
Regional Studies Association Annual International Conference: The Dilemmas of Integration and Competition

Prague, Czech Republic 27th – 29th May 2008

Gateway J: Knowledge based developments in old industrial regions

Convenors: Paul Benneworth & Gert-Jan Hospers

Creative Industries and Urban Regeneration
David Jarvis, Hannah Lambie and Nigel Berkeley

Applied Research Centre in Sustainable Regeneration (SURGE),
Futures Institute, 10, Coventry Innovation Village, Coventry University Technology Park,
Cheetah Road, Coventry. CV1 2TL.

Tel. +4424 7679 5759 Email. d.jarvis@coventry.ac.uk Web. www.coventry.ac.uk/surge

ABSTRACT. Over the past decade, Creative Industries have enjoyed much high-profile coverage and attention from policy makers and academics, most notably from the inception of the Creative Industries Task Force in 1997 and the publication of the Creative Industries Mapping Document in 1998. Today, much of the political rhetoric declares the creative industries to be key to the future success of the British economy, and an instrumental tool in urban regeneration. Against this backdrop, this paper assesses critically the assumption that creativity and regeneration are intrinsically linked, and interrogates those political and policy related assertions that creative industries are a panacea for both economic and social regeneration.

Introduction

Creative Industries have enjoyed much high-profile coverage and attention from policy makers and academics, most notably from the inception of the Creative Industries Task force in 1997 and the publication of the *Creative Industries Mapping Document* in 1998. Today, much of the rhetoric declares the creative industries to be the linchpin of the future UK economy and an instrumental tool in urban regeneration. However, much creative industries literature and commentary finds itself struggling for clarity as a result of the implicit acceptance of creative industries as a coherent single sector and, second, ambiguity about what the creative industries agenda means in policy terms. Against this uncertain background, this paper sets out to clarify and critique the role of creative industries in urban regeneration. In order to achieve this, the paper is structured in three key sections. The **first** is concerned with issues of definition, focusing specifically on the definition adopted by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS); the treatment of, and relationship with culture; the industries that are included and excluded; and problems of measurement. The **second** considers the extent to which creative industries can play a positive role in helping to foster urban regeneration, particularly the 'softer' aspects of regeneration such as social inclusion. Finally, the third section examines and critiques current policy approaches which connect creative industries and regeneration, identifying possible areas for improved policy formulation and delivery.

Creative Industries: the concept

The definition of creative industries to which policy-makers in the UK work is that determined by the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) in their 1998 *Creative Industries Mapping Document*. This defines creative industries as 'those industries which have their origins in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property' (DCMS 1998). The Mapping Document went on to dictate a boundary of coverage for the concept, understanding the creative industries to include advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, television and radio (DCMS 1998).

This definition, whilst explicitly curtailed, remains unwieldy and has sparked a plethora of critiques. Three key issues can be identified as contributing to the contested nature of the definition. **First**, the political imperative of the incoming New Labour Government in 1997 was to establish quickly a practical definition of creative industries that could be used as a basis for policy formation and intervention. This initial definition remains largely unaltered and lacking internal coherence. **Second**, criteria for the inclusion or exclusion of particular industries and sectors are problematic, with the complexity of relationships between creativity and capitalism and creative and cultural industries not fully accounted for. **Third**, the quantitative evidence base used not only to demarcate the creative industries, but also to establish their contribution to the economy and society, are potentially flawed, with serious shortcomings relating to the employment of UK Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes as a method of measuring the scale of the creative industries sector. Each of these points will now be elaborated in turn.

The role of policy makers in stimulating the initiation of the concept of creative industries is important to note due to both the perceived opportunist nature of the interest, and the fact that government policy has traditionally been seen as sitting awkwardly against innovation, fluidity and flexibility (Hartley 2007). This drive from policy makers and leading figures of government, simultaneously served to legitimise a particular interpretation of the creative industries and to promote a specific set of activities contained within the official definition. Certainly, it is clear that the DCMS definition, as outlined above, brings together a number of industries which would normally not fit easily side by side (for example the advertising and the antiques industries), whilst excluding a number of other industries which might be expected to feature under a creative industries heading. Notably, Howkins suggests that the DCMS definition favours those industries with a particular artistic or cultural skill and limits the interpretation of intellectual property to copyright (Howkins 2007: 118). As an alternative, Howkins favours a definition of a creative industry as one where 'brainwork is the preponderant and where the outcome is intellectual property' (Howkins 2007: 119).

Further definitional questions can be raised in relation to the meaning of creativity within a creative industries context, particularly as creativity can be regarded as a fundamental component of all enterprises within capitalist economies. The Cox Review of 2005, for example, states that that the future of the UK economy lies in the production of innovative, high quality, high value-added products and services (HM Treasury 2005: 5). The emphasis on creativity here, however, is not limited to a particular set of industries but instead, is

regarded as fundamental to the success of all small and medium sized enterprises in the UK. Where this review sits in relation to the UK Government's Creative Economy Programme is an issue which the 2008 strategy document attempts to highlight, asking 'how can the creative industries stimulate innovation in the rest of the economy, including through design?' (DCMS 2008: 32). These issues seem to illustrate further the uneasy and arbitrary nature of the boundaries set by the 1998 definition.

The role of culture in the 1998 DCMS definition of creative industries is an issue addressed by a number of commentators, and serves to highlight a further aspect of tension. An interesting argument is put forward by Hartley, who understands that the term creative industries 'combines two older terms; the creative arts and the cultural industries' (Hartley 2007: 2). This issue of essentially conflating culture and creativity is addressed in a number of other critiques, including that of Galloway and Dunlop who are quick to assert the distinction between the two concepts of culture and creativity (Galloway and Dunlop 2007a). In further work, Galloway and Dunlop discuss how arts and culture have become subsumed in the creative industries agenda, and are at pains to highlight the important (even contradictory) differences between the two concepts (Galloway and Dunlop 2007b). Of particular importance is the fact that creative industries are characteristically private sector profit motivated activities, whilst cultural industries are typically publicly funded and have social goals at their core. This highlights again the conceptual vagueness inherent in the DCMS 1998 definition of creative industries

Aside from these definitional aspects of the conceptual debate, questions can be raised over the quantitative evidence based used to support arguments over the impact of the creative industries on the national, and individual local, economies. The UK Standard Industrial Classification of Economic Activities (SIC codes) are the principal official tool used to assess the scale and impact of the creative industries. The first problem with the utilisation of SIC codes for measuring the creative industries is that they only record VAT registered companies, which leads to many small creative enterprises going unaccounted for. The DCMS *2001 Mapping Document* highlights this issue in relation to the crafts sector where it notes that the 'majority of businesses [are] too small to be picked up in business surveys' (DCMS 2001). Furthermore, SIC codes are unable to fully accommodate each of the different creative industries, for example there are no codes at all to match the design sector (DCMS 2001). Finally, individual SIC codes tend to group a range of related activities under each general heading, leading to the incorporation of activities which are not particularly "creative" within what are notionally creative categories. Similarly, businesses are classified according to their principal business function on the basis of self-completed questionnaires, adding a further layer of confusion. These problems in measuring the scale of the creative industries mean that at the same time some companies and activities are omitted, whilst non-creative industries are wrongly included. This is particularly significant given that employment data structured according to UK SIC is frequently used by government in order to demonstrate the importance of the creative sector to the economy. If the SIC code method of measurement is set aside, however, further difficulties arise. Specifically, any attempt to map the scale and impact of the creative sector (especially at the local level) also comes up against the problem that many smaller creative enterprises comprise just one or two highly mobile individuals and are, therefore, functionally independently of the local economies where they are based.

Evidence presented thus far shows that whilst there is a critical mass of opinion that regards creative industries (however defined) as the key to future economic prosperity, and an important tool in urban regeneration, there remains a persistent question over the validity of the 1998 DCMS definition around which government continues to shape policy interventions. The next section of this paper will progress to examine the connections which have been drawn between the support for the creative industries as officially conceived and the ongoing process of urban regeneration in the UK.

Creative Industries and Regeneration

'We are currently stumbling, fairly blindly, in the belief that the creative industries have a well-understood role in economic development, regeneration, and social inclusion.'

[Oakley, Not So Cool Britannia, 2004]

Much of the rhetoric and commentary on the creative industries incorporates the view that creativity and regeneration are intrinsically linked. Not only is this a weighty assertion, but it is often a largely unsubstantiated one. The Creative Industries strategy document launched in February 2008, *Creative Britain New Talents for the New Economy*, states that the 'creative industries play a role in local and regional regeneration ... They also bring wider social and cultural benefits' (DCMS 2008: 58). However, the exact role that creative industries play in local and regional regeneration and the precise nature of the wider social and cultural benefits that they bring is not specified. Again, this ambiguity is extenuated by a further definitional problem: what is meant by local and regional regeneration? Does it refer to merely to economic development and physical redevelopment or to community cohesion and community renewal as well? A similar level of ambiguity surrounds the terms social and cultural benefits. Does this refer to an increase in socio-cultural amenities, an improvement in community relations, the promotion of inclusion amongst disadvantaged or vulnerable people, or again a combination of these elements? Thus, failure to set out explicitly and to evidence the precise nature of the ways in which creative industries contribute to urban regeneration is a key failing of current policy literature.

In interrogating these assertions further, this paper will now look at three key aspects of the supposed relationship between creative industries and regeneration. First, the relationship between the creative industries and economic development; second, with social inclusion; and third in promoting local liveability.

Economic Development

The perceived links between creative industries and economic development have their origins in the work of Richard Florida. Florida's influential work *The Rise of the Creative Class* promulgates a theory of economic development as powered by creative people, and driven by the 'three T's: Technology, Talent and Tolerance' (Florida 2002: 249). Whilst the influence of Florida's work is recognised, many authors question the validity of his arguments (e.g. Malanga 2004 and Peck, 2005). Aside from the theoretical critique of Florida's work, two key points are important to note here. The relevance of his work to the UK is questionable owing to that fact that it is a US-based study, and there has been little attempt to understand the applicability of the approach to

other national contexts. Furthermore, the definition of the creative class which Florida employs focuses on innovation, incorporating scientists, engineers and knowledge-based professionals, clearly distinct from the softer cultural definition which UK policy has been working to for the past decade.

Aside from Richard Florida's work, there are other arguments which claim to identify the contribution made by the creative industries to economic development. Oakley provides a critique of this view, arguing that to utilise creative industries as a principal driver of policy risks creating polarised and unstable economic development (Oakley 2004: 67). Further to this, Oakley addresses the issue of how creative industries can exacerbate economic inequality, highlighting the problems such as gentrification and patterns of informal hiring by creative businesses (Oakley 2006: 255). Another important issue to be considered is the sustainability of any creative industries-led regeneration policy. The highly mobile nature of creative entrepreneurs noted earlier, coupled with the ephemeral nature of many of the commodities produced by creative enterprises could serve to destabilise a local economy dedicated to courting creative industries, particularly during times of economic downturn.

Social Inclusion

The view of National Policy makers presented in the *Creative Industries Mapping Document 2001* is that creative industries make an 'important contribution to social inclusion' (DCMS 2001: 13). However, there is a tension in the creative industries literature which sees the industries as simultaneously promoting diversity in terms of the creativity and different cultural influences they employ, whilst at the same time, putting up barriers to a more socio-economically diverse workforce. Not only is the validity of the latter argument easily identifiable, with much literature available to highlight the elitist nature of the creative industries workforce, but evidence disputing the former argument is also ample, with statistics suggesting that the percentage of employees from ethnic minority backgrounds is less amongst the creative industries than in the workforce as a whole (Oakley 2006: 263).

Landry provides a useful critique of the benefits which creative industries are said bring through increased diversity, arguing the notion that a strong cultural sector creates positive images is challenged by the question of whose images are to be legitimised (Landry 2007). These points are an important argument against the commonly-held interpretation of the creative industries as promoters of social cohesion, highlighting instead the problematic nature of determining which cultures and identities take precedence within creative sectors. The dominance of particular cultural perspectives within the creative industries is in opposition to policy which sees them as a tool in promoting inclusion and cohesion, and may in fact provide a further mechanism through which minority or disadvantaged communities are marginalised.

Liveability

In his book *The Creative City*, Charles Landry explores how it is possible to make cities more liveable and vital by harnessing people's imagination and talent (Landry 2007). This is an interesting idea, and is taken in this paper as the basis for a broader discussion about the role creative industries can play in promoting the "liveability" of a locality either through utilising concentrations of creativity (and creative people) as a means of

place promotion and a catalyst for enterprise growth or by public investment in cultural facilities which harness local talent. In an example of the later approach, the Gateshead Quays regeneration scheme saw the physical transformation of the area around the Quays, and the Public Art Programme launched in 1986 has seen the creation of over fifty major public artworks by leading artists in Gateshead (Gateshead Council 2006). The role of public art and the physical redevelopment that can arise from the work of creative industries is important to note, but crucially this contribution is typically underpinned by significant public investment in the cultural rather than creative industries. Moreover, where emphasis is placed on culture, successful programmes necessarily engage with a pre-existing sense of local identity (Bailey et al. 2004: 48). This has important implications for “cultural regeneration” initiatives that are pursued in areas which lack this historical sense of place and space (Bailey et al. 2004: 49).

Evidence presented here suggests that the dominant view of creative industries as a key tool in urban regeneration is at best questionable. There are many criticisms offered on the capacity of the creative industries to tackle issues of inclusion, diversity, and even economic development, and it could be argued that the potential impacts lie largely in public sector led physical redevelopment and place promotion as a catalyst for wider regeneration benefits. Despite these failings UK government is clearly committed to promoting the creative industries as a mechanism for economic development and regeneration. As such, the following sections of this paper will examine the ways in which the perceived regeneration benefits of creative industries are being operationalised through policy currently, and identify possible future directions which might address some of the issues raised.

Policy Approaches to the Creative Industries

The creative industries feature prominently throughout economic development policy at national, regional and local levels. There is a seemingly universal desire to pursue the concept of the Creative City (Landry, 2007) and to promote regeneration through maximising the potential of creative industries in an area. Whilst arguments presented so far in this paper have questioned the true breadth and depth of regeneration outcomes which can be expected from the creative industries, the dominance of creative industries in regeneration and economic development policy discourse makes it important to analyse the policies currently being pursued to foster and encourage growth in this dynamic sector of the economy. Within this, the focus will be on methods of supporting creative businesses and addressing their skills needs in order to maximise the impact of creative industries on regeneration.

The Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) is the primary lead on creative industries policy¹ and have undertaken and published much research on the creative industries, their impact, and implications for policy.² Most recently, February 2008 saw the publication of the creative industries policy strategy: *Creative Britain New Talents for the New Economy* (DCMS 2008). This strategy, underpinned by £70.5m of government support, covers a range of issues from creative education for children and young people, business support, continuing professional skills development, through to Britain as the world’s creative hub (DCMS 2008).

1 DCMS and shares responsibility with the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) where appropriate. The one anomaly being software, which BERR are entirely responsible for

2 For a full list of publications see http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/Creative_industries/QuickLinks/Publications/

At a regional level, Government Offices and Development Agencies are the key drivers of policy on creative industries. Creative industries feature prominently throughout the aims and strategies of Regional Development Agencies, and questions have been raised over the validity of the expectations of such widespread expansion of this sector (Oakley 2007: 73). From the perspective of Regional Development Agencies, the creative industries present potential in high-growth, inward investment, and regeneration opportunities and, therefore, can be found within each of the Regional Economic Strategies (RES) [See Table I]. The prevalence of creative industries in each RES is important to note, and draws attention to the question of whether creative industries per se are appropriate as drivers of each regional economy in the country. Do regions fully understand the extent and scope of creative industries within their boundaries, or are they just promoting the approach as a fashionable concept? Is a more focused policy which champions particular regional creative strengths more appropriate?

There is much commentary on the effectiveness of creative industries policy, and indeed the appropriateness of it. Three key questions to be considered within the context of this paper are the ability of government to manage a policy relating to the creative industries; issues around perceived skills gaps in the sector; and appropriateness of existing business support provision to creative businesses.

The adequacy of policy approaches

Issues have been raised by a number of commentators about whether policy makers are capable of arriving at a strategy fit for the creative industries, and the post-industrial way of working that they represent. This can be illustrated in arguments relating to the rigidity of Whitehall departments and departmental working, as well as the traditionally instrumentalist nature of government policy in this area which has tended towards grant-giving and subsidising (Leadbeater and Oakley 2007: 305).

Government programmes such as the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative, designed to foster enterprise, present good opportunities for initiatives targeting the creative industries. The Department for Communities and Local Government describe the programme as 'providing local authorities, in partnership with key stakeholders, with the freedom to best determine the needs, options, and solutions, for stimulating economic development in their area' (DCLG c.2005). The inherent flexibility in the LEGI concept means that the funding stream is well placed to support initiatives developing the creative industries. Citing just two examples, Leeds and Blackpool, it is possible to see how the creative industries are able to feature prominently in LEGI programmes. In Blackpool, the LEGI funding was said to enable the local authority to promote a positive enterprise culture, by pursuing key proposals including a creative industries hub (DCLG c.2006a). Leeds City Council describes how the LEGI funding will be put towards sector support for those with significant growth potential (DCLG c.2006b).

Despite these apparent successes, however, the appropriateness of promoting creative industries as a means of regenerating the kinds of disadvantaged communities targeted by LEGI has already been questioned within this paper, particularly given that they employ an almost exclusively graduate level workforce. Moreover, this

Table I.

Region	Regional Economic Strategy	Creative Industries
South West	Regional Economic Strategy for South West England 2006-2015	Creative Industries (with particular reference to digital media) are classified as an important regional sector.
South East	Regional Economic Strategy for the South East 2006-2016: A Framework for Sustainable Prosperity	For the Inner South East, the RES sees investing in 'high growth globally competitive sectors' as a priority resulting in 'increased productivity growth and export levels in key global sectors including aerospace, digital creative industries and environmental technologies'. The RES also sees the release of enterprise potential in the creative industries as a priority for the Coastal South East. Promoting the importance of design and creativity across all sectors is seen as an action to contribute towards achieving global competitiveness. In relation to increasing business stock the RES includes an action for supporting new and growing business in the creative industries. Finally, the creative industries are included as a cross-cutting theme, with specific key actions.
London	Sustaining Success Developing London's Economy Economic Development Strategy (2005)	The RES describes London as the 'global centre for the creative industries'. It discusses problems of support services and sees supporting the development of hubs for creative industries as key to the investing in enterprise agenda.
East of England	Regional Economic Strategy for the East of England: Draft strategy for consultation September 2007	The RES addresses creative industries within the context of the Greater Norwich Sub-region, citing the existing and emerging sectoral strength in the creative industries as an asset and including under Headline Ambitions, the development of Norwich as a nationally important centre in financial and business services and creative industries.
East Midlands	A Flourishing Region: Regional Economic Strategy for the East Midlands 2006-2020	Under Challenges for the Region, the creative industries are seen as a large and growing part of the regions economic offer, particularly in relation to building on cultural, sporting and tourism strengths. In relation to enterprise and business support, a priority action is targeting the growth of creative and cultural industries.
West Midlands	Connecting to Success: The West Midlands Economic Strategy (2007)	The RES states that a range of existing sectors exhibit strong potential for future economic growth and employment in the West Midlands. Creative industries are captured within two of the RDAs Priority Business Clusters [High Value Added Consumer Products and ICT and Digital Media] and are said to have healthy prospects for growth.
Yorkshire and Humber	The Regional Economic Strategy for Yorkshire and Humber 2006-2015	The RES sees the digital cluster (including associated creative industries) to be a priority cluster, being pivotal in contributing to future growth of the region. Culture, distinctly, is seen as integral to renaissance and 'cuts across' the strategy.
North East	Leading the way: Regional Economic Strategy 2006-2016	'Commercial Creative' is seen as a key service sector within the RES. In relation to the future of business support, it is noted that creative industries tend not to or cannot access mainstream support services. Under 'Delivering the Place Agenda' partners will work to ensure that the region's cultural, natural and heritage assets are protected, enhanced and promoted – this includes supporting business growth in the cultural and creative industries.
North West	North West Regional Economic Strategy 2006	In relation to the Cumbria economy, the prospect of growth in the creative industries is seen as a key asset and opportunity. In relation to regional sectors, undertaking cluster programmes for digital and creative industries is seen as important in developing key internationally competitive sectors. The RES also recognises the importance of meeting the skills needs of key sectors and growth opportunities.

situation is likely to worsen, given that the Department for Communities and Local Government's new Working Neighbourhoods Fund (which will eventually replace existing neighbourhood funding streams), focuses primarily on tackling worklessness in the country's most deprived neighbourhoods and does not, therefore, lend itself to supporting new creative entrepreneurs even in the same way as LEGI, which set out to tackle broader issues of enterprise (DCLG, 2007). Does this indicate that the government itself is now uncertain about whether and how the growth of the creative industries sector fits into the regeneration of the country's most disadvantaged communities?

Creative Industries Skills Needs

The adequacy of education and skills policy in relation to the creative industries is frequently raised and important to note. In order to be successful in these industries, the creative industries workforce needs to be equipped with business skills and provided with accessible educational services in order to maximise their potential and to meet the demands of new technologies. At the same time creative businesses require skilled and educated employees able to adapt to change and sustain their competitiveness over the long term and hence create the economic development outcomes presupposed by government. The development of professional skills such as business management, as well as experience of working in diverse teams and knowledge of global markets and supply chains are seen as of central importance to education in further and higher education (Design Skills Advisory Panel 2007: 4). Professional development is also seen as important, for example the need for designers to develop their skills and ability to stay in touch with the rapid pace of change in the sector (Design Skills Advisory Panel 2007: 4).

To this end, there are a number of education and skills initiatives and organisations which seek to address this issue, including Creative and Cultural Skills (the Sector Skills Council for advertising, crafts, cultural heritage, design, music, performing, literary and visual arts), the Cultural Leadership programme, and the Design Skills Advisory Panel. The Design Skills Advisory Panel has produced a UK Design Skills Development Plan which sets out recommendations to address creative industries skills issues at the levels of schools, universities and colleges, and professional practice (Design Skills Advisory Panel 2007: 4-5). In relation to secondary and tertiary education, the Advisory Panel explain how the popularity of design courses and the over-supply of new designers means that it is necessary to make the 'value and transferability' of design skills more pronounced, and to provide excellent careers advice (Design Skills Advisory Panel 2007: 4). This issue of over-supply is a concern given the wholesale push for creative industries pursued by government, and adds weight to the argument that the creative businesses do not provide a source of large scale employment opportunities.

Supporting Creative Businesses

The issue of business support services is important to note here. There are arguments which suggest that the creative industries have very particular needs, which are not addressed by mainstream support services. This has implications for policy makers at a more local level, but the current Business Support Simplification Programme being carried out by BERR should be taken into account here, and the implications that this may have on attempts to diversify business support services for particular sectors. Indeed, the *Government Response to Consultation* which was published in 2007 noted that 'the creative industries representatives responding to

this consultation felt that simplification of business support would only be successful for them if Business Link could respond to the sector's particular needs both at the national and the regional level' (BERR 2007: 24).

Policy Implications and Conclusion

In light of the findings of this paper, it is suggested that a smaller number of more nuanced policies be adopted in order to foster this dynamic and vibrant section of the UK economy. The arguments relating to the rigidity of Whitehall have resonance, and seem somewhat validated by the move to set up a dedicated task force and "programme" within one government department, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. What this paper has found, and those by numerous other authors, is that the creative industries are hard not only to define, but also to identify. This in turn suggests that to categorise these industries would curtail and restrict the potential impact of government policy. What is necessary is a far more fluid and novel policy approach, which resists the pigeon holing of the creative industries within one government department. This is supported by the fact that even those issues identified by government itself demand cross-departmental working (such as skills and business support services). It can be argued that in order to promote this problem solving a more fluid and flexible approach should be attempted by Whitehall.

At a regional level, the definitional difficulties outlined previously mean that a more effective approach might be to focus specifically on mapping, understanding and supporting particular niches within the creative industries rather than viewing them generically as a tool for economic regeneration and job creation. However, at the same time, the relationship between the creative industries and regeneration should not be forgotten. Whilst the individual creative sectors do not provide a panacea for economic development, they can be harnessed to stimulate physical redevelopment and to promote an area as a vibrant and innovative place to do businesses. This in itself will help to foster growth. As such, in light of the arguments made above, moves could be made by Regional Development Agencies to promote the impact of creative industries in relation to liveability. Links between the creative industries and local social enterprises and local physical developments could be encouraged, promoted and marketed as a part of a wider liveability programme.

This paper has sought to examine the links between creative industries and regeneration. Necessarily conceptual issues have been addressed, and it was found that the definition employed by the DCMS was problematic. The relationship between the creative industries and regeneration was explored, looking particularly at economic development, social inclusion and liveability, and it was found that in relation to the latter, the creative industries can play an important role. In light of this, it has been argued that initiatives should be supported which foster links between the creative industries and physical regeneration, whether that is in terms of public art, or physical developments. It has also been recognised that creative industries (whatever the particularities of definition), incorporate successful and dynamic business which need adequate support mechanisms to be in place, similarly the continuing professional development of creative professionals needs to be a continuing focus for policy makers.

Bibliography

Bailey, C., Miles, S., and Stark, P., (2004) 'Culture-led Urban Regeneration and the Revitalisation of Identities in Newcastle, Gateshead and the North East of England'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10, 47-65.

BERR (2007) *Simplifying Business Support Government Response to Consultation* [online] Available from <<http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file42641.pdf>> [16 April 2008]

Department for Communities and Local Government (2007) *Working Neighbourhoods Fund* [online] Available from <<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/566881>> [30 January 2008]

Department for Communities and Local Government (c.2006 a) *LEGI Round Two: Enterprising Blackpool* [online] Available from <<http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/displaypagedoc.asp?id=1857>> [21 January 2008]

Department for Communities and Local Government (c.2006 b) *LEGI Round Two: Leeds City Council* [online] Available from <<http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/displaypagedoc.asp?id=1857>> [21 January 2008]

Department for Communities and Local Government (c.2005) *About LEGI* [online] Available from <<http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=1696>> [21 January 2008]

Department for Culture Media and Sport (2008) *Creative Britain New Talents for the New Economy* [online] Available from <<http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/096CB847-5E32-4435-9C52-C4D293CDECFD/0/CEPFeb2008.pdf>> [1 March 2008]

Department for Culture Media and Sport (2001) *Creative Industries Mapping Document* [online] Available from <http://www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library/Publications/archive_2001/ci_mapping_doc_2001.htm> [20 January 2008]

Department for Culture Media and Sport (1998) *Creative Industries Mapping Document* [online] Available from <http://www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library/Publications/archive_1998/Creative_Industries_Mapping_Document_1998.htm> [20 January 2008]

Design Skills Advisory Panel (2007), *Design Blueprint: UK Design Industry Skills Development Plan* [online] Available from <<http://www.ukdesignskills.com/index.html>> [20th May 2008]

Florida, R., (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class USA: Basic Books*

Galloway, S., and Dunlop S. (2007a) 'What's Cultural about the Creative Industries?' [online] Available from <<http://www.regional-studies-assoc.ac.uk/events/lisbon07/papers/Galloway.pdf>> [20 February 2008]

Galloway, S., and Dunlop S. (2007b) 'A critique of definitions of the cultural and creative industries in public policy'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 12, (1) 17-25

Gateshead Council: Public Art in Gateshead and the Angel of the North (2006) [online] Available from <<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/DocumentLibrary/Leisure/Leaflets/Angel%20Pack%20small.doc>> [18 January 2008]

Hartley, J. (2007) 'Creative Industries'. In *Creative Industries* ed. By Hartley J. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing: 1-40

HM Treasury (2005), *Cox Review of Creativity in Business: building on the UK's strengths* [online] Available from <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/cox_review/coxreview_index.cfm> [20th May 2008]

Howkins, J. (2007) 'The Mayor's Commission on the Creative Industries'. In

Creative Industries ed. By Hartley J. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing: 117-126

Landry, C. (2007) *Creative Cities*. London: Earthscan

Leadbeater, C., and Oakley, K. (2007) 'Why Cultural Entrepreneurs Matter'. In *Creative Industries* ed. By Hartley J. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing: 299-312

Malanga, S. (2004) 'The curse of the creative class'. *City Journal* Winter, 36–45.

Oakley, K. (2004) 'Not So Cool Britannia: The Role of the Creative Industries in Economic Development'. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7, (67) 67-77

Oakley, K. (2006) 'Include us out- Economic Development and Social Policy in the Creative Industries' *Cultural Trends* 15 (4) 255-273

Peck, J. (2005), 'Struggling with the creative class'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29, 740-770.