems with using these platforms as crime prevention tools which is the longstanding digital divide question when looking at places and social interaction (Ehn & Linde, 2004).

As Wortham-Galvin (2008 p36) noted “as the world becomes more mediated by the ubiquity of the scrims of digital visual communication, Placemaking will depend ever more on the interdependence of the physical and the mental- of the made and the imagined”. It is therefore imperative in todays saturated online society that communication is multi-faceted and conducted always and simultaneously on multiple platforms including the time-consuming but necessary face-to-face element. Although ease of and effective communication and a feeling of connectedness to a place is essential to QoL, a dichotomy of this is that sole reliance on online communication and connections can have adverse effects to QoL (Leung & Lee 2004). There is no denying that social media is a powerful tool when used correctly in using and gauging online community communication for policy purposes in development and regeneration decision making. People’s likes and dislikes pertaining to a place can be easily collected and used in informing Placemaking actions as Moat and Preis (2017) conclude. Williamson & Ruming (2019) also found that the chosen online communication platform was being used for non-local purposes to activate and engage different communities with different attempts (not Placemaking for example) for mass participation against a recent city cycleway plan. Although any engagement and communication are commendable when looking at Placemaking for development and regeneration of a local area this kind of side project mass communication is unhelpful in defining and nurturing a local community in a specific place. This is also why a city-wide campaign will not be as effective as a targeted neighbourhood wide campaign when looking at urban Placemaking in development and regeneration since “quantitative data, readily available to the municipal authority...do not include the more general liveability and quality of life issues associated with urban areas” (Fahy & Cinneide, 2006 p. 692).

Further to the above is the necessity for such communication and connectivity to be able to be carried out with ease whether physically or online to be truly effective. Online, a balance needs to be struck between fresh new platforms specifically set up for neighbourhood communities such as the Next-Door App and more established social media platforms such as Facebook for example. Baborska-Narosni et al (2017) and Masden et al (2014) look at Facebook and Next-Door respectively and explore the efficacy of these platforms and their potential for mass-exposure which are both important for Placemaking to be inclusive and reach out and engage with the community as much as possible. The Next-Door app is
specifically used for neighbourhood engagement and therefore although purpose-built it could alienate people that do not already have the app and would not be interested in adding yet another separate online account to a long list of potential new apps (Kurwa 2019, Sullivan 2018, Masden et al 2014). Moreover, the Next-Door app could also potentially alienate parts of the community by having to provide proof of residency and creating boundaries that do not resonate with all people in the neighbourhood communities (Kurwa 2019, Roos 2018, Masden et al 2014). Although less formal, the pre-existing platforms such as Facebook can be seen as more inclusive by comparison to this since they do not place such restrictions at least on open groups and pages on their platform. However, this technology along with a personal connection built up via Placemaking and other efforts and activity can be an effective way to connect neighbourhoods and communities together (Sullivan 2018).

Another way of exploring inclusive stakeholder engagement in the development and regeneration process was considered by de Lange and de Waal (2013) and Yigitcanlar (2015) when looking at alternatives to the SMART city discourse. They argue that the issue of ‘ownership’ creates a “collective sense of responsibility and offers a fresh take on existing models for citizen engagement”. They discuss how ‘community informatics’ and ‘networked publics’ can convene around a shared matter of concern and provide a ‘data commons’ which can serve to manage collective action. This is something that has been explored in some cities such as the Noorderparkbar (www.noorderparkbar.nl) in Amsterdam however it is certainly not commonplace in local authorities through planning policy and action for development and regeneration practice. They also discuss how neighbourhood buildings and infrastructures can be crowdfunded and built with second-hand and/or discarded materials with the aid of social media and the appropriate Placemaking initiatives to also organise and mobilise temporary uses through collective will. In short, this is something to be explored as it is still relatively rare. This thesis will aim to contribute to this discussion through the case study empirical chapters.

A theme that has been prevalent throughout this literature review is how social media platforms can aid in this participatory process. They are, of course, additional ways for communities to collectively participate in quick, easy, and cheap debate and discussion either anonymously or not, and Apps such as Nextdoor, make it so that one must be eligible or invited to participate on criteria such as being physical residents of a defined area. Masden et al (2014) discuss the issues that arise through such conditions since it can create divides that Placemaking would want to avoid so it is not always conducive to enhancing PQoL/QoL. “Nextdoor also creates boundaries between communities, which may or may not align with how community residents themselves see these boundaries” (Masden et al 2014 p.3). Moreover, these applications create other issues of exclusion through surveillance of others (and therefore possible suspicion and bad feelings) who may not even be using the application and/or creating a socio-economic divide between those who do not have the means or the time to join (Kurwa 2019).
Baborska-Narosni et al (2016 & 2017) discuss some of these issues but do not tie them to placemaking practice to enhance QoL. The next steps would be to explore these issues from such a perspective. It is also important to note that recent research into these online apps such as “Nextdoor shows a disproportionate percentage of white residents online when compared to the geographical percentages” (Patton, 2019 p.39) and therefore Placemaking best practice could help to minimise this by creating a mixed and balanced community both on and offline. Cassidy (2012) discussed how participatory community activities could enhance community spirit through a sort of collective activism where the community takes ownership of a project and turns it into their own and in doing so can aid in enhancing PQoL which is something that would merit further research.

In concluding therefore, to social media tools Bonson et al (2014) examined stakeholder engagement on Government Facebook sites and found that “among all the available Social Media, Facebook offers the clearest possibilities for more sustained interaction between citizens and their local authority” (abstract). However, one community consultation tool does not replace another fully as each of them capture a different part of society and/or depth of engagement and when used as a suite of complementary tools within placemaking best practice should enhance QoL. “The appearance of social media has introduced another potential channel to facilitate engagement with citizens in government urban planning processes” (Williamson & Ruming 2019 p.5). Moreover, Leung & Lee (2004) found that QoL would be enhanced if people relied on more than just online communication and connections and therefore placemaking must ensure that traditional methods are always provided and available in tandem with online tools.

3.5 Summary

This final chapter of the literature review has dealt with the last three major themes overarching this thesis although many sub-themes and other related issues have also been briefly reviewed as they form part of the discourse behind the effects of Placemaking on PQoL/QoL in new development and regeneration. Defining the Local through Private and Public Spaces discussed how stakeholders within placemaking, development and regeneration deal with the issues surrounding the privatisation of the public realm and perceptions with regards to these issues are discussed. Next Participatory Community Consultation Practice was analysed with a specific focus on stakeholder engagement and how the literature deals with this when looking at Placemaking practice in urban development and QoL discourse. Moreover, the literature reviewed also highlighted the issues with ensuring that a most diverse mix of people are both willing and able to participate and how Placemaking can help to achieve this. The literature herewith has also reviewed how the most recent global recession of 2008 brought about Placemaking opportunities of true participatory communication and practice due in the most part to the
economic downturn and the opportunities that brought about for Placemaking to be used in a problem-solving capacity. The purpose behind such consultation was reviewed since it is key to understand the meaningfulness of local government and private developers’ engagement to ascertain its potential impact and effectiveness. If the purpose was more a place marketing and branding exercise for financial gain and/or to elicit a planning permission, then the effects of such activities have been highlighted as less effective than having a more long-term sustainable view.

The third theme that ends this review of Digital Placemaking deals with how the literature analyses the effectiveness of above-mentioned stakeholder engagement and community consultation from such social media and its participatory strengths and weaknesses have been discussed. In this section the potential of online communication tools was highlighted through demonstrating that existing literature does recognise this however there is little published research that specifically looks at this within the Placemaking function through a development and regeneration practice perspective and moreover links this to being able to enhance QoL. Another important issue is ensuring that the online data collected is of good quality and not just superficial quantitative or irrelevant pieces of information such as Williamson & Ruming (2019) found in their research when nonlocal people were using a specific local online platform for non-local or irrelevant communication. This is clearly an undesirable outcome of open online platforms as they can be difficult to police and keep relevant and on track. This same research found that city wide campaigns were therefore not as effective as targeted neighbourhood campaigns where communication could be kept more relevant with people connected more locally to each other. Finally, it was noted through the literature that ease of accessibility to placemaking communication platforms is of key importance as well as making sure they instil a sense of trust in their users. This thesis therefore aims to carry out a cohesive analysis through the case studies presented as part of a co-ordinated approach.

In short it is important to note that these practices are vital for successful development and regeneration to take place since “such transitions are seldom easy or smooth; economic, social and cultural communities are disrupted and transformed in the process” (Pratt 2008 p.1042).

To be able to answer the more general critical questions that this thesis aims to address, the literature review brought about the questions below:

1. What exactly is Placemaking to city authorities and stakeholders and how can it be implemented in new development and regeneration projects?
2. How can local governments and private developers truly consult and engage with all stakeholders, be it residents, workers and even visitors?
3. How effective is online and physical communication within Placemaking for development and regeneration in enhancing people’s PQoL?

4. Finally, how can such consultation and engagement bring about meaningful diverse and representative participation that is then utilised in the decision-making process for new development and regeneration projects?

The literature review chapters have brought to the fore several critical questions that this research will address namely:

1. How can Placemaking practice provide appropriate and targeted communication and connectivity in a new development/regeneration project that can truly contribute to people’s PQoL/QoL?

2. How can such Placemaking practice ensure that new development and regeneration projects provide affordable living, working and leisure environments including housing, services, and facilities?

3. How can Placemaking practice ensure the longevity of such measures once these new development and regeneration projects have been completed to continue to maintain and enhance people’s PQoL/QoL?

Finally, this thesis aims to contribute to the literature by linking these arguments and findings into a cohesive whole analysing that which is not well or comprehensively reflected in the literature to date. It is evident that although both QoL and Placemaking discourses and agendas are well documented and advanced, the effective implementation of Placemaking best practice in new development and regeneration with the aim of improving QoL is not yet fully explored. The case studies throughout this research will be guided by some of the well-established academic principles and methods that have been thus far analysed and draw on empirical evidence to explore this further.
CHAPTER 4: ESTABLISHING THE METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

Before clearly setting out this chapter’s specific empirical research approach in a coherent, analytical, and transparent manner, it is important to briefly outline at the outset the nature and direction which shaped the methodology. During the literature reviews it became increasingly apparent that a qualitative comparative mixed methods approach would have to be applied to this research to capture the complex nature of the aims and objectives of this thesis. Since urban Placemaking and QoL studies are both objective and subjective then to be analysed holistically the “importance of appraising the social value of place in neighbourhoods- a kind of data that (traditional) urban design appraisal methods often fail to capture” (Alvarez et al 2015) is paramount. Moreover, the literature reviews highlighted that research methods in QoL studies specifically benefited from mixed methods research (Bruno & Porta 2016, Xerez & Fonseca 2011, Jensen 2017).

Placemaking as a practice and QoL studies should and do utilise many different tools both quantitative and qualitative to be most effective and representative. However, some of these less traditional tools such as social media for example have a danger of being overused and under analysed or misinterpreted owning to the multitudes of easily accessible data that can be used. Therefore, when analysed in isolation the risk is not only of missing key concepts, connections, and results but also of potentially coming to the wrong conclusions resulting in ineffective practice and action as Jensen 2017, Glaeser et al 2018 and O’Sullivan 2019 note in their research. It is also important to note that the ever-increasing accessibility of online data, platforms and User-Generated Content (UGC) should not only therefore be seen as a benefit but also something to be taken with caution as Jensen (2017 p.4) discusses further “when researchers find themselves with easily accessible data, there is a temptation to apply those data to interesting research questions and populations, even when there are limitations in the representativeness of the sample”. When big data such as social media data is used alongside other more traditional qualitative research methods then it not only enriches the empirical evidence base, but it also adds a valid and useful quantitative element as Alvarez et al 2016 and Moat & Preis 2017 conclude.

Within the context of this thesis therefore, its research requires an effective, largely qualitative mixed methods approach that can be best achieved from a comparative case study setting within which the complex multi-faceted societal relationships, behaviours and viewpoints can be studied and analysed in-depth. Looking at several case studies of specific urban neighbourhood areas can help apply findings from the micro to the macro scale since the complex issues are best understood through specific detailed in-depth analysis. This involves triangulation which is a way of validating the various collected information
through the different methods such as interviews, survey and social media data, observation, and document analysis (Carter et al 2014, Golafshani, 2003). Validation is not necessarily the main driver of triangulation although it can be achieved in suitable scenarios, however analysing the same phenomenon through different dimensions can give more in-depth overall results.
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**Figure 5: The Triangulation Mindset, Jonsen & Jehn, Using Triangulation to validate themes in qualitative studies, 2015**

This benefit of more in-depth overall results is perfectly demonstrated by Fig. 5. One can argue that even if there are some inconsistencies or even contradictions in the findings the different layers that these present, assuming always that these separate findings are in themselves in-depth in nature, can be complementary to the overall results and help to verify certain elements of the research. The next few sections will therefore detail, within the context of the triangulation approach, the comprehensive research methods, and an explanation of how and why they have been utilised. This methodological approach is often referred to as a grounded theory approach or interpretive research since it is exploratory in nature and is used to answer the complex how questions that this research is addressing. After collecting the data “the inductive thinking exercise started with theoretical coding, which involves initial codes, focused codes, categories, and themes, until theoretical sufficiency has been achieved, which led to theoretical generalisations. It must be noted that the result of grounded theory is not just to code the collected data; it is to produce theory. Similarly, this theory must emerge from data, and not from any preconceived hypothesis along a conceptualisation progression” (Andrade 2009 p52).

### 4.2 Research Design Framework

The construction of this research design has developed from a combination of the literature review themes as well as initial findings from policy and practice in the case study areas to enable the main research aims to be addressed:
How can the implementation of placemaking initiatives and strategies at a neighbourhood level enhance city QoL/perceived QoL?

The qualitative comparative case study approach adopted triangulation methods to best analyse and define policy and practice. The following subchapter will expand on this methodological approach and its suitability for this study.

The themes of Placemaking and Quality of Life in this study are analysed through the urban development and regeneration lens. It is important to note this since both these themes are so wide that not focusing the research on a specific process would render this thesis unmanageable in scope. Therefore, it is paramount that urban development and regeneration practice is duly explored and analysed to ascertain the practical processes and procedures that Placemaking and QoL sit within. “Urban regeneration and redevelopment projects invariably create changes for urban social relations, be it impacts on existing residents, adjacent residents or the potentiality of future residents in an area” (Moore & Bunce 2009). Although this quote was not written necessarily as a definition of what is universally accepted as urban development and regeneration it does ultimately describe just that in a succinct and holistic manner.

As the above focus on change in an area that development and regeneration bring is clear; a qualitative case study approach is the most appropriate way of tackling the complex elements pertaining to change and the adoption of this research design ensures that a quality analysis of such changes (either past, present, future or a combination of one of more of these) and their effects on Placemaking practice and QoL is undertaken. The value of such case study research is that it can demonstrate why and how placemaking succeeds in enhancing perceived quality of life/quality of life by evaluating multiple complex examples of past, temporary and/or ongoing interventions, policies and actions embedded within the cases. This has informed the research approach by evaluating key issues within the urban quality of life discourse and how placemaking has directly impacted and affected these. Within the context of urban development and regeneration, the case studies have directly impacted urban discourse in many ways such as for example, Kings Cross’ exemplary reputation globally as a successful new development specifically within the context of placemaking (Regeneris 2017, Adelfio et al 2020). Methodologically, comparative approaches to case study research are also advantageous as “the evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust” (Yin 2014 p.94). In the case of this research, a comparative case study approach was advanced to better grasp and explain how context influences the success of place-making approaches and how lessons might be generalised and transferred with an appreciation of the need to tailor place-making intervention to the specific context to achieve intended planning and development outcomes.
The mixed methods design approach will ensure that using triangulation the different complex issues and layers embedded in the case studies can be analysed and studied in detail. This will enable a more thorough and in-depth conclusion to be reached as well as providing a clearer pathway to future recommendations that only mixed methods approach incorporating case study field work and analysis can accomplish. Of course, it is imperative that the quality of the case study design is not only robust but incorporates valid choices of selected methods such as interviews, document analysis and survey as well as general field observation work (Yin 2014, Mack et al. 2005). The multiple relationships within such a study can then begin to be unravelled and analysed clearly to represent these in a concise and efficient manner.

The representation of these varied relationships will reflect the different social interests that effective urban Placemaking practice must incorporate to ensure that QoL is enhanced for all facets of the community. These complex interrelationships are best analysed through a variety of different methods to ensure that potentially biased procedures are avoided, and unexpected opportunities are taken advantage of whilst constantly being aware of the study’s limits and bounds (Yin 2014). Each case study was chosen following an initial process that analysed global QoL at a city scale utilising the various international indices as the initial data sources (Numbeo 2020, Mercer 2020, The Economist Intelligence Unit 2020). Cities of a similar size were analysed further since a city with less than 1 million population and those with a population of nearer to 10 million would entail too many variables pertaining to the differences in their overall size and administrative set up. Secondly, once cities of a similar large size were identified it was deemed more holistic to compare 2 such cities that had a significant difference in urban QoL in the English-speaking world (for practical communication reasons). The final part of this analytical selection process was to find 2 case studies within each of the cities that represented different stages of urban development and regeneration processes again for reasons of comprehensiveness. It is important to note that a pilot study preceded this process chosen in a similar way albeit representing a single case. The pilot study was a way to benchmark and test some of the methods that should and would be used based on their effectiveness and limitations found.

Finally, the next section will expand on the final methodological element, that of the multiple comparative case studies. It will go into detail about how a single in-depth case study cannot achieve this study’s aims and objectives since a comparison is required to analyse the differences between Placemaking practices and their effectiveness in enhancing urban QoL. This will in turn enable ways of generalising findings from the different case studies to other situations by making analytic rather than statistical generalisations by following a replication rather than sampling logic (Yin 2014).
4.3 The Comparative Case Studies Method

“The comparative case study approach is particularly well-suited to social research about practice and policy” (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017 p.1). Since development & regeneration practice is the background of this study and the policies and procedures that are embedded within this practice are the key to unlocking exemplary Placemaking practice utilising a comparative case studies methodology seemed an obvious choice from the outset. Moreover, the effect of such practices and policies needs to be analysed to understand their effects on urban QoL/PQoL. It is also an appropriate method to tackle the differences in time and space that urban areas find themselves in and no single case study would be able to provide an in-depth understanding of such issues since in the period assigned to this study only an in-depth contemporary view can be drawn. As such, the changes that cover longer periods of time of large development and regeneration projects would not be fully understood.

Adopting a comparative case studies approach ensures that through the appropriate choice of case studies that are significant, unusual and of public interest, finding themselves at different stages in time and space of the development and regeneration process the above issues can be overcome (Yin 2014). The importance of choosing exemplary comparative case studies is paramount since the underlying issues must represent issues of national importance either in theoretical terms or in policy or practical terms to ensure they are complete (Yin 2014). The relevance of choosing exemplary comparative cases is that the study can build a robust analysis of the practices and policies that cover a naturally long process of time that the different carefully chosen case studies provide through being at different stages of the process themselves. This is extremely important when looking at QoL as the aim is that the best practices and policies can enhance QoL not just temporarily but over the course of a lifetime.

Another benefit of the comparative case studies method is that it is a way of investigating the contextual complexities of each case whilst being able to find the relevance beyond the individual cases “Specifically, comparative case studies adopt a processual stance to re-envision three key concepts in case study research: culture, context and comparison” (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017 p.8). The importance of context that Bartlett & Vavrus specify here is that within a particular case, the space and time that relevant actors inhabit and the social interactions they are a part of as well as the political and economic processes and developments create the relevant context for comparison which neither a single case study nor an experiment can benefit from. Since the cases being studied are the only data points and the context within these provides many variables of interest then their advantage is that they can be analysed and compared within and across-cases to provide relevant findings that can begin to develop middle-range theories.
To date, qualitative research has very much underutilised explicit comparative research; however, its many benefits are far reaching as different outcomes can be found from different case studies that use similar processes or similar outcomes can be found from different influences and similar trends or pressures can be related to seemingly distinct phenomena. Stronger arguments can be made through such insights from the different cases (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017). Comparative case study research can be more flexible since it is based on an emergent process-orientated approach and is therefore less of a pre-structured study that works based on decision rules. In short, these decision rules can loosely direct the study in order that processes can be followed to see how they unfold at times (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017).

The flexibility of comparative case study research seeks to ‘disrupt’ static categories and can therefore separate the context of place from the phenomenon (in this case Placemaking). This type of research also seeks to understand and include (at least partially) the social actor’s perspectives as well as the critical perspective analysing power and inequality. The ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are more able to be investigated by aiming to achieve a cultural understanding of the production and appropriation of policy. By doing shorter term periods of research in multiple sites across different scales to create a case study that is attentive to horizontal, vertical, and temporal comparison (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017).

4.4 Data and Analytical Strategy

At the beginning of this study the analytical strategy was more focused on a mixed methods multiple case studies qualitative and quantitative approach. The flexibility of this study was however built in from the start to gain the most relevant and useful data to analyse and enable justified conclusions and recommendations to be formed. This is crucial to comparative case study research since there are emergent fields which lead to mutable fieldwork and such studies cannot be ‘bounded’ from the start (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017). From the outset the research design plan was a robust way of collecting, analysing, and interpreting observations after having established what questions to study, what data are relevant and what data to collect as well as how to analyse the results broadly following the recommendations from Yin (2014).

As the study developed however, and the pilot study was completed, the methodology was refined further to consider initial findings and issues encountered. Once the main case studies were selected it was critical to “balance adaptability with rigour” since “when a shift is made, you must maintain an unbiased perspective and acknowledge those situations in which, in fact, you really have inadvertently begun to pursue a totally new study. When this occurs, many completed steps- including the initial design of the case study- must be repeated and redocumented” (Yin 2014 p. 75). As detailed in
the preceding chapters a mixed methods comparative case studies methodology was adopted and developed to ensure both care and rigour in conducting the research to be verified through triangulation methods.

A component of Bartlett & Vavrus’ comparative case study methodology is that the context of the different cases is spatial and relational, and culture is an ongoing contested production. Multi-sited and multi-scaler research approaches can provide a series of juxtapositions for qualitative social scientists from which to discover possible relationships between the sites through the data collection process (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017). Therefore, this study predominantly called for rich primary data to effectively research the contextual and cultural nuances within which the Placemaking phenomenon affects people’s perceived QoL. It is important to note that unlike traditional multiple case studies that may rely on replication logic to analyse and interpret their data, a comparative case study methodology relies more on the multiple cases being able to collapse the global and making them an integral part of parallel, related local situations This is achieved by examining the interconnectedness across the larger political economic framework in different locations to analyse what they have in common through their national and international policy making. (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017).

This comparative study utilises a transversal comparison methodology which will explore how the aforementioned “connections were formed historically and have led to spatially differentiated effects” (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017 p. 43). Following the phenomenon through a process of enquiry the comparative case study looks across scales and considers how they intersect. The juxtapositions that contrasting cases will provide will not only generate useful and interesting insights for the study but also add to the more traditional methods of tracing across similarities in the cases (Bartlett & Vavrus 2017). Snowball sampling was used to recruit participants via respondents to postings on social media sites such as Facebook and Instagram. The ability to follow interviewees’ explanations into topics not previously thought about for the study was another reason why a comparative case study methodology was decided upon and semi-structured interviews within this framework also support this approach. Using such a methodology can add clarity and guide subsequent data collection by adapting the conceptual framework when the fieldwork and interviews call for this.

The primary data collected from this study such as the semi-structured interviews was then used to inform and shape the survey questions that were then rolled out on social media, specifically Facebook and Instagram on the research dedicated accounts as well as emailed to interviewees for them to forward to others as they saw fit. This helps to build a wide range of robust explanatory and descriptive concepts linked closely to the primary data, but which are also abstracted enough to facilitate wider application. This will be explored at several levels beginning with the individual case study.
neighbourhood areas through to their city administrative areas finally ending with their wider impact on a global scale.

Data Sources

All the main case studies benefitted from a detailed analysis of the five different data sources below. The pilot case study also benefitted from these however a smaller number of each different source type was analysed due to time constraints. In all cases interviews followed by documents were the primary sources of data with other data sources featuring heavily in each case dependant on availability, time, and resource constraints.

a. Interview data carried out on a predominantly one-to-one basis with a variety of actors from policy making capacities to local affordable housing residents.

b. Document sources from national to local policies, online resources and materials used to promote development and/or regeneration in the case study areas, various meeting minutes and project reports.

c. Participant and/or field observations in-situ in the different case study areas, use of space on market days vs non-market days for example and other such informal events.

d. Social media pages, posts and data from relevant formal and informal organisations involved in the case study areas.

e. Survey data from responses received in the bespoke survey created for this study.

a. Interview data

The interviews were kept to an average of one hour for all participants but varied in length between 25 and 125 minutes. Interviewees were selected based on a variety of needs from each case study area, but each had at least one interviewee from each of the following local stakeholder categories:

- Local authority/municipality employee from the case study area
- Local resident
- Local business owner/employee
- Local volunteer/activist- either on social media or some other local group
- Local visitor or worker but not resident

These criteria were used to ensure that a full spectrum of local stakeholders was chosen (either through reaching out on social media such as local FB groups and asking already found interviewees for other
suggested potential interviewees) and resulted in more or less of one category being interviewed. With regards to participant selection, it is important to note that to ensure it is as representative as possible of the local case study population: local private developers, public municipal authorities, resident and volunteer stakeholders and local small business owners etc. Moreover, the context within which these participants operate, their constructs and ties in their local communities is key to understanding the rich complex data resulting from these interviews. It is also important to highlight that having enough willing participants relied on snowball sampling from situations such as colleagues in organisations organising other interviews and recommending others as many other unrelated individually contacted prospective participants were unresponsive to interview requests. The interviews were all carried out between the academic year 2018-2019 ensuring that they were all as close to each other as possible especially for each of the separate case studies so that any emerging and current issues at the time of interviews were similar for all interviewees. Pilot case study interviews were carried out at the beginning of the 2018 academic year followed by London case study interviews with the final Melbourne interviews at the end of 2019 (mainly in October). The participants were able to choose the locations of their interviews, this often providing a valuable insight into the context of their ‘stories’ behind agreeing to the interviews in the first place.

As previously mentioned, the interviews followed a semi-structured approach to engage on a more in-depth level with the interviewee (Mack et al 2005). The semi-structured approach was also helpful in engaging with different types of stakeholders as some were being interviewed in a professional capacity whilst others purely based on their local connection. Detailed background research on the interviewee’s involvement on the case study areas was carried out before the interviews to establish a loose set of questions to kick start and also shape the course of the interviews if necessary. Each case study benefitted from approximately 10 interviews with over 40 interviews conducted in total across all of them. This figure was arrived at from both time constraints and more importantly literature from previous qualitative research of this nature having similar numbers (Smyth 1993, McLellan et al 2003). Post interview questions were also asked at times when necessary and responded to generally via email if any clarifications or further issues arose after the event, particularly with regards to the post Covid-19 response. The interview data was key in gathering both personal and communal perspectives on the urban stories emerging from the case study neighbourhoods. It was also used to identify what, if any, understanding there was of the Placemaking concept and what the PQoL was in these areas as well as the key issues connected to them. This was crucial in gathering original empirical data since the literature review highlighted considerable gaps when looking at Placemaking and QoL issues together within development and regeneration practice.
The interview themes varied between participants since some were being interviewed in a more formal professional capacity and others as local community residents and stakeholders. However, some of the themes that were explored with most of the interviewees are listed below:

- How does their waterside location affect them, if it does, and do they use it? Such as for recreation and sport activities
- What their thoughts and perceptions are about their neighbourhood?
- What they believe the QoL to be like in their neighbourhood compared to other neighbourhoods in their city and how they believe the QoL in their city compares to other world cities of a similar size?
- What their thoughts are about what is impacting the QoL in their neighbourhoods and cities and what can be done if it needs to be improved?
- What they think about the impact of new developments and/or regeneration projects to their neighbourhoods?

When looking at the interviewees and their responses it is important to note that many had multiple roles, some in the professional capacity were also residents and/or local volunteers and vice versa. This presented a rich and complex multi-faceted layer to the interview data. Moreover, there was evidence at times that interviewees were answering in different capacities to certain questions such as the new development/regeneration questions from a professional capacity for example and the QoL in their city question from a personal viewpoint. These nuanced but important details need to be considered when looking at the research approach and it being a true and reflexive process. The ensuing data analysis process also benefitted from these nuanced comparative elements. Additionally, participants often led the interviews into singular topics which did limit the ability to compare responses since the topics were relatively varied. Through the literature reviews however, it was noted that Placemaking and QoL as concepts are hugely varied themselves, so the variety of responses was not a problematic issue since it fell in line with the findings of the literature reviews. Some interviewees also decided to offer some ‘off the record’ insights which although were not able to be recorded officially and used as part of the research data (in line with ethics approval) they were extremely insightful in gaining a fuller understanding of the topics they were discussing. The guiding principles of the ethics approval for this research (see Appendix 4) meant that anonymity, cultural sensitivities, the participants’ right to withdraw at any time and how data would be stored, used, and managed would be safeguarded and anything that could compromise this for participants would not be used.

When transcribing and coding the interviews it was important to note that “a researcher must make choices regarding whether a textual document should include non-linguistic observations (facial
expressions, body language, setting descriptions etc) be transcribed verbatim; and identify specific speech patterns, vernacular expressions, intonations, or emotions" (McLellan et al 2003 p66). These considerations were all considered during the data analysis process and when using secondary data for triangulation purposes. The interview coding process went through a rigorous preliminary then secondary coding stage to ensure that all themes were encapsulated. This resulted in the following list of wider themes from the interviews:

- Accessibility
- Local (place, space, amenity, area, people, community etc)
- Community
- Affordability
- Governmental and other public structures
- Inclusive/ exclusive
- Noise
- Desirability
- Longevity
- Culture
- Placemaking role/function
- Decline
- Connectivity and communication
- Public vs private
- Safety and security
- Events
- Personal, Esoteric (lived experience of place)

These themes were compared to those that were found in the literature reviews and although some were much more prevalent than others within the Placemaking and QoL literature this provided the critical framework within which the detailed analysis. The empirical evidence was then used to ascertain to what extent the case studies had incorporated the necessary critical processes for effective Placemaking in development and/or regeneration practice to contribute to enhancing QoL.

b. Document sources

To benefit from the triangulation method, document sources such as national, regional, and local government policies, meeting minutes, specialist reports and website information as well as published sources from private organisations were analysed for each of the case study areas. This was primarily
used to strengthen and “test validity through the convergence of information from different sources” (Carter et al 2014 p.545). Moreover, these documents were used to identify and ascertain whether macro-level development and regeneration policy practice and supporting evidence (such as the meeting minutes and specialist reports) reflected the themes found in the literature reviews and the interview data. The documents were also used to inform some interview questions and other documents were found and recommended by the interviewees and explored and analysed considering this. Documents were reviewed specifically from a Placemaking and QoL perspective in development and/or regeneration practice therefore often these documents were from the Planning and Design stages of such practice. The documents were mainly those published by national, regional, city and local administrative areas to capture the possible top-down and bottom-up policies and strategies with regards to urban Placemaking and QoL specifically in development and regeneration practice.

c. Participant and/or field observations

These observations were made on several separate occasions in the case study neighbourhoods where photos and field notes were taken as either direct observation and in response to data gathered through interviews and document reviews that required further observation. These also form part of a strong triangulation methodology (Carter et al 2014) since they allow further investigation and analysis of singular concepts, ideas, and information from individual interviews and/or documents. As Pink described these observations are key to understanding “Placemaking as a universal and constant human activity (and/or outcome of human practice)” (Pink 2008 p.179). Restrictions to do with time meant that since observations are rather time consuming these had to be limited to a few visits in each of the case study areas, over and above the interview visits, to ensure participant observations were maximised as much as physically possible. Moreover, observations on the PQoL in case study areas could be made and analysed further in tandem with the other empirical data gathered.

With more time, it would have been useful to make further participant and field observations and to attend committee meetings, and generally more community events etc. However, as a full observer and non-active participant on several occasions with community markets, events, and projects these were still a useful added layer of data on social interaction observing chance and organised meetings of educational groups, friends, and families as well as the age groups involved. It was also useful to attend and observe several related seminars, exhibitions, and educational tours in the case study areas.

d. Social media sources
From the literature reviews it became clear that Facebook was the most useful source for data analysis for this research due to it being the largest source of membership and coming first place for Social Media rankings (Bonson et al. 2014). However, an independent review for these case studies was undertaken nonetheless including Facebook, Instagram, and Pinterest as well as briefly Twitter and LinkedIn. Key words from the case study areas were used to search for relevant material such as community groups and pages and it was found that indeed Facebook had the highest number and take up, followed by Instagram then Pinterest. The number of hashtags on Twitter and threads related to many random events and conversations about those case study areas meant that without a meaningful quantitative analysis this would not be a useful source of data and was therefore dismissed. Facebook and Instagram were therefore the 2 major sources that were analysed as well as to a much smaller extent Pinterest and LinkedIn. Research social media pages for this study were also created on Facebook and Instagram respectively, they can be found on:


Although these pages have not provided quantitative data, as was originally hoped, they have shed light on some of the issues discussed and analysed in this study as well as a rich source of qualitative data especially in the case of Instagram. This will be discussed in greater detail in the empirical chapters.

e. Survey data

Initially the survey was set up to gather additional quantitative and qualitative data following the case study interviews and document reviews. It was an online survey rolled out via email to all interviewees and social media channels such as the Instagram page set up specifically for this research project:

Figure 6: City Splaces research Instagram page: https://www.instagram.com/city_splaces/
and its equivalent Facebook page:

![Urban Splaces research Facebook page](https://www.facebook.com/cityplacemaking)

Figure 7: Urban Splaces research Facebook page: [https://www.facebook.com/cityplacemaking](https://www.facebook.com/cityplacemaking)

and other group and personal pages as well as LinkedIn. This created its own snowball sampling effect whereby others who had been sent the survey directly via email shared it via newsletters sent to residents and the social media channels attracted other forms of snowball sampling. It was hoped through this that a high response rate would be achieved of at least 500 completed surveys. However, this ended up being just under 300 due to time constraints. Despite a slightly lower response rate the sampling achieved did have at least several responses from people within the case study areas themselves and participant recruitment was diverse in terms of age, gender, and other diversity factors. Finally, it became apparent that the survey data would serve as supplementary and secondary to interviews, documents and observations since the sampling was not enough to reflect the intended population (Ponto 2015 & Golafshani 2003). Among other more qualitative survey questions 5-point Likert scales were used in some of the questions by Harpe (2015). The figure below demonstrates one of the 5-point Likert scale choices given to answer several questions:

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Figure 8: A sample 5-point Likert scale from the survey for items requiring agreement or disagreement
Selection of Case Studies

The pilot case study was initially selected because of an urban science postgraduate team competition entry for Aecom’s Urban SOS: hOUR City in 2017 (Aecom 2017). Following the end of the competition the data gathered on the Lower Broughton area in Salford was further analysed in depth from a Placemaking and QoL perspective in development and/or regeneration. The choice of case study pilot seemed appropriate since issues surrounding QoL, community cohesion, sustainability, deprivation, affordability, Placemaking, and regeneration and development opportunities were all prevalent. The scale of the case study was at a city ward level this being the smallest administrative boundary level in the UK that can be easily measured, and data obtained for. When analysing other international cases to choose the final four for this study and in "seeking to achieve a meaningful set of results, rigorous selection criteria were drawn up to ensure that the same basic characteristics were present in each case-study area thereby enabling a full comparative evaluation between individual [cases]” (Hemphill et al 2004 p.759).

Other rigorous selection criteria included:

1. Regeneration opportunity of old affordable housing stock or new development opportunity area,
2. Waterside location (since the pilot study was defined by the wards’ boundary with the river Irwell),
3. Previous or reinvented cultural hub, for example, including current or bygone features such as theatres, clubs, churches, parks, university etc,
4. Similar population size of administrative area (and type so in UK a council ward for example) and.
5. Similar size of development and/or regeneration opportunities (so not 50 residential unit development vs 5,000 for example).

Moreover, the case study cities were chosen using global city QoL indices over the past 5 years allowing a comparison between a consistently upper mid-range QoL city and a lower mid-range one. The table below shows 2 world cities that both featured in the ISO 37120 (2018) standard for Sustainable development of communities and the Numbeo QoL Index over the 5-year period preceding this study. Since ISO standards are a benchmarked worldwide set of criteria with a specific methodology attached to them this standard seemed appropriate to use in helping to choose case study cities. The Numbeo QoL Index was one of the few free online indices that used verifiable data over many past decades to ascertain QoL in cities worldwide and therefore seemed appropriate to use to help determine the case study cities.
Table 1: Melbourne and London case study city QoL rankings. Source: Numbeo Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Upper mid-range city</th>
<th>Numbeo Rank</th>
<th>Lower mid-range city</th>
<th>Numbeo Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>30/184</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>129/184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>10/177</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>129/177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>6/143</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>104/143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>21/150</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>90/150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>19/95</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>49/95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the city selection, 2 neighbourhoods from each city were chosen using the case study criteria. The St Pancras & Somers Town (for the Kings Cross area) and Hoxton and Shoreditch wards in London were selected, as well as Docklands in Melbourne and St Kilda both being 1 of the 31 Greater Melbourne Municipalities albeit varying in population size more than the London wards. A handful of carefully selected case studies such as these are considered to provide a diverse and sufficient range of examples (Hemphill et al 2004). A further secondary way of narrowing down the case studies was by choosing a major local city to the researcher (in this case London) for ease of movement and accessibility as well as previous knowledge through previous work experience and/or leisure visits (in this case also leisure visits to both case study areas in Melbourne) some before the research began. Since this approach could throw up potential bias this was mitigated through the following actions:

- A written detailed timeline of decisions made and why; summarised in at least one of the end of year reports for this study and the potential impact these choices could have had on the research trajectory.
- Thorough and detailed extra background research on potential participants for the case study areas from the perspective of an interested researcher to ensure a consistent and professional relationship to be built with them.

The Lower Broughton Pilot Study

Figure 9: Lower Broughton within the Greater Manchester area and England (Mapping GM 2021)
In the context of this study the QoL, PQoL and the Placemaking policies, activities and interventions for the Lower Broughton area were used as a pilot to evaluate how the main case study areas should be assessed. This was carried out so that any weaknesses, in methodology would be addressed before looking in greater detail at the 4 main case study areas (chapters 5.3 & 5.4).

(Lower) Broughton is a ward within the City of Salford in the Greater Manchester administrative area, UK. It has a population of 16,517 within a population of 233,933 in the City of Salford (Salford ward profiles data as at 2019). The Greater Manchester area has a population of 2.78 million (Greater Manchester Combined Authority 2017) and is the combined authority with a mayor incorporating the City of Salford. Development and regeneration within these areas must comply with UK wide national planning guidance as well as Local authority planning in this case the Greater Manchester combined authority and Salford City Council. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), last updated in February 2019, is the overriding planning policy document from which the Local Authorities base their policies. The NPPF therefore not only contributes to the Lower Broughton study but to all 4 case studies. Therefore, a review of the NPPF and other national, regional, and local planning documents below will contextualise not only the frameworks within which this case study sits but also the following case studies. The planning documents table 1 gives an outline of these documents and their related policies to placemaking and enhancing quality of life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National or local document</th>
<th>Document and date</th>
<th>Placemaking policies and/or objectives</th>
<th>Quality of life policies and/or objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td>NPPF (2019 update)</td>
<td>No specific ones but many separate aspects of placemaking such as conserving and enhancing the historic environment in chapter 12 for example.</td>
<td>No specific ones, not defined as a term and only mentioned 4 times throughout the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td>Our People Our Place-The Greater Manchester Strategy (2013)</td>
<td>No specific ones however it mentions a few times a need to develop a place-making approach (pgs. 37,38 &amp;46).</td>
<td>Many of the priorities use the term quality of life in the context of aiming to raise it and providing a good quality of life (pgs. 46,50, 65 &amp; 70).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td>Greater Manchester Housing Strategy 2019-2024</td>
<td>No specific ones but many separate aspects of placemaking such as affordability and accessibility (pgs. 21, 30, 32, 33 &amp; 35).</td>
<td>Strategic priority A3 specifically aims to improve the quality of life of vulnerable adults by “delivering healthy homes services” to support them (p30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td>Greater Manchester Strategic Housing Market Assessment (January 2019).</td>
<td>None however it does have a chapter on affordability and affordable housing and that contributes to placemaking in development and regeneration (chap.7 &amp; appendix 8.2).</td>
<td>Looks at quality of life from a healthy life expectancy perspective (pg.158).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td>Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document- Bolton, Bury, Manchester,</td>
<td>No specific ones however policy JP-P2 point 1 when referring to individual local plans</td>
<td>The document places quality of life high on the agenda by linking it to all its major themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Culture &amp; Creativity Strategy (2019)</td>
<td>None however culture and heritage as its main theme feeds into placemaking overall and it aims to create great places as discussed further in chapter 5 on Our people Our places.</td>
<td>No specific focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>The Salford Publication Local Plan (2021)</td>
<td>No specific ones however elements of it such as inclusive places in Policy F3 and chapters 12, 20 &amp; 24 on mix of uses, recreation and heritage respectively.</td>
<td>Discusses contributing to quality of life through heritage and nature (pgs. 19 &amp; 44).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Salford Digital Strategy (2019)</td>
<td>One of its measures is to be “the voice for and to contribute to integrated place-making” (pg. 31).</td>
<td>Its vision among other aims is to improve quality of life for its citizens by providing stakeholders…with a mechanism to link the digital economic drivers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Placemaking and Quality of life in planning documents relating to Lower Broughton

The NPPF is divided into 17 chapters focusing on new development and regeneration in both urban and rural areas of the UK. Within each of these chapters the term “Placemaking” is never used, however, it is important to note that Placemaking as a concept by its nature is identified within these chapters through the individual aims, objectives, and actions they contain. Chapter 9 for example aims at promoting sustainable transport and contributing to making high quality places and chapter 12 gives guidance on how to achieve well designed places. Finally, chapter 16 gives guidance on how to conserve and enhance the historic environment. These chapters go some way into establishing Placemaking principles however when not presented as such they portray disparate sets of expertise and focus e.g., the transport chapter is relevant for transport policy (NPPF 2019 chapter 9) and the supply of homes chapter (NPPF 2019 chapter 5) is relevant to policy on private and affordable housing. This can create a disjointed approach via the creation of work silos on a practical level when looking at individual development and regeneration opportunities as was found in Lower Broughton when a few of the resident interviewees expressed a desire for better transport facilities in the area such as bus routes and a wider choice of local leisure, retail, and cultural offerings. Yet when the professional City of Salford and Salix Homes (local Housing Association) employees offered the residents a consultation for the redevelopment of their area they voted to not be a part of these plans.

Placemaking policy and practice in this instance and others can act as the glue that binds these disparate sets of people, communities, aims, objectives, and expertise together by providing an effective framework from which to present back and work through issues that separate and provide only a lose-lose scenario such as in this case no redevelopment and little wanted new transport links, leisure, retail, and cultural offerings.
Without a measurable and effective interpretation of the term QoL it is merely used in the NPPF as desirable but not as an achievable aim of new development and regeneration projects. It is therefore missing a real opportunity to have a quantifiable impact on the communities and places it serves. Places like the Lower Broughton area, which are still consistently ranked in the top percentile in the indices of deprivation, would benefit from strong guidance on QoL and Placemaking adding a valuable framework and streamlining a planning process that all too often focuses more on the socio-economic factors involved in development and regeneration projects rather than the qualitative ones.

Feeding through from the NPPF to more local government planning policy to reflect the requirements of the NPPF; the Greater Manchester Housing Strategy 2019-2024 discusses many aspects of placemaking separately but only mentions it once as a concept in chapter 5.5 in the context of encouraging a “stronger commitment to skills development and retention within the industry in Greater Manchester, as well as issues of place-making, culture, build quality and architectural design” (pg26). Through a set of strategic priorities this plan aims to improve the quality of life of residents especially more vulnerable and older ones. In contrast to the GM Housing Strategy the GM Strategy Our People Our Place (2013) discusses a need to develop a place-making approach (pp. 37 & 38) and emphasises the “need to see housing policy as just one part of a wider place-making approach” (pg. 46). When looking at quality of life however, the Our People Our Place strategy focuses on raising the quality of life and providing a good quality of life to also (among other reasons) enable the city to “compete with the best international cities in terms of the quality of life” they can offer (p50). The GM Places for Everyone document places a very strong emphasis on quality of life by using it as one of the key drivers and aims of all its major policies such as retail and leisure, new-build housing, transport, open and green spaces, and inclusive & economic growth. Indeed, the document states “If quality of life is to be enhanced then it will be vital to maximise the opportunities that our places offer and limit the constraints that they place on how people live” (p.174). Finally, the Salford local plan (2016-17, 2019, 2020, 2021) and the Salford Cultural Strategy (2017) endeavour to put in place strategies and policies that will enhance quality of life through effective placemaking. Policy CT2 of the Salford Draft Local Plan (2016-17) states in the reasoned justification 8.9 that the “continued enhancement of artistic and cultural opportunities is seen as central to placemaking in Salford and contributing to a good quality of life. online policy link Salford 2016-17.”

The Lower Broughton area is made up of the Lower Broughton Road which runs along the river Irwell to its left and is bounded by Frederick Road to the north and the River Irwell to the South (see Figure 8). As this area is not an administrative area the boundaries are more down to physical constraints such as large road crossing and delineations and natural ones such as the river Irwell. However, some locals may define this area slightly differently due to their relationship and association with the name and connotations with the area.
To understand the Lower Broughton case study’s idiosyncrasies and learn how placemaking has and can contribute to quality of life here and elsewhere it is important to understand the area’s history and notable events and places that have helped to shape it. “Salford has undergone a wide-scale demolition and population dispersal over the past 40 years... objects relating to the demolished urban districts of Salford were collected...the installations aimed to rejuvenate a sense of place, despite the eradication of the built and social environment” (Cassidy 2012).
Figure 12: The Church of the Ascension in Lower Broughton. Google Maps. 2021.

Figure 9 shows some notable buildings, locations, and places in the area. The Church of the Ascension is a notable building being Grade II listed, built in 1869 and designated as a world heritage site in 1998. It has been the victim of arson attacks in the past and has been refurbished 3 times in the past 50 years. Other notable buildings are the old Victoria Theatre, the Mocha Parade (see figure 10) and William Crabtree House. Other features include the river Irwell notable for its famous flooding especially the floods of 2015 and its historic use as sewage and waste disposal for the Victorian factories during the industrial revolution, the Albert, and Green Grosvenor Parks for being the main public open spaces in the area.

As can be seen from Figure 13 the main shopping area has boarded up flats over shops, most shops closed and dangerous broken concrete slabs lying across the public areas. Although at some point in the planning, regeneration, and development phase of an area it is necessary to evict and close existing residential and commercial premises it can and must be done in as quickly and painlessly a way as possible, potentially turning it into a placemaking opportunity through sharing of plans visually through boards and images and curating of such area throughout the whole process. “Dereliction and
depopulation are key problems for Lower Broughton, which sits on the eastern side of Salford, around a mile from central Manchester” (Quinn 2010).

**Lower Broughton Analysis of online interactions**

As detailed in the methodology and literature review chapters a thorough social media search was conducted on Facebook, Instagram, Pinterest, and LinkedIn. Twitter was not analysed as it was decided through a combination of factors such as having to first filter through hashtags to find the data required to enable a deep analysis to take place for this study. Facebook was found to be the social media portal with the most qualitative interactions that were also easy to find in a short space of time and full of interesting content for this study. Instagram hosted more business-related pages advertising through photos and posts for the local area such as The Tree House café below.

![The Treehouse café on Instagram](https://example.com/treehouse_cafe)

**Figure 14: The Treehouse café on Instagram, Lower Broughton Road, Salford, 2017.**

As can be seen from the above post (figure 14) hashtags, appealing photographic images, and the tagging of other users to engage with an online audience were used as additional marketing tools. At the time of this post this café was a local café on the Lower Broughton Road and was using social media, in this case Instagram to grow an online following with the aim of attracting more sales and business for the café as well as wider communication with the local community. With regards to Facebook as can be seen from
figure 12 below the 4 main groups were all community groups related to a place and/or building in the Lower Broughton Area.

![Top Local Facebook Groups](image)

**Figure 15: Lower Broughton Top Local Facebook Groups, 2018**

The Lower Broughton pilot demonstrated that the complex nature of communities and neighbourhoods would necessitate not only detailed interviews with residents, workers, business owners and public authorities but would also require for additional insights into these issues a set of follow up questions and a more generic pool of contributors to the issues via the form of a short public survey. This would be to capture and ensure the best possible number of responses to the more specific and specialised terms and areas such as placemaking and people’s knowledge of the term, use and understanding of it to name just one issue with using interviews alone.

*The international policies and objectives in relation to urban Placemaking and QoL*

As mentioned in the introduction and in the preceding section herewith, the international annually updated city QoL indices such as Mercer, the Economist and Numbeo to name just a few are a way of comparing international cities’ QoL. However, a more useful measure that tends to guide many national and city policies are the international Sustainable Development Goals set by the UN. The relevant one for this specific study is Goal 11: Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable. Another less widely used international measure is the ISO standard 37120:2018 for ‘Sustainable cities and communities-Indicators for City Services and Quality of Life’. This section overviews the policy climate within which these three components operate.
**International city QoL indices**

These indices tend to be put together and published by different private sector firms. Their intention is to inform themselves and their readership of the (typically) annual changes in the liveability of certain world cities. Similar social indicators are used in the determination of place-based trends to monitor and predict a set of future targets (McMahon 2002, Mayer & Knox 2007, Santos & Martins 2006, Zinkernagel et al 2018). The three indices that this study has focused on are: the Numbeo Quality of Life Index by City, the Mercer Quality of Living City Ranking and the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Global Liveability Index. The problem with these indices is that they all measure different factors and cities with differing methodologies making their use for academic and/or policy purposes very limited. However, they do provide some convergence that aligns several world cities with similar rankings helping to find some use from them such as for example Melbourne having a higher quality of life than London in all 3 indices for the past several years (Numbeo 2019, Mercer 2019, The Economist 2019).

**International UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG’s): Goal 11**

The UN’s SDG11 has within it 10 targets and a set of indicators to go with them. Some of these targets are aligned with the literature review and case study themes namely, 11.1 affordable housing, 11.2 safe, affordable, accessible, and sustainable transport systems, 11.3 inclusive and sustainable urbanisation and capacity for participatory, integrated, and sustainable human settlement planning, 11.4 to protect and safeguard culture heritage, 11.7 provide universal access to safe, inclusive, and accessible green and public spaces.

**International ISO standard 37120:2018**

ISO 37120: 2018 entitled Sustainable cities and communities- Indicators for city services and quality of life, was first introduced in 2014 and was updated in 2018. As a recognised international standard, it claims to also contribute directly to SDG 11 among others and to be applicable to any city, municipality, and local government regardless of size. Standard measures, such as 13. 1 & 2 (Square meters of public indoor and outdoor recreation space per capita), 15 (shelter and housing), 17 (digital connectivity), 18 (transportation and accessibility) and 19 (urban planning and green areas) are also themes that are shared throughout this thesis. The World Council on City Data (WCCD) ([https://www.dataforcities.org/about-wccd](https://www.dataforcities.org/about-wccd)) uses the ISO 37120 standard as a tool to certify cities according to their compliance with the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and was founded in 2014. Both Melbourne and London have registered for the year 2014 and 2015 as this is an annual certification.
The EU and national (UK and Australian) policies and objectives in relation to urban Placemaking and QoL

The EU does through various grants and accolades offer cities within its union financial and other incentives that are both directly and indirectly linked to placemaking and quality of life in development and regeneration. For example, the annual European Capital of Culture not only benefits from publicity across the continent and in its home nation but also real socio-economic benefits (Falk & Hagsten 2017). However, since Brexit has come into effect some of the EU grants and programmes that would have been on offer to UK cities are not so relevant, and it is in this context that the UK case studies have been researched. The Australian case studies benefit from the national system in place in Australia, which offers each of its States certain planning and development decision and policy making powers. Therefore, in the two Melbourne case studies the State of Victoria was the dominant decision-making authority, especially for the Docklands case (along with the City of Melbourne) and the City of Port Philip was the main decision and policy making authority for St Kilda, since not one single project in St Kilda was as big in scale and prestige as the Docklands development.

In the UK the London case studies benefit from the NPPF (The National Planning Policy Framework) that the GLA (Greater London Authority), use to define their London Plan Policies that London Boroughs then must adhere to as planning authorities for development and regeneration with their own 5-year borough plans and policies. For the pilot study the City of Salford benefits from the same NPPF and the Greater Manchester Authority co-ordinates, in a similar way to the GLA, the local authorities within it, such as the City of Salford. The following chapters explore these policy contexts from a Placemaking and Quality of Life in Development and Regeneration perspective for each case study.

A detailed summary of the chosen case study areas can be found in the following chapter 5.

4.5 Summary

To report the data in the following empirical chapters effectively this methods chapter has detailed, illustrated, and justified the research design and empirical approach used. The reasons behind using a comparative case study approach have been outlined as well as the benefits of using triangulation from interview, observation, document, social media, and survey data. The various methods have been developed because of findings from the pilot demonstrating that a multiple case study triangulation
approach was the best fit for tackling these complex social and technical issues. Finally, the relevant international and national planning and development policy tools for new development and regeneration projects were outlined to explore how these have been changed and adapted over the years because of rapid urbanisation of major world cities and dense urban conglomerations. These show how QoL and Placemaking discourse has in many cases found its way into the cities’ planning and development agendas producing a few examples of Placemaking activity at various scales.

The data produced from the different sources mentioned above was rich enough to enable possible Placemaking solutions to enhance city QoL to be fully explored. In fact, it is important to note that access to the multiple data sources varied in difficulty between case studies, which meant that the triangulation method approach was more critical when analysing the data. In practice this did not mean that some of the data from the case studies was more or less valid than other data, but it is important to note when presenting the case studies in the following empirical chapters. The variability of the available data and participants within the case studies meant that validity through the triangulation method was difficult and the focus of this study therefore centred around the shared concepts and themes to ensure that the empirical conclusions made were only because of evidence.

Conclusions drawn in this thesis are a direct result of in-depth analysis of the data gathered through this methodology and have been used to inform best practice examples within a wider national and international context. The next empirical chapter looks at each of the case study areas in turn, to extract the wider Placemaking and QoL best practice examples. Chapters 6, 7 & 8 give in depth empirical evidence with regards to the issues the case study areas face in attempting to enhance QoL & PQoL through Placemaking in development and regeneration practice. In looking at each of the case study areas in turn in the following chapter a detailed analysis of their socio-demographic make-up will be provided to further support the empirical Placemaking best practice arising from their neighbourhoods.
CHAPTER 5: QUALITY OF LIFE AND PLACEMAKING IN THE CASE STUDY AREAS

5.1 Introduction

As detailed in the methodology chapter the case studies were selected following a rigorous approach that highlighted several in-depth examples of neighbourhoods in different stages of the development and regeneration process so that as much of the process could be observed, albeit in different case study areas, to study the effects of Placemaking on QoL. The methodological approach was refined by the pilot study to best serve the 4 main case studies.

The literature reviews (Chapters 2 & 3) concluded that the study of Placemaking in development and regeneration and its effect on city QoL is at best looked at holistically through a city-wide lens but not on a site-by-site and/or neighbourhood level, which is why huge inequalities persist between different places in the same city (Howley et al 2009, Klekotko, 2020). Finally, these chapters brought together two concepts usually looked at in isolation, with an aim to understand how they can work together to enhance urban QoL. The literature review chapters did not identify Placemaking and QoL examples from the specific case study areas. This chapter will introduce these to give a context within which the empirical data can then be presented, analysed and recommendations made in the following chapters. These Placemaking experiences, ambitions and strategies will contribute to “Casting an anchor, and continuously monitoring and benchmarking city dwellers’ quality of life around the world, is also an important step towards implementing Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities” (De Neve & Krekel 2020 p.62).

This chapter presents an overview and analysis of the main international, EU (where relevant in a post-Brexit environment) and UK policies and objectives relevant to Placemaking and QoL in development and regeneration practice to show how these issues above are expressed through specific policy contexts in each of the case study areas. The historical and contemporary policy frameworks will be explored at different scales for both the London and Melbourne case study areas. To conclude, this chapter will outline some of the most pertinent issues and tensions within these policy contexts, that will be elaborated in proceeding chapters, using empirical material from interviews and observations with various actors in different capacities (see also Chapter 4). This exploration is important in defining and comparing the four case studies and the context within which they operate, from both a top level and bottom-up approach, to identify the common factors and actors. However, for each case study there may be some anomalies and peculiarities as they deal with their pressures differently that may not be comparable yet remain relevant when analysing some of the overall effects of Placemaking on urban QoL.
5.2 London’s Kings Cross and Hoxton and Shoreditch

Following the pilot study, the main 4 case studies were chosen in accordance with the criteria detailed within chapter 4. London as a major world city has ranked in the quality-of-life indices mid table as shown in table 1 of chapter 4 in this study. London’s population of 9.002 million (source: London population mid2020) is spread over its 32 boroughs. The pilot case study was undertaken on a ward level, which is the uniform administrative level in England that not only works well for detailed case studies of a geographical area and place but also on a policy and socio-demographic level, as not too large an area for people to not identify with it on a neighbourhood level. As detailed in the chapter above the NPPF is the overall planning document covering all areas in England including London, although the Mayor of London’s office has some additional powers much like the GMA and its own planning policies. Below is a table showing the relevant planning documents from a quality of life and placemaking policy perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National or local document</th>
<th>Document and date</th>
<th>Placemaking policies and/or objectives</th>
<th>Quality of life policies and/or objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>NPPF (2021 update)</td>
<td>No specific ones but many separate aspects of placemaking such as conserving and enhancing the historic environment in chapter 16 for example (p55).</td>
<td>No specific ones, not defined as a term and only mentioned 4 times throughout the document either to not undermine or have significant adverse impacts on quality of life (p27 &amp; p53) or in chapter 16 conserving and enhancing the historic environment. “These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for the contribution to the quality of life of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>London Plan (2021)</td>
<td>“Those involved in planning and development must: understand what is valued about existing places and use this as a catalyst for growth, renewal, and placemaking, strengthening London’s distinct and varied character” p17. Also, policies HC1 on heritage and D4 on good design. It is noted however that placemaking is not in the glossary of terms in the document.</td>
<td>Yes, embedded within some of the key policies. D14: Noise “in order to reduce, manage and mitigate noise to improve health and quality of life...residential and other non-aviation development proposals should manage noise” p153. Also, policies G3 with regards to Metropolitan Open Land and S1 on Air Quality. The quality of the public realm, social infrastructure, the historic environment, the night-time economy, and transport are all specified as affecting quality of life within the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hackney SPD (2017)</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Public Realm and Placemaking. This is a holistic chapter looking at specific case study areas within Hackney and applying placemaking principles to identify council led development</td>
<td>No specific ones and not defined as a term or ambition of planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Local** | **Hackney Sustainable Design & Construction SPD (2016)** | **Noted as an aim of energy efficiency**  
"Applying a full package of these measures will achieve Hackney’s desire to tackle fuel poverty, enhance the quality of life of the building user, and reduce the carbon impact of the property on the environment” p45. | **No specific ones and not used as a term in the document.** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Local Plan LP33 (2020)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Here the policy states at the outset “The Council has put sustainability and quality of life at the heart of urban design” pg.11. and goes on to specify quality of life links of public spaces and social infrastructure throughout the document. It ends in the glossary by defining Neighbourhoods and Communities as “Sustainable communities...contribute to a high quality of life” pg.276, and within this definition describes what they are and do.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Placemaking features as an aim in some of the main policies such as transport and infrastructure, historic environment, mix of uses including policy LP26 on employment land and floorspace “new employment space...will be permitted where: ii. The employment use is small-scale and would contribute towards placemaking” pg.112.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Draft Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan (2019)</td>
<td>No specific ones and not used as a term in the document.</td>
<td>Quality of life is a clear driver of this document with the introduction and vision statement stating that the plan is to “create a better overall quality of place and life for all” p7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Camden Local Plan (2017)</td>
<td>No specific ones and not used as a term in the document.</td>
<td>Many references to quality of life in strategic objectives and policies such as “to promote and protect the high levels of amenity and quality of life that makes Camden such an attractive, successful and vibrant place for residents, workers and visitors” p14 and Policy C2 where it states that “community facilities such as schools, community centres, leisure facilities and health centres are a vital part of the infrastructure supporting Camden’s quality of life” p134.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Camden Site Allocations (2013)</td>
<td>P8 has a section entitled ‘Placeshaping’. It goes on to explain that “Camden has many other strategies that cover the broad range of the Council’s work in...”</td>
<td>This document states that “As set out in the Core Strategy” it will “seek to ensure that development in Central London contributes to London’s economic,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placeshaping”. Although Camden call this Placeshaping they describe it so “Placeshaping encourages an integrated approach to development by focusing on and creating better social, physical and economic environments”. This is essentially placemaking by another similar word. There are then however, no other references to ‘placeshaping’ in this document. Social and cultural role while meeting the needs of local residents and respecting their quality of life” p65. It then further in the document states that it will “not cause harm to the quality of life of local people” p136. There is only one reference to enhancing quality of life when the document states it will aim to make “significant improvements to the opportunities and quality of life for local people” p40. The other references are just to respect quality of life and not harm it.

| Local | Kings Cross Shaping the Future- A Plan for the Wider Kings Cross Area (2014) | There is one mention that “Placeshaping provides an opportunity to collate information on what is happening on areas of focus like Kings Cross, and we will consider how information can be collected and made available, including developing a dedicated webpage for the Kings Cross Area (action 1.3)” | Quality of life is mentioned twice in the context of “the quality of open space provision” being “important to the health and quality of life of local communities p46. It is also mentioned in the context of housing “There are a range of housing issues around the Kings Cross area including overcrowding, an overall lack of variety |

| | | | |
There is a mention of “significant public ‘place-making’ (p44). Also, when highlighting opportunities in Camley St it states that “the street offers some limited scope for townscape improvements, but creative landscaping, good lighting and any potentially occupiable buildings along the west side are important to place-making” p61. No other specific policies are included.

There is a mention of “the requirement for a sustainable, mixed-use development that addresses the requirements for maintaining good quality of life standards in high-density mixed-use areas” p15. Quality of life is mentioned one other time in the document in the context of London as a world city not in any policy requirements and not in any aims to enhance said quality of life.

Table 3: Placemaking and Quality of life in planning documents relating to London, its boroughs, and wards

Table 3 shows the six different planning documents pertinent to the Hoxton and Shoreditch case study as well as those pertinent to Kings Cross. The London Plan (2021) is the overarching document that covers both London case studies. It is divided into policy sections that cover issues thematically, such as affordable housing, for example, and how this should be included in planning applications for new development. Figure 16 demonstrates how the National Planning Guidance sits above all planning policy and feeds down into the London Plan for the two London case study areas, then into Camden policies and similarly for Hackney and other London Boroughs. None of the planning documents analysed have...
demonstrated a comprehensive placemaking and quality of life framework and strategy for new development and regeneration.

Figure 16: Euston Area Plan policy Framework, p7 (GLA, TfL and Camden 2015).

While the two London case studies, Hoxton & Shoreditch, and Kings Cross (or “The Knowledge Quarter” as the new development has been dubbed) do share some similarities, such as being north of the Thames, both bordering the Regents Canal and both being in the central core of London, they are also extremely different to each other. The Kings’ Cross area in the St Pancras & Somers Town ward has a major international train station (St Pancras) and a major national train station (Kings Cross) as well as the British library, the Francis Crick institute and finally a major new international development where Google, Meta, YouTube, Nike, Sony Music, Camden Council, Central Saint Martin’s College (part of UAL) and over 120 other major businesses have moved their headquarters to or have satellite offices there. In contrast, the only real major business of note (nationally or internationally) in the Hoxton and Shoreditch ward is the original Boxpark which has now turned itself into a franchise and drawn not only many independent start-ups to the area but also visitors from outside the local vicinity and had a major impact on its urban fabric and culture. Argent is the developer that has been involved from the inception of
Kings Cross redevelopment and regeneration plans and continues to own and manage the area. The Argent Kings Cross Limited Partnership was formed to become “the single landowner at King’s Cross, making development and delivery easier. Many of the people working on the project have been involved from the beginning. This brings an unusual level of continuity and commitment” (Argent Kings Cross Partnership). The ability for a developer to have such a long-term business model was created through the partnership with an Australian Pension Fund, Australian Super. 2021 marked the 20-year anniversary since Argent first started working on planning and designing the 67-acre site at Kings Cross with their Principles for a Human City about Kings Cross. Since then, they have built 1100 homes and another 600 are currently under construction.

The north of the St Pancras & Somers Town ward is bounded by the Regents canal and the southern part is bounded by Kings Cross and St Pancras stations, the British Library, and Euston Road. Both London wards have similar populations, Hoxton and Shoreditch sits at 13,000 as of 2016 (Hoxton and Shoreditch ward profile) and St Pancras and Somers Town sits at 18,000 as of mid 2019 (St Pancras and Somers Town ward profile). The populations of Camden and Hackney boroughs are similar at 279,500 and 280,900 respectively (2020, Office for National Statistics data). Hackney as a borough is divided into 2 parliamentary constituencies and 21 wards. The case study relating to the Hoxton & Shoreditch ward therefore falls under the Hackney South and Shoreditch constituency as pictured below. None of the specific Hackney SPD documents covered this area.

Figure 17: Hackney Wards and Parliamentary Constituencies, 2021 source: Hackney Council webpage
The north boundary of the Hoxton and Shoreditch ward is bounded by the Regents Canal and has the largest concentration of old Hackney Council estates in the ward around the Britannia leisure centre, most of which form part of comprehensive estate regeneration plans by the Council themselves. The southern boundary of the ward is the most connected to the centre of London and has the better transport options, such as Shoreditch High Street overground railway station in zone 1, which Boxpark sits directly on top of.

Boxpark is an important, albeit supposedly temporary, development that has become a major destination in Shoreditch. When the CFO of Boxpark was interviewed he explained that “Boxpark was created seven years ago. It started with fashion and trade stands but was costly to set up and take down so came up with the container idea as the key was flexibility. Shoreditch Boxpark is owned in a tripartite Joint Venture with Network Rail, Hammersons and Ballymore. The Boxpark site in Shoreditch sits across 2 boroughs but for the most part two-thirds of it sits in the Hoxton and Shoreditch ward”.

5.3 St Kilda and Melbourne Docklands

Melbourne in contrast to London, ranked consistently higher in the quality-of-life indices, as shown in table 1 of chapter 4. Melbourne’s population of over 4.8 million (source: Melbourne population) is spread over its 31 metropolitan areas in a similar vein to London’s 32 boroughs (although the London borough populations are in most cases approximately double the Melbourne city municipality populations). As detailed in section 5.2 the case studies are most effective at the smallest combination of
neighbourhood and administrative level possible to analyse the complex issues of placemaking and quality of life in development and regeneration. From a planning policy perspective there is no national planning policy framework as in England. Rather, there is a Regional Planning Strategy published by the Victoria State Government entitled Plan Melbourne 2017-2050.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National, regional, or local document</th>
<th>Document and date</th>
<th>Placemaking policies and/or objectives</th>
<th>Quality of life policies and/or objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 Victoria State Government</td>
<td>The plan is comprehensive and does mention placemaking a few times throughout and in some of its directions and policies specifically Direction 4.1 to Create More Great Public Places across Melbourne and policies 4.1.2 to Integrate placemaking practices into road-space management and 4.4.4 to Protect Melbourne’s heritage through telling its stories. However, there is no framework for how to achieve effective placemaking practices although many of the separate policies provide elements of it such as aiming to provide housing that is affordable and accessible (p8).</td>
<td>Several times throughout the document the focus is on enhancing liveability (pgs. 9, 23, 78, 81, 117 &amp; 124). The glossary on p139 also describes liveability as “a measure of a city’s resident’s quality of life, used to benchmark cities around the world. It includes socio-economic, environmental, transport and recreational measures”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Future Melbourne 2026</td>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>No specific mention of placemaking however almost every goal and priority in the plan is a placemaking principle i.e., priority 2.4 affordable for all to live and priority 2.7 an inclusive city to name just two of many.</td>
<td>Quality of life is mentioned in the plan a couple of times such as on p13 as part of priority 2.6 affordable community facilities and services “contribute to our quality of life by encouraging people to meet and feel connected”. However, on p9 it states that “the framework of goals and priorities builds on the strengths and attributes that make Melbourne the world’s most liveable city now and for future generations”. Priority 6.4 also aims to “enhance the municipality’s liveability”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Metropolitan Council Plan 2021-2025  | City of Melbourne | No mention of placemaking however many priorities and major initiatives are key placemaking principles such as affordable housing etc. | No specific policies and strategies however on p33 the plan mentions “health and wellbeing encompass the following elements: mental health, quality of life and happiness (among others)”. The plan also prioritises enhancing liveability (pgs. 26 & 46). It also claims to be “one of the |
| Metropolitan | City of Port Phillip Health and Wellbeing Strategy | No specific policies or strategies however p31 states that an objective is that “health, environmental and economic co-benefits are generated through integrating land use and transport planning and place-making approaches. Page 34 has an objective that states “facilitation of infrastructure and place-making initiatives support the local economy and workforce participation.” | No specific policies or strategies however p6 states that the Council aims to “maintain and improve the standard of living and quality of life” and on p28 aims to enhance “the quality of life for people as they age”. Page 32 finally mentions that an outcome by 2027 it wants to be “a greener, cooler and more liveable city”. |
| Metropolitan | Council Plan 2021-31 City of Port Phillip | No specific mention however many important elements of placemaking in the plan such as inclusiveness, affordable housing and other such aims and objectives and sets of indicators for outcomes. | No specific mention however aims and objectives to be a liveable city. |
| Local | Docklands Community and Place Plan (2012) | No specific mention however many important elements of placemaking in the plan such as culture, creativity, diversity, heritage, accessibility, | No specific policies and/or strategies however it aims to “improve the quality of life for residents and workers while welcoming visitors” |
and connectivity as well as encouraging the delivery of affordable dwellings. (p13). It also states that “Docklands plays an increasingly important role in the growth of Melbourne as a global city helping secure it as the world’s most liveable city in 2011” (p8).

| Local | Docklands Public Realm Plan (2012) | No specific policies and/or strategies however some elements of placemaking principles such as affordable dwellings are mentioned. | No specific policies and/or strategies however improving quality of life is mentioned. The plan also states that “the design of beautiful and functional public spaces impacts positively on our quality of life” (p6). It then goes on to state that “the most liveable cities in the world are testimony to the value of great public streets and spaces” (p15). Finally, it promises that “in 2022, Melbourne will continue to be one of the world’s most liveable cities with an excellent public environment” (p16). |
| Local | Placemaking Action Plan 2018-2021 City of Port Phillip | The whole document is an internal Council framework with a set of placemaking actions, | Quality of life and liveability are not mentioned. The plan is specific actions and |
activities to be carried out and timeframes. deliverable targets to do with placemaking interventions in specific areas only.

Table 4: Placemaking and Quality of life in planning documents relating to Melbourne, its metropolitan areas, and administrations

The Council Plans for both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip are the next policy documents after the Victorian State Governments’ Plan Melbourne, as can be seen in Table 3. It must be noted that Table 3 is not an exhaustive list of policy documents related to Melbourne, Docklands and St Kilda but rather a list of the major overarching policy documents used for development and regeneration as starting points, as there are too many specific ancillary documents that cover the process of planning and building permits, as well as in the London case studies. The Future Melbourne 2026 plan, which covers the 14 municipalities under its jurisdiction, including Docklands, as can be seen in Figure 19, is a short document outlining the city’s vision with a list of 9 goals and a set of priorities within those.

Figure 19: City of Melbourne, municipalities map, source: city of Melbourne interactive maps

The Docklands’ 200 hectares of land and water area (much like Kings Cross in London) has been part of a major development and regeneration drive since the 1990’s attracting new funding and investment, residential and commercial buildings, as well as the stadium. Businesses such as National Australia Bank,
Axa and the Bureau of Meteorology have made a new home there, as well as an estimated 22,000 people by 2031. Unlike London’s Kings Cross, however, Docklands has been criticised heavily for its lack of culture, diversity and mix of uses, and has been likened to a ghost town, especially in the first few years, which is then a difficult reputation to get rid of. St Kilda has suffered other struggles, such as a comparative lack of development and regeneration investment and a general decay of the urban fabric at times, such as on Fitzroy Street, the main street for retail, cafés, and restaurants. Docklands and St Kilda share some geographic similarities, such as being waterside locations in the southern part of the city with their northernmost boundaries near central Melbourne and the CBD. They, however, are very different to each other in terms of new development and regeneration, specifically since Docklands as an area is a comparatively new large-scale regeneration and development. St Kilda, on the other hand, is known for being the creative and cultural hub of the city, in many ways like Hoxton & Shoreditch in London, full of history and heritage with many run-down areas, issues of affordability, gentrification, and inequality all prevalent within its urban fabric. The population size of both administrative areas is just under 11,000 for Docklands and just over 20,000 for St Kilda (2016 Australian Bureau of Statistics Census data) meaning that all four case studies have a population size of between 11,000 and 20,000. The City of Melbourne municipality population (which Docklands is a part of) is 184,000 as of 2020 (city of Melbourne municipality population) whereas the City of Port Phillip population (of which St Kilda is a part of) is just over 108,000 as of 2016 (city of port Phillip population).

Figure 20: Public Art installation in Docklands, City of Melbourne, October 2019
In the City of Port Philip, one of the 31 Melbourne City Councils in Australia, they have a ‘Placemaking Action Plan’ for 2019 that defines Placemaking as “an action learning process that enables all parts of the community and Council to work together to create great places” (City of Port Philip, 2018 p. 1). The very existence of a Placemaking Action Plan written by the Placemaking team, headed up by a Placemaking Director for the City of Port Philip - created after dissolving the Economic Development team there - makes this case study key. It is the only one of the case studies to have a bespoke, standalone, and new (2 years in post at the time of writing) specific Placemaking team.

![Figure 21: St Kilda, City of Port Phillip Placemaking online campaign 2018-onwards](https://pridecentre.org.au/)

The Victorian Pride Centre on Fitzroy Street was still under construction during the interview period, however, it is a major new development in St Kilda and the first of its kind specifically planned, designed and built to welcome the LGBTQ community to a new community hub to meet and work in (https://pridecentre.org.au/). This diverse hub will be analysed further in the later chapters. On two different occasions a national reality TV series called ‘The Block’ was filmed in St Kilda and 2 derelict blocks from the area were used. In 2019, when the research was undertaken, the Oslo block on 38 Grey St (around the corner from Fitzroy St) was being filmed and, previously, the Gatwick building on Fitzroy St itself was used. The Oslo block was an old Victorian terrace of five houses from 1859 (the Block 2019). More analysis on the cultural, heritage and creative significance of St Kilda will be provided in the subsequent chapters.

In the Docklands, however, when the Development Director for Development Victoria was interviewed she explained that they are now working on “renewal within renewal” and that there are opportunities around the stadium for strategic intervention and she went on to say “if Development Victoria had their time again they would have held back certain areas but at the time they went ahead with this development project there was a real threat of losing jobs to Sydney so it was economic drivers that led it”. Although it seems obvious and simplistic to state that economic drivers led the regeneration and
development of Docklands when to some extent that is a key driver of many if not all development and regeneration projects, it is more the type of economic drivers that determine the outcomes. Giving planning, design, and construction jobs to many workers in Melbourne for Docklands would have stopped the flow of jobs being lost to Sydney for a time. However, that is a short-term and short-sighted economic driver for Docklands whereas, for example, Kings Cross had much longer-term drivers as Argent and Australian Super had longer term interest in the land, its management, and the economic return way beyond the construction period.

5.4 Waterfront and Waterside Case Studies and their Relevance

As discussed in chapter 2.2, waterfront and waterside placemaking can and should wherever possible be a key priority in development and regeneration projects, especially in those areas that naturally benefit from being in such a location. All the case study areas, including the pilot study, benefit from such a natural waterside and/or waterfront setting. Not all of them, however, make the best use of this natural placemaking opportunity and advantage. Both London case studies benefit from Regent’s Canal waterside location and both Melbourne case studies from the coast and seafront waterside location. This section will contextualise how these locations interact with and use their waterside/waterfront in new development and regeneration projects through placemaking and how policy documents deal with this. It will also look at how waterside/waterfront locations are perceived to affect quality of life. The policy documents that deal with the waterside and/or waterfront locations will be analysed in table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National, regional, or local document</th>
<th>Document and date</th>
<th>Placemaking policies and/or objectives relating to waterside locations</th>
<th>Quality of life policies and/or objectives relating to waterside locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>NPPF (2021 update)</td>
<td>Nothing specific however in the glossary of terms on p70 Open Space is defined as 'All open space of public value, including not just land but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>London Plan (2021)</td>
<td>No specific placemaking policies however many policies on waterways their infrastructure, strategic role, transport, use and enjoyment and their protection and enhancement which are all elements of placemaking such as accessibility and connectivity “convenient transport connections and street, rail and waterway networks that allow the efficient movement of goods and people are also vital” p23.</td>
<td>No specific quality of life policies however many policies on the impact of waterways such as environmental impact “wind, daylight, sunlight penetration and temperature conditions around the buildings and neighbourhood must be carefully considered and not compromise comfort and the enjoyment of open spaces, including water spaces, around the building” p140.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 Victoria State Government</td>
<td>No specific policies or directions however many policies such as 6.5.2 to Protect and enhance the health of urban waterways.</td>
<td>No specific policies or directions however many references to liveability being affected by water i.e., “the Yarra river and its parklands shaped the development of Melbourne and are essential to the identity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Plan/Project / Area</td>
<td>None however it does mention that it will “improve the health of its waterways by capturing stormwater and thus reducing potable water demand for irrigation and pollution” (p11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Future Melbourne 2026</td>
<td>None however many placemaking principles such as 24-hour summer culture, heritage, accessibility, community participation, desirability, diversity, development, and redevelopment and “economic development to achieve a balanced use of the foreshore public land for both residents and visitor” (p5). Redevelopment of St Kilda Pier, sailing boat harbour and construction of the separated penguin boardwalk (p12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regents Canal Conservation Area Appraisal Hackney 2007</td>
<td>None however many placemaking principles are discussed such as affordability “waterside developments increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development values by more than 20%” (p8), also community involvement and accessibility by activities run by Laburnam Boat Club, desirability and heritage and history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regents Canal Conservation Area Appraisal Camden 2008</th>
<th>None however many placemaking principles as above such as water-based leisure, history and heritage, accessibility, and desirability- lack of access discourages use (p22). Pgs.24-25 re: Kings Cross, also p33.</th>
<th>None.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Docklands Waterways Strategic Plan 2009-2018</td>
<td>None however the vision encompasses an “integrated water and land, tourism, services, environment including adjoining land uses” (p3). Other aims such as “increasing frequency and diversity of water-based public activity” (p3) also include basic placemaking principles.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Placemaking and Quality of life in waterside and waterfront-based policy planning documents relating to London and Melbourne, their metropolitan areas, and administrations

The blue-ribbon network (figure 22) in London links the waterways in the capital and the Thames and London Waterways Forum brings together all stakeholders involved to advise the Mayor of London on river and waterway issues.
When the Chair of the Friends of the Regent’s Canal community group was asked in interview about his views on the impact of the canal on residents, workers, and visitors he answered, "there is so much diversity along the canal that it is difficult to answer" and that he only gets involved in proposed changes. He then went on to say, "People who have lived in social housing for 30 years don’t like having more boats than there used to be as they associate it with bad behaviour, pollution and conflict as social tenants didn’t choose to live there". This insight into both London case studies highlights some of the placemaking and quality of life issues that will be analysed in the following chapters.

In Melbourne the desirability of the waterside/waterfront locations of St Kilda especially were mentioned by most interviewees. When asked about the quality of life in the area they always mentioned the beach as a contributor to quality of life there.

5.5 Summary

The case study areas presented in this chapter will be used thematically in the following chapters to analyse the placemaking and quality of life empirical findings from development and regeneration in their locations. These case studies provide a significant insight into communities and neighbourhoods and the
interplay within which development and regeneration has, does, and will affect them, and how placemaking and quality of life are perceived, used, and abused in this context. To summarise this chapter the case studies have been introduced so that a holistic contextual background is presented for the themes to be fully explored empirically. The final section of this chapter brought together all the case studies to analyse the waterside and waterfront placemaking and quality of life capacity they share by exploring their policy context, as well as some empirical findings specific to this.
CHAPTER 6: PLACEMAKING IN CITY PLANNING AND POLICY FOR QUALITY OF LIFE

6.1 Introduction

The different planning policies we see from the case study areas because of national, regional, and local stipulations have a real impact on placemaking’s potential to affect quality of life in new development and regeneration projects. The literature review chapters highlighted the themes and principles that make up exemplary placemaking such as affordability, inclusivity, diversity, culture, and accessibility and how these are not always present in planning policy for development and regeneration. When exemplary placemaking is present in planning policy it arguably creates development and regeneration projects that people want to spend time in and in turn can affect and enhance individual and collective happiness and quality of life (Attia & Ibrahim 2018; Brunnberg & Frigo 2012; MPavilion 2017 and Montgomery 2013).

Whilst the previous chapter set out the context of the different country and city and local authority areas planning approaches for development and regeneration in relation to placemaking and quality of life, this chapter will explore, compare, and contrast the different planning approaches, policies, and outcomes highlighted in the case studies. Despite the differences and similarities in their approaches the need to continue striving more than ever for better quality of life through placemaking in development and regeneration is evident throughout. Indeed, “casting an anchor and continuously monitoring and benchmarking city dwellers’ quality of life around the world is also an important step towards implementing Sustainable Development Goal SDG11: Sustainable Cities and Communities” (De Neve & Krekel 2020 p62). This goal’s aims (inclusive, accessible, sustainable, affordable, desirable, and diverse communities with rich cultural heritage) do not differ from many of the placemaking, and quality of life principles, core aims and objectives. City planners, therefore, regardless of context, are facing similar challenges and issues in their development and regeneration policies and practices and can therefore learn from best practice examples from other cities and neighbourhoods as well as learning how to avoid some common pitfalls and mistakes made elsewhere.

Placemaking, however, requires a bespoke solution applied to each individual neighbourhood area and community to best address its quality-of-life needs. Therefore, specific localised planning policy will need to target the different areas’ constraints, communities, and exploit its opportunities. As noted in the previous chapter, London has a complex history and heritage of built fabric and neighbourhoods and communities that provide hundreds of years of rich context as well as challenges when it comes to placemaking and quality of life in development and regeneration. Some
of these come as the pressure of homelessness, need for affordable and private housing and cost of living are rising exponentially and meeting these needs must be addressed as well and quickly as possible. Therefore, every new policy especially with regards to planning and development is deeply scrutinised within the planning policy making process and by the public along with its possible effects on quality of life, for example the level of affordable housing that is provided with every new development and regeneration project.

The London Plan (2021) and its various draft and consultation iterations have guided the different Boroughs in their policies and procedures such as Camden’s Local Plan (2017) and its Site Allocations document (2013) and Hackney’s Local Plan 2033 (2020), Draft Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan (2019) as well as its Supplementary Planning Documents 2016 & 2017. As with all cities’ administrative areas the London boroughs take years to change, issue and renew these policies and they do not often co-ordinate with each other which only leads to inevitable planning issues with timings of applications for new development and regeneration projects especially those spanning across 2 or more boroughs. This can cause not only delays to much needed placemaking projects but also sometimes aid other projects getting planning consent without the due care and attention needed for holistic placemaking and quality of life to be fully included (such as the Camden/Islington divide at Kings Cross and the lack of affordable amenities in the development itself, therefore relying on neighbouring Islington for such everyday “normal” necessities as a Kings Cross interviewee noted).

In contrast to London, Melbourne has a much newer urban fabric and infrastructure and in this context planning, development and regeneration have a different approach to embedding placemaking and quality of life. Many of the issues Melbourne faces are, however, much the same as those in London, namely affordability, culture & heritage, and homelessness. The two Melbournian case studies, Docklands and St Kilda, share some socio-economic and demographic similarities with the London case studies.

The planning documents that are relevant to Melbourne are the overriding Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 that covers the 31 metropolitan councils much like the London Plan covers the 32 boroughs. This plan then guides the metropolitan council plans in this case the Future Melbourne 2026 plan and the Council Plan 2017-2021 and the City of Port Philip Council Plan 2017-27. As in London, there are also a host of other ancillary plans that guide and direct strategy and policy such as the Melbourne

Indeed, in contrast to the UK cities the quality of life in Melbourne by global standards (it also being a global city on a par with London in all but size & capital status) has in the past decades and still ranks much higher than London on a consistent basis.
Annual Plan and Budget then localised plans specifically related to Docklands. By contrast to the Docklands, the St Kilda area does not have a similar set of strategic plans published. This highlights the level of investment and focus on the Docklands project “which gave Melbourne a ‘waterfront address’ and the potential to lure finance and other business” (Rawnsley & Spiller 2008 p85) and further demonstrates a deliberate attempt to create a place to attract inward investment.

The empirical data presented in this chapter will build on the common themes from the different case studies and is split in three sections. The first section will focus on Administrative & Other Boundaries and their Implications. This will provide an analysis of case study data on the effects of formal borough boundaries to placemaking and quality of life in new development and regeneration projects, people’s attitudes to these as well as more physical boundaries between access to public and private spaces, waterside locations and large road and building intersections. The second section focuses on the Multiple Developmental Approaches that look at not only planning policy in development and regeneration and the different levels and layers of administrative co-operation and interaction (i.e., between the City of Port Philip and St Kilda and the City of Melbourne and Docklands etc), but also its interaction with private developers’ and landowners’ placemaking, development and/or regeneration aspirations. The analysis will also include the level of interaction between the public and private professional entities and the public from an organisational and policy perspective. The last section will wrap up the planning policy analysis by illuminating the Execution, Constraints and Expertise of such administrative and private professional bodies as well as local community members.

6.2 Administrative & Other Boundaries and their Implications

As discussed in the literature reviews, all places have an identity (Hall 2006, Harris 2011, Healey 1998, Lew 2017) and “we are now in the era of ‘placemaking’, or a holistic approach to the planning, design and management of urban space that enables urban identities to flourish” (Richards 2015 p.1). This identity, however, often clashes with the boundaries given by administrative authorities to divide or “carve” up urban areas into distinct political and economic units creating issues related to cross-boundary collaboration between different administrative areas.

When analysing the impact of placemaking in development and regeneration it is important to note the impact that these boundaries can and do have on quality of life. An example of this identity clash can clearly be found in the Kings Cross area where its close eastern border with the borough of Islington along York Way has posed many issues for residents, new development and for effective placemaking. Interviewees here recognised the need for more affordable retail and leisure facilities
in the Kings Cross new development with one resident stating during an interview that she “would like to see a few more ‘normal’ shops as for these day-to-day shops we still have to go to Islington”. On the other hand, it became clear through an analysis of planning documents and Camden Council interviews, that having a more ‘expensive’ retail and leisure offering was a deliberate attempt to create a destination for a certain demographic and to encourage and foster a financial and economic viability that prices out more affordable retail and leisure offerings that can be found a short walk away in other wards and boroughs. The Section 106 (2006) planning obligation agreement between Camden Council as planning authority and the owners and applicants of Kings Cross in its Retail Framework in Schedule LL in the 4th point highlighted that:

“4. In considering whether to approve a proposed use and/or location the Council shall only be entitled to refuse approval if it has not been demonstrated to the Council’s reasonable satisfaction that the mix and location of unit sizes and classes:

a) Meets the needs of the phased development, its residents, workers, and visitors.

b) Delivers benefits to surrounding communities.

c) Does not materially adversely affect residential amenity.” (p.162).

Another example of the type of retail offering that has been engineered here can be seen via the highly curated ‘Kiosk’ publication (figure 23) hard copy (and now, a few years later, also a physical store and event hub in Coal Drops Yard) published by the Kings Cross Partnership https://www.coaldropsyard.com/kiosk-n1c/. It is named Neighbourhood Essays N1C and goes on to portray a culture for the area that is focused on higher end, sometimes independent fashion, and consumption of expensive art, food, and drink offerings. One such article in the publication discusses “Store’s new base on Lower Stable Street promises to become a focal point for the emerging N1C community. Hosting a series of regular after-school clubs open to local state school pupils, the site will provide a platform for creative interaction between local people and the new world of designers, shopkeepers, and architects in Coal Drops Yard” (Kiosk 2020 p13).
From a placemaking in development and regeneration perspective what this does is push for an artificially high quality of life by a set of specific metrics in one area, whilst putting pressure on other areas to provide and make up for the shortfall of affordable retail and leisure for those residents, workers and visitors requiring it, thus creating inequality and stifling diversity. As specifically noted in the Camden 2025 plan “There is a real concern about Camden’s identity and sense of place being fundamentally changed under the pressure of economic inequality...” (p.8.) This creates artificial and physical boundaries in different neighbourhoods where those on lower incomes feel they do not belong or are relevant to a more affluent area’s offering, as one of the new residents of the new development mentioned when interviewed that the area was “pricey” and that half the shops in Coal Drops yard shouldn’t be there, but they are “nice to look at”.

In short, when drawing a ‘line’ around a specific area there is a responsibility that what is planned in development and regeneration terms can enhance quality of life through effective placemaking. This means curating a place that is in and off itself perfectly able to sustain and enhance quality of life for all.
that live, work, and visit the area while being mindful as well of adjacent neighbouring communities and places. It should by default then not be at the expense or to the detriment of other neighbouring areas.

Figure 24: Photo of Camden Civic Centre in Kings Cross (Wembley Innovation, 2021)

As can be seen in the figure 24 the Camden Civic Centre with a new gym and swimming pool demonstrates the high investment into the area. As a field observation, on numerous visits through the St Pancras and Somers Town ward on the other hand the lack of placemaking investment is easily seen in Somers Town between Euston station and the British library just a stone’s throw from the new Kings Cross quarter where urban decay such as boarded up shops, rubbish in the streets and inadequate street lighting in passages demonstrate the lack of benefits of such placemaking and quality of life for many residents of the older social housing estates, workers and retail and commercial owners of the area. To these communities having the Kings Cross quarter nearby does not and cannot enhance their quality of life by much as apart from being able to walk there and enjoy some of the free activities and facilities in the public spaces there is little to be gained by them in the placemaking efforts of Kings Cross.

In this case, one does not even need to blame a lack of cross-boundary collaboration from out of the ward or the borough’s own administrative area but rather the privately owned boundaries of the 3 major train stations (Euston, St Pancras & Kings Cross) bounding Somers Town. It can be noted that if more collaboration had been implemented here then placemaking in the new development activities of these stations would have aimed to address the issues found in Somers Town. Placemaking in isolated boundaries does not and cannot benefit the neighbouring communities and areas that most desperately need it if it does not take them into account.
In contrast to the Kings Cross area the Hoxton and Shoreditch ward does not have such a major development and regeneration project taking up such a large part in size, prestige and focus of the administrative boundary area. There are several smaller infill developments and towers that are either mostly commercial or residential such as the redevelopment of the Britannia Leisure centre, which when finished, will incorporate a mix of residential towers, the new leisure centre, school and other smaller retail and commercial offerings. This means that unlike Kings Cross there is a more fluid interaction and less formal delineation between new development and regeneration projects in the area with the existing urban fabric. Placemaking in new development and regeneration projects can therefore either directly benefit and enhance local quality of life or do the opposite depending on how effectively it is planned from the outset. For example, interviewees here noted that most of the newly finished development is inward facing. Much of the open space created by it looked only to be used by its direct residents and not by other locals living and/or working nearby when it could have been public open space to be enjoyed by all.

Figure 25: Design Principles of the Britannia Project in Phase 2B public engagement 02 presentation 7th October 2021
Given this wider context, it is encouraging to see that the Britannia Project (Figure 25 above situated in the northern part of the ward just south of the Regent’s canal and to the right of Shoreditch Park) will incorporate outward facing public spaces that engage with the wider community and older existing parts of the area. The Hoxton and Shoreditch ward boundaries do not reflect people’s associations, and the culture of Hoxton and Shoreditch which is fluid and interplays across the boundaries. As one of the interviewees from the Laburnam Boat Club mentioned that the “borough is much more united” when she was asked about the quality of life in the area and went on to mention that for example the Dalston Sq. Central Economic Zone (CEZ) is an “increased community zone so for young people quite a lot is happening there”. For placemaking in this area then it is easier to have new development and regeneration projects that capitalise and make use of that fluidity and try to reach all neighbourhoods and communities especially the more social and affordable housing blocks to the north of the ward. The Shoreditch trust charity supports people from all areas in Hackney not just this ward or even borough, even though, as interviewees noted, the funding is tight and should reflect the wider reach and needs of the community. Some people come to the area for work, connections or education and are not necessarily residents themselves. In this case the administrative boundary is not relevant as it does not stop people coming in from other accessible areas.

In Melbourne, however, the administrative boundary of the Docklands underwent a complete marketing overhaul and launched campaigns such as the postcode 3000 (Rawnsley & Spiller 2008) to attract investment into the area. As part of the City of Melbourne administrative area the Docklands boundary has created a place pushed to the edge of the water that has suffered from what some Melbourne interviewees described as not a place they would ‘choose’ to go to if they didn’t already work or live there. On the other hand, a resident interviewee described the place as somewhere ‘great’ to live in that she loved being one of the first residential occupiers from the first phase of development. There is no beach to flock to in the Docklands area (unlike St Kilda) and unless you are taking or own a boat the water is just an aesthetically pleasing boundary to walk beside. This physical boundary turns the Docklands into a specific destination and not somewhere you can wander through or chance through on your way to somewhere else. This is a substantial additional pressure to be considered when looking at this area and the implications of it on quality of life and placemaking. Placemaking efforts need to ensure that people that do not just live and/or work there are attracted into the area to sustain a vibrant and mixed community. Therefore, the connectivity from other areas in Melbourne needs to be easy and attractive to ensure people are attracted to go to the Docklands. The physical boundary of the railway line, as can be seen in figure 26, also hinders this connection creating an imposing boundary to the city centre and North Melbourne, with the water itself creating the Southern boundary. Having such a restricted area poses problems to the Docklands administrative authority about how to have a fluid movement of people.
In contrast to the Docklands, the St Kilda area is the only waterside location to have a city beach in the Melbourne Metropolitan area and is therefore a natural destination for those wanting to use it. Its physical boundary with the sea makes it more of a destination in some ways than the Docklands where waterside activities are limited and come at a price. St Kilda, however, benefits from a free beach on its southern boundary and the start of Albert Park along most of its western boundary. Both boundaries are fluid destinations attracting movement between St Kilda and other administrative areas and therefore placemaking doesn’t have to work as hard in doing this. It is however interesting that interviewees noted that living in St Kilda can be seen as dangerous, as there are serious issues with crime and safety with families moving out of the area because of this as the member of Our Place Reference Group explained “residents are targets of assaults by desperate addicts and dealers”. Placemaking in new development and regeneration must work to encourage the local community to feel invested in the area, safe, secure, and proud to live and work there. Administrative boundaries, of course, try to strike a balance between population size and geographical area and constraints, however, this can sometimes lead to not enough or too much focus and funding in one area and not another.
When it comes to the administrative boundaries in the Melbourne case studies it is important to note that they constitute a similar geographical area size (approx. 3sqkm each), however, St Kilda has approximately double the population of the Docklands area (approx. 30k vs 15k as at 2020) Interviewees from St Kilda a lack of funding into the area both by the local council and investment from businesses, noting that the localities largest employer is the council itself. At the time of this study the City of Port Philip, where St Kilda is located, had a Programme Director for Placemaking and a team budget for interventions and investment. Although much effort and policy documents and key drivers were set (City of Port Philip Placemaking Programme 2019 & Fitzroy Street Place Plan 2019), many local interviewees felt it was not enough to drive and sustain real change required. In contrast, the Docklands administrative area has not seen interviewees complain about a lack of funding.

All the cases presented have administrative boundaries that effect the way placemaking can and does occur in new development and regeneration. These boundaries not only affect people’s relationship and attitudes towards these places but also funding and planning choices made, as well as practical connections such as travel. Administrative boundaries then, for planning and development purposes, should not create unsurmountable or hypothetical obstacles, but be treated more as a way in which to link themselves to each other, such as Kings Cross to Somers Town, Docklands to Melbourne Centre, etc, to enhance quality of life in these areas more equitably so that inequality and pockets of deprivation are eradicated with the help of placemaking in new development and regeneration. This type of holistic thinking can bring about area-based planning coordination and connectivity. Communities and connections are also made online as discussed in the literature review chapters. In all the case studies there are also boundaries created by private Facebook groups where one can only join by request, as one of the residential buildings in Kings Cross as one interviewee described. There are also boundaries created by apps such as Nextdoor, where one must be a physical resident of the neighbourhood they wish to join. For placemaking to truly be inclusive it must transcend physical and online boundaries. The difficulty lies in applying effective ways of doing this. Although the Area Action Plans for Kings Cross both in Camden and Islington put a mechanism in place to achieve a more cohesive connection with its neighbouring areas the implementation could have been improved (Islington and Camden Area Action Plan for Kings Cross). Planning policy needs to find a way of supporting and encouraging this by having a more flexible approach to boundaries, but also specific policies aimed at making sure the benefit of new development and regeneration is spread to other neighbouring poorer areas, much like the Mutual Benefit Programme in Rotterdam (Attia & Ibrahim 2018).

6.3 Multiple Developmental Approaches

Each case study presents many different top-down and bottom-up approaches to placemaking in development and regeneration projects and for enhancing quality of life. This section will analyse these
to ascertain those which are seen as effective both by the local communities and neighbourhoods and the local administrative authorities. Strategies that have not been so successful will also be analysed along with the reasons attributed to their shortcomings and failures, as well as strategies and ideas yet to be implemented.

As discussed in the literature review PPS (2012) see Placemaking as an intrinsically bottom-up approach. However, it is far too simplistic and dismissive to see Placemaking’s contribution as only being able to come from this angle. Having several effective top-down and bottom-up approaches working in unison could result in the most sustainable long-term improvements of many placemaking and quality of life activities. The CFO of Boxpark (which started out in Shoreditch and has since rolled out to other London locations) believes “Boxpark works well in terms of Placemaking as when developers such as Ballymore are looking to build new residential towers in an area nobody would want to live somewhere with no activity, so Boxpark helps with that by looking for and providing competitive leisure”. This is an example of where bottom-up and top-down (top-down through the planning permission and development process and bottom-up through the emergence of the Boxpark concept brought about by the community’s needs for start-up retail space) approaches have both been used together for successful placemaking activity.

Planning policy for development and regeneration differs in each of the case studies. The level of cooperation and interaction between these has a direct impact on the potential quality of life that a new development/regeneration project can have, such as between the London Plan policies and borough ones and the development applicant/s. This can be seen, for example, in London where p117 of the London Plan specifies in Policy D4 on delivering good design that “masterplans and design codes should be used to bring forward development and ensure it delivers high quality design and place-making”. This policy is then implemented at a borough level through the planning application, subsequent permission and then development such as in Kings Cross, Camden, and the Britannia Centre in Hackney. The interpretation of high-quality design and placemaking is then determined by the Local Authority giving their own specific site allocation guidance. In Kings Cross for example a Camden Councillor when interviewed stated that it was “not the Council’s intention to only have such high-end retail in the Kings Cross development”. This demonstrates a level of disconnect between the multiple layers of policy, intentions, implementation, and execution. Although the Camden Planning Department’s Design Review Panel looks at elements such as urban, inclusive design not all development proposals are referred to this panel and it does not specifically look at placemaking as one of its criteria.
In Hackney, for example, the regeneration manager for the Hoxton and Shoreditch area indicated that a more practical and hands on approach was taken in planning for new development/regeneration projects noting that

“Particularly in Hoxton because there is more than one scheme in a small area, taking the partnership approach, regular meetings, and feedback, making sure that they are not at cross purposes as don’t want two schemes to deliver the exact same commercial for example, is there enough childcare? Etc. The area approach is about understanding the specific area - not off the shelf approach. Starting to see a more strategic approach to channelling benefits to communities.”

This indicates an approach that at least endeavours to cut through the often inefficient and overly convoluted UK planning system. A similar approach was taken in Melbourne by the City of Port Phillip with the Placemaking team taking an area and endeavouring to work with the locals online and through targeted events and committees such as in St Kilda.

Figure 27: City of Port Philip, Have Your Say interactive online portal, source: haveyoursay
As figure 27 shows the online portal for City of Port Philip targets new development and regeneration proposals and seeks to engage with the local and interested community (as you do not need to live there to engage and have a say) in the planning process. However, St Kilda interviewees were not convinced that concerns and issues they have expressed many times to the City of Port Philip—such as problems with crime and drug use on Fitzroy St—were addressed seriously. The senior placemaking facilitator for Fitzroy St employed by the City of Port Philip noted the issue of how many years a vacancy on the street has been sustained is a “political hot potato” and the community on and around the street is a “polarised community”. Despite many so-called “placemaking” efforts from the municipality, it appears that many deep-rooted issues are not being resolved quickly enough.

The Docklands in Melbourne has also seen multiple development approaches from an international, national, regional, and local level with much financial investment but (compared to the other case studies) little formal community involvement and engagement. As the Docklands is the area that had the smallest existing community (either residential or other uses) it is disappointing to see that any approach between an existing community group here and the municipality was not capitalised on, the opposite seems to have happened as described below:

“In a submission to the Melbourne Docklands Taskforce in 1991 a spokesperson for the Wurundjeri Tribal Land and Compensation Cultural Heritage Council argued that, as they were the traditional owners of this site, they wanted to see open space retained especially in the underdeveloped swamp land along the Moonee Ponds Creek. They also recommended that the area be renamed in recognition of its indigenous heritage to Doutta Galla (Docklands Taskforce, 1991), which was not adopted. Nevertheless, these recommendations provided clear testimony to the on-going connection and presence of indigenous occupants and their wish to be part of its new place-making.” (Oakley and Johnson 2013 p351).

It not only seems that a genuine opportunity was missed to engage more meaningfully with the indigenous communities but also that the approach adopted by the Melbourne Docklands Taskforce may not have been in keeping with both the local communities’ and municipalities’ aspirations due to friction between the state government and the city of Melbourne. The project executive for state infrastructure in the City Design and Projects team for City of Melbourne stated that “the City of Melbourne didn’t agree with a lot of State Government ideas such as cutting off the old city from Docklands with the big highway bypass and putting the stadium on the edge as it doesn’t draw people to stay”. The interviewee has been the main contact between the state government and the Docklands for the past 12 years as Urban Design Manager. As most of the land was owned by the state government, the Docklands project was politically and financially biased towards attracting the highest economic return and not primarily...
focused on achieving the best possible placemaking that could lead to higher quality of life for new residents, regular workers, and visitors.

Figure 28: Melbourne Docklands, highway, stadium and initial residential towers in background, source: Docklands image

From a planning policy perspective, we have seen how the tensions between contrasting levels of authority: national, regional, and local may bring about less than ideal placemaking in new development and regeneration. This is also due to the additional relationship that needs to be managed between authorities at multiple levels and private developers and landowners that either own and/or control the land to be developed as well as the professional interaction with citizens with an interest in these new placemaking opportunities. This has been demonstrated in Docklands with the tensions between the state government, the city of Melbourne and the indigenous groups. However, the Development Director for Development Victoria commented “Placemaking outcomes can be manipulated over time” and for example at Docklands “the retail hasn’t been working and developers are now taking a more curatorial approach to their retail, so they now hold it and curate it so has to open Friday and Saturday nights to push hard so people change their habits and build up levels of interest”.
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The approach taken in putting together the Future Melbourne 2026 Plan was to engage a citizen’s jury ‘selected from respondents to the over 7,000 invitations sent to people who live, work or own a business in the municipality’ to develop and write the plan. The jury was therefore as inclusive and representative as possible although it is unclear how the jury was selected and by whom. Unlike the other case study plans, however, this plan has taken a multiple developmental approach to its creation by having not just employed professionals writing it but also several residents, business owners and ordinary employees. In this way the top-down approach has tried to meet as much as possible with the bottom up so when it comes to the individual Councils within the City of Melbourne having to develop their four-year plans, they have the benefit of a multi-layered plan with common goals and priorities to base them on.

The City of Port Philip has its own rolling 10-year Council plan and budget from 2021-31. The developmental approach of this plan is very different to the Future Melbourne Plan. The Have your Say Portal for the City of Port Philip (already briefly mentioned) is a rolling community engagement portal where proposals in real time are consulted on. The approach is therefore continuous with the citizens rather than a more formal citizens jury, as in the Future Melbourne Plan. The CEO of the City of Port Philip explained in his interview that the Council only employ him directly as the Head of the Corporation employs and directs all the other Council employees. Then in stark contrast to the City of Melbourne the CEO of the City of Port Philip heads up a specific Placemaking team with a Placemaking Programme Director who reports to him directly. When asked what the most rewarding part of his role was the CEO responded he likes “leading cultural change in large public sector organisations as departments tend to be very siloed... now problems such as drug use and public housing have intersected when before you could compartmentalise in the public sector as it was simpler- all issues are now intersecting so 90% of problems are really ‘wicked’” What he also enjoys the most is “getting an organisation with 24 departments to integrate a response”.

When looking at different developmental approaches Hackney have a regeneration team. The regeneration manager for Hackney in London reports to the Director of Regeneration. The departments that report to the Director are Housing Policy and Supply, Estate Regeneration, Housing Management and Area Regeneration. When asked if there is a placemaking team or if that is part of a team’s role at the Council, he answered that “essentially the team do placemaking but just don’t call it that”. Unlike the placemaking team in Port Philip in Hackney his role does not require him to push investment and there is also a separate cultural development team that he works with in the borough. He goes on to say that the “local community in Hoxton like the area as it is and just want more council services working with local charities and policy team for future intervention”. Essentially a more joined up inclusive approach is wanted locally between the Council and interaction with the community. The Peace of Mind Project Manager for the Shoreditch Trust when asked if there was anything she wanted to add that as a team
they try to meet with other organisations to piece together what’s on offer in the borough and she added that “many clients feel lucky and comment on how there is a lot of support, and the council are doing a lot in partnership to jointly deliver these services” and she hopes this will continue.

In Kings Cross when the Placemaking Project Director for Argent was interviewed he explained that Argent went beyond their S106 planning obligations with Camden and provided a £1.3M grant to distribute to local organisations to enhance estates and/or mitigate the impact of the new development in the wider area, such as Somers Town. Camden Council and Argent didn’t want to distribute the fund themselves so established Camden Giving charity. The initial seed funding of £1.3M has now grown to £5M. When interviewed, the Director for Hatch Regeneris who worked on the consultancy commissions for Kings Cross mentioned that the flexibility of Argent’s single ownership of the new development enabled to put things in place early such as the Camden Giving Charity above.

The specific new build estate regeneration project by project focus of Hoxton & Shoreditch compared to Kings Cross, St Kilda and Docklands demonstrates the needs of the area and its developmental approach is set up with this in mind whereas in Docklands and Kings Cross the new build is more focused on a single blank canvas with almost no existing resident and working community in those areas. Although this is partly because of the difference in area characteristics between used and unused land this must be considered when planning these areas which is where placemaking could really be of benefit. Comparatively in St Kilda the focus is not centred on new build development since apart from the Victorian Pride Centre there are no other big new build projects in the area at the time of this study. These different approaches to placemaking policy emphasise the need for bespoke, inclusive, and flexible local solutions that provide quality of life improvements for local communities both new and existing. Being able to incorporate a balanced mix of top-down and bottom-up approaches to determine actions, policies and procedures undoubtedly brings about the most effective and appropriate placemaking interventions to enhance the quality of life in new development and regeneration projects.

6.4 Execution, Constraints and Expertise

The final section of this chapter deals with how placemaking strategies in development and new regeneration projects are executed and the constraints surrounding their effective implementation and management. Issues surrounding different levels of expertise, what is seen as suitable and qualified and the impact this has on quality of life in new development and regeneration areas will also be analysed. For example, in the Kings Cross area as briefly seen in the previous chapter that Argent set up a recruitment agency (KX Recruit) and physical office on site to attract and deliver the right level of expertise for job opportunities created by local employers. KX Recruit is entirely run by Argent as they are the landlord and long-term asset managers of the development. The s106 planning agreement document
set an obligation on Argent, from the outset (Camden et al 2006 p4) for several facilities to be provided as part of the development with the Skills and Recruitment Centre being just one of eleven other facilities to be provided. Since 2014 when the KX recruitment office started operating, it has supported more than 1,000 people into new positions. Undoubtedly the retention thus far of the ownership and running of KX Recruit by Argent ensures a focus on its success as opposed to perhaps leasing the space to an external recruitment agency. The execution of this placemaking intervention can be seen as something to not only upskill the local community but also harness local talent and engage with the community to keep people motivated, employed and in turn enhancing local quality of life for residents knowing they have that resource to hand. Having this physical recruitment space/office (as well as online) in the Kings Cross development is undoubtedly a placemaking achievement since one key aim of placemaking is to use newly developed and regenerated areas for work activities to enhance quality of life. Here, "placemaking arguably involves the creation of a reality that generates externalities, including economic, social, and cultural benefits, as well as putting a place on the map for being a good place to live, work, visit, and generally 'be'" (Richards 2015 p20).
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**Figure 29: Kings Cross, KX recruit and information office, Winter 2020**

However, to understand the impact of such placemaking interventions, specifically at Kings Cross, the Hatch Regeneris team were approached by the Kings Cross sustainability and regeneration team to evaluate the public realm as there was no evidence to show how successful it was. They sought advice on how to measure the evolution of the social, economic, commercial, and environmental impact and the result was the report issued in November 2017 which highlighted, among many other things, the developer’s built-in flexibility from the outset. It noted that "Argent would encourage and support
initiatives to tackle issues from early-on in the development process, with a focus on leveraging additional benefits and investment, helping to respond to local authority resource constraints” (Regeneris 2017 p6). Working flexibly in partnership from the outset allows for placemaking strategy to grow and develop and respond to changing needs according to the constraints and expertise of all those involved, and Kings Cross is an example of how this was attempted.

In a similar vein the Victorian Pride Centre in St Kilda (under construction at the time of this study) is a co-working hub offering especially the LGBTIQ community with retail facilities and office spaces as well as practical and supportive services under one roof in https://pridecentre.org.au/about/about-the-centre/. This purpose-built facility is the first of a kind in Australia and shows what inclusive placemaking can do when the willingness and funding is there to allow development and regeneration projects to be completed. The City of Port Philip gifted the land, and the development was part funded by the state government, which in 2016 contributed to the construction of the facility. It is a standalone development in the area and not part of a wider masterplan or developer obligations. The consultant responsible for the Victorian Pride Centre project concept and delivery explained, however, that it is his goal to have a “safe and sustainable home for the LGBTIQ community but cannot do that if the street isn’t so-- therefore this can be a catalyst for revitalisation”. The street he is talking about, Fitzroy Street, is a challenge that requires not just the Pride Centre as a catalyst for change but also a co-ordinated expert effective approach to turn it into a street where people want to go, spend time in, and develop and invest in. He goes on to explain that following the international tender competition for the delivery of the centre the most frustrating part of his role has been “finding and having competent people and trusting and delegating to them.” Of course, having the best qualified and appropriate professional people involved in the redevelopment of the street is a key factor for the success of the placemaking attempts.
Both examples above demonstrate how a top-down placemaking approach can contribute to having a great impact on quality of life.

In Hoxton and Shoreditch however, some of the most effective placemaking examples come from a community bottom-up approach from organisations such as the Shoreditch Trust and Laburnam Boat Club. These organisations work with and for the local community to provide them with much needed services and spaces to meet and work and train. The Shoreditch Trust for example has space for start-ups to hire/make use of offices. The Laburnam boat club has play space for children especially those with special needs and learning disabilities and a chance to go boating on the canal. As one interviewee who has worked for the Laburnam Boat Club for 16 years explained it has “Grown into gap filling, where the community could benefit from additional services”. This level of expertise has come about from local workers knowing their community and its needs and setting up to provide the services that are missing themselves.

However, the constraints that come along with this type of bottom-up approach are often to do with not having enough funding to enable the projects to grow and evolve into the placemaking interventions that are required. The interviewee goes on to explain that although Hackney have funding available for them, to obtain it the workers “have to submit very time consuming and erratic in-house bids”. She goes on to explain that the club has a £300,000 turnover of which £50,000 is earned and the rest is charitable income from 17 different funders with a third coming from the Council. From a placemaking perspective it is a wasted opportunity that local new development and regeneration projects do not engage more with the club to achieve added mutual community and quality of life benefits. For example, the same interviewee goes on to say that when planning the regeneration of the Colville estate redevelopment nearby the club was not consulted. Even directly opposite the club where there used to be a community playground “they had to consult on the redevelopment and in the plans, they had gated the playground further down so the club asked to keep it open but was ignored”.

Figure 30: Construction hoarding, Victorian Pride Centre, St Kilda, October 2019

Figure 31: Laburnam Boat Club, Hackney, May 2019
The Docklands in Melbourne has experienced not so much a lack of funding, but the lack of a bottom-up approach from an existing in-situ local community. The Development Director (DD) for Docklands at Development Victoria (DV) explained “it was the economic drivers that led, and it was DV’s role to facilitate that”. Most of the development expertise in Docklands has come from the private and professional sectors, in fact the international developer Lendlease has the largest land holding at Docklands of 30 hectares as the DD pointed out and followed on by saying “so you see placemaking more in their precinct”. DV’s DD explained that as the organisation manages the negotiations and enters into the Development Agreements with the private developers on behalf of the state it straddles and “when they can all work together collaboratively it is really satisfying”. She went on to explain that the most challenging part of her role is “when people are so entrenched, when developers are ignorant to the Council’s needs, the risk profile means the satisfaction in renewal precincts is a slow burn and deals take a long time so at the end of the process if you stay the course, you can overcome the obstacles and then all get there”.

To bring about successful placemaking from an almost exclusively a top-down approach DV’s DD said that they “are still learning as there is no recipe and exact formula, you can try to bring things that work elsewhere, and it doesn’t work, some things do” she went on to say that they have also “been adventurous, tried Pokémon and it got a lot of footfall”. An important point she made was that they “have had a lot of negative press even though starting to get more of a culture and ‘permission to fail’ when you bring successful things from elsewhere thinking they will work, and they may not necessarily because of the levels of engagement”. Professionally the concept of ‘permission to fail’ does not seem to come across in the UK case studies. However, in Melbourne it is interesting to note that it is mentioned by the City of Port Philip professional team members when interviewed. This forgiving and flexible approach demonstrates a level of maturity and opportunity for growth and learning from placemaking intervention mistakes which allows quick responses and ideas for other solutions and different interventions. However, in practice, when the DD for DV was asked if she thinks placemaking affects quality of life she said she thinks “it does in the sense intrinsically it is about good design and people say they want to do some placemaking then internally they get push back by saying if it had been designed properly in the first place it would be successful”. This demonstrates again that actioning change and improvements is not done as much as it is endorsed and spoken about.
Figure 32 further demonstrates how the disconnect between the public and private professional and ordinary citizens, workers and residents in new development/regeneration projects can cause very real problems especially with regards to large sites with long development periods such as Docklands (more than a decade long development programme). The appropriate level of flexibility, expertise, and engagement at the outset to deal with differing constraints would give the best possible chance for a smoother development project execution and satisfaction and quality of life for all involved. A dedicated placemaking team with a budget for implementing interventions and change such as in St Kilda can go a long way to achieving this with the right level of expertise and ability to act. The Placemaking Programme Director for the City of Port Philip explained it in this way “The Fitzroy st night market had delegated power to be organised quickly in six weeks even if not a successful market in the end. The delegation is so important so you can try these ideas, even if you fail, you fail fast and learn from it.” The reason this is so important is that placemaking is an iterative, flexible process and one that works best by either taking time to implement an instant success or failing fast and moving on to turning that failure into a lesson learned and a better placemaking intervention next time shortly thereafter.

The lack of a placemaking specific focus in the London Plan means that the right level of expertise and a placemaking process is harder to define from the outset in new development and regeneration processes as can be seen from the examples in Hackney. Here, placemaking action is focused more from a bottom-up approach than a top-down approach. The constraints that this brings about are not only a lack of
funding limiting the ability to execute the placemaking intervention to its maximum potential but also a potential lack of expertise and resources in the development and regeneration process. By contrast, the focus on placemaking in both the Melbourne plans (City of Melbourne and City of Port Philip) means that the resource and funding can be directed to placemaking. Of course, in practice as we have seen in Melbourne issues still arise from a too heavily focused top-down approach in Docklands not achieving the quality-of-life enhancements that effective placemaking could achieve or too much focus spending and allocating funds quickly in St Kilda on unsuccessful interventions to meet targets.

6.5 Summary

This chapter has analysed the case study areas placemaking and quality of life policies and/or lack thereof as well as interviewees attitudes and opinions within the context of three critical factors: Administrative and other Boundaries and their Implications, Multiple Developmental Approaches and Execution, Constraints, and Expertise. The first critical factor investigated empirical case study data and evidence that expounds the impact of administrative geographical boundaries as well as physical ones (such as waterways, large busy roadways, and large private areas) on placemaking and quality of life. The London and Melbourne case studies all demonstrated that the administrative boundaries created a lack of cohesive placemaking activity on an individual neighbourhood level where need for change and improvement was most desperately required, such as for example in the Chalton St area in Camden between Euston and Kings Cross, Fitzroy Street in St Kilda, the Regents Canal Towpath areas by the Coalville and other estates in Shoreditch. Although all these areas require successful placemaking activity to enhance the quality of life, the different administrative boundaries provide different responses such as on Fitzroy Street with the City of Port Philip’s attempt to improve the vitality of the street with the introduction of physical tables and chairs to encourage people to sit and enjoy a coffee.

Figure 33: Fitzroy St, St Kilda, October 2019
What the City of Port Philip have tried to do is allocate a budget so small but with visible placemaking interventions in the hope the area will become more attractive and regenerate itself. In contrast, the Chalton St area near Kings Cross has not benefited from a temporary targeted placemaking intervention and being sandwiched in between Euston station and the British library it has been left behind. Although some efforts were made by Argent in Kings Cross to direct funds to Somers Town improvements, without an expert dedicated taskforce to use these funds in a timely and effective manner it is harder to see real interventions taking place in the short term even if just small quick wins such as the brightly coloured tables and chairs with a welcoming message in Fitzroy Street. Having a flexible developmental approach at planning policy level will give the best possible chances of successful placemaking and not one of the case studies does this perfectly as can be seen from the regeneration project by project approach of Hackney and the City of Port Philip to the massive investment drive at Docklands and Kings Cross. Many of the constraints come from the spaces the areas are in, the first two in Hackney and Port Philip delivering small projects to fit in to infill development spaces as and when the opportunities arise and/or materialise with different landowners. The two latter cases (Kings Cross and Docklands) have both the benefit and responsibility of one large project taking up much of the administrative space, focus and time. Both approaches are necessary in urban development as they fulfil two very different and yet important placemaking requirements that can have huge impacts on quality of life.
CHAPTER 7: ACCESSIBILITY FOR SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

7.1 Introduction

As noted in chapter 3 accessibility is by no means a new concept for either exemplary placemaking practice or quality of life metrics. However, the term itself is so wide that it is difficult to define comprehensively and subsequently achieve in new development and regeneration projects. Within placemaking activity, accessibility is not only physical but also, on a community social interaction level, and increasingly digital (Appleyard et al 2013, Belk 2013, Jensen 2017). This then needs to be considered when placemaking policies and interventions are introduced, implemented, and applied to new development and regeneration projects. Physical and digital accessibility are all important in shaping quality of life and therefore need to complement each other to enhance people’s quality of life in new development/regeneration projects. The next three sections of this chapter will explore and analyse these themes in this context. Firstly, Moving Around Easily and Efficiently in Order to Enjoy Staying a While will explore the concept of physical accessibility and analyse empirical evidence to demonstrate that when people are able to access places in an easy and comfortable way, they are more likely to go back to those places and spend more time in and use them for recreational purposes as well as work, residential, etc. This is then something that can enhance quality of life and is therefore crucial to successful placemaking policy. This is also key to people navigating their way through newly developed/regenerated places that have different accessibility options, such as modes of transport to, from and through these locations for communities to establish themselves successfully. Empirical evidence will demonstrate how improved footfall benefits and stimulates these new communities in general and how accessibility is a key factor. Mixed use developments, safety issues and daytime and night-time access are all factors that will be analysed through the empirical evidence in this section.

The section on Accessible and Effective Resident Consultation and Engagement will focus on empirical evidence demonstrating how engaging effectively with a local community for planning and placemaking interventions must be as accessible as possible. A comprehensive mix of engagement material will be analysed to ascertain how truly accessible this is and the effect it has on people’s quality of life. When it comes to digital accessibility it has been noted that “the advent of digital media technologies in the urban sphere offers opportunities to organise citizen engagement neither in local bottom-up nor institutionalised top-down fashion, but in networked peer-to-peer ways” (de Lange & de Waal 2013 p4). The empirical evidence in this section will analyse not only the traditional physical methods of community engagement in placemaking and development, such as leaflet and letter drops, community notice boards, local papers, and specific open consultation events but also the digital engagement through open access portals, webinars and online events, social media groups and other such digital
platforms. The accessibility of these physical and digital methods will be analysed to ascertain whether they contribute to enhancing quality of life or the perception thereof (subjective rather than objective) for local communities in development/regeneration practice.

The final section on The Significance of Local Events and Activities in Placemaking Practice will analyse how accessible or not local activities and events are in planning for new development/regeneration projects. These activities and/or events are not the consultation and engagement events and activities discussed in the previous section but those that come about from either temporary use (for example, Boxpark in Hoxton & Shoreditch or The Skip Garden in Kings Cross) or temporary festivals, markets, concerts and other such events and activities before and/or during the development/regeneration of an area. These events and activities are typically used to engage the local incoming new and existing community and bring them together. The empirical evidence will analyse how effective these events and/or activities are and how accessible they are to the community. Without accessibility, new development/regeneration projects will not truly be inclusive and as effective in enhancing quality of life for their communities. Placemaking policies and interventions in planning will be analysed in this section also in the context of meanwhile use and temporary installations, events, and activities.

7.2 Moving around Easily and Efficiently to Enjoy Staying a while

Section 3.2 of the literature review revealed how accessibility attributes of great places have been analysed in academic discourse as well as in the professional sphere (Attia & Ibrahim 2018, Talen 2010, PPS 2009). For a place to be physically accessible, placemaking activity needs to encourage the right mix of 24-hour use (Argent St George 2001, Talen 2010). The CFO of Boxpark when interviewed said that they “would like to move away from meanwhile use and become a permanent fixture in society, always open and people wondering through even just to use the public toilet, so they don’t have to spend money”. What this comment highlights is the aim of being a permanent fixture by always being open and accessible to all. As such ease of movement in a place can enhance quality of life by allowing people to come, go and stay according to their needs and desires. For example, the senior placemaking facilitator for Fitzroy St explained that “transport is difficult, to commute to work, more difficult to move around so you don’t leave your patch i.e., you are less likely to go to Northcote from St Kilda whereas in the past it was easier”. If it is not easy or efficient to move around then one is less likely to do so and this can make people feel trapped in one place as the Shoreditch Trust Community co-ordinator explained when comparing Hackney Wick new build area stating that it is “ghostly, only builders there, there is nowhere to sit, you just walk around aimlessly”. The longest serving manager for the City of Port Philip emphasised (he oversees the municipality’s building surveying) that paths are made a certain way then people use them differently and mark out their own “shortcuts, so then you redo a path with the shortcut. There is a balance though as need to cater for access for all, disabilities etc”. For all to move around easily there
needs to be inclusive and affordable transport offering that is well connected on foot, by road (private and public transport) and other relevant means (in London, for example, the Regents Canal could be better used and, in Melbourne, the coastline). When assessing different transport options for ease of accessibility all possible uses should be integrated into a placemaking strategy for new development and regeneration projects. Figure 34 shows the two different ownerships of the land surrounding the Regents Canal at Kings Cross. This means that to make any changes to improve or manage accessibility the Kings Cross Partnership which owns the red hatched land, and the land owned and maintained by the Canal and River Trust (in blue-brown), which is essentially the public footpath/towpath beside the canal, must work in unison.

Figure 34: Map showing ownership of land surrounding the canal at Kings Cross (courtesy of Argent LLP)

When interviewed, the Chair of the Friends of Regents Canal community group reflected on the effects of the Kings Cross development, saying, “It has given something but done very little to the canal, just
brought more people to it...boat trips are on the up as there is a greater number of customers who get dropped off and picked up at Granary Steps, so it draws people to the canal”. Effectively, more people seem to be accessing and using the canal for getting to and from the new development which not only integrates the canal and the boat transport option but also makes it more accessible and diverse. The Peace of Mind Project Manager for the Shoreditch Trust, when asked about who she thinks uses the Regents Canal the most, said that it was “mainly children” and she continued to say that “the use of the canal has increased dramatically, it’s very busy, there are lots more people living on boats and parking along it in the past 5-6 years”. Planning policy wise, “Edward Jarvis, Urban Design Manager at LB Camden, explained that while the council doesn’t have a designated canal strategy, much of the canal comes under its own Conservation Area (CA) stretching from Kings Cross to Camden Lock” (Future of London 2019 p1). The planning process is thus simplified as the canal does not have to comply with different sets of planning policies and character appraisals. In this policy environment placemaking strategies and interventions to enable better accessibility and connectivity can be implemented with more ease as can be seen with the Kings Cross development, Granary Steps, and the improvements to the towpath.

In the Melbourne Docklands however, the planning policy documents, such as the Docklands Public Realm Plan (2012), Docklands Community and Place Plan (2012) and the Docklands Waterways strategic plan 2009-2018, all aim to integrate the waterside location with plans to access transport options such as water ferries. However, as of 2019 these were still not in operation but proposed as part of the ongoing development of the area. This is a shame, since when specifically asked what she thought the quality of life was like in Melbourne compared to other cities, the Development Director for Docklands said, “it fares really well thought it struggles in public transport, the trains are congested and slow, sometimes you have to wait half an hour because of delays and congestion”. In St Kilda, the Art and Soul City Strategy 2018–22 (p38) had as one of the actions to “work collaboratively with local place users to co-create and implement four-year plans to revitalise three priority places: Fitzroy Street, Waterfront Place and Clarendon Street” with an estimated cost over four years of $1.55m. In St Kilda, therefore, the only placemaking focus of Fitzroy Street does not integrate St Kilda beach or Pier to its development and regeneration plans even though the tram and the street go directly towards and join these locations, as can be seen in Figure 35.
Figure 35: Map showing Fitzroy Street leading directly to St Kilda beach and pier from discoverstkilda.com

Moreover, the dedicated website to promote Fitzroy St as a destination https://discoverstkilda.com.au/ has on its ‘getting there’ page all possible transport options apart from the ferry, which is accessible only from another website (https://www.parks.vic.gov.au/places-to-see/parks/st-kilda-pier-and-breakwater). Integrating and promoting all transport options would be the most diverse and inclusive placemaking option, which also includes promoting the role and link to the waterside location. Interviewees when discussing St Kilda specifically mention St Kilda beach and its general waterside location as an asset as do some Docklands interviewees, as it is the only beach side location in the city of Melbourne. It seems short sighted that a co-ordinated placemaking effort has not yet been applied to maximise accessibility to and from this St Kilda asset to integrate Fitzroy Street and benefit much needed regeneration of this street.

The tram in St Kilda goes through Fitzroy Street and, as the CEO of the City of Port Philip noted, “they built a great tram on Fitzroy Street, but they didn’t think of the people on the street”. He explained that placemaking as a discipline aims to bring together different urban experts to avoid issues and single silver bullet solutions that do not consider the whole solution and its effect. In this case the tram taking up such a divisive large role on the street that people do not feel encouraged to walk, sit, eat, drink, and talk on the street as it is a less than welcoming pedestrian environment and leaves a lot to be desired in this regard. At the same time, however, a St Kilda resident and member of Our Place reference group discussed how some of the best features of St Kilda are the “public transport access is wonderful in St Kilda… there are 4 trams on weekends with visitors to the beach” and its “proximity to the beach”. He
goes on to explain that accessibility is so good in St Kilda that the use of a car is not necessary for getting around. Placemaking must maintain the transport accessibility, whilst improving street accessibility at pedestrian level by integrating and softening the impact of the tram and finding ways of making both sides of the street easily accessible with crossing points and pedestrian access prioritised.

Moving on from the above there are inequalities in the accessibility of a large part of the Hoxton and Shoreditch ward area as it is not within walking distance of a London underground station, compared to the Kings Cross area, which is serviced by Kings Cross underground station, as well as national rail, St Pancras, Euston, and other stations within a short walking distance. By contrast, Hoxton and Shoreditch has Shoreditch High Street overground next to Boxpark at the South-eastern boundary of the ward, Hoxton overground at the Eastern Boundary and Old Street underground to the west beyond the ward boundary. No underground stations are within the ward and the northern boundary is poorly connected as the Regent’s Canal also borders it to the north. Public transport options in the Hoxton and Shoreditch ward are therefore not as good as Kings Cross and accessibility and daily quality of life of residents and workers in the area are compromised. The PTAL ratings explained in Figure 36 demonstrates the difference between the excellent 6b rating for most of the Kings Cross Ward and the variety of ratings for the Hoxton & Shoreditch ward from a maximum of 6b by the south, where Great Eastern St and Commercial Street meet with Boxpark to a minimum of 2 by the Britannia Leisure Centre and all the residential estates in the northern part.

Figure 36: London TfL map showing PTAL ratings for Kings Cross and Hoxton & Shoreditch from: TfL

PTAL
For placemaking to be successful it needs to ensure accessibility is not only a range of diverse transport options, but access also needs to be always safe. This means having a place that feels comfortable to access in be in and travel through at any time of day or night. Going back to 24-hour use and accessibility, such that was briefly mentioned at the beginning of this section in the context of Boxpark it is important to note how important safety is when looking at exemplary accessibility of places. The Chair of the Regents Canal explained that there is “lots of bad behaviour on the canal, wild cyclists, people used to have organised walks, it’s a mostly healthy place but people are scared and now vote against it. The CRT (Canal and River Trust) should do something about it, they are in denial there is a problem”. The canal’s accessibility and safety is put into question here and who should be acting to address this the Canal and River Trust or the Council or both working in unison? Planning policy wise the Camden 2025 plan emphasises that the borough should be safe and when new Kings Cross residents were interviewed, one mentioned how she knew the area had a reputation for being “dodgy” before and was considered unsafe and another resident said how safe they felt there now because there are friendly security guards on site all the time patrolling, and they smile and say hello and make everyone feel secure. When it comes to safety, Fitzroy Street in St Kilda is still considered unsafe and one of the local resident interviewees and member of Our Place Reference group described how his “partner was mugged on the local tram and neighbour was car jacked, so there are real safety issues”. To address this the City of Port Philip Art and Soul Strategy 2018-22 focuses on “ensuring the safety and quality of life for our residents” (p24) and goes on to target 8 actions (p26). None of the actions specifically target safety measures, instead they focus on re-activating the street and attracting more shops and premises to open and people to visit. One could assume that safety would increase with these actions being implemented, however, one criticism from an interviewee when asked what he thought of the City of Port Philip placemaking strategy for the area and if it addresses his concerns was that residents:

“Keep referring to research and surveys on public safety and council focus keeps steering towards fairy lights, pop ups and public art. They don’t want to address the hard issues of the derelicts on the street who present as homeless, but we believe are not. People who identify as homeless cannot be moved on as police have to call social workers, so drug dealers have worked this out and are only homeless between 9-5”

He went on to say that he and other locals believe only 10% of those who say they are homeless are truly homeless. Clearly, this local resident believes the placemaking strategy does not address the important issues of safety and security. Finally, if one does not feel safe and secure in an area then that area will be avoided and become inaccessible. The broader point here about tackling homelessness as part of a holistic placemaking approach is to not displace them elsewhere but find a way to make them feel they
belong and do not need to be on the streets anymore. In closing then physical accessibility to, from and through a place is a key placemaking aim and new developments and regeneration projects through planning and effective consultation must ensure it is achieved. This effective community consultation will be discussed in the next section.

7.3 Accessible and Effective Community Consultation and Engagement

Local communities want to feel empowered and engaged with their neighbourhoods (Hes & Hernandez-Santin 2020) as section 2.2 of the literature review explained. Placemaking activity needs to ensure this is not only accessible but also effective and inclusive as explained in sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the literature review. As Ladin-Sienne (2017) explains these consultations should provide “measurable and accessible street-level insights” (p5).

Placemaking attempts should not only rely on online campaigns and communications but also on a comprehensive and simultaneous effort to communicate face-to-face and in print as for example is shown by the Kings Cross Partnership in London with their numerous online and print communications and physical office space open to the public onsite as well as regular organised events and activities. A resident of the intermediate rented affordable new build apartments at Kings Cross mentioned how 1.5 years ago an event was held in Granary Square where people were stopped and asked what they wanted to see in the area and were asked to fill out a questionnaire. However, when she was asked if she had ever heard of the Francis Crick institute, she hadn’t even though it is less than a ten-minute walk away. She said in this regard that it would be better to have more “communication for events outside Argent’s red line area in Kings Cross, i.e., the Francis Crick events”. In an interview with the Community Engagement Manager for the Francis Crick Institute she said that the community she works in is within a 1-mile radius from the Institute which Kings Cross (figure 37) is well within. It is therefore disappointing to see that an opportunity for collaboration between the Kings Cross Development and the Francis Crick Institute was not developed as both developments want to engage with the community that is local to them both.
The lack of collaboration and communication between different local landowners even within the same borough and ward area demonstrates a missed opportunity for placemaking interventions. Local communities such as in Kings Cross do not benefit from enhanced resources at their doorstep due to a disconnected approach to engagement at the planning and development stages. For example, in Kings Cross KX recruitment centre (winter 2020) on site there is no communication and information with regards to the Francis Crick Institute and vice versa (Autumn 2018).

The fact that the Future Melbourne 2026 plan held over ‘30 face-to-face events and 2,000 people engaged in online conversations to produce 970 ideas for the future’ and a ‘citizens’ jury of 50 people was appointed to review and rewrite the Future Melbourne Plan to make it relevant for the next ten years to 2026’ shows the organisation and importance placed by Melbourne on effective and meaningful community participation and access. Of course, of it difficult to ascertain if the London Plan also put as much emphasis on engagement as the results of such are not as well publicised and listed separately online (london plan consultation responses) and there is of course the issue of local-level placemaking which is not addressed by such a wide-scale outreach and cannot be as meaningful and inclusive as the neighbourhood policy consultations. When the CEO of the City of Port Philip was asked what the most
rewarding part of his role was, he said it was “the enabling role...and the co-creation and co-contribution to build community capacity to enable them to find solutions for themselves and that is where Placemaking sits”. MPavilion (https://mpavilion.org/about/) in Melbourne is a co-creation and co-design studio to enable to local urban community to “come together to engage and share” (Figure 38). This sort of city-wide community programme demonstrates a real attempt at not only engaging with anyone in the community that wants, but also consulting with them on day-to-day urban issues.

The issue with effective engagement and consultation is that however inclusive it is not everyone will want to be involved, whether in person or digitally and having as many ways of engaging with communities is the best way of capturing as large a proportion as possible (Masden et al 2014, Williamson & Ruming 2019). In this context social media is another channel by which to increase engagement with those that would otherwise not attend community consultation events in person. When the Placemaking Programme Director was asked if social media is effective for example in her team’s Love This Place campaign, she said that:

“Yes, it has a role, it can help promote the places, ideally you wouldn’t need it because of word of mouth but these days social media is word of mouth! So yes, to kickstart placemaking, it needs a little
Most interviewees echoed these sentiments when asked about social media’s potential role in placemaking practice. Below is a table of social media pages that are hosted by the different case study councils and the number of their followers, last active posts and number of likes, comments, and shares to demonstrate the level of engagement these digital channels create:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study administrative authority</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>Linkedin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hackney Council</strong></td>
<td>Followers: 10k</td>
<td>Followers: 10.2k</td>
<td>Followers: 13,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active posts: daily</td>
<td>Active posts: daily</td>
<td>Active posts: daily</td>
<td>Active posts: weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 0-72</td>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 7-1,443</td>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 8-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments per post: 0-63</td>
<td>Comments per post: 0-25</td>
<td>Comments per post: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares per post: 0-19</td>
<td>Shares per post: n/a</td>
<td>Shares per post: n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camden Council</strong></td>
<td>Followers: 6.3k</td>
<td>Followers: 1,262</td>
<td>Followers: 16,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active posts: daily</td>
<td>Active posts: weekly</td>
<td>Active posts: daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 0-13</td>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 19-61</td>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 1-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments per post: 0-6</td>
<td>Comments per post: 1-5</td>
<td>Comments per post: 0-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares per post: 0-3</td>
<td>Shares per post: n/a</td>
<td>Shares per post: n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Port Phillip</strong></td>
<td>Followers/page likes: 11,172</td>
<td>Followers: 5,566</td>
<td>Followers: 11,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active posts: daily</td>
<td>Active posts: daily</td>
<td>Active posts: weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 0-129</td>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 12-162</td>
<td>Reactions per post (likes etc): 13-116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments per post: 0-11</td>
<td>Comments per post: 0-6</td>
<td>Comments per post: 0-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares per post: 0-17</td>
<td>Shares per post: n/a</td>
<td>Shares per post: n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above shows that engagement with all 3 social media channels is similar across all 4 case study areas as a proportion of their respective followers. There is a clear lack of engagement with social media when looking at the number of reactions, comments and/or shares as a total proportion of followers, meaning that either the official administrative authorities’ posts need to change and/or be promoted more or that they should also have a robust physical presence for engagement either through events, their website (although digital) and community noticeboards, postal publications, and leaflets. What is interesting is the number of unofficial social media pages, however, that are used, managed, and engaged with by local communities and neighbourhoods. Some residents of Kings Cross mentioned their apartment block’s Facebook group. One interviewee mentioned that advertising events on there would be good as “it is a well-used group and great for the sense of community” and went on to explain that it has a really big impact as they can ask neighbours to take packages for them when they are out or ask to borrow items and making friends for example. Likewise, the Senior Placemaking Facilitator for Fitzroy St said she knew of five different community group Facebook pages for St Kilda, Residents in St Kilda, Friends of St Kilda, Rate Payers of Port Phillip, St Kilda images and stories, and St Kilda live music. She
went on to say it is "interesting to see how they react in those forums so you can tap into that resource, but it needs to be done really well" and they are not set up for that in the communications team yet. So, the accessibility to the engagement and consultation resource is one thing but the next step is for it to be effective and useful as a tool.

All the case study areas have their administrative authorities' online presence through websites, some more interactive than others set up for planning consultation. As part of a statutory requirement in England, Camden, and Hackney both have planning portals where planning applications are dealt with and can be monitored online including publication, consultation, and monitoring. There are also formal physical attempts at resident consultation and engagement by the administrative authorities such as in St Kilda where the City of Port Philip has put together Our Place reference groups. One interviewee said he had been a member of the group since it was established 6 months prior. He went on to discuss more about these types of groups and said there are also other local official groups such as the West St Kilda Resident’s Association, RASK (Resident Action St Kilda), Friends of St Kilda Hill and St Kilda Junction Residents. When explaining how these groups can become official groups he said:

"There is a legal framework for incorporated associations who register with the government and have at least 1 AGM a year and there is a requirement for an elected office holder and financials reported. So, it is a governance framework for groups such as these, historical societies for example also etc." He represents RASK and "expects group will report to council on what the result will look like, and several structural changes will be initiated- hard decisions...will draw up a matrix for the whole group, how do we know when to stop? Life of this group is 1 year ish advisory role...would like to see 10% shop vacancies so a 15% reduction on the street" (Fitzroy Street).

The consultation and engagement evident here by the community association is that they are seeking hard results for Fitzroy Street, the main large problem street in St Kilda. The local community want to see change that will enhance quality of life, as the CEO of Port Philip discussed placemaking facilitates this as it is "that process of getting a community to understand and teaching through action learning. Community capacity building to solve complex problems...and to influence a place i.e., Fitzroy Street in St Kilda- getting the owners to create more foot traffic by curating their street". This demonstrates a joined-up approach coming from top-down and bottom-up action using both physical (the reference action groups) and digital (the Have Your Say Port Phillip community engagement web portal).

In contrast to St Kilda, the Docklands has struggled to have a similar joined up approach. Even though three planning documents in the development and regeneration of Docklands were specifically designed
to encourage and promote engagement and consultation (Docklands Community and Place Plan 2012, Docklands Public Realm Plan 2012-22, and Docklands Waterways Strategic Plan 2009-2018) some interviewees described a lack of real engagement, resulting in assumptions that “a quiet life for some people is what they are after so they will not want to engage in community events and activities etc”. This comment from the Development Director from Docklands goes some way in explaining the difficulty with community engagement. There could be a higher proportion of Docklands residents and workers etc wanting a quiet life or this could be an assumption made to justify the lack of engagement and consultation. The Docklands Public Realm Plan described how “Places Victoria and City of Melbourne have spent time engaging with thousands of Melburnians to articulate and refine a community vision for this important and unique place in Melbourne” (2012 p1). Furthermore, the Dockland Community and Place Plan details how “more than 3,700 people were involved in the preparation of the second decade of Docklands draft shared vision for Docklands which was launched in October 2010. More than 2,000 people shared their views and ideas about their priorities for the next 10 years of urban renewal at Docklands” (2012 p15). Effective consultation and engagement therefore is about not only involving a high number of people in development and regeneration plans but also bringing forth plans of specific actions people want to see change. In this regard the Docklands Waterways strategic plan highlights some of these issues such as “re-establishing a (water) shuttle service is supported by many stakeholders but requires a review of public and private funding arrangements” (2009 p5) and “although most people understand it is still a developing area, Docklands is criticised as being soulless” (2009 p6). Effective engagement and consultation should also mean finding ways to overcome financial barriers to support and implement sustainable transport solutions such as the water bus shuttle service and other popular ideas.

It is not enough, therefore, as noted above for consultation and engagement to be accessible. That is the first step, but it needs to be effective and foster change and action that has resulted from the consultation and engagement process. In this way it can implement change to enhance quality of life for the communities it serves through placemaking and planning policy.

7.4 The Significance of Local Events and Activities in Placemaking Practice

Sustainable communities can only thrive if they are continuously engaged in a constructive and supportive way. Kamvasinou (2015) uses the example of the Kings Cross Skip Garden (figure 39) to demonstrate how temporary uses and installations can, over the course of time, provide creative conversations and proposals in a long-term development and regeneration vision. Although the study does not explicitly highlight placemaking interventions or their effect on quality of life it will analyse further these findings, to illustrate how Argent the Developer on Kings Cross provided a Placemaking Team and resource to drive temporary public realm pop ups and actions.
The Francis Crick Institute also host lots of temporary events in their public space such as film screenings, exhibitions, tours, and science talks as well as getting “involved in lots of community festivals- Chalton St etc” in the local area and using the concourse outside for family events, as the Community Engagement Manager for the Francis Crick Institute described in her interview. As discussed in section 7.3 the lack of interaction with the new development at Kings Cross is a missed opportunity. In her interview the Community Manager stated that “local attendance to events is a smaller portion of total attendance” and she goes on to say that she is “focusing on employing local talent to co-produce events together” with the type of audience they want to engage. They did their first summer youth project where they recruited young people who promoted and hosted an event as a pilot and will go on and do another. There is also an older person’s group co-producing matinees. Again, as noted in section 7.3 the KX recruitment centre in Kings Cross would be an ideal place to recruit local talent to promote the Institute and cross-sell both new developments’ placemaking capacity. If cross collaboration between new developments was encouraged and even enforced to some extent at the planning stage, then some if not all these opportunities would be capitalised on and would go some way in enhancing local quality of life.

In contrast to Kings Cross and specifically the Francis Crick Institute in Hackney the community co-ordinator for the Shoreditch Trust confirmed that they did not host activities and events other than small group activities currently funded for Hackney residents only, but they do get invited to attend events and
they collaborate on these with the likes of Hackney Council and others. However, Shoreditch Boxpark as confirmed in an interview with the CFO have round the clock events, 320 of them in the one site each year. They have lots of different events there like children’s raves on New Year’s Day and a choir at Christmas time as well as showing important national and international sports events on big screens. The CFO stated that they have created employment with most staff being local people and that Shoreditch Boxpark is seen as a safe environment. Having temporary tenants and constant pop-up events is useful for pocket infill developments going up at different times in the local area as there is always something different to welcome old and new residents, workers and visitors and keep a more engaged local community. Unlike other events organised in the other case study areas Boxpark has become a well-known brand that has grown and is mentioned in guidebooks for the area as a destination, somewhere for people to come together where there is always an event or other to keep one interested, entertained, and occupied. Placemaking practice needs to keep the maximum number of local people as engaged as possible and a place like Boxpark can help bring communities together if it is as inclusive and diverse. The CFO also mentioned that they do receive noise and alcohol complaints as they are an easy target to blame but they control it, and it does not cause them too much of a problem as, in their view, they are seen as more of a benefit to the community rather than a hindrance. Boxpark was developed as a meanwhile use on a future development site and has seen successful use of the area before it is developed and/or regenerated. The Shoreditch Boxpark has had its lease renewed when a new development stalled and hence the flexibility of such a use is another factor when looking at placemaking within new development and regeneration projects.

In Melbourne the interviewee responsible for the Victorian Pride Centre concept design, planning and project management describes how Fitzroy St in St Kilda has a “huge amount of activity but no action...for example last year’s project on the tv show On the Block was the Gatwick building round the corner” and then he went on to discuss how these temporary activities come and go and do not in themselves fix the problem long term that the street needs revitalisation and to be cleaned up and safe and accessible for all. The controversy surrounding the Gatwick building (figure 40), a former homeless shelter, in St Kilda is that this local temporary activity was for entertainment tv, and the relocation of affordable housing tenants had to take place for the show to take place. Some of the controversy can be seen in this article: on the block Gatwick building controversy or this article: on the block Gatwick building controversy 2. Interestingly the same TV show did the same thing for another season a year later with the Oslo backpacker’s hostel around the corner from Fitzroy Street. The mixed response from locals was that they were generally happy to see a potential reduction of crime and increased safety, but others expressed concerns of displacement of those poorer vulnerable residents and gentrification. The point of these temporary solutions of course is to not solve some issues by causing others and leaving the place with these.
The temporary local events and activities used in placemaking practice need to enhance quality of life for the local community and it is therefore a delicate balancing act when regenerating an area such as the Gatwick building in St Kilda where the tv show was the clear focus and not placemaking to enhance quality of life. Both the Placemaking Director and CEO for the City of Port Phillip explained that being able to trial temporary placemaking activities, events and interventions with the 6 weeks delegated powers is key to implementing some quick wins and engaging with the community as well as understanding what works and what doesn’t for future interventions and some longer-term projects. This is a principle echoed by the CFO of Boxpark with regards to events, activities and even the length of their tenancies, as well as by the community engagement Manager for the Francis Crick Institute and their interventions. One of the Shoreditch Trust interviewees mentioned how in the context of making best use of the Regent’s canal through placemaking practice there could be more annual events such as on bank holidays have community BBQs and organised fun runs, for example Haggerston Boat Club every year gets packed out.

What new development and regeneration practice can do is be a “catalyst for revitalisation” as the interviewee responsible for the Victorian Pride Centre explained and temporary events, activities and installations can help in providing such revitalisation before, during and after the new development and regeneration takes place. Planning policy needs to facilitate and encourage such temporary uses by making such a process fast, inexpensive, and accessible to all as was more broadly discussed in the literature review and Andres (2013). The Meanwhile Use London report (Arup 2020) explains that “to be resilient, meanwhile use initiatives must be designed and delivered in a way that creates real value for local communities, and that ensures these benefits are long-lasting, even where the initial activity is time bound” (p3). Policy D7 of the London Plan does give opportunity for meanwhile uses in the early phases.
of development and regeneration projects however it does not go into specific detail about how funding for such uses could and should be obtained. Moreover, although such policy is encouraged there is no framework within which it can and should be applied such as a placemaking framework. Both the Docklands and Kings Cross have had since the beginning of their respective developments and continue to have meanwhile uses either using temporary markets, either seasonal, weekly or monthly, temporary installations such as the Sea lights Water Pavilion in Docklands and the Skip Garden in Kings Cross and even temporary buildings such as the Hub @ Docklands and the Skip Garden café and learning centre at Kings Cross. In this context then it interesting to see that the Programme Manager for Groundwork London who has worked there for 18 years had not experienced a joined-up approach for meanwhile use opportunities at planning and development stage of projects. Instead, Groundwork provide meanwhile uses in areas and communities “to enhance people’s wellbeing through for example physical interventions and neighbourliness by trying to understand what the issues are rather than making an assumption”. Figure 41 shows Groundwork London’s website and a list of their ongoing projects the majority of which are not as part of a meanwhile use for new build development.

Figure 41: Groundwork London webpage, Feb 2022, groundwork London link

The Laburnam Boat Club in Hackney, for example, can and does host temporary events and activities, however, as previously discussed when asked in an interview whether they were consulted on the new development proposals of the Colville Estate nearby they confirmed that they had not been. The lack of...
cohesive engagement at early planning stages shows a disconnect with local communities and societies and a bespoke placemaking planning framework would aim to join up these resources to enhance quality of life. One of the new residents at Kings Cross development when asked about the Quality of Life there said that one of the best features here were "the Canopy Market and Waitrose which has a jazz bar in it on a Thursday and the free events like a punk gig, it is nice to be able to do everything in this area" She went on to say that there are not as many pop up events now but it is still great and at Christmas, for example, they were giving out free roasted chestnuts. She believes that residents of other Kings Cross and Camden estates as well as further afield, come here and has noticed in the past six months people coming from Islington and she thinks it is more than just Camden people coming in to visit and use the area. "At Halloween for example lots of people came in for a Harry Potter walking event. People go on the Kings Cross website to find out what’s on and look at the activities board on the station wall for the temporary programmes and pop-up events." She finished by saying she would like to see more music events in Granary Square and that more weekend pop-ups and Cubic Square Cubic Sessions would attract lots of people. The senior placemaking facilitator when asked what the most rewarding part of her role is responded the "art programme for example has nice responses from people in the community and the musician parking zones also get nice responses on social media, they are really simple not massive steps". These events and activities are the type of events that can take shape during a planning, development, and post development process to always benefit the community and when they are initiated at the planning stages of a new development, they can become the foundations for enhancing quality of life.

However, it is important to note that these meanwhile uses could and should also be seen as "potential for people to get involved in the litter picking activities, a charitable team building activity perhaps and help staff of the Shoreditch Trust with their Corporate Social Responsibility" as the Chair of the Regents Canal pointed out, but he has more respect for those who do these things anonymously since M&S did it once and made it to the BBC news. He also mentions leisure boat trips and describes them as "100 hot tub gimmick if they get in the way of the boats" he would be annoyed as these long-term private party boat moorings "detract from quality of life but pay the Canal and River Trust a lot of money". Talking of the Canal and River Trust he criticised how they employ a poet to reach out to the wider community but lay off people such as engineers to look after the navigation of the canal and that should be their "primary function but you wouldn’t think it from their activities". These valid concerns shed some light on some of the issues that need to be addressed when looking at temporary activities and events in new development and regeneration practice as well as ongoing future meanwhile uses.

In conclusion, meanwhile uses in the form of local events and activities in placemaking practice in new development and regeneration projects are seen as contributing to enhancing quality of life by all those who have experienced them. It is of course important to ensure these uses are appropriate and not just a
means to economic enhancement or a quick fix. The way to ensure that these meanwhile uses can be more than just encouraged is by embedding them into planning policy via a placemaking framework.

7.5 Summary

Good accessibility is a key factor in placemaking best practice as has been evidenced in this chapter. Accessibility is not only physical but also digital and psychological, as demonstrated within the cases discussed in the preceding sections. In the first section: Moving Around Easily and Efficiently to Enjoy staying a While, it was evident using empirical examples that a 24-hour offering of a mix of uses that ensure people always have access to places via different transport options is the most inclusive way of ensuring accessibility and enhancing quality of life. In development and regeneration, the ease of public and private travel options to get to a new destination need to include an ease and a choice of walking and other modes in a safe environment. Planning policy therefore needs to recognise the difference between its policy aims and objectives in this regard and its ability to determine actions that will affect how people relate to new development and regeneration projects. The private and public sectors need to work together to ensure accessible options are not only planned but also built out to satisfaction. The relationships between people and place either physical and/or digital, need to be as easy as possible and made accessible so that through placemaking they do contribute to enhancing quality of life.

The second section focused on Accessible and Effective Community Consultation and Engagement and demonstrated how the different case studies approached planning policy and engaged with their local communities both digitally and physically. It was evident how new development and regeneration projects sometimes worked in isolation of the existing built environment close to and/or around them without collaborating on engaging and consulting with the local communities they serve. To have the best chances of being inclusive when planning for new development/regeneration projects, landowners, public and private sector organisations, and developers should take full advantage of all digital and physical consultation and engagement platforms and opportunities available. Even so it will never be possible to consult and engage with the whole community. The different digital platforms such as social media channels were discussed and how they were used officially by administrative authorities as well as groups and pages run by private professional organisations and community groups. Enabling accessible engagement through as many channels as possible to be effective as well as formal planning and placemaking consultation and action was shown to be the most effective way to enhance quality of life for the local communities.

Finally, the Significance of local events and activities in placemaking practice analysed empirical evidence of interventions by private and public organisations in new development/regeneration projects. Whether these organisations were for profit or voluntary or required forms of grant funding to operate is a factor
in the placemaking effect of such meanwhile uses and temporary spaces. Since planning policy in the case studies does not have specific requirements for these meanwhile uses and merely plans for them without ensuring them as an obligation it is then up to the development/regeneration project to ensure their implementation. Another factor to consider is that these meanwhile uses are also subjective and not always popular or for the greater good but more for profit than a community benefit. The time bound element of these temporary events and activities are also a factor in people's perception of them and their effectiveness in placemaking practice since their seasonal, weekly and day or night-time use engages with different facets of the community they serve and therefore they need to be as diverse and inclusive as possible. In short, the complex nature of ensuring placemaking practice is accessible for all and serves to enhance quality of life in new development and regeneration means that diversity and inclusivity must be core placemaking criteria. To achieve this planning policy needs to be comprehensive and inclusive and be able to prescribe specific required actions in new development/regeneration projects to benefit the existing and incoming communities. In doing so administrative authorities should work in collaboration with private landowners, developers and organisation and co-design and co-create an effective placemaking strategy. This placemaking strategy will ensure accessibility is at the core of new development and regeneration by bringing together the complex relationships, interests and aims that need to be balanced between the different stakeholders involved. The case studies demonstrated the different ways in which accessibility could be improved to enhance quality of life in new development and regeneration.
CHAPTER 8: ISSUES OF AFFORDABILITY, DESIRABILITY AND CULTURE

8.1 Introduction

Following on from the previous chapter that analysed the placemaking principle of accessibility (both physical and metaphorical) this chapter will focus on three of the most important placemaking principles: affordability, desirability, and culture. Appleyard et al (2013) in their list of examples of livability (and its link to quality-of-life p64) include a ‘desirable quality of life, existance of unique cultural and environmental resources’ and ‘affordable and appropriate housing’. The case studies will demonstrate the effect that Affordability has on placemaking in new development/regeneration and on quality of life. Densification and Gentrification are important issues in this regard that will be analysed from a planning policy perspective through to the lived experience. As highlighted in the literature review in chapter 2.3 affordability has always been a prevalent issue for landowners, administrative authorities (planners), developers and ultimately the end users. It is the end users that arguably have the most to gain or lose if a new development/regeneration project is not affordable for them in the long run. The issue has been pertinent for many decades of course as “Relatively little public discussion thus far has considered the impacts on particular localities of changes in government rental policies or the increasing costs of the private rental market for the poorest residents” (Mee 2002 p348). The literature review also discussed how placemaking is often seen as an unaffordable option in new development/regeneration projects or if it is incorporated then it can lead to driving up land prices that filter through to development costs and rental and purchasing costs of the housing, retail, and commercial spaces. This is then described by many as one of the ways in which gentrification comes about, affordable places make way for expensive new developments where gentrifiers move in and push some of the existing affordable tenants to other more affordable areas. Finally, then it is important to note that “to build more and denser housing in neighbourhoods where it was once forbidden, conversations persist about whether that move alone is sufficient to keep neighbourhoods affordable” (Misra 2019 p1). Placemaking in this context then will be analysed from an affordability perspective to see whether it can aim to enhance quality of life whilst still being affordable for administrative authorities (planners) and developers to deliver and local communities to benefit from.

The second part of this chapter will analyse how desirable, inclusive, and diverse neighbourhoods are in the context of new development/regeneration projects and how placemaking can impact this. The literature review highlighted in chapters 2.4 and 3.2 how placemaking is and always will be to some extent a highly subjective, personal experience. It is now evident that in times when “man has enough nourishment and the threat of early death from non-treatable diseases declines the desire for quality of life arises. It is not enough to live, how one lives also becomes important” (Cramer et al 2003 p35). Recently, although not part of this thesis, this has been seen in a post-Covid City movement where using
outdoor spaces and bringing the indoors outside for larger gatherings has been the endeavour of many urban settings to make places outside homes desirable and safe for people again. Placemaking in this context can plan for resilience by being flexible and adaptable and planning policy needs to not only encourage and allow for this but make it criteria for new development and regeneration projects. To achieve this and to be desirable, placemaking practice must be inclusive and diverse. The danger if it is not is that it can create “an inability to connect (that) can lead to exclusion from the system. This exclusion adds a new dimension of inequality to those already present” (Kirdar 1997 p384). This will not only lead to enhancing quality of life but also add resilience to a place, hopefully preventing decline. This section will, through empirical evidence, highlight these factors in the context of new development and/or regeneration projects. Finally, it will touch on how planning policy can and has succeeded in making its new developments and regeneration projects more inclusive and diverse from the outset, therefore creating a desirable place for all to enjoy.

The final section will analyse Cultural History and Heritage and Fostering Creativity. Leading on from desirable spaces and places, section 3.2 of the literature review emphasised how history, heritage and the arts are an important factor for ensuring their desirability. Examples from the case studies will demonstrate this and how it can and has been incorporated into new planning, development, and regeneration practice through placemaking. Examples of where it hasn’t been incorporated will also be analysed. All the issues analysed in this section are complex and interlinked and placemaking is therefore an important tool in ensuring that they are brought together in the right way for each individual development and regeneration project.

8.2 Effects of Densification and Gentrification on Affordability

As discussed in chapter 2.3, affordability is by no means a new placemaking or quality of life concept. It is widely accepted that “since the 1980s the concepts of liveability and sustainability have become highly visible topics in transportation and land use planning. Neither term has a single agreed-upon definition; instead, the terms encompass a wide range of social, economic, and environmental concerns and objectives ranging from public health and safety to affordable housing to preservation of habitat and open space” (Appleyard and Frost 2020 p152). It is important to note, however, that affordability is also seen as subjective and when looking at, for example, the Numbeo quality of life index for 2022 Numbeo indices 2022 as far as a whole city analysis goes the cost of living in London (ranking 16th out of 255 cities) is much more than Melbourne (44th), and property in London is much more expensive as a proportion of one’s income (London is 59th and Melbourne 150th). Finally, therefore the purchasing power for Melbourne (ranking 60th) is better than in London (ranking 92nd). Figure 42 shows London’s cost of living ranking compared to other cities in the Numbeo index:
Melbourne’s overall quality of life ranks 39th and London is way down (164th of 255 cities). Affordability has a big part to play in quality of life and at least in this ranking this year Melbourne, in general, is seen as more affordable than London. Placemaking in new development and regeneration has an important part to play in aiming to change this through some of the interventions and policies highlighted above.

In Hackney, the peace of mind project manager for the Shoreditch Trust noted when asked about the quality of life in Hoxton & Shoreditch compared to other London areas that there is:

“Lots of interest and popularity but the original residents have either been pushed out or stuck in a place they cannot afford. There are some lovely cafes but the issue with gentrification is that there is less for the original residents (so they) fall back on the local Weatherspoon’s as they cannot afford to enjoy what their borough has become. With the local housing crisis there is not enough thought into how local people will continue to afford to live here, for example a local cheaper clothes shop- Peacocks- that used to sell school uniforms etc shut down and was replaced with an M&S food shop instead”.

Planning policy in the case study areas does prioritise affordability but it disproportionately prioritises affordable housing and not affordable transport, retail, and leisure options. For example, one of the
Camden Councillors explained how it was not the Council’s intention that Kings Cross ended up being such as expensive exclusive retail, food and beverage destination offering higher end and not everyday prices and basics. The S106 (Camden et al 2006) planning agreement for Kings Cross stipulated the number of affordable homes to be provided by the developer, an affordable housing transfer price, floorspace and number of units (750 in total split as 250 intermediate units and 500 social rent units pgs. 166-173). However, although retail and leisure facilities were also specified, they were not specified to be affordable either for tenants or users or both. Many interviewees echoed that although they lived in affordable intermediate housing units which they were grateful for the area is “slightly more on the expensive side” so visitors to the area tend to be “people with more money”. When asked about quality of life in the area a resident interviewee explained that if she didn’t have her “reduced price flat it wouldn’t be as good” and other things she thinks about “with regards to quality of life are if goods are affordable” so she didn’t think the quality of life is super high “as it is pricey” but not low either and she would give it a 7/10.

An example of the area being pricey is the now permanently closed Café Alain Ducasse in Coal Drops Yard. Online reviews of this café described it as “overpriced” and “a little more expensive” (cafe alain Ducasse reviews). The private Camden resident explained that the Council should be “helping shops by giving them cheap rates and young people free space” to help with affordability. In Hoxton and Shoreditch, the Laburnam Club interviewee when asked about quality of life responded “the price of housing is an issue” giving it the highest importance when discussing quality of life. She also mentioned that the activities at the club were subsidised and therefore made affordable for all the children attending it. The ambivalence and resistance to affordable housing by developers in such developments is an issue that placemaking can address by providing a collaborative framework with which to overcome them. A flexible solution that still provides developers with the returns they require must involve consultation with the community to find out their needs and aspirations.

In Melbourne the Future Melbourne 2026 plan has a set of goals and Goal 2: A City for People has a set of 9 priorities. The priority 2.6 is entitled “Affordable community facilities and services” and it goes on to say that “Melbourne will provide affordable community facilities and services that contribute to our quality of life by encouraging people to meet and feel connected” (p12). This particular emphasis on affordable facilities is in striking contrast to London policy and plans, which focus on affordable housing. There is no explanation given in the policy document for this specific emphasis, however. Interestingly, however, the policy focus and objectives are not always aligned with what some interviewees saw as affordability issues. In this instance even the CEO of the City of Port Philip admitted that “One of the key issues is housing affordability” when questioned on the quality of life in St Kilda. From the outset when Docklands was still in the early planning stages the various consultations resulted in a “key issue related to the need
for public and affordable housing to be provided; social mix is a related concern which appeared to arise, at least partly, from a concern that Docklands would be developed purely for those on middle and upper incomes” (Docklands Taskforce 1991 p37). This quote from the Melbourne Docklands Draft Strategy for Redevelopment demonstrates a recognition for affordable housing in the development as well as a sustainable and balanced mixed community. However, in interview when the Project Executive for State Infrastructure for City Design and Projects was asked if there was any affordable housing in Docklands he replied “yes but a smattering as less than 1%” which ultimately shows that in practice as development went on in Docklands strategic intentions do not always result in achieved actions. In the UK by contrast and in London in particular the mayor has set out a target of half of new homes should be affordable (policy H4 London Plan).

Gentrification has been seen by many as pushing prices of a local area up to such an extent that it becomes affordable for the average existing resident, and many cannot afford to stay there. In St Kilda the senior placemaking facilitator for Fitzroy Street explained that there are “some of Melbourne’s wealthiest households and people that are really struggling, increased tensions” and ultimately the stark contrast between such a polarised community is that there are homeless people who cannot afford to live next to some of the most expensive properties in Melbourne (which is also a common problem in London and most other urban areas) as is demonstrates by figure 43.

Perceptions of affordability of course also play a part as the longest serving manager for the City of Port Philip said that they have the “strongest affordable housing mechanism in Australia” and that they have given “car park airspace to affordable housing units”. He also went on to say that he has “never lived in this area due to the cost although it is affordable now if you buy an apartment”. What is considered
affordable to some is not affordable to others and a balance needs to be struck in ensuring there is a variety of affordable offerings for all parts of the community regardless of household incomes.

It is interesting to note that gentrification is only referred to by interviewees in the context of pushing out existing residents and communities and not described as an issue in developments such as Docklands, even though when it is discussed, it is in the context of pushing prices up, a lack of affordable housing and residents not being able to afford to live in a certain area anymore when new development and/or regeneration projects are delivered. In this context placemaking has a difficult role to fulfil as many people associate it with gentrification and causing affordability issues. The regeneration manager for Hackney when asked what he thought generally about placemaking in the borough and the private-public partnerships to achieve it answered that they had “some real success sometimes though it comes back to haunt you if it becomes too successful, starts to cause problems with affordability...previously everybody started with energy and hope to drive investment, which happened, but nobody imagined the issues surrounding affordable space and housing.” This is an interesting comment since there is a long history of these issues occurring in development and regeneration of urban areas and therefore one would assume this wouldn’t come as a surprise and be accounted for in the planning stages to prevent it from happening. Obviously, when a large amount of investment goes into development and regeneration projects a return on that investment needs to be achieved and in so doing if it is not properly planned could drive these new project areas to be unaffordable for end users. The end users being mostly residents and workers in an area are the ones who will suffer most from unaffordable living. In Kings Cross the developer Argent has retained the ownership of the developed area and in doing so is seeking a long-term return on their investment by ensuring that revenues from the retained ownership of retail, food and beverage space is maintained as high as possible and so being less affordable for residents, workers, and visitors. This issue of affordability is largely ignored when analysing official documents and data on Kings Cross although the long-term management and economic and financial gain to be had are identified such as in the Regeneris report (2017) of the Economic and Social Story of Kings Cross as shown in figure 44:
Where Docklands differs from Kings Cross is that as far as long term management is concerned there are multiple owners and stakeholders involved in this process as the project executive for state infrastructure explained: “Docklands was mostly state-owned redundant land with high interest rates so (they) decided to carve it up as a series of individual precincts for sale with pretty robust development agreements giving cheap land to deliver improvements such as infrastructure to roads, sewers, fully serviced”. A truly holistic placemaking strategy and approach should ensure long-term affordability for residents and end users from the outset. All the quality-of-life indices show affordability to some extent in their rankings, however, as discussed in chapter 2.3, this is done purely on a city-wide level and does not deal with the issues of affordability for people in their own neighbourhoods and communities, and in new development and regeneration projects. When the project executive for state infrastructure at Docklands was asked what he thought the quality of life in Melbourne compared to other cities he said “brilliant, very good if you are fortunate enough to have a well-paid professional job...but the reality is for many young families they are pushed out to the fringes not nearly as rosy for them as spending lots of time and money commuting”. This brings to the fore the issue of not being able to afford to live closer to where you work, an opportunity that placemaking can change for the better in new development/regeneration projects if enough affordable housing is provided for the type of jobs on offer in the local area as defined by neighbouring older areas and not just the nucleus of the new development.
Figure 45: Affordable Housing Strategy 2020-2030, City of Melbourne, December 2020.

Figure 45 shows the City of Melbourne’s income ranges to qualify for affordable housing. Even though there is a shortfall of over 5500 affordable homes pre-covid (City of Melbourne Affordable Housing Strategy 2020 p5) it is clear from figure 46 that Docklands has not contributed to this even though the land was state owned and this in theory could have been achieved through a bespoke placemaking approach. It is then interesting to see that King’s Cross’ privately owned land has in effect delivered a much higher percentage of affordable homes than the state-owned Docklands development (over 33% vs approximately 1%). As affordable housing is a direct cost to the landowner this would have hit the Victorian’s state’s pockets but in Kings Cross the affordable housing was secured as part of the cost of planning permission.
In St Kilda there is also an affordable retail initiative for operators on Fitzroy Street to encourage them to operate successfully. The Council have declared Fitzroy St a ‘Special Rate Area’ in the Placemaking Action Plan 2018-21. The President of the Fitzroy Street traders Association when interviewed explained that the percentage paid on rates by each trader means there is additional funding “used to run activations on the street and the marketing for the street” is all done by his association. A St Kilda resident and member of Our Place Reference Group explained, however, that “landlords have reduced rents, but operators look at the street and are not interested as there are so many vacancies”. So even though action is being taken by the local traders, the Council and voluntary organisations to make the street more affordable, other issues persist as to why there are empty shop fronts and units. In this case it is a complex set of interconnected and interrelated issues that make the area unaffordable to many. The President of the Fitzroy Street traders Association went on to say that a place marketer he spoke to said “St Kilda and Kings Cross in Sydney are two of the most deprived places in Australia but also some of the most expensive real estate... rents in St Kilda are very high and are squeezing people out. The wealthy play and work in the city”.

Finally, it is important to draw on the public literature from different city administrations when looking at the vast complex issue of Affordability in Placemaking and QoL practice when looking at it from a development and regeneration perspective. The Future Melbourne 2026 Plan has 2 main affordability Priorities, Priority 2.4, and Priority 2.6, Affordable for all to live and Affordable community facility and services. They go on to promise that “Melbourne will provide affordable community facilities and services that contribute to our quality of life by encouraging people to meet and feel connected” (Future Melbourne 2026 2016 p.15). The London Plan in a similar vein yet from a different perspective contains Policies (Policy E3: Affordable Workspace, Policy H7: Affordable Housing Tenure, Policy H5: Delivering Affordable Housing and Policy H8: Monitoring Affordable Housing) to enforce on private development and regeneration to ensure the affordable delivery of new residential and commercial spaces.

The different perspective comes from the policy emphasis from London on private entities as opposed to a promise of delivery of such by the City of Melbourne. Similarly, the Revised Draft Local Plan for Salford (2019) contains affordable housing policies to ensure the delivery of such through development and regeneration obligations usually carried out through S106 planning obligations. However, the Salford Plan also places emphasis on providing more affordable public transport and Digital Infrastructure through its proposed Policies A5 and DG1 respectively. Finally, the City of Port Phillip Council Plan 2017-27 (2019) also emphasises the need for an increase in affordable housing as an outcome to be measured against by 2027. Other issues in the Plan include Affordable local community events and activities and Affordable
Council user charges and rates and a budget is shown and allocated in the plan for Placemaking interventions and activities to deal with this directly.

It is clear from the various city documents from a top-down initiative that the Australian cities identify a need for not only affordable housing but affordable community facilities, services, events, and activities that in part they propose to activate through Placemaking interventions. The UK cases, however, do not demonstrate the same level of top-down efforts in this. Therefore, this thesis also aims to analyse how these issues impact and play out in the different case study areas.

### 8.3 Desirable, Inclusive and Diverse Neighbourhoods

A great neighbourhood to live, work in and/or visit is one that can be described as truly inclusive, diverse, and desirable. To achieve this, placemaking in new development/regeneration must address the socio-economic inequality that can ensue from creating a ‘desirable’ and ‘diverse’ destination neighbourhood. A way of addressing this is by creating a mixed neighbourhood policy to diversify housing stock (Ostendorf et al. 2001). As the literature review pointed out in sections 2.4 and 3.2, quality of life and desirability can be very subjective and therefore placemaking needs to be as diverse as possible to ensure that the whole community has been included. For example, when the Strategy and Design Manager for the City of Port Phillip was asked what he thought about QoL in St Kilda compared to other parts of Melbourne he responded “generally pretty high, extremely fortunate to have 9-11kms of beach as it is the only metropolitan beach in Melbourne...Parts are incredibly diverse, can see post WW1 migration, pretty tidy in general...nice neighbourhoods, (also) drugs and sex so gritty- more urban feel so longer term problems, residents complain about a lot but also like the grit and diversity so it’s a fine line”. So, the challenge for placemaking in new development practice is to ensure that diversity thrives but not at the cost of desirability or a loss of quality of life from ‘mismanagement’ of that inclusivity and allowing all to thrive.

Planning policy wise there are different attempts to manage desirability, inclusivity, and diversity in new development/regeneration projects to enhance quality of life. These attempts do not always, however, work as well in practice, especially when given the opportunity such as in Docklands, Melbourne. The Future Melbourne 2026 plan published in 2016 recognised as its 9th goal that it should be ‘A City with an Aboriginal Focus’ and in priorities 9.1 through to 9.4 how to go about actioning this by 2026. However, in the Docklands development (as already noted in section 6.3) the local indigenous community groups were consulted on but then not included in the final plan of implementation. This loss of diversity and inclusivity is something that is then difficult to claw back further down the line. The Docklands News (hard copy) from October 2019 (issue 157), however, is full of 32 pages of diverse community news, adverts, and a community calendar at the back (with even a few free events), showing at least how the
local community have acted to try to create a diverse and inclusive neighbourhood going forward (figure 47):

Figure 47: Docklands News Community Calendar, October 2019.

When asked about the QoL in Docklands compared to other Melbourne areas, the Project Executive for State Infrastructure, City Design and Projects for the City of Melbourne explained “It does come down to personal choice as I have spoken to many people who love living there, they like the quiet and exclusiveness of it, because of the Docks and the water there is openness and light unlike other areas that feel hemmed in”. However, of all the interviews in Melbourne and those asked if they would live in Docklands only the existing Docklands residents interviewed confirmed they would choose to live there. If people therefore feel they are given plenty of choices and indeed are given and can make as many choices as possible to satisfy their prerequisites for what constitutes a desirable place for them through placemaking activity that, in turn, will create a diverse and inclusive local community and enhance quality of life for all those living, working and visiting.

The City of Port Phillip Art and Soul Strategy (2018–22) describes Port Phillip as a “highly sought location to live, and St Kilda is the second most visited place in Victoria, with more than 3.4 million visitors per year” (p16). In this Strategy Outcome 1 describes its precincts as providing “opportunities to be inclusive and welcome all residents and visitors” and that a “focus for Council is working with business to grow the visitor economy while maintaining the City’s diversity and accessibility and ensuring the safety and quality of life for our residents” (p24). The strategy then goes on to list what needs to be done and how they will do it, creating its own set of indicators and benchmarks by which to assess successes. Action 32 of their plan, for example, is to “Update and integrate the Indigenous Arts Plan, including consideration
It is interesting to note that although many strategic and policy documents for the two Australian case studies had to include aims and objectives to integrate the aboriginal culture more during interviews and observations this was not highlighted at all. Placemaking needs to not only encourage action but assist it in taking place organically so that it becomes part of the environment by being desired and not only curated. The CEO of the City of Port Philip when asked what the QoL in St Kilda is like compared to other Melbourne areas answered it is “exceptional, it has always been the playground of Melbourne... full of diversity and creativity, on the edge as a place, with a very high entrepreneurial spirit, live music, beach, foreshore, blessed with public space i.e., Albert Park, one of the best public transport networks, schools, community groups for everything”. A high quality of life is a highly desirable aspect of new development and regeneration projects and a key driver for placemaking practice. Developing and regenerating an area such as Fitzroy Street in St Kilda therefore is done to also enable it to contribute to the area’s desirability and its cyclical nature and inevitable decline (as described during this period of research in Fitzroy Street) as explained by Jane Jacobs and pointed to in the literature review chapter 2.

Finally, it is important to note how interconnected these themes are to the other themes of consultation, engagement, and connectivity, as without these working in tandem placemaking activity would not be diverse and inclusive or desirable. The Development Director for Docklands when asked what the QoL in Docklands is like compared to other Melbourne areas explained:

“Depends on your perspective as everything is new, impressed with the resident facilities, the wellness, pools, libraries, BBQ’s, tennis courts, so it depends on your individual interest you could be attracted to different towers in the area. The liveability is better now and the sustainability but still wonder about the community and social aspect as I’ve never lived in an apartment and personally find street interaction easier and it probably does become tough for making friends if there are lots of serviced apartments in the area which bring about liveability challenges for permanent residents, garbage collection, noise as hotel type guests won’t be as mindful of this”.

Similar policy and practical issues are found within the London case studies. Desirability is a complex issue and therefore difficult for placemaking to achieve but imperative to be able to be diverse and inclusive and contribute to enhancing QoL. For example, the KX Quarterly Issue n7 (hard copy) for Kings Cross (figure 48) is 32 pages of a special ’Design Issue’ split into 4 sections aimed at the Food & Drink, Style, Culture and Lifestyle offering in the newly developed area.
As has already been discussed in section 8.2, the retail, food, and drink offering are aimed and caters for a certain middle to higher income demographic as evidenced by the more costly nature of shops such as Paul Smith, Tom Dixon, Diesel, and Waitrose etc. This is a desirable offering for some but not all facets of the community. One of the affordable housing residents said that she loves this area and moved here originally as it was easy to get to work. As detailed in section 7.2 accessibility itself is a desirable quality of place and an integral element of placemaking practice contributing to quality of life. This Kings Cross resident when interviewed went on to say that “there are lots of interesting things, coffee and eating out and social events and the gym too next to Camden Council offices with a swimming pool”. In contrast to the perceived desirability of the new Kings Cross area, when the Blue Marble Training Project Manager working for the Shoreditch Trust was asked about his thoughts on what he thinks the QoL in Hoxton & Shoreditch is compared to the rest of London he explained:
“Like most parts of inner London in general it masks the reality of life, like sometimes the reputation of an area comes before some prevailing issues such as poverty issues- more likely to be young black people suffering from this- but if you are a funder of a business this is seen as an up-and-coming area for regeneration. Because of all the new people coming into Hackney it doesn’t cater for the people who have been here for generations, they have the same levels of poverty and deprivation, and life is difficult (i.e., the Barnsbury estate near Kings Cross). Integration is important but I have issues with the term as different people require a different approach as for example some apprenticeships exclude people who didn’t get C grade at GCSE and so forth. So there needs to be enough resources to do things differently depending on who the target people are.”

The above sentiment is an in-depth analysis of how placemaking can, if not careful, put diversity and inclusiveness at risk, in pursuit of becoming and continuing to be a desirable place for people to live, work and visit. What has happened in Hoxton and Shoreditch is a complex issue and one that in the context of placemaking and QoL cannot be resolved either by this study or by planning policy, strategy, and intervention alone. The estate regeneration programmes in Hoxton and Shoreditch, however, are going some way by attempting to rectify some of the inequalities seen by the growing divide in the area and lack of inclusiveness for all the community, new and old alike. Figure 49 shows one of the Hoxton & Shoreditch estates, the Colville Estate, and its regeneration programme:

Figure 49: Colville Estate Regeneration plans, February 2022. Source: https://hackney.gov.uk/colville-estate
The plan of the Hackney Estate Regeneration programmes is to reprovide all the existing affordable homes but also add more affordable homes, as well as some private homes to help fund the project, as well as new improvements to neighbouring areas:

- “a new community centre
- A communal courtyard garden and podium garden for residents
- New landscaped pedestrian routes with pocket parks
- Commercial spaces including Fixagon- a new local café
- 180 bicycle parking spaces
- Food growing areas
- Formal and informal playspace throughout the estate
- A new energy centre which will serve the whole of the new Colville Estate” (https://hackney.gov.uk/colville-estate in section ‘what other benefits will the project bring’).

From a placemaking perspective as discussed in section 7.2 the accessibility of the estate and its wider benefits will be enjoyed by other locals as Hackney Council have “rethought the street layout to link the neighbourhood with surrounding areas and make the previously inward-looking estate feel much safer. These plans are creating improved public spaces, better amenities for existing residents and a fair recovery from the pandemic- including three new schools and a state of the art new leisure centre, and providing training and employment opportunities for Hackney residents”(https://hackney.gov.uk/colville-estate section ‘what other benefits will the project bring’). The diversity of this estate bringing in these new mixed commercial uses as well as new private residents will also go some way to improving its desirability and inclusivity, also making it more accessible and safer with a mix of uses. Therefore, although desirability can be seen as problematic as it is very subjective effective placemaking practice in new development and regeneration projects can enhance overall desirability for a larger more diverse and inclusive community. Of course, the scale of the placemaking intervention has an impact on its desirability for the local community as the smaller the scale the potentially larger the impact on the existing community and their attitude towards it. As the Chair of the Regent’s Canal when interviewed explained about existing residents living in the apartments along the canal both in Kings Cross and Hoxton & Shoreditch “these people are more concerned with noise levels...they are inches above the canal... it is fairly claustrophobic...there are other stretches where it is very quiet and there is lots of hostility to a café opening, something that benefits the masses has a dramatic effect on people living there; one theory is that anti-social behaviour would stop if café opened but in practice it doesn’t work. The public realm is privately owned in Kings Cross so for example one can’t simply perform here unless it is organised with the property managers, so the quiet is maintained here as it is a bit like a shopping centre”. 
Finally, as desirability means different things to different people, it is important for placemaking practice to find the best way of managing this through planning policy for new development and regeneration projects. However big or small the new project or intervention is, it should not make the existing desirability worse but enhance it to attempt to increase quality of life in the area and continue to regenerate itself but not so much that it brings about its own decline by being too desirable for one part of the community but not another. That is where it needs always to be inclusive and diverse. If inclusivity and diversity can be at the core of placemaking’s attempt to create desirable places and spaces as mentioned in the Camden local plan “design should create safe and attractive places and be designed to prevent crime and antisocial behaviour” (2017 section 7.18). The attractiveness of places is therefore also intrinsically linked to their safety, which will contribute to their desirability, inclusivity, diversity, and quality of life. The more flexible an area’s spaces and buildings are the easier it will be to achieve this as the Future Melbourne 2026 plan points to in its priority 4.1 entitled ‘A Safe and Flexible city’. It goes on to say that “this will be achieved through more efficient facility sharing, better transportation services, promoting inclusiveness, assisting businesses and celebrating this culture”. A placemaking framework to achieve this would ensure actions are put into practice for how to go about achieving claims such as promoting inclusiveness by setting several benchmarks and KPIs as in placemaking action plan for the City of Port Phillip has (2018-2021). Without such benchmarks it would inevitably be difficult to ascertain if the planning policies and priorities had been achieved and, if so, by what actions.

8.4 Culture, History and Heritage and Fostering Creativity

Culture as a placemaking principle is key to driving desirable places analysed in chapter 8.3. As noted in chapter 2, culture, history and heritage and creativity can affect quality of life since “recapitalisation of the urban environment compromises the very liveability and distinction it enhances...this reclaimed creative city is a worthy one. It is only part of the good city however...for as long as the ‘non-creative’ poor continue to do the work no-one sees, and travel further and further to do so, further reclamation is necessary” (Shaw 2014 pp141 & 147). The CEO of the City of Port Phillip expanded on this when describing his role with regards to placemaking said “Place is socially and culturally defined and means different things to different groups and individuals as it is defined by experience- even in high crime areas people attach themselves”. When an interviewee member of Our Reference Group for St Kilda was asked to share his thoughts on the area, he said “the best features are the amenity and interesting architecture from Victorian to today on the same street”. In comparison he described the Docklands as “disengaged”. He went on to describe the history of the St Kilda area in an animated way, even with regards to the public transport and the trams having been here since the 1960’s. Culture, history and heritage are all seen in planning policy terms as driving creativity and thriving cities. The City of Port Phillip’s Art and Soul Strategy highlights this in its opening message from the mayor when it goes on to say that “the Council
needs to better leverage the assets and places it has, identify new clusters of job growth and creativity, and help facilitate and foster their development” (2018-22 p4). It continues to describe the importance of this strategy by explaining "our history and heritage remind us we have long been Melbourne’s creative playground... Gentrification, escalating land values and the rising cost of rent also present challenges for creative practitioners, art organisations, entrepreneurs, and small businesses” (2018-22 p10). This is a reminder of how complex and intertwined an issue city quality of life is and how placemaking intervention can bring all these elements together. It can do this by creating a framework with which to tackle and resolve these at times conflicting issues as seen in sections 8.3 and 8.2, where desirability can also lead to higher costs and impacting affordability.

The Camden local plan 2017 also highlights the importance of history and heritage by emphasising that “Camden has a rich architectural heritage, with many special places and buildings from throughout Camden’s history”. It continues by noting that “the Council places great importance on preserving the historic environment ...The National Planning Policy Framework states that in decision making, local authorities should give great weight to conservation and designated heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance” (7.39 & 7.41). When the Chair of the Friends of Regent’s Canal Group was asked how he thought the history of the canal affects its present and potential future use, if at all, and how important this is for placemaking and quality of life, he answered “History is important. People make a connection with it, and it is always a delight when things are brought back to their original use. The canal went to waste in the 60’s as the government thought that roads were the future.” At Kings Cross the Council, various stakeholders and the Developer Argent worked hard to preserve the history and heritage of the area by preserving the gas holders at great expense and the old brick coalhouse buildings by the canal. Figure 50 shows how some of the gas holders have been used to integrate into the new development:

Figure 50: Gasholder Park and Gasholder apartments, May 2019
The integration and preservation of history and heritage in placemaking practice is so important since once new development and regeneration projects are planned and then implemented, without that history and heritage can be lost and then the memory and identity that goes with it can be damaged. As a private Camden resident working for Hemingway design stated, “It is so important for people working on a project to know its history, every area has its own DNA, its own history”. At times an area’s history and heritage can also bring about a bad reputation. Several people when interviewed about King’s Cross mentioned that they remembered before the development the area did not have a good reputation. One interviewee who regularly travels in through Kings Cross station to go to work and for leisure said that he would not have wanted to bring his family through the area before it was redeveloped but now, they “go there all the time to eat, shop and visit some of the temporary activities and installations”. An example of culture in placemaking and how it can be curated can be seen from the very glossy high-end looking Kiosk Magazine (2020) published by the Kings Cross Partnership calling it Neighbourhood Essays N1C (figure 51). Essentially it is a sales brochure for the area, advertising the goods and services, art, and fashion you will find in its retail quarter mainly located in the historic Coal Drops Yard.

Figure 51: A Page from Kiosk Magazine in Print, Winter 2020.

Kings Cross was previously known to many as a “dodgy area”, although it was also known for its great nightlife and clubbing scene. When one of the new Kings Cross residents was asked if she had any other thoughts on the area she mentioned that “Coal Drops Yard is built into the old infrastructure and the area has used the old gas holders to show where the place has come from, it has tried to draw from history and a lot of people really like that and it is a good model when developing other historic areas”.

In contrast to this, the Docklands area in Melbourne has not capitalised to the same extent as Kings Cross on its history and heritage, although as the Development Director for Development Victoria pointed out
“where Docklands struggles is that it always gets compared to the CBD which took 150 years, it takes time for an area to develop character, it always gets criticised for being devoid of character”. However, from a planning and strategy perspective the Docklands Community and Place Plan (July 2012) in section 4 ‘Embracing Melbourne’s Waterfront - A Waterfront Heritage’ discusses the importance of the preservation and integration of history and heritage into the new development. It notes that:

“From a meeting place for Aboriginal Communities, through to a thriving port for early settlers, Docklands has many fascinating layers of history that give it a unique place in Victoria’s story. As Docklands flourishes into a business, residential and visitor destination it is important that its waterfront heritage is preserved, integrated, celebrated, and made accessible to the broader community”.

In practice, it cannot be said that this aim was achieved as the Project Executive for State Infrastructure for City Design and Projects Melbourne explained:

“The harbour esplanade redevelopment hasn’t happened or the ferries because the river is too narrow and the redevelopment hasn’t been thought out...the stock in Docklands is all very recent stock, 15-20 years old max and is all a bit weird as there is a sameness and newness to it. Some key lessons are that it was a bit of a mistake to blitz everything and only retain 1 or 2 sheds getting rid of so much history. So, the downside is also that it’s so new and shiny, where is the grunge, retained heritage where some activities would never work in new places such as art and cultural uses, studios etc”.

It is clear then that history and heritage is associated with nurturing and encouraging creativity to thrive in an area. The lack of history and heritage will also reduce the desirability of an area to a more diverse and large part of society, as the appeal of new, shiny, clean buildings is limited for prolonged and repeated leisure activities, as well as attracting different people to live and work.
Hoxton and Shoreditch has experienced a very different kind of preservation and integration of culture, history, heritage to foster creativity. Fostering creativity is a fine balance between being liberal and allowing diversity to thrive and still managing to keep an order that will keep the community at large feeling safe and secure. The Chair of the Friends of Regents Canal group explained it in this way when looking at new development and regeneration proposals:

"Hackney is poor, nothing seems to get stopped, for example Hackney helped save Holborn Studios as listed the buildings but then accepted developers' proposals so then did a U-turn so they could pick and choose which bits to keep. I am not happy with Hackney...maybe it values land less, more apathy among residents maybe? The demographic is different maybe more short-term trendy Shoreditch types. Lobbyists tend to be retired people and maybe there are not as many in Shoreditch...there is a Hackney society, but it is thinly spread, and I don't think the Council listens to them much”.

This demonstrates the complexities involved in preserving culture, history, and heritage in different settings. The perception of Hoxton and Shoreditch is that the community is less of a cohesive whole and
as such care less or at least do not act in unison to integrate the old with the new. However, Hackney’s planning policies and specifically it’s Draft Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan (figure 53 2019) do set out to “protect the assets and features of Shoreditch” (p34) as one of its overarching objectives. It does so by setting out in Policies FS05: Supporting Arts, Culture, Entertainment and Retail and FS07: Delivering High Quality Design its intentions in how they will go about doing so. For example, Policy FS05 in section C specifies that: “the loss of arts, culture, entertainment and retail in Shoreditch is resisted in line with Local Plan Policies” and Policy FS07 goes on to say in section A that it will: “respect the significance and setting of the area’s heritage assets”. Both these policies state policies with which they cross reference with the Hackney Local Plan (2033) in line with planning policy hierarchy.

Even the Future Shoreditch Plan’s front cover shows its cultural focus on the arts with the street art on development/regeneration project hoarding with a Victorian building in the background. When asked about the QoL in Hoxton & Shoreditch compared to other London areas, the Shoreditch Trust Community Co-ordinator responded that it was difficult to put into words as there is a lot of inequality however: “It is very left, very liberal and artsy...the non-gentrifiers who have been here 25 years go to the Caribbean hairdressers...” she continued to explain about how the old cultural fabric was being changed by new incomers to the area and that places were being closed down, such as the Ridley Road market. However, she didn’t think the Ridley Road bar would be closed though as it is frequented by young professionals. An important way for placemaking to support the arts is to make the creative industries accessible and affordable to all. When the Shoreditch Trust Community Co-ordinator was asked if she thought the Trust contributed to this, she said “it does in an interesting way”. She went on to explain that part of their business is that they own start-business offices. She was then asked if she thought Placemaking has an effect on QoL and she went on to explain that even things such as supermarkets are a great way of
placemaking as: “they are so telling, organic shops, whole foods, deli’s Italian and Greek- very cultural and multi-cultural but it is one type of person that goes in there who likes to travel and can afford it- fresh pasta- not everyday prices”. She went on to explain that she embraces culture, but it isn’t accessible to everyone. When she was asked what she thought of the placemaking capacity of the area she said, “there are layers and layers of people putting their stamps continuously, a never-ending capacity and maybe one day there won’t be such a stark difference between the groups of people”.

The aim for placemaking practice then in this context is to enable culture, history, heritage, and creativity to be accessible for all the community regardless of their differences as these influence and fuel a deeper connection and culture, the layers of people and places old and new. Quality of life can only be enhanced if new development and regeneration practice achieves this fine balance of mixing these differences together and having them co-habit the same space without inequality becoming an issue. For example, the Laburnum boat club worker when asked about the QoL in Hoxton & Shoreditch said “it is a cool place to live, but inequalities are quite stark...lots of bars around one corner, not very integrated- no more chicken shops! Inequality is a plus side as well as there are still real people doing real jobs and a sense of community, not taken over by one or the other”. It is therefore apparent that a sense of inequality is expected by some to co-habit places that are diverse and full of culture and creative mixes. Does it mean then that to continue to foster creativity one must accept a small element of inequality and can exemplary placemaking practice achieve this in new development and regeneration projects through a balanced framework within which to work.

8.5 Summary

This chapter has concluded the empirical analysis of placemaking principles that are required for successful development and regeneration to achieve greater quality of life. It has analysed the complex balance that needs to be struck when densifying urban areas with new development and/or regeneration projects to ensure affordability of not only the development process but also and most importantly of the area to the end user. Although affordability in planning policies can be as seen from the document analysis as being focused on housing, it is also imperative for commercial, retail, services, leisure, and entertainment to be affordable to enhance quality of life. If a newly developed and/or regenerated area is lacking in affordable necessitites yet houses affordable tenants and communities but is too expensive for them in other ways, then it has failed on a fundamental placemaking and quality of life level. Gentrification has also been linked time and time again to affordability since in part new development is seen as attracting wealthier newcomers to an area and making it so unaffordable for the original communities that it marginalises them or pushes them out. Finally, in this section the world city indices highlight the various ways, through their criteria and methodology, in which affordability is key to enhancing quality of life. The second section analysed why it is important for places to not only be
desirable but at the same time inclusive and diverse and how placemaking practice in new development and regeneration projects can achieve this through implementing successful mixed neighbourhood strategies. To be inclusive and diverse, everyone in the community needs to feel and be empowered to do as much or as little as they want in their neighbourhood, whether through events, consultation and engagement or simply enjoy a place's natural features, such as waterside locations.

The thread between all the placemaking principles is finding the right mix of these themes is what enhances quality of life and makes places desirable. Although desirability itself is and can be a very subjective aim for placemaking practice, it is nonetheless just as important that it seeks to please most of the community hence the pre-requisite for diversity to be an integral part of a desirable place. The loss of such character or “desirability” is essentially an identity that people can relate to and support and is vital to upkeep, as the loss of it would make it much harder to restore. Re-instating desirable, diverse and inclusive places or starting from ‘scratch’ is difficult as for it to be truly organic and layered takes a long time and needs to be curated. By its very definition, this less organic, although if carried out carefully not impossible. As has been highlighted in this chapter a high quality of life is a desirable feature of any place and not everyone associates desirability with shiny new developments and regeneration projects, therefore culture, history and heritage need to be preserved and creativity encouraged to thrive.

Following on then from all the previous chapters, adding to the layers it is appropriate to finish with this placemaking principle since it is key to retaining and creating an authentic place that is sustainable and successful for generations to come.

What this chapter has highlighted is that for placemaking to be able to enhance quality of life in new development and regeneration in the case study areas “it requires social housing and affordable work and community spaces, a fine grain and a human scale and recognition of the area’s (indigenous and) multicultural and industrial heritages” (Shaw 2013 p515). Placemaking practice then should through planning policy (top-down) and bottom-up approaches, seek to create a flexible framework through which development and regeneration can be planned and implemented to enhance quality of life in the areas that they reach.
CHAPTER 9: DEVELOPING A PLACEMAKING IDEAL TO ENHANCE QUALITY OF LIFE

9.1 Introduction

The preceding empirical chapters have demonstrated a clear need for inclusive and effective Placemaking policy for new development and regeneration projects aimed at improving quality of life. These chapters have also highlighted a need for this policy to be flexible and adaptable as well as being able to encourage a diverse and meaningful bottom-up involvement. As Beza & Hernandez-Garcia 2014 p65 noted “Much of the literature revolving around placemaking has embedded within it an assumption that people living within urban environments have the right to direct and influence the creation of public spaces. Built into this assumption is the consideration that urban inhabitants may be called to participate, through an official regulatory planning framework, in directing urban outcomes”. The first part of this chapter will therefore analyse the different Perceptions of Placemaking and Quality of Life that the case studies have highlighted to illustrate both their subjective and objective nature and their impact on development and regeneration practice. The second part will look at the Public and Private Roles within Placemaking and the successes and failures of the public and private sectors in their development and regeneration projects. The final part of this chapter will analyse what a Flexible, Sustainable and Adaptable Placemaking Framework could look like through best practice examples from the case studies, with an aim to enhance quality of life through new development and regeneration.

9.2 Perceptions of Placemaking and Quality of Life

Each case study has highlighted different approaches and perceptions to placemaking practice and its relationship to and potential impact on quality of life. Moreover, the overarching survey conducted and completed (via social media, as well as email) by most case study interviewees, highlights people’s general perception of what placemaking is. Figure 54 shows these results via the main themes that group words used to describe placemaking by respondents:
The figure above further cements some of the interviewee's own explanations of placemaking function in their areas when interviewed. For example, the CEO of Port Phillip, when asked how and if he thought placemaking differs from Urban Design, planning, architecture, urban renewal and other disciples in development and regeneration, answered:

"Placemaking is a process. Urban design and planning are tools. There is a great debate about whether placemaking is just another tool for community engagement- but it is a convergence of disciplines around place, the risk is when one discipline dominates the discourse... the danger with
(different) disciplines is that they become the silver bullet rather than the integrated medium to engage with communities. Place and community should create a vision then comes the urban design and planning disciplines but unfortunately nine times out of ten it is the other way around and then you must bring placemaking in to sort the problem out. For example, they built a great tram on Fitzroy Street, but they didn’t think of the people on the street”.

This quote goes some way in explaining the City of Port Phillip’s approach to Placemaking in it being relevant to the needs of their community at the time in developing solutions to real problems and regenerating one of the main streets in St Kilda to help enhance quality of life. As placemaking is seen as a process it is one that can be employed at any stage even in finding solutions to fixing issues arising from not engaging with placemaking in the first place, such as the tram on Fitzroy Street.

In a similar vein, in Docklands when the Development Director for Development Victoria was asked what she considers placemaking to be responded that from their perspective “it is about understanding what the user’s needs are and providing opportunities for those things to occur so if it hasn’t happened already, you can do it, for example temporary art installations and events”. Although Docklands, unlike the City of Port Phillip, did not have a specific visible Placemaking team or function within the City of Melbourne and therefore no particular emphasis on it, nonetheless it integrated many placemaking principles within its development and regeneration policies and strategies as highlighted in chapter 5. It is important to note that not all perceptions of placemaking are that it is important to quantify as a principle. As the Project Executive for City Design and Projects for the City of Melbourne (including Docklands) explained he hates the word placemaking and does not use it at all as:

“It is more about city making which means so many different things to different people...it is more than making places active and safe but also more interesting. How do you build new bits of a city and retain old bits to make a thriving whole city? There is a Placemaking and engagement team at the City of Melbourne and I don’t get what the placemaking function does even though it has been in existence two years. Sometimes it is dangerous to look at other successful stories and think there is a formula and because it worked somewhere it will elsewhere but that is not necessarily true. We want to make Melbourne a better place for people...there is no need to destroy what it is, we should retain the good things whilst we go about the process of incremental change”

This perception of a placemaking team is, in effect, the interviewees’ opinion of a team that does not seem to add value and their role is not understood externally. Whether the placemaking team at the City of Melbourne add value or not is different to the principle of placemaking best practice being the
intention that the interviewee is describing as making the city a better place. In the London case studies, much like Docklands, there are no specific visible placemaking teams, policies, or strategies within the local administrative authorities. However, in Kings Cross there has been a clear placemaking focus and drive ever since Argent, the Developer, published their “Principles for a Human City” in 2001 describing the challenges and opportunities of developing Kings Cross and their ten principles for doing so successfully and sustainably.

The report published almost 20 years later - *The Economic and Social Story of Kings Cross* (2017) - goes into detail about the added value of the Kings Cross Partnership and Argent approach by unpicking the heightened focus on placemaking and looking at its successes to date. It concludes that “this approach marks a departure from more traditional approaches to development in London, where place-shaping typically has less prominence than the delivery of commercial and residential space and returns. While the value of placemaking is now more widely recognised and fundamental, Argent has been at the forefront of this” (Regeneris 2017 p56). This sentiment is echoed in this research, with statements from new resident interviewees:

“before the redevelopment of Kings Cross it was an empty place just for getting the train in and out of London and not on the map for somewhere to move to... (now) this area is much more privileged than other London areas as it is almost in its own right a complete area as you don’t need to leave it now to get everything you need... it feels like there is more investment than other areas and a good buzz and people are fairly well off here”.

An aim of placemaking is to create ‘complete’ areas in new development and regeneration projects, whatever their size so that they are sustainable for present and future communities. Through the empirical chapters in this study, Kings Cross has been analysed and found to be an ‘almost’ complete area. It, however, lacks a wide range of affordable options, ranging from everyday shopping to leisure and retail, which also goes some way in explaining the comment in the interview above about people being ‘fairly well off here’ (Chapter 8).

By contrast, placemaking is seen by one of Hackney’s regeneration managers as something that his team does but they just don’t call it that. When he was specifically asked if placemaking features as a strategy, objective, or goal in the estate regeneration programmes of say Buckland Street, Hoxton West, the Britannia Leisure Centre, and the Colville Estate he simply answered that it did and that his own schemes “come with commercial and placemaking opportunities”. Indeed, it is important to understand that local charity and community workers in Hoxton & Shoreditch interviewed expressed concerns with regards to new development and regeneration and its impact on quality of life and using placemaking to potentially
address this. The Peace of Mind Project Manager for the Shoreditch Trust, for example, when asked if she thought enough was being done when it comes to placemaking in Hoxton & Shoreditch explained:

“Perhaps new people have a stronger influence. I wonder if there is communication between older residents and new residents—how do they meet? Not enough is being done and I worry about falling into the narrative of them and us. Older residents’ needs are not being represented, for example now the borough offers them relocation to Luton etc where they would have to leave their families, uproot their homes and start again...however, there seems to be a strong desire to communicate with the voluntary sector and build strong relationships with partners also delivering mental health services...we try to meet with other organisations in the borough to piece together what’s on offer and many clients feel lucky and comment on how there is a lot of support and the council are doing a lot in partnership to jointly deliver these services and I hope this will continue”.

Many localised issues are discussed in the quote that have already been analysed in the preceding chapters. However, what is worthy of note is that, specifically with regards to placemaking activity and new development and regeneration in the area, there are outcomes desired that placemaking best practice could and should address before a development/regeneration project takes place, ensuring these issues do not arise in the first place.

**9.3 The Public and Private Roles within Placemaking Practice**

The empirical chapters have highlighted the different stakeholder roles in development and regeneration practice and their impact on an emphasis on placemaking to enhance quality of life such as for example the City of Port Phillip’s placemaking team and their actions, Argent’s objectives and accomplishments in Kings Cross, Hackney’s estate regeneration programme and the Docklands development in Melbourne. In St Kilda the public sector’s role in placemaking is emphasised by the CEO of the City of Port Phillip:

“The Solution must come from within government and the danger is it is becoming commercialised. It must be done for public value and therefore I am against the privatisation of public space. However, getting a sustainable philosophy in government when drivers are short political cycles and silos, all different teams want is to push their individual solutions without the community. Community comes first so unless you have a circuit breaker at the top like a CEO that brings all these parties together all normal drivers kill placemaking. Most laws etc are put in place to constrain what can be activated in a place so we must work on three levels:

1. **Place within the community**
2. **Place within the organisation and finally,**
3. **A place at the city-wide level to connect to broad strategies**

*It must be joined up at the strategic and organisational level and ringfence placemaking*. 

The CEO of Port Phillip saw the public sector as being a leader in implementing sustainable placemaking practice and emphasised his view that public spaces should not be privatised, implying at least that he does not see the private sector as being able to provide a sustainable leading role in placemaking best practice. The joined-up approach he emphasised between stakeholders is focused solely on the community and the municipality and providing that link that enhances communication between the two stakeholders and creates the necessary environment for holistic placemaking actions to take place. Indeed, the City of Port Phillip’s Placemaking Action Plan (2018) states about placemaking that “the process is based on the philosophy that those who use a place are often in the best position to know what a place should look and feel like and should have input into the way places are planned, funding is allocated, and services are provided” (p2). However, when including all those who use a place it is important to note that the private sector is also made up of people who use a place and therefore should be included in the placemaking process.

In Kings Cross, for example, the private sector, in the form of Argent the developer, took a leading role in the placemaking process in collaboration with Camden Council and other stakeholders, as the Regeneris report (2017) highlights “The Placemaking and community initiatives introduced on-site have helped to effectively connect local partners, and have embedded the new development within the existing local context” (p15). Although the public spaces at Kings Cross are privatised (as they are owned and managed by Argent and their pension fund backer, Australian Super) this does not seem to impact placemaking practice in a harmful way as many interviewee residents confirmed. One interviewee a new resident of the development when asked if she thought the space was being used well, answered “yes absolutely. For example, the Redemption Road coffee shop is tiny but great and the Canopy Market also. I have never seen anywhere use the space so well with seats by the canal at the steps and picnic areas. I give it a 15 out of 10 for its use of space! Even the LED lights in Granary Square”.

At Kings Cross, it is evident that the long-term private investment into place management has had a huge impact on the need for the development to thrive and be successful on a socio-economic level, since without this the post-delivery effects could erode the sustainability, desirability, and quality of life, with, in turn, a financial impact on the returns to private investors. This is a complex issue since the issues surrounding Kings Cross’ affordability is directly from this long-term private investment. A Camden resident working in the borough near Kings Cross when interviewed said with regards to Argent’s placemaking efforts at Kings Cross that: “they have been brilliant, they did a lot of consultation early on
and talked to residents... I regularly go there for food with friends and family and a swim as ‘suddenly’ there is a footpath straight from my housing leading there... Camden is falling apart so all locals, friends meeting up etc go to Kings Cross as there are no tourists there, so the locals go to escape the hordes of tourists in central Camden”. When asked if she thought placemaking affects quality of life she went on to say it does and that “at Kings Cross Argent curated and had complete control of this process and it is a perfect example of this”. Figure 55 shows one of the private public spaces at Kings Cross and its use by the public:

Figure 55: Granary Steps, Kings Cross, Winter 2019.

Hoxton and Shoreditch are, in a similar vein to the City of Port Phillip, taking a leading role in the development and regeneration of their neighbourhoods and areas specifically with regards their Council Estates. When the regeneration manager for Hoxton & Shoreditch was interviewed, he explained that he is part of the Housing Management and Area Regeneration team in Hackney and that it used to be called the Economic Regeneration team. He went on to say that he works with developers and planners in the borough and programme manages the infrastructure projects. The borough has their own in-house urban design team for their projects. His “role also entails partnership working with external organisations and businesses, residents, charities and large cultural events and how to support them”. Although the estate
regeneration projects are led by the borough, the same issues of affordability and gentrification are
raised when interviewees are asked about development and regeneration. Therefore, even though the
Local Authority- in this instance a public entity rather than a private one- is leading on many of the major
development and regeneration projects in Hoxton & Shoreditch, whose economic viability impacts their
immediate and long-term affordability and that of the area.

Boxpark, as a private entity in Hoxton & Shoreditch, have, however, had a powerful effect on the area
since their inception and achieved this in collaboration with the local authority and local stakeholders.
When the regeneration manager for Hoxton & Shoreditch was asked about Boxpark’s contribution to
Placemaking and quality of life he responded “it is important to use the space especially if it is a
meanwhile use as an opportunity for people to start businesses. It brings about job creation and sets a
good precedent to get agreements in place to what social benefits and community activities want to be
seen locally… it is good to activate space that is redundant”. This activation of redundant space was
brought about by the private sector leading the way with a solution and collaborating with all
stakeholders, demonstrating that collaboration is more important than whether the private or public
sector take the lead.

Finally, the public and private entity issue is very complex since the collaboration between the state
government, who own/owned the land at Docklands, and the private developers who collaborated with
Development Victoria to purchase the land, did not bring about the best possible placemaking outcomes
for quality of life in the initial development process, even though the opportunity was provided through
planning and design. For example, the Project Executive for State Infrastructure, City Design and Projects
for the City of Melbourne explained:

“...The City of Melbourne didn’t agree with a lot of state government ideas such as cutting off the
old city from the Docklands with the big highway bypass and putting the stadium on the edge as
it doesn’t draw people to stay. The City of Melbourne would be adopting the public realm and be
responsible for the long-term interest... so the City of Melbourne wrote the public realm plan but
there was a lack of connectivity to the rest of the city with three main dead ends... there are two
very isolated communities, Harbour Town and E-Gate and we need to make a link and
connection”.

It is important to note that regardless of whether the public or private sector take a leading role in the
development and regeneration process that it is, in effect, a collaborative and holistic placemaking
process that needs to be at the forefront of planning so that quality of life can be established and/or
enhanced at the outset, so that needless mistakes don’t then need to be rectified down the line. As the
Project Executive for State Infrastructure, City Design and Projects for the City of Melbourne explained when asked about the most challenging part of his role. “Dealing with bureaucracy at the state government level, getting people to understand important decisions to be made to maximise value... if you put another 10% in you could get 100% more on your investment, but people lose focus and then move on to new and other ideas even when they haven’t finished with this idea yet!”

9.4 A Flexible, Sustainable, and Adaptable Placemaking Framework

When it comes to enhancing quality of life for a community, new development, and regeneration projects, however small or big they are, can have a large impact. Placemaking best practice can ensure this impact is not only positive but sustainable that can change to suit the needs of a community over time. Within the case studies, even though they are taken from two different world cities, and two different areas within each, no one single case study embodies a flexible, sustainable, and adaptable placemaking framework that can be applied and used as exemplary for new development and regeneration practice to follow. The significance of such a framework, of course, is that if it is flexible, sustainable, and adaptable it not only can be used in all different contexts but can deliver a holistic solution to development and regeneration practice that can go some way in enhancing quality of life. The Building Better Building Beautiful Commission in England (2020) go some way in addressing this policy gap by having as one of their policy proposals to educate in promoting a wider understanding of placemaking. Indeed, it is not enough to have piecemeal independent approaches to placemaking, as seen by some municipalities and developers, as this will not be able to address the issues that a lack of best practice placemaking initiatives bring about. If during the planning policy and design process, however, there is an agreed placemaking framework that is flexible and adaptable enough to address each localised issue, then it will be a long-term sustainable solution to enhancing quality of life.

Independent efforts, such as evidenced by the case studies and others, such as in figure 56 are worthy of note since, without them, the best practice sustainable framework would not be able to be developed.
Figure 56: Countryside Partnerships PLC, Placemaking Diagram, internal email from interim CEO February 2022.

Figure 56 demonstrates that placemaking is a complex but worthwhile approach when analysing development and regeneration processes. Although not part of the case studies, the Countryside placemaking diagram demonstrates all the basic principles analysed in this thesis, apart from modern methods of construction. The case studies highlighted are thus used as examples of independent placemaking approaches that could be further improved by learning from each other’s successes and failures. In doing so, those successes can be used to form part of the framework’s basic principles and failures can be analysed further to implement a solution through the said framework.

An integral part of this placemaking framework will be the human element, people’s involvement in its creation and direction of change as and when that is deemed to be necessary. As the strategy and design manager pointed out when asked what he considered placemaking to be:

“There is no single answer as it is different in each organisation, for example it was called place management ten years ago. So, you can define it slightly differently depending on where the focus sits in an organisation and then it takes on different forms and flavours however at its heart placemaking is about making spaces that are attractive for people to use and participate in and feel that they can and bringing the community and others in and feel they have agency and are not solely at institutions and governments discretion. A place could look great but be dead, so it is not all about design but about people wanting to be there, so design it with them and not for them, give them the power to make decisions. Often the most successful projects are the ones
where the community are treated like adults, and it is demonstrated that they have been listened to and they can see that...ultimately you get a good response from them when it is genuine engagement, and they will be much more accepting of the outcome even if it is not what they wanted.”

Moreover, when asked if he thought placemaking affected quality of life and why he said, “it can and it does as it shows people different ways to use spaces from what they envisaged and their perceptions through invitations to participate, such as just going to a market, the social interaction, events and activities etc”. It is evident that placemaking is seen as a holistic process that can be used for all who engage in it to learn about how to engage with and use local spaces and places. Development and regeneration projects in cities will always have a big impact on quality of life, since urban growth is set to continue exponentially in the coming years “grassroots sustainability initiatives are best conceived of as exercises in material, socio-cultural, and political-economic ‘placemaking’ which is especially evident in the gentrifying urban environment” (Hakansson 2017 p145). Gentrification, as note in previous chapters, is seen as an effect of development and, especially, regeneration. However, it is interesting to note that in Hakansson’s perspective, political-economic ‘placemaking’ is especially evident in the gentrifying urban environment, putting placemaking as a possible solution to fix a problem created by development and regeneration. Nevertheless, the purpose and intention of a placemaking framework in planning policy is that the problems and mistakes of current and past development and regeneration projects can be prevented. Hence, gentrification in its negative connotations can become a past issue once and for all along with affordability and other issues related to development and regeneration projects.

Of course, since placemaking is a process and will always learn from and renew itself, it is important that it is seen as a framework of ideas, learning processes, and principles to follow to ensure successful development and regeneration projects are delivered to enhance quality of life. One survey respondent expanded on the meaning of placemaking “placemaking is part of good planning. Often it is an element which isn’t delivered to the original vision due to budget cuts, interpretation, and lack of understanding of what impact it has on increased sales revenues, health, and wellbeing. We have a duty to deliver the best possible development. We need to stop the cycle of unsustainable development- we should learn more from the Victorians- they weren’t afraid to try things, they were bold and not scared of change. We are too fearful and the majority of new development lacks conviction and identity”. For all to be able to embrace change a flexible and adaptable placemaking framework would help those that lacked that boldness, conviction, and identity necessary to make successful development and regeneration projects. Finally, then as one of the training managers working for the Shoreditch Trust explained when asked if enough is being done in his area when it comes to placemaking he responded “no. how we deal with, and support people is only being looked at through one prism and we need to understand the different
dynamics before implementing. Things are only being looked at on the surface and then a catch all is assumed that will work for everybody but who does it reach? Who accesses it? Why are some groups still marginalised? This is a massive issue with people feeling completely marginalised and they don’t think society helps them to express themselves”.

Figure 56 (p.188) demonstrated how a private national housebuilder in the UK values placemaking and has used three key principles underpinning its significance. The key messages from the case studies using these are scored and their relevance to place-making discourse are therefore summarised in table 7 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High quality design</th>
<th>Building sustainable communities</th>
<th>Collaborative working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kings Cross</td>
<td>High quality urban design and planning throughout the site as evidenced in case study data</td>
<td>An attempt that is too centred on high-end retail, food &amp; beverages offering resulting in some affordability issues for the overall community</td>
<td>Examples of collaborative working have been evidenced throughout the case study such as Skip Garden temporary installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoxton &amp; Shoreditch</td>
<td>Some high-quality design elements such as the Britannia Centre redevelopment</td>
<td>A bottom-up approach at building sustainable communities that could benefit from a more co-ordinated and resilient holistic approach from the top-down also.</td>
<td>Many examples of collaborative working have been found at a community level such as the Laburnam Boat Club and the Shoreditch Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kilda</td>
<td>Some high-quality design elements such as the Victorian Pride Centre</td>
<td>An approach that is too focused on small, fast interventions that does not address the wider issues comprehensively</td>
<td>Some examples of collaborative working are evidenced albeit lacking true and effective impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands</td>
<td>A lack of people centred design and planning creating an 'anywhere' place</td>
<td>A top-down approach that has lacked a genuine community involvement throughout the</td>
<td>A few examples of collaborative working have been evidenced in the so-called ‘renewal within renewal’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Key case study messages & their relevance to place-making discourse

| planning & design process | processes now underway in Docklands |

In short, if these principles are applied with passion and integrity following an effective framework from the outset, placemaking has the power to help marginalised communities enhance their quality of life by engaging with their places and spaces in a constructive and sustainable way.

9.5 Summary

This chapter has brought this thesis together by integrating the aims and objectives set out in chapters 1-4 with the empirical analysis of chapters 5-9. It has done so by using the case studies as a basis through which to not only understand the issues within new development and regeneration projects but also their successes and failures, the impact of placemaking practices and how this has impacted perceived quality of life. Having such a complex issue to define, address, analyse and find solutions to has meant that a final analysis and conclusion is only possible after bringing together the case studies, their themes, and implications.

Finally, it is important to note that each of the case study themes are worthy of a much more thorough and detailed analysis which is not possible when bringing them together as a comprehensive and concise study to achieve its holistic aims and objectives. It is hoped that in analysing so many independent yet intrinsically linked themes in the planning, placemaking, development and regeneration processes that quality of life or ‘perceived quality of life’ will be enhanced by utilising some of these common themes, principles and lesson learned. “Studies of placemaking typically focus on street life. However, to secure public order and place capital, placemaking must do more than redesign streets— it must guide eyes and feet. To do so, it insinuates itself into private space, it monitors the poor and the discontented, and it harnesses the memories and dreams of suburbanites” (Montgomery 2016 p788).
CHAPTER 10: FINAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

10.1 Introduction

The thesis concludes by summarising the research and case studies analysed in the preceding chapters. The project aims and questions will be reassessed, considering the empirical findings and the research brought together by placing it within the overall field of urban development and regeneration. Finally, further research that has come about from this project will be outlined briefly to provides the opportunity for further development of this work.

The fact that "a person is so far formed by his surroundings, that his state of harmony depends entirely on his harmony with his surroundings" (Alexander et al 1979 p106) as quoted in chapter 1 means that whilst new placemaking development and regeneration projects continue to be carried out, the knowledge with which they are planned and executed will require updating in order to continue to find that harmony, happiness, quality of life, wellbeing or 'good life'. This thesis aims to contribute to this knowledge whilst acknowledging that new experiences from development and regeneration will continue to add further complexities and layers to already complex concepts. It has been seen during this project how in response to the Covid-19 global pandemic people changed how they go about planning and designing new urban development and regeneration projects to enable them to build in that additional layer of resilience in case of future global emergencies.

Although this thesis has not been able to account for this change, the case studies have elucidated the challenges that placemaking in development and regeneration can and need to address to contribute to enhancing perceived quality of life. Unpacking such complex issues was done by highlighting the different placemaking themes in planning, designing, and carrying out development and regeneration projects in the literature reviews, as well as links to urban quality of life aims, objectives, policies, and strategies. Utilising a comparative analysis mixed methods case study approach has provided the complex research framework required for these ‘real-world’ examples to assess their interrelated multi-faceted relationship, similarities, and differences.

The first section in this chapter will discuss the Empirical Findings, Lessons, and Examples by addressing the research questions of Chapter 1. The second section will go into more detail on the issues raised above surrounding Responses to Covid-19 in Placemaking, Development and Regeneration by analysing some of the themes coming out of the most recent literature and comparing them to the themes addressed in this thesis. Finally, the last section will discuss Implementing a Placemaking Framework to Enhance (Perceived) Quality of Life. It will do so by briefly assessing the potential impact of exemplary
placemaking practice on (perceived) quality of life by drawing on the empirical findings and responses to Covid-19. This chapter will then conclude with a discussion on further potential research to come out of this study.

10.2 Empirical Findings, Lessons, and Examples

Every facet of this study, from the literature reviews, methodology and critical analysis, has been collated and marshalled with the project’s aims and objectives at the forefront. The empirical findings comprising of the comparative document analysis, semi-structured interviews, observations and discussions, online survey, and social media pages content, achieved the objectives by interlinking complex concepts and their effect on development and regeneration practice. To address the aims of this research, the four case studies of Hoxton and Shoreditch, Kings Cross, Docklands and St Kilda from the world cities of London and Melbourne were used to provide relevant examples of placemaking practice in development and regeneration projects, and their potential effect on (perceived) quality of life.

Table 8 details the overall aim, objectives and key questions posed at the beginning of this thesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Aim of Study</th>
<th>To find evidence that the implementation of placemaking initiatives and strategies at a neighbourhood level can enhance and sustain QoL/PQoL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objectives to achieve this Aim | 1. Unpack how neighbourhood connectivity can help improve PQoL by identifying the community stakeholders involved in placemaking and finding solutions that foster their meaningful involvement and co-operation. This will focus particularly on forms of networking facilitated by online and social media sources.  
2. Determine how issues of housing and other affordability (such as retail and leisure) and gentrification can act as barriers to inclusive placemaking.  
3. Illuminate how developers and regeneration experts are reimagining how they conceive of placemaking to deliver more inclusive, sustainable urban environments with an improved PQoL. |
Key Questions critical to this Research

1. Can common placemaking principles be agreed upon to be implemented in urban areas?
2. Do the above-mentioned placemaking principles affect QoL/PQoL in cities and if so, how?
3. Is there a way of measuring a cost and benefit of city placemaking and if so, what is it?
4. Are there several free and/or cost-effective common placemaking principles that can be applied and implemented in urban areas with a poor quality of life and indeed all cities to enhance their QoL/PQoL?

Table 8: Overall Aims, Objectives, and Key Research Questions

**Objective 1:** Unpack how neighbourhood connectivity can help improve PQoL by identifying the community stakeholders involved in placemaking and finding solutions that foster their meaningful involvement and co-operation. This will focus particularly on forms of networking facilitated by online and social media sources.

Early examples of community engagement and participation in the planning process focused on traditional, in-person consultation events, dedicated exhibition spaces, community forums and postal surveys. Over time we have seen dedicated websites such as the ‘Have Your Say’ webpage for the City of Port Phillip as well as each local authorities'/municipalities’, developers’, professional organisation, and community groups’ dedicated social media pages on Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn. Meaningful engagement and participation, however, are seen when all the methods are used in conjunction as a multifaceted placemaking intervention that does not rely on any one form of engagement to ensure neighbourhood connectivity is maximised.

Without using the full array of placemaking interventions available marginalised members of the community may not be able to meaningfully engage as seen in Hoxton and Shoreditch, for example, with the Laburnam Boat Club and Shoreditch Trust in person approach to involving the local community rather than relying on digital and/or social media. In contrast to this Boxpark have a dedicated social media and marketing team and regularly engage with their community on their digital platforms to communicate events and activities and obtain feedback from their stakeholders. Some stakeholder groups are more dismissive than others about the potential to impact neighbourhood connectivity through all forms of engagement, whilst others, such as in Kings Cross, embrace this and benefit from the rewards by keeping...
everyone informed and engaged and the local community active in the spaces, places, events, and activities on offer.

This neighbourhood connectivity, if not fostered from the very inception of the planning and development/regeneration process before the new community is in situ, will be stunted and suffer the consequences of such connectedness as has been the case with Docklands. Even when a community is established, and connectivity is improved, the long-lasting reputational effects are difficult to eradicate completely meaning that neighbourhood connectivity is perceived worse than it is and PQoL is impacted adversely for the local community in loss of trade, visitors, and general activity. The role of development and regeneration then in enhancing PQoL through placemaking is of paramount importance since to instil this neighbourhood connectivity from project inception provides the best possible chances of success compared to having to go in later and artificially curating and retrofitting the solution.

**Objective 2: Determine how issues of housing and other affordability (such as retail and leisure) and gentrification can act as barriers to inclusive placemaking.**

These issues have always been difficult to find a solution to. However, inclusive placemaking practice claims to be, if the development/regeneration project is not affordable to all the different members of the community then some will inevitably be marginalised and that is where issues of gentrification may occur. It is too simplistic to blame gentrification on less than exemplary placemaking practice, since as a construct gentrification is a complex one, implying, by its very nature that it is part of diversifying and mixing an existing (ungentrified) community, or by default it would not be an issue. What this thesis has highlighted, however, is that inclusive placemaking allows to as great an extent as possible for all members of the community to find housing and services (including retail and leisure) affordable and appropriate to them in a newly developed/regenerated area.

Each of the case studies presented shortfalls in meeting this basic requirement exemplifying the complexity of truly inclusive placemaking. Although some affordable housing was provided at Kings Cross, the leisure and retail offering is aimed at higher levels of affordability. Although considered as aspirational, this presents problems for the everyday citizen and certainly for a working-class Londoner. Similarly, gentrification was mentioned in Hoxton & Shoreditch as a way of funding new development and regeneration projects by pushing people out to make way for new wealthier residents when, in effect, the perception from some earlier experiences and memories does not entirely ring true when looking at new Council Regeneration projects in the borough reproviding the same amount of new housing for existing residents before additional new housing and services for incoming ones.
Perceptions of gentrification and affordability can then lead to stifling placemaking efforts, as seen in St Kilda, where experiences and a reputation for drugs and crime on Fitzroy Street take time to change for the better. In this case, gentrification would be an effect of cleaning up the street and making it more inclusive, driving desirability, however, without appropriate placemaking intervention impacting affordability. In any new area such as Docklands there is no pre-existing community to speak of and therefore compare the effects of gentrification to, hence it is not an issue. However, affordability, especially in the delivery of a quantum of housing, is almost always underachieved according to certain metrics, as seen in the quality-of-life indices in chapter 5 and various planning policy targets such as the London Plan and will always be a barrier to inclusive placemaking if it is not addressed and delivered more flexibly.

Objective 3: Illuminate how developers and regeneration experts are reimagining how they conceive of placemaking to deliver more inclusive, sustainable urban environments with an improved PQoL.

The case studies presented different approaches to placemaking in development and regeneration, all with the aim of delivering more inclusive, sustainable urban environments with an improved PQoL. Argent and the Kings Cross Partnership, with their long-term investment model, highlighted the obvious benefits of developers having the set up and the financing to not just simply plan, design and develop a place but also do this with a view to managing it from the outset, giving a more holistic perspective and ability to deliver the desired urban environments. In Hoxton and Shoreditch, development and regeneration experts work on smaller projects such as Boxpark, the Council on the estate regeneration programmes, and community groups on smaller placemaking interventions focusing on the less tangible element of regeneration, developing the community through support, activities, and events. This approach provides less dramatic effects that take different amounts of time, depending on their inception in relation to each other and their collaboration.

In St Kilda, for example, the dedicated placemaking team in attempting to become regeneration experts have worked to introduce small but quick placemaking interventions to see their impact and effect and determine their usefulness in staying or trying something different. This flexibility is key to the delivery of inclusive, sustainable placemaking, since any intervention that fails can be replaced with an intervention that succeeds, building on and learning from failures to find better solutions. In Docklands Development Victoria are looking to reactivate some of the areas that were not as successful as they could or should have been the first time and, in doing so, begin the learning process that is placemaking, a never-ending cycle of change for improvement, especially from a development and regeneration angle.
**Key Question 1:** Can common placemaking principles be agreed upon to be implemented in urban areas?

As can be seen in not only the case studies but also survey results, common placemaking principles can be agreed, however, being implemented in urban areas through, say planning policies and strategies, is something that has not been shown in this thesis. The document analysis made it clear that although some references to place-making and place-shaping have been made there is not one uniform definition or set of guiding principles, meaning that its effect can only have a limited reach and impact whilst it is up to each individual stakeholder to implement. For example, in St Kilda the City of Port Phillip’s placemaking team, through their action plan, had a set of guiding aims and objectives to measure the impact of their placemaking interventions. Their common principles, whilst not a complete and holistic definition of placemaking -especially when relating it to new development and regeneration projects- gives them a benchmark with which to assess and measure their failures and successes.

It is clear through the document analysis that a common set of placemaking principles is not only achievable but beneficial in the planning and designing of new development and regeneration projects. The London Plan (2021), for example, has an exhaustive glossary list that could easily include common placemaking principles to be implemented in each of the boroughs and their plans. The same can be said for the City of Melbourne plans and documents. The sometimes-used misconception that placemaking is just a buzz word and a fashionable term is unhelpful and misguided, since a common set of principles could simplify, guide, and shape the different disciplines involved in new development and regeneration to streamline their separate contributions, defining where they meet without overlapping, whilst complementing and enhancing each other’s work.

The common placemaking principles that this study has collated through empirical findings from the case study and survey evidence base include but are not limited to:

1. Accessibility both physical (to, from and through a place) and digital
2. Affordability of housing, retail, and leisure facilities for all
3. Desirability to visit, work, and/or live in this place
4. Inclusivity demonstrating a feeling of belonging for all
5. Creativity inspiring through culture, history, and heritage

There are, of course, many other important sustainable principles related to the above some of which are too complex to be discussed in this thesis and are more of a technical nature, such as Modern Methods of Construction, Sustainable Energy, which sit alongside placemaking. However, this study has deliberately not dealt with these separate issues. Within each of these principles there is an important
underlying principle of safety, since without it, each of the individual principles does not achieve its goal in its entirety. A place cannot be truly accessible, desirable, or inclusive without being safe.

**Key Question 2: Do the above-mentioned placemaking principles affect QoL/PQoL in cities and if so, how?**

This study has demonstrated that of the five placemaking principles stated above, each of the case studies had examples of where these principles have been applied successfully and where they have not. In Docklands the physical accessibility of the area to the rest of the city centre is hindered by the large national highway that cuts it off, and the big stadium on the edge makes the area less attractive to get to and therefore less desirable for some. It is also clear that the principles are all inter-related and if one falls short of success that can bring about failures of other principles. This is a complex balance, since if an area becomes too desirable it can drive demand up and become un-affordable to some, and therefore less inclusive as has been demonstrated in Hoxton & Shoreditch with housing choices, and Kings Cross with retail and leisure offerings.

Finally, QoL and/or PQoL are objectively and subjectively measured differently in different cities, countries and by different sets of criteria. Hence why this study is particularly relevant since the effect that placemaking has is a complex concept to measure. Each liveability or quality of life index -although different to each other in many ways - assess some, if not most, of the five principles above in some way as discussed in chapter 5. Each principle is interlinked as was also to some extent evidenced as affecting PQoL. For example, except for Docklands each case study stood out for its culture, history and/or heritage, without which a place is deemed less desirable and QoL/PQoL is affected. Although many policy and strategy documents related to development and/or regeneration of the case study areas have, to some extent, their own interpretations of these placemaking principles, they do so in such disparate and convoluted ways that the essence of their significance is lost. They become an aspirational, at times unachievable goals, such as Kings Cross being more affordable and therefore inclusive and Docklands being more accessible and therefore desirable.

**Key Question 3: Is there a way of measuring a cost and benefit of city placemaking and if so, what is it?**

This question ties into the preceding objectives and key questions since to measure cost and a benefit there needs to be an agreed definition and set of common principles by which to assess placemaking. By doing so- in some ways much like the City of Port Phillip have looked to do in their placemaking action plan- there is then a way of recognising the importance and significance of exemplary placemaking practice. By assessing it in relation to QoL/PQoL it is also a way of bringing together many already agreed common principles to guide and shape future development and regeneration projects. in Kings Cross, the
Regeneris report published in 2017 went some way to attempt to measure the cost and benefit of Argent’s placemaking efforts. To guide and shape the direction for say Docklands’ need for ‘renewal within renewal’ as Development Victoria’s Development Director described, a guiding set of placemaking principles that could measure the cost and benefit of applying such initiatives to new development and regeneration would be beneficial for their planning, design, and delivery.

Finally, then it is important to note that to be able to measure the cost and benefits of city placemaking, policies and strategies at a local, regional, and national level (as well as international) would need to shape such discourse or it will only ever be piecemeal, carried out differently by different stakeholders as seen with Argent, City of Port Phillip, and other examples such as Countryside Partnership’s Placemaking Diagram in Chapter 9. Development and regeneration projects are crucial in helping to shape a city’s future QoL/PQoL and, as such, these projects require the appropriate tools to deliver the sustainable result to which all aspire.

**Key Question 4:** *Are there several free and/or cost-effective common placemaking principles that can be applied and implemented in urban areas with a poor quality of life and indeed all cities to enhance their QoL/PQoL?*

This is a pertinent question for development and regeneration projects, since many of these projects can be and are carried out at a small local scale, and do not necessarily need to be a whole estate regeneration project or even a new building to be classified as either development or regeneration. As with the City of Port Phillip, small free and/or cost-effective solutions can be trialled, such as the tables and chairs on Fitzroy Street, for example. Since each one of the case studies already have a digital presence, many online interactions can be improved at little to no cost and go a long way in bringing the community together and making it more inclusive. The closed Facebook group for residents in one of the new buildings at Kings Cross was seen as a real benefit for the new residents, as they could get to know each other in a safe, quick, and efficient way. Without the knowledge of such groups, measuring the cost and benefit is impossible which is why such actions could and should be implemented at a larger scale at the planning stage.

Each of the five placemaking principles can have free and/or cost-effective solutions applied, such as Boxpark type retail and leisure offerings, as they can be more affordable to the start-up businesses and hopefully consumers too, as well as being more inclusive. Having more information about the history and heritage of Docklands on site, for example, instead of just online would be cost-effective and could help draw more people to visit as well as become more inclusive. The same could be implemented in Hoxton & Shoreditch by the canal where, apart from the Laburnam boat club, not many people from the estates
spend time there. Drawing people to places is a cost-effective way of driving up inclusivity and accessibility as well as desirability. Utilising a resource such as the Regent’s Canal, like at Kings Cross, is something that could also be cost-effective if, for example, all the estate regeneration programmes worked on such a project together.

10.3 Responses to Covid-19 in Placemaking, Development and Regeneration

The research for this study was completed in the early winter of 2020, just before the Covid-19 global pandemic took hold in March of that year. This meant that the study results would be written in this thesis during the pandemic. It was therefore not possible to revisit and carry out more relevant research to update this study especially as travel was restricted. In August 2020, Kings Cross in London was, however, accessible and it was interesting to observe how the place was being used. Apart from some obvious safety measures some pictured in the figures 57 and 58, people were sat enjoying the Granary Steps by the Regents Canal pictured in figure 59 and the space was still being used well and seen as desirable to be in.

Figure 57: Hand Sanitation stations, Kings Cross, August 2020
Much has changed since March 2020; however, this change has more than ever brought to the fore the importance of the five placemaking principles analysed in this thesis. Although it was not possible to gather any significant Melbourne post-pandemic information in relation to this study a recent paper by Bocca (2021) discussed the significance to Melbourne of accessibility "20- minute districts (Melbourne) work on increasing the accessibility of essential services, encouraging slow mobility and in particular Melbourne- creating a system of ‘neighbourhood activity centres’" (p398).
‘lockdown’ restrictions “residents were restricted to exercising or walking within a 2km distance from their home...This led to a focus on access to greenspace and the quality of local greenspace as a key spatial justice issue- not every home has usable greenspace within a 2km radius and not all greenspace is equal in terms of design and quality” (Scott 2020 p.344). The placemaking principles of accessibility, inclusivity and, to a lesser extent, desirability, affordability, and creativity all have a part to play in spatial justice as has been demonstrated by the case studies. This research has not focused on greenspaces, as all spaces green, blue, and hard landscaped areas can have a big impact on well-being. This can be seen in the London Plan’s (2021) glossary terms of Green Corridors, Green Cover and Green Infrastructure, which include “relatively continuous areas of open space leading through the built environment, which may link to each other” (p506) and waterways, water, canals, rivers, and parks etc.

Many other impactful issues have emerged more starkly than ever since the pandemic, such as mental health problems, loneliness, affordability. These are all hugely worthy issues, which this thesis cannot cover due to limitations of time. However, it goes without saying that the five placemaking principles can work within new development and regeneration to combat these issues and resolve some of the problems that have emerged. As discussed at the beginning of this thesis it is also not possible to look at placemaking in the management of places and spaces. However, as Argent have shown in Kings Cross ongoing management is crucial to the continued success of new developers and regeneration projects.

10.4 Implementing a Placemaking Framework to Enhance (Perceived) Quality of Life

As has been discussed in this thesis, the five placemaking principles that form the basis of this research to be effective need to form part of an implementable framework. A framework that is common among urban planning policies and strategies and can be measured against real-world outcomes in new development and regeneration projects. One element that one cannot lose sight of and has been discussed at length at the beginning of this thesis is the fact that both concepts of placemaking, and more importantly, quality of life have, to a lesser and greater extent, subjective and not only objective qualities. This is important to note as a flexible framework must take this into account and find ways to mitigate for and include such subjective and objective qualities. For example, there was a consensus empirically that Docklands was devoid of character and not a desirable place to live or visit, however, this was always caveated by the fact that some of the elements that make it generally undesirable and devoid of character are the very elements that appeal to some people.

There is, therefore, much potential for further research, not least that required to propose a solution for a fully flexible and adaptable placemaking framework, one that can be implemented at the planning stages of development and regeneration projects. Furthermore, being able to measure QoL/PQoL
through such a framework is another crucial but additional piece of research. This thesis has shed some light on the value of meaningful stakeholder consultation, where it is not only carried out as part of a tick box exercise but where it is taken account of and resulting actions from such consultation are put into effect into the placemaking strategies and interventions. However, to gain a further understanding of this work it would be useful to conduct this research in other world cities with a much lower overall quality of life, such as Mumbai, for example, to ascertain that the five placemaking principles brought together by this thesis are also applicable in such urban environments. This would allow for a more refined comparative, mixed methods analysis on a wider scale for a more accurate evidence base.

Finally, it is important to note that this thesis has attempted to bring together many separate concepts worthy of a whole PhD thesis in themselves. Thus, the further research that could come out of it is expanding on these separate concepts, such as placemaking in even just one case study area such as accessible placemaking for example. However, the aim of this research was to find evidence that the implementation of placemaking initiatives and strategies at a neighbourhood level can enhance and sustain QoL/PQoL. Hence a comparative case study approach was adopted to find as many different examples as possible of placemaking initiatives and strategies. In doing so, it is hoped that a better understanding of the complexities, pitfalls, and benefits of placemaking practice in development and regeneration have assisted in shaping a discussion around the advantages of adopting placemaking as a practice by implementing a flexible adaptive resilient framework encompassing its principles. Of course, further research surrounding the specific effects of Covid-19 on development and regeneration and the continued appropriateness of the placemaking principles as they appear in this thesis is also required. Overall, future research would allow for clearer correlations to be found with a longitudinal data analysis over a longer period and a larger number of case studies.

10.5 Closing Remarks and Research Limitations

In concluding this thesis, it is important to note its limitations. By conducting a comparative, mixed methods analysis with four different case studies many issues were encountered along the way. Even with the knowledge gained from the pilot case study there were limitations of time, availability of interviewees, planning and strategic documents in draft form that changed during this study, and many different skillsets required to, for example, gather online and digital data from social media. Whilst ideally these issues would have been ironed out at the pilot stage, the reality of each different case study area meant that not all individual peculiarities could be accounted for before the data collection process began. For example, a limited amount of time was spent in Melbourne, and it was not possible to go back a week, month or year later like it was in London.
The benefits of this research, however, still outweighed the complications and setbacks it encountered as different neighbourhoods within different cities and countries were able to enrich the empirical data with their own peculiarities, whether it be the way a city administration organises itself internally and its departments with its resulting policy and strategy documents to how community groups interact with local developers. Many lessons were learned that could benefit future research leading on from this thesis. Some of these lessons include but are not limited to partnership working and collaboration with peers in the same research field, whereby academic papers and joint projects could overcome some of the limitations this project encountered. Another benefit was to look at a neighbourhood scale at some of the issues that are discussed, assessed, and implemented at a global, national and city scale to understand not only the idiosyncrasies this brought to the fore but also what could be applied and how back at a city, national and global scale. As is explained by Apparicio et al (2007) “indicators calculated on the metropolitan scale cannot in fact reflect the conditions encountered by residents of large metropolises in their daily living environment, especially in the case of populations with little mobility whose lives are centred around their immediate residential environment, such as public housing populations” (p41).

These findings are relevant to urban academics and practitioners as they bring together planning and development and although not in this study, they also lead to place management through the implementation of flexible, lasting, and effective placemaking policies and practices as can be seen in the image below:

**Figure 60: Placemaking Process, 2022**

The figure above demonstrates how the placemaking process can bring together the separate practices of planning, development/regeneration, and place management to enhance quality of life. These disciplines do not often naturally work well together or feed into each other on their own and therefore placemaking can provide the glue to ensure they can work in harmony as a process. This can be used and/or translated into relevant policy by recognising this thread and embedding it as a cornerstone and
principle within local administrative urban authorities as well as private practice such as consultants and developers. Whilst different planning policies come and go over sometimes as short a period as four-year cycles, the development and regeneration of some areas can often take more than twenty years. Therefore to ensure delivery of these areas is still fit for purpose to enhance quality of life the placemaking process can provide the stability that government policies and report findings often cannot. Some reports and findings for example the Building Better Building Beautiful Commission (2020) are often never used as they were intended or market conditions change therefore rendering them more of a challenge to deliver, however, placemaking can overcome such obstacles as this thesis aimed to highlight. The findings contained herewith should therefore be embedded into wider placemaking policies that would last longer than short political cycles and would become part of a resilient, sustainable, and lasting urban development and regeneration agenda.

The power of placemaking is already being embraced in policy agendas. For example, the – Planning for the Future white paper seeks to bring a greater focus on placemaking, design and sustainability within the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) in England. Other such government documents in England continue to attempt to place more emphasis and policy guidance on placemaking although the continuous changes in the political climate have meant that an effective framework has not yet been implemented in England. By contrast the inaugural Australian Placemaking Summit which took place in May 2022 brought together practitioners from across the globe to focus on the best ways of achieving placemaking best practice in all communities and settings notwithstanding differing city, national and international policy frameworks.

Finally, then, it is hoped that this thesis has shed some light on the complexities and the commonalities of placemaking practice in development and regeneration and its effect on QoL/PQoL to find ways of involving all stakeholders in shaping a better more resilient future for our urban environments.
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APPENDIX 1: RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWEES

Pilot case study- Lower Broughton, Salford

(PD) Development and Regeneration Manager- Salford City Council (1)
(FT) Tenant resident in Lower Broughton- Salix Homes (2)
(AMH) Local Councillor- living on Lower Broughton Road (3)
(FT) Member of Green Grosvenor Park FB Group, local resident, working professional

(KS) Parks and Streetscene Manager- Place Directorate, Salford City Council (4)
(AH) Owner of the Treehouse Café on the Lower Broughton Road (5)
(BC) Broughton Neighbourhood Manager- Salix Homes (6)
(FT) Local Resident and Teacher (7)

Kings Cross case study- Camden, London

(MA) Local (intermediate rent) Resident (1)
(MA) Local (intermediate rent) Resident (2)
(KC) Local (private) Resident (3)
(FT) Local (intermediate rent) Resident (4)
(MA) Local Camden Councillor (5)
(IF) Argent Placemaking Director (6)
(CP) Regeneris Consultant (7)
(HC) Community Engagement Manager Francis Crick Institute (8)
(FT) Camden events Manager (9)

Hoxton & Shoreditch Case Study- Hackney, London

(MA) CFO Boxpark (1)
(FT) Peace of Mind Project Manager for Shoreditch Trust (2)
(FT) Laburnam Boat Club Employee (3)
(FT) Community Co-ordinator for Shoreditch Trust (4)
(AS) Regeneration Manager LBH for Hoxton & Shoreditch area (5)
(FT) Project Manager for Groundwork UK (6)
(IS) Chair of Friends of Regents Canal (7)
(FT) Laburnam Boat Club parent of son with learning disabilities & Hackney resident (8)
(FT) Laburnam Boat Club parent of daughter with autism & Hackney resident (9)

Docklands Case Study- City of Melbourne, Melbourne

(KC) Docklands Development Director for Development Victoria (1)
(RM) Project Executive, State Infrastructure, City of Melbourne Design & Projects (2)
(LB) Docklands resident and member of FB group (3)
(FT) Docklands resident and local business owner (4)
(FT) Villagewell Placemaking Consultant (5)
(FT) Villagewell Placemaking Consultant (6)

St Kilda Case Study- City of Port Philip, Melbourne

(GC) St Kilda Resident and representative for Our Place Reference Group (1)
(DD) Manager for Urban Design & Strategic Planning at City of Port Philip, Melbourne

(TH) Senior Placemaking Facilitator for City of Port Philip, Melbourne (3)
(GB) City Development & Statutory Planning Manager, City of Port Philip, Melbourne

(4)
(RS) Voices of the South Side Project Leader (5)
(MA) Local Developer and Resident (6)
(PM) Planner responsible for Victorian Pride Centre (7)
(MA) President of Fitzroy St Traders Association (8)
(AD) Placemaking Programme Director- City of Port Philip, Melbourne (9)
(MA) CEO of the City of Port Philip, Melbourne (10)
(FA) Acland St Traders Association, City of Port Philip, Melbourne (11)
(FA) Acland St Traders Association, City of Port Philip, Melbourne (12)
APPENDIX 2: URBAN SPACES AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PREFERENCES ONLINE SURVEY

Qualtrics survey -

Welcome

This survey relates to the place/neighbourhood you may call home, work in and/or currently spend most of your time in.

Some of the questions are about you however none of your responses will be used to identify you as the survey is completely anonymous. If you want to skip any questions or leave the survey, you are free to do so at any time and all the questions are optional. You can also add other/ additional comments at any time at the end of the survey regarding any of the questions.

The University of Warwick will use the data to identify perceptions of where people live, work or both. The data will be stored online in the Qualtrics data platform and downloaded to be analysed by the researchers conducting this study.

Please allow 7-10 minutes to complete the survey as this is the expected time it will take to finish it and most of the sections just require you to click your choice. There are 15 questions in total with 5 that include photos, some are about you and others about your opinions.

Should you require any further information please contact:

j.slattery@warwick.ac.uk

☐ Please tick to confirm that you have understood the above and are happy to take part in this survey, then click next below to start.

The rest of this page is intentionally left blank
If you are viewing this survey on a mobile device, it will display better in a landscape orientation, click next to continue

Place features

1. Please rate the photos below which show different types of places. You can click on all the photos to enlarge them:

   ![Photo 1](image1)
   □ like a lot □ like somewhat □ neither like nor □ dislike somewhat □ dislike □ dislike a lot

   ![Photo 2](image2)
   □ like a lot □ like somewhat □ neither like nor □ dislike somewhat □ dislike □ dislike a lot

   ![Photo 3](image3)
   □ like a lot □ like somewhat □ neither like nor □ dislike somewhat □ dislike □ dislike a lot
### About the place where you live, work or most identify with

1. When considering just 1 place where you live, work or most identify with (including its open spaces, buildings and other features such as rivers, canals, the sea etc) please answer the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>somewhat agree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>somewhat disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It should be a more diverse and creative place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport should be better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It benefits from a strong sense of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being near the water and/or water features (such as canals, fountains etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not concerned if open spaces are privately owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mix of affordable housing and retail options should be available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. (continued from the previous page)
I feel safe in all areas □ □ □ □ □ □
At night and during The day □ □ □ □ □ □
Culture, history and Heritage should be Treasured & promoted □ □ □ □ □ □

3. How would you rate the quality of life in this place/ neighbourhood?

☐ extremely high
☐ high
☐ neither high nor low
☐ low
☐ extremely low

About you

4. How often do you enjoy spending time in this place/ neighbourhood for leisure, recreational or sports activities (including shopping, going to exhibitions, shows, public events, markets etc)?

☐ daily
☐ 4-6 times a week
☐ 2-3 times a week
☐ once a week or more than once a month
☐ less than once a month
☐ hardly ever

5. What do you use this place/ neighbourhood for? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ as main residence
☐ as main workplace
☐ exercise
☐ recreation and leisure activities (including arts, music etc)
☐ shopping (including markets, fresh produce, etc)
☐ spending time in public spaces (i.e., a waterfront or feature), parks, squares etc
☐ passing through
☐ dog walking
☐ socialising (including eating and drinking out etc)
☐ attending public events
☐ other (see below)

If you clicked other, please state the other reason(s) you use your place/ neighbourhood for below:
6. How often do you leave this place/neighbourhood for any of the above reasons (from the previous question)?

- daily
- 4-6 times a week
- 2-3 times a week
- once a week or more than once a month
- less than once a month
- hardly ever

7. Are you familiar with the term “placemaking” when thinking about places, neighbourhoods and urban spaces?

- yes
- no
- not sure

If you have answered yes to the above, please describe in 1 sentence below what you believe placemaking is:

8. Looking at the buildings in your place/neighbourhood are they…?

- mainly high rise (typically blocks of 10 or more storeys)
- mainly low rise (typically housing or blocks of less than 3 storeys)
- mixed (an equal mix of the above 2)
- unsure

If you have answered unsure, please explain in 1 sentence below why that is:

9. What is your gender:

- female
- male
- other
- prefer not to say

10. How old are you:

- Under 20
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
11. Are you currently working:

☐ Yes
☐ No

For the purposes of analysis please provide the postcode area of the place/ neighbourhood you have answered the above questions for (and please state country if outside the UK):

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Please feel free to provide any other comments with regards to any part of this survey below:

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you very much for taking part and your time, please click next to finish.
Please share this survey with your friends, colleagues and on social media using this link:

........................................................................................................................................................................

Finally, how did you hear about this survey:

☐ Facebook
☐ Instagram
☐ LinkedIn
☐ twitter
☐ email
☐ survey cycle
☐ other (please state other here)........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX 3: URBAN SPLACES FACEBOOK AND INSTAGRAM PAGES & LINK

https://www.facebook.com/cityplacemaking

https://www.instagram.com/city_splaces/
APPENDIX 4: ETHICS APPROVAL SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS

BIOMETICAL & SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (BSREC)

Protocol for Research Project: The Relationship Between Perceived Quality of Life (QoL) and City Placemaking

Lay Summary: There is a clear lack of research and understanding about how city dwellers and workers perceive their QoL in relation to a city’s attempts and actions towards placemaking strategies and initiatives. These may include things such as a Private Rented Sector New Build Development Blocks’ sports courts, a Local Authority annual summer fete or a free exhibition run by a city architectural firm in their private courtyard space. This research will attempt to examine several placemaking characteristics such as type, accessibility, and variability to enable a deeper understanding of how the presence of localised placemaking initiatives translate into (perceived) QoL benefits. This will in turn aim to deduce a more holistic and replicable approach to be applied to city and neighbourhood placemaking strategies and initiatives across the globe. Social-level interventions can be a cost-effective and far-reaching method of improving QoL, therefore by understanding key placemaking features it may be possible to make informed decisions for future urban design. This study seeks to develop a set of resources for key urban professional groups such as planners, developers, consultants etc. The resources will support these groups in their decision making about placemaking practices and their promotion of responsibility and resilience amongst city dwellers and workers. They will provide a basis for wider dissemination and training and opportunities for the development of further training tools will also be sought.

Using quantitative and qualitative methods (including computational analysis, surveys, interviews, and observations) the project will:

1) Analyse placemaking and QoL information flows on social media platforms.
2) Explore the perspectives and experiences of social media stakeholders; and
3) Explore potential regulatory tools in social media spaces, including online self-governance mechanisms that could help to enhance perceived QoL via placemaking initiatives and ideas.

The results will be disseminated in written publications, conferences, and other events. They will also be presented in a range of impact activities, including school, college and university engagement visits and showcase events.
Background:

Modern migration over the last century has led to over half the world’s population residing in cities, as of 2007, a statistic expected to rise to 66% by 2050 [1]. It is now more critical than ever for urban planners and city stakeholders to create places and spaces to embrace the ever-evolving urban landscape and take on their social responsibility to provide happy, resilient, and sustainable neighbourhoods for their residents and workforce. However, there is growing evidence to suggest that QoL is poorer in larger (mega-)cities where the urban populations exceed 10 million [2]. Places themselves may influence how we feel, from spaces associated with fond childhood memories or relaxing walks, to environments where we tend to feel stressed or claustrophobic [3], therefore there is a need to understand which placemaking strategies and initiatives are key to improving city QoL especially if they can be translated to mega-cities where the need is greatest and most urgent.

Many organisations have recognised the importance of city QoL and to name just one The Economist publishes an annual ‘Liveability Index’ where it attempts instead to quantify the world’s most “liveable” cities—that is, which locations around the world provide the best or the worst living conditions. The index, measured out of 100, considers 30 factors related to safety, health care, educational resources, infrastructure, and the environment to calculate scores for 140 cities [4]. There are many other indices that measure QoL or happiness in cities and do so independently of each other, using different data and factors, with different criteria assessing different cities to each other.

It is not enough for a city to be deemed as ‘SMART’, ‘liveable’, ‘happy’ ‘resilient’ ‘sustainable’ and other such appellations if they do so independently and indeed without a fair comparator to their counterparts around this ever-shrinking world. Therefore, it is now necessary to align measures and ways to enhance city QoL in a replicable manner which is where placemaking comes in. Placemaking “is a genuinely holistic approach which seeks to give equal recognition to economic, environmental and social characteristics in the planning, development and renewal of our towns and cities” [5]. Although there are many other working definitions of placemaking this captures the essence of not only its aim but its usefulness and relevance to QoL studies.

As concepts, placemaking and QoL have so far not come together in a cohesive way to provide the missing link in urban planning and design discourses. The aim of this research is to therefore critique the existing measures that are used to assess city QoL as they are almost entirely economically driven, and their data aggregated at a city scale. Furthermore, these indicators do not account for local factors that play a significant part in lived experience of place or QoL. “This interest is motivated by the possibility that design principles associated with the built environment can be used to manage individual activities and improve the quality of urban life” [6].

Aims/Objectives:

The overall aim of this research is to investigate associations between different characteristics of placemaking initiatives and strategies and urban Quality of Life, to increase understanding of what is potentially beneficial, where and to whom. The hypotheses to be tested are therefore:

- Placemaking characteristics, in particular the level of citizen engagement with the characteristics in question, are more strongly associated with (perceived) Quality of Life than quantities/ their presence alone.
The implementation of placemaking initiatives and strategies at a neighbourhood level can enhance city QoL/‘perceived’ QoL.

The specific objectives are therefore to:

- Characterise urban placemaking (e.g., Accessibility and diversity) using spatial and statistical analysis methods.
- Study and test associations between these placemaking characteristics and (perceived) Quality of Life in urban environments.
- Examine whether characteristics of urban placemaking (and specifically features that are indicative of diversity) are associated with residents’ and workers’ (e.g., commuters’ who are not resident but in the neighbourhood every day) QoL, to a greater extent than the amount of placemaking initiatives and strategies.
- Develop a greater understanding of how city placemaking strategies and initiatives can be optimally designed to enhance urban QoL.

Design/Methodology:

The following research will be a combination of primary and secondary data analysis. It will be a multi-phase, mixed-methods study; some data collection will occur with different kinds of participants. The recruitment and consent procedures are outlined in full in the next section.

- **Analysis of online interactions (Work package A):** existing and publicly available social media messages will be collected and analysed. Information will not be sought from the social media users involved other than instances in which publication of messages may threaten user anonymity.

- **Online survey (Work package B):** experts in the fields of new build and refurb development, architecture, surveying, retail, the Arts and facilities management both in private and public sectors as well as local residents and workers of the areas in question will be invited (through formal and informal approaches) to complete a short series of (between 2 and 4) online surveys. An ethical statement regarding anonymity, the right to withdraw etc. will be given at the start of each survey and submission of responses will be taken as informed consent.

- **Observation of governance practices (Work package C):** formal permission from sites will be sought including police organisations, social media companies, civil service, support organisations etc. to conduct observations and interviews in the setting. Participants will be given an information sheet via the participating site and then asked to sign a consent form before starting data collection.

- **School, college, and university visits** - visits to a small number of schools will be made to conduct short focus group style sessions with groups of students aged 5+. During initial visits we will ask students to tell us about their perceptions of their QoL and about the urban setting they live and study in and during subsequent ones we will deliver short sessions on what they would like to see in their urban settings to improve their QoL. In keeping with Protocol 25, informed consent will involve initial formal consent.
from the school, parent/carer opportunity to opt-out their child from involvement, and verbal assent from the children involved.

Ethical Considerations:
This is a mixed method project using different approaches in different work packages. Project activities that involve new data collection and analysis are:
Work package a)- quantitative and qualitative analysis of collected social media data.
Work package b)- a series of online surveys (‘Policy Delphi’ and separately to lay audiences)
Work package c)- interviews and observations at fieldwork sites dealing with different placemaking strategies, initiatives and spaces and their effect on users and passers-by etc.
Impact and dissemination- school, college, and university visits to talk to students aged 5+ to find out about their use of different local, neighbourhood and city spaces and subsequent visits to deliver sessions on some of the key results, their potential impact, and ways to improve Quality of Life for all city dwellers and workers.

These project activities require careful attention to ethics but do not present any novel challenges to good practice. Careful attention to ethical issues will be always given when preparing the project workplan. The project raises 3 key ethical issues:

1) Access to research sites and research participants:
- Work package A uses online data that is publicly available on social media. These data will be harvested and processed using a computational analysis system. Individual participants do not need to be approached.
- Potential participants for the online surveys in Work package B include several existing contacts known to the researcher. Potential participants will therefore be approached in an appropriate way to invite them to take part. Formal written invitations will be sent to participants who are not existing contacts. In all cases, participants will be made aware of what participation involves and the voluntary nature of participation.
- Access to sites for Work package C (interviews and observations) will begin with formal approaches to the institutions involved- likely to be police organisations, social media companies, minority support groups etc. After that individual participant will be approached in a manner agreed with the participating institution.
- Access to schools, colleges and universities will begin with formal approaches to teachers and lecturers. Once agreement for access has been reached, information will be sent to parents/carers.

2) Informed Consent
Informed consent procedures will be applied throughout but will differ according to the method used.
- Work package A analyses online social media data in the form of Instagram, Facebook, and Pinterest. Informed consent will not be sought in most cases because these data are already publicly available and, as described below, steps are taken to ensure the anonymity of users. The data will be harvested and processed using a computational analysis system. Individual participants do not need to be approached. In instances where users are at risk of being identified, we will seek informed consent to publish material. This is discussed further below.
- In keeping with standard practice for surveys, participants in Work package B will be given information concerning their participation, anonymity, withdrawal from the study etc. before being presented with the survey questions. As an online survey, participants will read this information on the opening page of the survey before clicking the screen to move on to see the questions. Submitting responses will be taken as an indication of informed consent. Our survey will involve participants submitting responses in rounds, so each participant will be asked to submit responses to between 2 and 4 surveys (the exact number will be determined as the project proceeds). Participant information will be presented before the start of each survey round but amended as necessary in later rounds to reflect that the participant has already submitted some responses.
- The exact informed consent processes for Work package C may differ according to the requirements and procedures of the different institutions involved. However, it is expected to be
able to provide potential (interview and/or observation) participants with an information sheet via the participating site— to be sent over email or distributed on paper as appropriate. Time to ask questions and for reflection will be provided before asking individuals to participate. Consenting participants will then be asked to sign a consent form.

- The informed consent procedures for the school visits will follow Protocol 25. Information sheets will be sent out to parents/carers, who will also be given an opportunity to opt-out their child from the study. During the visits verbal assent from the students will be sought to check they are happy to participate in the session activities.

3) Participant Confidentiality and Data Security

Careful attention to data security will further ensure the privacy and anonymity of participants. After submitting the required documentation and being granted permission to access the required data, log in details will not be issued until a training course has been attended. This course will provide further information regarding the management and processing of sensitive data. The data may only be accessed remotely via a virtual secure environment, from an institutional setting within the UK. Data will therefore only be accessed from the student’s lockable office at the University of Warwick, on a password protected computer with a maximum 5-minute screen saver.

Within the data itself, confidentiality is maintained by using anonymised personal identifiers and only postcode location, rather than specific address. No attempts will be made to identify any individual, under any circumstances. The analyses will be undertaken at a local level, for example by predicting Perceived Quality of Life outcome from average travel distances to placemaking location.

When analysing the data, no information will be taken from the social media sources or the questionnaires by printing or copy and pasting. Only results and outputs may be downloaded; these are created within the secure setting. In the case of questionnaire data only results and outputs will be downloaded using appropriate software programmes. When preparing results, heat maps of perceived Quality of Life and placemaking may be created; these would be created at minimum Census area level, so that the results are aggregated, and no individual data would be visible. Statistical results would also be aggregated, for example to borough level, after the initial pilot, although it is likely that most results would be presented in terms of final models, which will be at the Greater Manchester, Greater London, New York, and Greater Melbourne levels. Any findings about a small group, for example a demographic, would have to be carefully presented to ensure no individual could be identified; again, this could be aggregated, or alternatively provided just in terms of the outcome, with no information regarding location. If creating maps to demonstrate the methods, postcodes where no perceived Quality of Life or individual data is available could be used as an example, and this would be specified in the report, to ensure it could not be mistaken as the location for an individual from the dataset. Study information (including research data, consent forms and administrative records) will be retained for a maximum period of the end date of this project.

Right of Withdrawal

Participants will be able to withdraw from the research process at any time. Participants will also be able to withdraw their data if it is identifiable as theirs and will be told when this will no longer be possible (e.g., once it has been included in a final report or publication).

Funding:

The Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) fund this PhD, and therefore this research project including any data access fees and other costs incurred which will be paid through the EPSRC grant. The funding also covers studentship, office space and personal workstation.

Dissemination and Implementation:

It is hoped that publications may be prepared after testing the association between placemaking characteristics and Quality of Life within the initial pilot neighbourhood of Lower Broughton in Salford, Greater Manchester. Following this, findings may again be prepared for publication after testing these associations across the other test neighbourhoods and cities with high and low Quality of Life. Depending on the significance, quality and
quantity of results, multiple publications may be appropriate. This process is consistent for intermediate and results, as well as the PhD thesis.
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APPENDIX 5: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS LIST FOR UK & AUSTRALIA CASE STUDIES

UK documents:

- NPPF 2021
- London Plan 2021
- Hackney SPD 2017
- Hackney Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2016
- Hackney Local Plan 2020
- Draft Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan 2019
- Camden Local Plan 2017
- Camden Site Allocations 2013
- Kings Cross Shaping the Future – A Plan for the wider Kings Cross Area 2014
- Kings Cross Opportunity Area Planning and Development Brief 2004

Australian documents:

- Plan Melbourne 2017-2050
- Future Melbourne 2026
- City of Melbourne Council Plan 2021-2025
- City of Port Phillip Health and Wellbeing Implementation Strategy 2017-2021
- City of Port Phillip Council Plan 2021-2031
- Docklands Community and Place Plan 2012
- Docklands Public Realm Plan 2012
- City of Port Phillip Placemaking Action Plan 2018-2021
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