



MP4 WP1.3 Transnational Assessment of Practice



Langthwaite Grange

Mel Burton
University of Sheffield
August 2010



**The Interreg IVB
North Sea Region
Programme**

*Investing in the future by working together
for a sustainable and competitive region*



Introduction and Context

Langthwaite Business Park, formally Langthwaite Grange Industrial Estate (the Estate), is a large (57 ha) industrial estate located on the edge of South Kirkby, a former mining village in the south east of Wakefield District. Opened in 1949 the site's design was influenced by the British "Garden City" movement with wide pathways and grass verges, tree-lined roads and common grassed areas planted with shrubs. Initially the site proved successful, attracting textile and clothing industries providing stable, though relatively low-paid, jobs for a predominantly female labour force.

In the 1980s West Yorkshire suffered a serious economic downturn following the closure of the collieries and the decline in manufacturing, particularly the textile and clothing sectors. One of the measures introduced by the UK government to help the economic recovery of the worst affected areas were Enterprise Zones (EZ), where planning controls were loosened and financial subsidies offered. Although Langthwaite Grange was given EZ status this resulted in disjointed development and a lack of stability, as businesses moved in to take advantage of subsidies then left when tax advantages ended. In addition Wakefield Council sold off much of their Estate portfolio, exacerbating the problems of ad hoc development, lack of coherent management and a deteriorating environment that grew with increased multiple ownership. The site became locked in an increasing spiral of decline. By July 2005 27% of the units on site were unoccupied and between April 2004 and July 2005, 8 companies left the site with 400 jobs lost.

In 2000 *first*, the Wakefield District Development Agency was set up as a public-private partnership with the strategic aim of making Wakefield District a 'first choice' location for business, investment and relocation in Yorkshire. Despite major successes in attracting significant investment to the district as a whole, the south east, where Langthwaite Grange was a major employer, proved less attractive to businesses. The wards surrounding the Estate are within the UK Government's 10% most deprived in the country. The closure of the Selby coalfields in early 2004, with the loss of 650 local jobs, added to the urgency to regenerate the local economy. In 2005 *first* led a consultation with occupiers of Langthwaite Grange to engage them in a partnership approach to halt and reverse the estate's decline.

The project & the 'place-keeping' approach

The overall aim of the project was "to create a vibrant setting for investment through effective and critical environmental and physical regeneration"¹. The key benefit was to be the attraction and retention of new investment onto the Estate which it was believed would lead to increased confidence in the local area. An additional benefit from the improvements on the estate was make it "an area of environmental appreciation for the community"².

The lack of coherent management and improvements over the years had led to three main problems that required action. These were;

- Security
- Environmental issues centred on the Estate's run down appearance, fly tipping and the use of the estate by vagrants and drug users
- Poor quality of roads and pavements and the lack of signage and street names



Figure 1. 'Before' the improvements to the business park: fly-tipping was a significant problem.



Figure 2. 'Before' the improvements to the business park: security was an issue as properties were broken into.

Source for both images: *first* Wakefield District Development Agency.

Security

High levels of crime and fear of crime were having an economic impact and causing concerns over personal safety amongst businesses and their employees. They were reported as key factors contributing to the negative image of the site and lack of confidence of investors. A survey undertaken in 2004 indicated 338 crimes had been committed. The estimated total value of goods stolen was £108,410 with an additional £205,524 per annum spent on security measures. Only 30% of these crimes had been reported to the police, indicating that businesses had very little faith in the ability of the police and companies complained of few or no criminals being caught or convicted^{2,3}. In addition to reported crimes other problems included derelict units attracting people sleeping rough and abusing drugs, illegal burning and fly tipping. A lack of co-ordination between businesses, police and the local authority added to the sense of an estate that 'had been forgotten about'.

Many criminals were local and accessed the site through boundary fences and paths that link the site to the surrounding community. Poor quality street lighting created a dark and threatening environment and rendered CCTV images ineffective. The widespread proliferation of security fences and CCTV cameras, together with the degraded, uncared-for appearance of the estate dominated by graffiti and unmanaged, undeveloped land contributed to the perception of the area as unsafe.

Environmental Quality and Maintenance

The original garden city approach endowed the estate with wide grass verges, trees, boundary walls, open space at the site entrance and footpaths connecting to the surrounding housing estates. When the estate was owned by the local authority it was reported to have been well maintained² however the multi-ownership of plots and a constant turnover of business tenants meant that establishing ownership of the common areas was difficult. Curtilages, grassed areas, shrubs and trees became overgrown and unkempt². There was no control over the appearance and maintenance of individual premises. Some business were storing waste materials outdoors, and carrying out illegal burning. Shrubs and fences acted as 'litter traps'. In particular the inconsistency of style, dominant position and state of repair boundary fences along the access projected an image of a place for industry not people. Undeveloped plots, unoccupied buildings, overgrown vegetation and the affects of crime and vandalism such as graffiti, broken windows and fly-tipping added to the overall appearance of a run-down, declining and unsafe site².

Access

A substantial number of delivery vehicles, particularly trucks visit the site. Roads on-site were in poor condition and narrow and large vehicles often mounted the pavements leading to damaged

verges and pavements. Traffic bottlenecks, particularly at the Estate entrance, parked vehicles and lack of traffic calming measures created traffic circulation problems². Joy riders and youths on motorbikes added to the nuisance problems. The lack of signage and street names made it difficult for visitors to locate their businesses.

Impact of Problems

The impact of these problems on the economic decline of the estate is difficult to prove however exit interviews with managers and landlords of businesses leaving the estate highlighted crime and the ‘unattractiveness’ of the site as the key reasons for leaving². One landlord stated that potential occupiers had said they would not come to Langthwaite Grange in the past because of the poor perception they had of the Estate.

The Physical Improvements

The clear and simple ‘vision’ which *first* had and which was the driver for the improvements to the Estate was for it to be ‘safe and attractive’. Improvements were needed which would tackle the real problems of crime and low landscape quality to improve the negative image and raise confidence in the site. Some of the first ‘quick win’ actions were to undertake site clearance to remove fly tipping and other rubbish and to address the illegal burning carried out by occupiers. The physical improvements took the form of two interlinked packages of works:

- An Estate wide security system;
- A coherent package of environmental improvements including boundary treatment, to footpath and roads, improvement of signage and site clearance.

Security Measures

The challenge was how to make the Estate safe without becoming the ‘fortress’ which the majority of the businesses wanted. The Project Manager (see later) drew on their experience from similar projects to demonstrate that, through the careful placement of cameras and other security measures, effective security could be achieved without the need to fence the whole Estate boundary. ‘White lighting’, whilst more expensive to install and maintain, was insisted on to ensure that CCTV cameras captured clear images required to secure evidence for convictions. In addition, speakers linked to the CCTV cameras allow the security guard in the on-site control centre to alert those acting suspiciously that they are being watched.



Figures 3-4. After improvements to verges, boundaries and footpaths
 Source for both images: Mel Burton.

Environmental Improvements

The main challenge, alongside tackling years of dilapidation and misuse, was to how to re-establish a ‘sense of place’ and identity for the Estate. Ad-hoc improvements by individual businesses meant there was no overall design style. These challenges, and a limited budget, forced a pragmatic approach to re-establish a consistent design approach and a phased masterplan design was developed so that priority areas could be identified and implemented first.

The main priority was to improve the access road into the estate to maximise the visual impact on visitors and employees. The majority of funding was spent on improvements to the boundaries of properties along this route. Improvements included;

- new boundary fencing set back from the pavements softened with hedging to give seasonal interest,
- removal of old walls,
- footpaths improved and verges protected from vehicle damage,
- new entrance and site signage,
- new trees, although this was limited due to conflicts with the position of the CCTV system.

Partnerships, Governance and Engagement

The key players in the partnership that developed the ‘place-making’ project and have managed the subsequent place-keeping are, **first**, the Local Authority and Langthwaite Grange Business Association (LGBA).

Place-Making

first was not the first organisation to attempt to regenerate the Estate. Although the exact details of previous initiatives are not available it appears that these attempts had been relatively uncoordinated, did not involve or gain the businesses’ participation and made little impact on the problems. Whilst such efforts did not have a negative impact, they left a legacy and perception amongst the business and local communities of “broken promises, hostility and lack of credibility of public sector agencies”^{2,3}.

There was a strong local perception that Langthwaite Grange was not seen as a priority for the local authority which focused on other key projects. **first** recognized the importance of Langthwaite Grange due to the number of businesses based there and its significance as a key employment zone in a particularly deprived area. Having some independence from the Local Authority, **first** was able to set its own priorities for projects.

In April 2004 following consultation with English Partnerships (EP)¹, **first** took the lead in developing a regeneration strategy for the Estate. At the time the project was seen as such a problem that no-one wanted to take the lead however, this also meant that there were no territorial or leadership issues to resolve prior to commencing the project. A series of four public meetings attended by **first**, the Local Authority – the Town Council and Wakefield Council, Estate businesses and the Police were held over a period of six months to initiate partnership development.

There was a lot of cynicism and anger directed towards **first** during these early meetings as they were seen as being from the ‘Council’. To counter this and to actively demonstrate their commitment to solving the Estate’s problems, the Director of **first** attended all the meetings in person rather than delegate this to task to a less senior officer. Additional one-to-one and group meetings were held with businesses and stakeholders. Through negotiation with English Partnerships **first** secured an investment fund offer of £1,039,000 from English Partnerships for capital and revenue works on the Estate. The offer, however, was conditional on businesses supporting the proposal and contributing to the revenue costs of sustaining the project beyond the period of three years of pump priming funding.

Over the six month period, despite some disagreements and even walkouts from meetings, a business and implementation plan was drawn up that all participants signed up to. The key aims of the implementation plan were to:

- Reduce the number of businesses leaving Langthwaite Grange
- Encourage businesses to locate to the Estate
- Create a sustainable environment that would be an exemplar and a catalyst for the regeneration of the wider area

The proposals for the physical improvements detailed in the implementation plan were developed through consultations with businesses, the Langthwaite Grange Business Association and public meetings. In addition, the Project Manager acted as a key focus for comments and feedback. These were fed to the Landscape Architect enabling him to develop an improvement masterplan for the site with cost estimates as well as and a list of priorities for implementation. Together with Sections of the Local Authority these player formed the ‘implementation team’ that took forward the on the ground delivery of the improvements.

Langthwaite Grange Business Association (LGBA), is a 'not for profit' limited company formed from businesses on the Estate and a key output of the place-making process. The aim of establishing the LGBA was to encourage businesses to formally join an organisation which would contribute to the long term financial and business success of the estate and to ensure real democracy and ownership of the project, through the Board whose members were elected by business peers. The aim was for LGBA to take over responsibility for the long term management of the Estate, delivering the revenue support for the investment and any further improvement proposals.

To facilitate the partnership and ensure the delivery of the project a **Project Manager** was appointed early in the development process and employed by *first*. The role was to provide the link between the businesses on the estate, *first*, the Landscape Architect and contractors and to oversee the day-to-day implementation of the planned improvements. Following earlier disappointing experiences employing consultants, who had done little to materially advance the project or gain local stakeholders and businesses buy-in, *first* strongly believed it critically important to recruit not only someone with the right skills but also with a local track record and commitment to the local area. The person selected was also able to bring considerable experience and expertise of 'safer by design' principles to the planning and specification of the new security measures.

The **Landscape Architect** played a key role in translating the partnerships vision into achievable goals. Preliminary work had been undertaken by a local practice but this required review and further development into a comprehensive scheme. Unlike many projects the client did not provide a prescriptive development brief. Instead the Landscape Architect and client engaged in a dialogue about aspirations and how these could be achieved, with the ideas subsequently translated into a site masterplan. Photographs of other business park developments were used to help the occupiers and local stakeholders envisage what the improvements and especially the planting would look like. The implementation of the proposals was facilitated by the effective working relationship developed between the Landscape Architect who supported the Project Manager in the day-to-day liaison with the contractors on site. This was effective as the Project Manager was located on site and available most of the day, whereas the landscape Architect would normally only periodically visit the site.

The **Local Authority** was a key stakeholder in the project and they had responsibility for the upkeep of the highways as well as some common spaces. Their role in the project was as advisors and implementers. However, *first* occasionally encountered an attitude of "this is not your job, it is ours" from some sections of the Local Authority which caused significant problems in implementing the project. The Regeneration Section were eventually marginalized from the project team as it was felt they were effectively undermining what was trying to be achieved and this was wasting a lot of time. They did not seem able to translate their words into effective action. Dispensing with their services was only possible as *first* had the full backing and confidence in their leadership from the community and businesses on the Estate. The Highways and Environment Section of the Local Authority were also involved and after their initial uncertainty about the role of *first* and the Project Manager they became an important and productive ally and a core member of the implementation team.

'Place-Keeping'

The Langthwaite Grange Business Association was formed to ensure the long term success of the improvements and to avoid the problems of the past that had stemmed from ad-hoc management. However, due to the still complex multiple ownership of land on the Estate, responsibility for site management is divided between the key stakeholders. The Local Authority manages the public spaces - the roadways, verges and trees and open space at the entrance of the site. Businesses or landlords are responsible for their own sites. This includes cutting the hedges along their boundaries that were planted during the improvement works. LGBA is responsible for managing site security. This includes maintaining the security system as well as monitoring the estate-wide CCTV system and providing on-site security on the form of out-of-hours patrols. These services are provided through contract that was won by the Local Authority's contracting service.



Figure 5. LGBA is responsible for the delivery of security services.



Figure 6. Verges are managed by the Local Authority whilst business owners manage boundary fences and hedges.

Source for both images: Mel Burton.

Businesses pay a fee-based on the rateable value of their property to join LGBA and enter into a service agreement with LGBA for their security and management services. The agreement has a three month break clause and payment is on either an annual or monthly basis. Through **first**, acting as the legal employer, LGBA has engaged a full-time **Estate Manager** (employed, as long as funding is available, by **first** as LGBA do not have the mechanism to employ staff). The role of the Estate Manager is to represent the interests of LGBA members as well as managing the Estate. They act as the first point of call for problems and play a key role in liaising between **first**, other agencies and LGBA. A major element of the Estate Manager's role is to support the development of LGBA as a self-sustaining organization.

Future work and Design Code

The available funding did not cover the full extent of improvements needed on the Estate such as those along the secondary access routes. To ensure future work is consistent and contributes to the desired Estate 'identity', a design code has been developed. The code gives guidance on colour schemes, security fence design and distance from the footpath and some occupiers have already invested in new boundary fencing in accordance with the new code. The Planning Department has been supportive, insisting that any new developments on the Estate followed the design code introduced to ensure the quality of the site is maintained.

Finance – place-making

When the Business and Implementation Plan for the 2007 improvements was written the overall capital cost of the proposals was estimated at £838,500. The majority of the budget was to improve site security. A breakdown of costs is given in table 1 below.

Table 1: Breakdown of cost estimates for capital works

Security	£580,000
Roads and Footpaths	£80,000
Environment	£139,000
Signage	£40,000
Capital Total	£839,000

In addition to the capital costs revenue costs of £130,000 per annum were estimated to staff the security control centre, employ security guards out of working hours and administrative work. Further initiatives were also proposed in the Plan including an additional £60,000 to employ a full-time gardener to manage and maintain the Estate but so far funding has not been secured.

Funding for the improvements was obtained from a variety of sources as shown in Table 2. The total raised exceeded the original estimates which enabled additional work to be undertaken.

Table 2: Contribution to total cost of improvements (capital and revenue, 2006 figures)^{1,2}

Funding source	Total
Interreg IIIB Funding though 'Creating a Setting for Investment'	£99,856
English Partnership funding (in principal £839 000 capital and £200 000 revenue for 3 years)	£1,039,000
Wakefield Metropolitan Council (contribution)	£160,000
Contribution to security and environmental works by companies on the Estate	£90,000

Contribution from business

To secure the EP funding it was necessary for the businesses on the Estate to contribute towards the costs of maintenance, security guards and Project/ Estate Manager. To facilitate this *first* developed a scheme which allowed businesses to pay towards these services and the contribution was subsidized (using the funding from EP) on a reducing scale over the first three years. The required minimum of 50% of businesses contributing was achieved in the first 2-3 months with over 35 businesses agreeing to pay a total of £90 000. The contribution from businesses, based on the ratable value of their property with a minimum charge for small units was felt to be the fairest way and if all businesses paid this would generate the finances required. Grants of up to 50% were made available to members of the LGBA to install new fencing.

Funding place-keeping

The aim for LGBA when it was set up was for it to quickly become financially self-sustaining. It was anticipated this would be done through increasing the number of businesses on the Estate joining the organisation. This has not happened. Although membership remains strong the initial join up rate of 40% of businesses on the Estate has not been exceeded despite constant efforts of *first* and the Estate Manager. Businesses quickly realized that they would gain the same benefits from the security system and site management whether they were members or not. The majority of members are among the large and medium sized businesses with relatively few smaller businesses joining. The minimum membership fee is £600 per annum which can be hard for smaller companies to find.

The advantage to LGBA of being self-sustaining financially is that they would not have to rely on the Local Authority for certain elements of the site maintenance such as clearance of fly-tipping and litter picking. There are no litter bins on site and the Local Authority cannot afford to install any, or indeed empty them if they were installed. Despite the close working relationship and willingness of the Local Authority to support the Estate, the reliance on another organization for part of the management can lead to frustrations. LGBA wish to have greater control over the site, plan and to set individual priorities. Long-term planning for site management must include the replacement and updating the CCTV security system.

As LGBA have not achieved financial self-sufficiency *first* have continued to be closely involved with the running and development of the organization. They have also continued to subsidise running costs (figures were not available). LGBA does have its own Board on which sit members of LGBA elected by business peers, representation from *first* and the Local Authority. Others with an interest in the Estate, such as the local police are invited to attend to discuss particular issues. The continued close support of *first* does bring benefits such as direct access to expertise and current information and more recently support in progressing to the 'next step' in terms of the long term management and the future for the Estate. The next step is a proposal to establish the Estate as a Business Improvement District (BID). The BID would be set up initially as a 5-year programme giving guaranteed income over that period. This approach would place a legal requirement for all businesses on the estate to contribute financially and would generate enough income to achieve self-sufficiency. One of the issues with the existing voluntary membership of LGBA is that members in effect subsidise those who are not. If all businesses are required to pay the fees for all should reduce, giving a saving for existing members. Unsurprisingly, LGBA members are supportive of the idea and, despite only 40% of businesses

being members, they control over half of the rateable value which should be sufficient to secure enough votes to set up the BID.

Evaluation

The project was quickly ‘successful’ and this success has been maintained. A range of measures of success was identified by the project team:

New Business and Jobs

The most striking success following the improvements to the Estate was a reversal of the decline in occupancy. As of February 2007 16 new businesses had located to the Estate bringing over 200 new jobs and a total of more than £6 million investment. Anecdotal evidence indicates that the improvements themselves were instrumental in this but the positive publicity surrounding the project contributed greatly to the changed perception of potential investors. No specific marketing was undertaken. Occupancy of the estate remains high.

Crime

A reduction of 70% in reported crime was recorded in the first year after improvement work started and this has been maintained. As well as having an economic impact through reducing the financial burden of crime (no figures available) there was evidence from interviews with businesses that the fear of crime had also been reduced. The nuisance problems caused by youths on motorbikes, quad bikes and cars using the Estates roads and paths have also stopped.

Image and Confidence

The image of the site has improved, a particularly important factor for businesses who receive visitors. It was reported that businesses are now happier to have visitors and people feel as if they are now on a ‘business park’ rather than an industrial estate. Changing the name to Langthwaite Business Park completed this transformation. New signage has improved the legibility of the Estate making it easier for visitors to find their destination and has contributed to the more positive image. The improvements have been credited with bringing a ‘feel good’ factor to the site which has had a knock on effect in the wider area and that people’s expectations had been lifted and confidence had been restored.

The Partnership and LGBA

Turning a group of Partners into a ‘team’ was deemed a measure of the project’s success. The key point in the project team’s development was when the members started to display enthusiasm and commitment where previously they could only imagine bad luck and failure. This contrasted with the earlier problems and level of cynicism at public meetings and was seen as a major achievement.

One of the main outcomes of the partnership was the founding of the LGBA which, despite not yet being fully self-financing, has managed to maintain the initial successes. However if the BID is unsuccessful it is unclear how LGBA will continue without continued financial support from **first** and funding to upgrade the security system. In the current poor economic climate it may be difficult to sustain even current membership levels.

The role of place-making and place-keeping

The impact of the landscape improvements and management to Langthwaite Grange cannot be doubted however compared to many new business parks the overall landscape quality of the Estate is still not high. It appears that it is the degree of change, raising it from a very poor level to a ‘standard’ level through addressing the main environmental eyesores (such as fly tipping and damaged boundary fencing) that has had the biggest impact. The improvements and the inclusive process of agreeing and contributing to the funding of these through the LGBA appear to have reinstated a sense of pride and responsibility for the estate. No doubt the new security measures have made the biggest impact on the project’s success. However it is doubtful whether the project would have been as successful without measures to improve the visual appearance and signage of the Estate and the importance of these other elements were recognized by key project members as the project progressed. Much of the success in improving the image of the site lies in the fact the site is now perceived as being ‘cared for’ and the ongoing management is crucial in maintaining this perception.

Transferable Lessons

first and Team Members

The enthusiasm, commitment and expertise of key project members, played a major role in the projects success, transforming a partnership of individuals into an effective delivery 'team'. Their positive attitude and the perception that 'they did care' was enough to persuade some business occupiers to get involved. The Project Manager was crucial in providing a central point of contact for occupiers, contractors and other stakeholders facilitating communication. The 'hands on' approach and the fact that they were based on-site helped to develop and maintain effective working relationships. This crucial co-ordination and communication role is now undertaken by the Estate Manager. Based on-site, the Estate Manager provides the first port of call for, and facilitates communication between, businesses, LGBA, **first** and other stakeholders.

Whilst recognizing and promoting an inclusive, partnership approach, the benefits of a single agency with overall responsibility and accountability (and with the commitment to and drive to take the project forward) was strongly advocated by **first**. This commitment to and ownership of the project by the lead organization has ensured that LGBA continue to be supported. Without this support it seems unlikely that the place-keeping would have been as successful, mainly as there would have been insufficient funds to manage it fully.

The expertise of team members was very influential in ensuring well-designed and successful improvements. The Project Manager brought experience in 'designing out crime' and the Landscape Architect was an experienced practitioner who took a practical and pragmatic approach to the design of the site. By insisting on a coherent design and 'quality over quantity' the focus was on areas with the highest visual impact, believed to ensure the maximum returns from the limited budget. However, although the landscape improvements are robust and low maintenance the security system requires a high level of ongoing management and maintenance and will be expensive to replace.

Consultants

Consultants usually bring scarce high order skills to regeneration projects but, as experienced with this project, there may be an issue of ensuring the consultants connect with an area or the community. Although those employed early in the project had 'looked good on paper' their involvement was not effective so their services were dispensed with as they were not adding value to the project. It was felt that they treat the project as 'just another job', not seeing themselves as part of the team and sharing the team's enthusiasm for the project. In response contracts with consultants were carefully written in order to maximise their input and to engender a more robust relationship - getting them to raise their game and think differently.

Money

The project's success was largely due to English Partnerships committing funding to kick-started the project. This had two main impacts; it gave the businesses on the Estate the perception that **first** was serious about their commitment to the project and it was used to lever in other funding. These funding streams convinced the businesses to support the project and also persuaded Wakefield Council to bring forward their own five year investment plan for the Estate. Crucially English Partnerships were persuaded to include three years revenue to fund the initial phases on 'place-keeping'.

Involving Businesses

Forming LGBA was one of the early actions of the project. Bringing businesses on board was necessary to secure the project funding as well as drive the project forward and to secure its long term future. LGBA played a consultancy role throughout the project development, helping to identify priorities and comment on proposals. This helped to engender a feeling of local businesses ownership of the project essential for its long-term success.

Realistic timescales

The timescale and time commitment to undertake the project was one area which those involved underestimated. Involving people, building partnerships takes time and one member of LGBA commented that such long timescales could deter businesses from becoming involved. It was

suggested that the project would have been completed much quicker if it had been undertaken in a 'business way' rather than a 'Council way'.

The restrictive timescales of the grant regimes presented a problem in that funding was required to be spent within a certain time period. This meant that activities such as planting had to be undertaken outside the main planting season which could compromise its success and cause ongoing management problems. Any delays, such as waiting until a more favourable season, might result in funding being lost. Implementation plans need to take such restricted timescales into account.

The retrospective payment of funding also caused problems. Accessing reserves can be done once or twice but not every time and any delays in funding payment can cause major financial difficulties. This is a particular problem for smaller organisations with limited reserves. Grant regimes do not encourage innovation due to their inflexibility and preoccupation with accounting for outputs in a bureaucratic way i.e. accounting for every last penny appears to be more important than the success or benefits the project brings.

Communication

The length of time the project took highlights the need for good communication between the project team and the stakeholders for maintaining good relationships and interest over a protracted period. At Langthwaite Grange, as well as the Project Manager on site who had daily contact with occupiers and contractors, there were regular meetings of the LGBA, public meetings and a regular newsletter to update businesses on progress. This role, initiated by the Project Manager, is continued by the Estate Manager.

The positive publicity received by the project has played an important role in changing perceptions of the site as a place to invest in and appears to have had an impact in helping to improve the image of the wider area.

References:

- Creating a Setting for Investment (Interreg IIIb) funding contract for Langthwaite Grange. CSI (06)08. South Yorkshire Partnership and Wakefield **first**.
- Business and Implementation Plan for Langthwaite Grange Industrial estate, South Kirkby, Wakefield. July 2005, **first**
- The Role of an Attractive Setting in Securing Investment. (Power Point Presentation by Mohan de Silva to CSI Making Places Profitable Conference, 19.09.08)
- <http://www.environmentinvestment.com/conference2006>

Format of this report

This report is adapted from a case study report undertaken for the Interreg IIIB NWE Project: Creating a Setting for Investment. It is based on the findings from a series of face-to-face in-depth interviews carried out with the Director and Langthwaite Grange Project Manager of **first** Wakefield District Development Agency and the Landscape Architect, Director of Camlin Lonsdale and two members of Langthwaite Grange Business Association in November 2006 and May 2007. This case study report has been updated for the MP4 project with findings from an interview with the Langthwaite Grange Estate Manager in March 2010 who granted permission for MP4 members to use their responses in this report in 2010. These interviews were semi-structured and conducted using the question schedule used in the data collection for all the case studies. All photographs are reproduced with permission.

Glossary

‘Place-making’: creating high quality places that people want to visit, experience and enjoy. It implies a people-centred approach which emphasises designing spaces that promote health, wellbeing and happiness. Such spaces engender a sense of belonging and connection for those who use them.

‘Place-keeping’: relates to maintaining the qualities and benefits – social, environmental and economic – of places through long-term management. The management required to maintain these qualities and benefits, the approach adopted and the timescale will depend on the ‘place-making’ aims, the available resources and the life span of the ‘place’.

Partnership: is defined as agreed shared responsibility between public, private and community sectors. It is a relationship which, in this context, is normally formed between governmental and non-governmental sectors – i.e. it is a manifestation of governance relationships.

Engagement: is a cross-cutting issue which describes successful models of working with communities and encouraging appropriate use. Engagement is an aspect of governance particularly relevant in forms of participatory governance and is intrinsic to the concept of ‘governance’ as defined below.

Governance: relates to the relationship between and within government and non-governmental forces. The term implies wider participation in decision-making than representative democracy or other forms of government, recognising a wider range of actors other than the state, and allowing for varying governance contexts and processes.

Finance: describes financial models for efficient long-term management.

Policy: is discussed within the context of embedding best practice into spatial planning and other policy.

Valuation: describes the economic impacts of improvements to open spaces, but also relates to wider socio-economic and environmental benefits.