Report
on the
Audit of
Cultural Heritage Assets

to the

South Downs National Park Authority

December 2014

business of
culture

6 Paddington Street
London W1U 5QG
t: +44 (0)20 7224 5680
www.businessofculture.com

CONTENTS

Glossary & Definitions   **1**

ACE – Arts Council England

BoC – Business of Culture

CIL – Community Infrastructure Levy

EH – English Heritage

PMP – Partnership Management Plan

SDNP – South Downs National Park

SDNPA – South Downs National Park Authority

URN – Unique Reference Number (applied for the audit purposes only)

Cultural Asset – all publicly accessible buildings and sites with arts spaces, heritage, archives, museums, libraries, landscapes & gardens of merit (registered), etc.

1 sq. metre = 10.764 sq. feet

1 hectare = 2.471 acres

1   Executive Summary

1.1 The **South Downs National Park** is the 6th largest national park in the UK and is located in an extremely varied sub-region of the South East with many towns, villages, landscapes and open countryside all contained within its boundaries, which are adjacent to several large towns, cities and the South Coast with its seaside facilities. It has a rich cultural heritage of arts, music and rural traditions and this heritage lives on with contemporary cultural and artistic expressions, building on the strong traditions of the past.

1.2 Business of Culture, together with ConsultingWhere and Currie & Brown, were commissioned to undertake an audit to identify and describe as many cultural assets as possible across the SDNP and to report on projects that might be considered by these organisations during the lifespan of the SDNPA's Partnership Management Plan.

1.3 Two methods were used to gather the necessary information on the cultural heritage assets and their projects. Firstly, we used an online questionnaire, which was circulated to 149 assets. Secondly, we undertook a series of face-to-face and telephone interviews with a predetermined selection of senior managers/directors of organisations and also gathered further information via email.

1.4 The audit did identify a proportion of cultural organisations and their potential projects, which might be delivered between 2014 and 2019. The collected data on planned improvement or development projects was analysed by Currie & Brown and an appraisal report on each of the 24 projects was completed.

1.5 The GIS mapping carried out by ConsultingWhere as part of this audit shows the park-wide spatial distribution of the cultural heritage assets by types. The mapping is supported by a detailed gazetteer for each cultural heritage asset as well as a list of planned projects, including indicative costs (at 2014 prices).

1.6 Our audit of the total cultural asset provision suggests a current total of circa 668 sq m of floor space / 1,000 population. This is six times the ACE/ Elson benchmark factor of 109 sq m of 1,000 population and is in need of re-interrogation with more accurate floor area data.

1.7 The results of our audit suggest that there is a lack in the provision of publically accessible production and rehearsal spaces and that this may impact on emerging and younger creatives or on voluntary groups and hinder the development of creative skills and enterprise within the SDNP.

1.8 With regards to the usage of SDNP's assets this audit has found that although most surveyed cultural assets collect audience and user data to some degree, mostly in the form of audience and outreach participant numbers, they do not further segment their audiences. This is especially the case for smaller organisations that may not have the in-house capacity, technology or resources to do so. As a consequence of the incomplete audience data a detailed analysis of and subsequent conclusions on the distribution of current audiences or visitors and their pattern of use in terms of events and participatory and learning activities across the SDNP was not possible.

1.9 It might be that SDNPA, via CIL, could consider supporting cultural organisations in undertaking detailed audience research in order to fill the gaps in their knowledge about their users and audiences. It would also be extremely beneficial to commission a park-wide audience research to understand the users and audiences of the local cultural heritage, their motivations and distribution better in order to be able to plan better and more strategically for the future.

2   Context of the Audit

2.1 Culture and the arts link communities, connect people and spaces and enhance a sense of pride and the feeling of belonging to a certain place. Spaces for culture and the arts also play an important role in social and economic regeneration and cultural activities and participation in the arts inspire learning, soft skills and personal development. The provision of an adequate cultural infrastructure is therefore "essential to the creation of truly sustainable communities"[1] .

2.2 There are 15 National Parks in the UK and each one is administered by its own National Park Authority, which are independent bodies funded by central government to follow two statutory purposes:

- Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage; and
- Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of National Parks by the public.

2.3 In carrying out these aims, National Park Authorities are also required to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Park.

2.4 The **South Downs National Park** (SDNP) is the 6th largest national park in the UK and covers an area of 1,624 square kilometres. It is located in an extremely varied sub-region of the South East with many towns, villages, landscapes and open countryside all contained within its boundaries, which are adjacent to several large towns, cities and the South Coast with its seaside facilities. The population of the SDNP at the 2011 census was 112,000 and its density is low at 70 persons / sq kilometre compared to the average of 440 persons/ sq kilometre. It has a rich cultural heritage of art, music and rural traditions and this heritage lives on with contemporary cultural and artistic expressions, building on the strong traditions of the past. Key aspects of the SDNP's cultural heritage include archaeological sites of the Bronze and Iron Ages, iconic villages and towns and their important features such as churches, early industrial sites from flint mines to ironworking furnaces, a varied range of historic buildings, often clustered in Conservation Areas, designed parks and gardens and artists, craft makers, scientists and thinkers inspired by their environment (SDNPA 2012). One of the South Downs National Park Authority's seven Special Qualities, that form the cornerstones of the National Park Authority's work, thus relates to this rich cultural heritage.

2.5 Whereas some of the above cultural heritage is intangible much of it relies upon an infrastructure of buildings, townscape, organisations and people.

---

[1] (Elson 2012: 2).

2.6 SDNPA monitors listed buildings and archaeology sites and some heritage information about the national park and holds it in the Historic Environment Record (HER) database. English Heritage also compiles information on 'At Risk' sites, whose historic information or fabric might be lost if not attended to. However, as English Heritage is dependent upon reports and information received from third parties, their registers may not include all sites at risk.

2.7 This wide ranging infrastructure poses a complex process to the Authority in defining and prioritising the detailed needs of the wider cultural sector and in delivering the policies of its SDNP Partnership Management Plan (PMP).

3   Aims and Rationale of the Audit

3.1 The South Downs National Park Authority seeks to be strategic in supporting projects in the cultural heritage sector over the current five-year lifespan of the national park's PMP (2014 – 2019) and to maximise the return on their investment by attracting other external funds, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL enables authorities to raise funds from developers towards the cost of infrastructure needed to support an area's development. The definition of infrastructure, which can be enhanced through CIL, has been kept broad in The Planning Act (2008), so that contributions towards a varied range of facilities can potentially be secured, which could be used to increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing infrastructure. Cultural facilities are considered to be within the definition of relevant infrastructure, as "many are strategic, serving catchments and areas larger than most development sites" (Elson 2012)

3.2 In order to establish key areas on which the SDNPA might wish to focus the potential for investment, this audit was commissioned to identify and describe as many cultural assets as possible and report on projects that might be considered across the National Park. There were therefore two principal goals of the audit:

- To identify, map and describe as many of the existing cultural assets as possible. The information, gathered in an online survey, and added to by 1 to 1 and telephone interviews, was transcribed onto gazetteers; one for each cultural asset organisation. Thus a database supported by GIS mapping could be assembled for the first time across the SDNP and this information could support the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- To invite and interrogate those cultural asset organisations intending to carry out a development project and obtain information on their projects (including indicative costs) which could be reviewed and reported back to SDNPA. This provides an updated

evidence base for potential CIL investment and underpins the SDNPA's Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2015.

3.3 The audit did identify a proportion of cultural organisations and their potential projects, which might be delivered between 2014 and 2019. The GIS mapping carried out as part of this audit shows the park-wide spatial distribution of cultural heritage assets and their organisations by types. The mapping is supported by a detailed gazetteer for each cultural heritage asset, as well as a list of planned projects, including indicative costs (at 2014 prices).

4   Approach & Methodology

Definition of cultural heritage assets for this audit

4.1 According to UNESCO, cultural heritage encompasses tangible cultural heritage (which refers to movable cultural heritage, such as paintings, immovable cultural heritage, such as monuments, and underwater cultural heritage, such as underwater ruins) and intangible cultural heritage (such as oral traditions, performing arts and rituals). Against this backdrop further guidelines by ACE and EH have informed the development of this project and the definition of cultural heritage assets to be included in this audit.

4.2 The scope, methodology and categorisation of cultural heritage assets for this project have further been guided by the "Community Infrastructure Levy advice note for culture, arts and planning professionals" by Prof. Martin J Elson (Elson 2012), English Heritage's unpublished guidance notes to SDNPA on heritage assets that could attract investment through the Community Infrastructure Levy (English Heritage 2013) as well as SDNPA's State of the South Downs National Park 2012 (SDNPA 2012). This audit therefore has only considered "designated" assets, as legally defined and referred to in the South Downs State of the National Park report 2012.

4.3 While the report on the State of the National Park (2012) outlines the rich cultural heritage and historical features of the SDNP, the SDNPA does not have sufficient data that accurately represents the current volume, scale and scope of the National Park's cultural heritage infrastructure.

4.4 This audit was therefore commissioned to complement and add to the current data and identify and map the present cultural infrastructure in the SDNP in 2014.

4.5 Based upon ACE and EH guidelines the following classes of cultural heritage assets were defined for this research (for more details on each category see below, 4.7). Each category is given a letter for the purposes of classification for this audit only:

4.6

Category Code	Category Description
A	Public libraries
B	Public archives
C	Art galleries (not part of a museum service, including in historic houses)
D	Multi-use arts spaces
E	Production, rehearsal and participation/learning spaces
F	Museums and Historic Sites
G	Historic houses, parks and gardens
H	Conservation areas
I	Infrastructure (Old railway lines, canals, etc.)

4.7   The consultancy team was required to establish an overview of the type, quantity and status of cultural organisations and their plans for the future but a full on-site survey of every asset, its organisation and venue used for cultural activities in the SDNP was not thought feasible within the scope of the audit. The inclusion of a cultural asset, site or facility was pre-determined by a number of factors, based upon the previous work of the SDNPA (such as the Special Qualities report and the State of the South Downs National Park, 2012) and guidelines from the national agencies for this sector, such as Arts Council England (for arts, museums, galleries and libraries) and English Heritage (for scheduled, listed and registered historic sites).

Criteria for inclusion in the audit

4.8   The primary criterion in selecting asset organisations for inclusion in the audit survey was that their ownership had to be within either a public authority or a charitable trust or some equivalent not-for-profit governance, this being generally the first test for the SDNPA in grant-aiding a project. Cultural assets, therefore, in private or commercial ownership were not included in this audit.

4.9   An initial database of organisations and some of their contacts was thus supplied by SDNPA. Other organisations and more contacts were added to the list to be surveyed as the audit proceeded and in the end 149 assets were contacted (excluding the 166 conservation areas for which no designated contact organisation could be established).

4.10 The following were the criteria for inclusion in the audit :

1. *Does the asset fall within the definition of cultural heritage for this piece of work?*
2. *Is the asset physically in the National Park?*
3. *If the site is not physically within the National Park is it:*
a) *Closely linked to the cultural heritage of the National Park, e.g. by having heritage collections relating to the National Park?*

b)   And / or serving the residents of the National Park and near enough to the SDNP boundary for it to be regularly used by SDNPA's residents?

4.11 Determining which cultural heritage assets are considered geographically near enough to be used by residents of the SDNP would ideally be informed by catchment information drawn from visitor surveys or box office records. However, this audit has highlighted the fact that only a few of the audited assets can supply this type of information. We were able to compare the average catchment area for different types of cultural facilities established by a similar study of local authority-owned assets in South Hampshire (The South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit, 2010), which we used as guidance. As the SDNPA is likely to focus upon facilities close to the Park's boundaries, it was determined after discussion with stakeholders that the guideline for including out-of-SDNP-boundary cultural heritage assets into this audit should be a maximum buffer zone of 2 miles around the boundaries of the SDPA for all categories of cultural provision.

A.   <u>Public libraries:</u> All audited libraries are provided by local authorities with free public access, with the exception of one, which is provided by a charitable trust. As mobile library services are an important service for residents in rural areas, especially if they otherwise rely on public transport to access services in the nearby towns, they have also been included in this audit.

B.   <u>Public archives:</u> Public archives refer to the County Record Offices and their holdings and activities and relate to the whole county, including areas within the National Park. The Record Office buildings are within the 2 mile buffer of the SDNP boundaries and they have been included in this audit as their holdings and services are relevant to the SDNP.

C.   <u>Art galleries:</u> These are defined as facilities (galleries) with collections which have temporary and permanent exhibitions and related storage, curatorial and education functions; all owned by public bodies or charitable trusts and used for public benefit. Two art galleries (Pallant House Gallery in Chichester and Towner in Eastbourne) are outside the SDNP's boundaries but are within the buffer zone of up to 2 miles. Also, both have collections of works by artists inspired by the landscape of the National Park and both provide learning and participatory activities that serve schools and communities within the SDNP.

D.   <u>Multi-use arts spaces:</u> This category includes multi-purpose performing arts venues (suitable for performances, exhibitions, workshops, talks and film screenings), theatres of all types and other specialist performing arts venues, such as large concert halls and opera houses. Arts venues and theatres tend to be based in urban areas and to have

variable catchments, depending on the scale of their facilities and the quality of their arts offer. The South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit (2010) found that 50% of the multi-use arts spaces have a catchment area of between 3.9 and 13.5 miles. However, the SDNPA is likely to focus upon facilities close to the SDNP's boundaries and so the 2 mile buffer has also been used for this category.

E. <u>Production, rehearsal and participation/learning spaces:</u> This category refers to production, rehearsal and education spaces for arts, including artists' studios, education spaces, workspaces and a range of spaces which could encompass media and recording studios, incubation spaces for visual and performing arts development organisations, and facilities used by universities, community groups and schools for arts-based activities or teaching.

F. <u>Museums and Historic Sites:</u> This category includes museums with collections relating to or used by SDNP residents and managed by local authorities or charitable trusts. The audited museums also had to be accredited or be in the process of obtaining accredited status, as this provides a benchmark of quality. All the museums within the 2 mile buffer zone have collections relating to the National Park and are therefore included in this audit. Furthermore, two museums outside this buffer zone have been included as they contain collections with strong links to the SDNP: Horsham Museum is provided by Horsham District Council to serve the whole district, including parts of the National Park, has strong rural life collections and is accredited. Littlehampton Museum has been included, as the town was an important port exporting South Downs sheep, amongst other cargos.

G. <u>Historic houses, parks and gardens:</u> In this category only sites in charitable ownership have been included. Historic parks and gardens refer to those that are included on the national register managed by English Heritage or the county lists of the Hampshire and Sussex County Gardens Trusts. All audited historic houses, parks and gardens are within the SDNP.

H. <u>Conservation areas:</u> The best measure for the significance of historic areas of settlements is the existence of conservation areas, which are defined by the local planning authority and provide certain protections and constraints on change and development. All the conservation areas are considered wholly or partly in the SDNP, i.e. all the conservation areas in which the SDNPA could be involved as the lead local authority or as a partner.

I   <u>Infrastructure:</u> This category includes former routes with heritage value that are still in use or could be revived for public use and which in public or charitable ownership or are a national trail. The heritage value may lie in the evidence of constructing the railway or

canal or the buildings that served the route. The South Downs Way has been included, as it is an ancient route and also crosses or is close to many important archaeological remains. These assets do not have dedicated gazetteers because there were no identifiable lead organisations to respond to the on line survey. The GIS maps however show the principal routes and locations of cultural infrastructure heritage.

4.12 Some assets that were initially included in our audit had to be removed following the decision on the maximum buffer zone of 2 miles around the boundaries of the National Park. Therefore some URNs had to be retired, which explains why the current list of URNs is not continuous. The final amount of assets included in the audit amounts to 142 (excluding the additional 166 conservation areas which were not surveyed).

Primary desk research

4.13 The initial desk research gathered information and data on the background and context of this audit, such as the three cultural strategies developed by the three county councils within the SDNP, and identified the wider influences on the potential of the cultural heritage assets and their projects in the South Downs sub-region.

4.14 Legal protection exists for some parts of the cultural heritage in the SDNP, usually based on a test of importance of the site to the nation. These include "scheduled monuments", which refer to important archaeological sites protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act of 1979, "listed buildings" and designated "Conservation Areas", covered by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act of 1990, as well as registered parks and gardens. The latter are not protected under an Act of Parliament but are a material consideration in any planning application.

4.15 It was essential for the objectives of this audit to carry out wide primary research to gather information on the cultural heritage assets, their activities, and planned projects as well as the implications for capital improvements and/or increased learning and participatory activities. Due to the diversity of the cultural heritage assets and their locational spread we had to design a survey method based on as large and as diverse a sample of assets as possible within the resource scope. This shaped the methodologies used, the spread of the results and their interpretation.

Questionnaire and Online Survey

4.16 Two methods were used to gather the necessary information on the cultural heritage assets and their projects for the time of the PMP's lifespan. Firstly, we used an online questionnaire, designed with the SurveyMonkey online software, which was circulated to a database of contacts (managers, curators, directors, archivists, heads of libraries,

etc. of the cultural assets' organisations) that was initially provided by SDNPA and supplemented by research by the consultancy team. Secondly, we undertook a series of face-to-face and telephone interviews with a predetermined selection of senior managers/directors of organisations and also gathered further information via email (see below, 4.18 – 4.20, for more detail).

4.17 The online survey was designed to allow the diverse qualitative and quantitative data to be fed easily into the SurveyMonkey engine and its wording was carefully developed in consultation with SDNPA. The questionnaire was pre-tested several times for user-friendliness and the final draft was reviewed by SDNPA staff members before it was sent out. A guide to completing the online questionnaire was also sent to all asset contacts. See the appendices (Appendix 11.1) for the template of questions asked of those surveyed using SurveyMonkey and for the completion guide pro-forma (Appendix 11.2).

4.18 The link to the survey was sent directly from Business of Culture to the list of contacts. It was preceded by an introductory email by SDNPA to explain the purpose and benefits of taking part in the audit – the wording was established between SDNPA and BoC. 149 cultural heritage assets in the SDNP area were contacted.

4.19 In some cases more than one asset or multiple cultural heritage sites within one asset are managed by one organisation (such as county libraries). In these cases one questionnaire was completed per organisation rather than per cultural asset.

4.20 The total number of assets whose organisations responded to the survey amounted to 104, corresponding to a response rate of 69.8 %. At the outset of this audit a target response rate of 50% was considered to be a reasonable minimum return.

Total number of contacted assets	149
Total number of asset responses	104
Final number of assets included in the audit[2]	142

In-depth Interviews and Follow-up Research Visits

4.21   To gain a deeper insight into the cultural heritage infrastructure of the SDNP and elaborate on the survey answers, one-to-one consultations were held using an in-depth, semi-structured interview format, including open-ended questions, allowing the interviewees to expand on previous answers and to bring up new thoughts and

---

[2] (7 assets were removed during the course of this audit; five of them were situated outside the agreed buffer zone or the agreed scope of this audit, one was a duplicate and another one was just a part of an asset. Furthermore, the 166 conservation areas were not surveyed.)

additional information during the interview. See Appendix 11.5 below for the interview template.

4.22   Most of the interviews were face-to-face as part of a follow-up research visit to the cultural heritage asset. Through these we got a more tangible perspective on the status and scale of the cultural asset and its activities. A number of additional interviews were held via phone to accommodate diverging schedules in a short timeframe, bringing the total number of interviews up to 12, representing 30 assets in total. See Appendix 11.3 below for a list of interviewees.

4.23   The sample of interviewees was selected on the following basis: All respondents to the online survey who had fully completed the survey and who had mentioned plans for future projects were contacted for an in-depth interview. Among the interviewees who were available for a follow-up visit a selection based on geographical spread and across different types of asset categories was made.

4.24   Cross-checking and matching interview results with the online survey results and primary desk research results triangulated and enhanced the detail findings of the audit.

Appraisal of Planned Projects

4.25   Currie & Brown, Cost Consultant members of the audit team, reviewed the data collected through the audit of those cultural heritage assets across the SDNP which returned information on planned improvement or development projects. That data was then analysed and appraised and an appraisal report on each of the 24 projects was completed.

GIS Data

4.26   ConsultingWhere, a specialist GIS mapping consultant member of the audit team transcribed core data from survey returns and gazetteers into GIS map formats with Shapefiles containing the asset's individual information. Each audited asset was given a unique reference number (URN) which has been used to identify the assets throughout the audit and in this report (and not for any other purpose). The SDNPA is now able to load maps onto their portal on which icons are used to portray the location of the asset within or near the SDNP and the category of asset. The SDNPA can also link through a click on the icon to the Shapefile containing the information on that particular asset as described above.

4.27   Postal addresses, provided by survey respondents were cleaned manually to remove spelling mistakes and obvious errors. They were then loaded into a PostgreSQL database

that was preloaded with the Ordnance Survey AddressBase® database containing the officially sanctioned addresses for the area in and around the National Park along with a National Grid Reference (NGR) for each address.

4.28   A series of SQL statements were devised to match the addresses from the survey with the AddressBase data. Through this process each address was matched with a NGR. The data was exported as CSV files and loaded into a desktop GIS software where they were converted into ESRI Shapefiles.

4.29   Cultural Assets without addresses, for example St Michael's Parish Church Plumpton, were located individually using the descriptive address and mapping software to obtain a NGR.

4.30   To locate those conservation areas without management plans within the SDNP a Shapefile showing the location of all conservation areas in the National Park was provided by SDNPA along with an Excel spreadsheet listing those conservation areas without management plans. The two datasets were matched to create a Shapefile showing only the conservation areas without management plans.

4.31   The location of the disused railways and abandoned canals was obtained from Open Street Map, while the location of the South Downs Way was supplied as a shape file by SDNPA.

4.32   Those cultural assets that are listed by English Heritage At-Risk register were identified by referencing information available via the English Heritage website.

5   Cultural Asset Analysis and Outputs

GIS Maps

5.1 The location of all the assets has been displayed on maps, using a custom styled version of OS VectorMap™ District, an Ordnance Survey open data product, as a backdrop. Each class of asset is represented by a symbol, chosen in collaboration with SDNPA, and separate maps were produced showing:
- Each asset category and
- All of the assets within each of the park's constituent counties and unitary authorities.

The maps were calibrated for printing using standard A3 paper.

Gazetteers

5.2 Each audited cultural asset has been presented in the form of a gazetteer, modelled on the original format of the online questionnaire. All data collated, whether via the online survey or by additional information gathered through follow-up visits and emails, face-to-face and phone interviews, is included in each asset's gazetteer.

5.3 The gazetteers exhibit different levels of comprehensiveness because of the wide range of response details given in the survey. In many cases some questions remained unanswered despite several attempts by the team to gather the outstanding information. We have produced gazetteers of those assets that did not complete the online survey form, but in these cases only the information available to us, such as contact details and address, is included.

5.4 All gazetteers have been handed over to SDNPA.

Summary of existing cultural assets across the National Park

Please note this is a summary of results across the SDNP for each category of cultural heritage assets. For detailed information on each particular cultural asset please refer to its individual gazetteer (see Appendix 11.6).

5.5 A: Public libraries

All libraries are owned by the relevant county council, apart from one, which is owned by a trust (Chawton House Library). Formal reviews of the assets' condition are undertaken on a regular basis by the relevant county council. All surveyed libraries plan to increase their activities and their engagement with their users and audiences. Whereas some audience data is collected, a full segmentation and analysis of the audience/user profile is not available. The considered improvements range from the refurbishment of existing libraries to the redevelopment of additional library spaces. For more details on each asset and any planned projects please refer to the gazetteers in the appendix (11.6).

5.6 B: Public archives

All buildings in which public archives are housed are owned by the relevant county council. Their collections, however, are largely privately owned (by individuals, organisations, etc.) whilst deposited with archive and record offices. Formal reviews of the buildings are undertaken on a regular basis by the county council and the collections are reviewed by record office staff themselves. All surveyed archives plan to increase their activities and their engagement with their users and audiences. Whereas some audience data is collected, a full segmentation and analysis of the audience/user profile is not available. The considered improvements range from extending the existing

archiving facilities to establishing processes for long term digital preservation. For more details on each asset and any planned projects please refer to the gazetteers in the appendix.

5.7 C: Art galleries

Two thirds of the surveyed art galleries are owned by the galleries themselves (by a trust or charity), whereas the remaining third are on long-term leases from other bodies. All of them undertake regular reviews of the condition of their building, some of them being formal, some being informal. The plans to increase their activities and their engagement with their users range from attracting more diverse audiences to increasing learning and community programmes. Whereas some audience data is collected (mainly just audience numbers), a full segmentation and analysis of the audience/user profile is not available. The considered improvements range from the refurbishment of existing facilities to the conversion of on-site storage areas. For more details on each asset and any planned projects please refer to the gazetteers in the appendix.

5.8 D: Multi-use arts spaces

75% of the surveyed multi-arts spaces are on lease from other bodies (such as a trust or a private owner) and 25% are owned by the organisation managing the asset. Most of them undertake regular reviews of the condition of their building. Their plans to extend their activities and engagement with users range from increasing capacity development in participatory programme through to increased digital offers aimed at generally increasing access. Whereas some audience data is collected (mainly visitor numbers), a full segmentation and analysis of the audience/user profile was not available. The considered improvements range from the refurbishment of existing facilities and environmental improvements to costume storage maintenance. For more details on each asset and any planned projects please refer to the gazetteers in the appendix.

5.9 E: Production, rehearsal and participation/learning spaces

As mentioned above, this audit has, for the purposes of clarity and especially the spatial representation of the cultural heritage assets on the GIS maps, allocated one category to each asset, equating its principal and foremost function. Most cultural assets in the national park offer participatory and learning activities, but do not necessarily have specific spaces allocated to them. Some assets, especially multi-use arts spaces, also contain production and rehearsal spaces. These are mainly used for their own purposes. Few are rented out to third parties.

The results of this audit suggest that there is a lack in the provision of publically accessible production and rehearsal spaces, which impacts the ecology of the arts scene in the national park. Emerging and young artists often need the support of a publically

accessible and affordable infrastructure to establish themselves. For more detail on this please refer to chapters 7 and 9.

5.10 <u>F: Museums and Historic Sites</u>

30% of museums and historic sites are leased from other bodies and 70% are owned by the organisations that manage the assets (such as the National Trust or private owners). 60% of museums and historic sites undertake regular formal reviews of their asset's condition (in some cases supported by English Heritage), whereas 40% undertake informal reviews. Their plans to extend their activities and their engagement with their users range from increasing school visits to attracting more diverse audiences. Whereas some audience data is collected (often it is just audience numbers), full segmentation and analysis of the audience/user profile was not available. The considered improvements range from the redevelopment and extension of existing facilities to the restoration of "at risk" structures. For more details on each asset and any planned projects please refer to the gazetteers in the appendix.

5.11   <u>G: Historic houses, parks and gardens</u>

About a quarter of historic houses, parks and gardens are on lease from other bodies and three quarters are owned by the organisation that manages the asset (such as the National Trust). Some of the historic houses, parks and gardens have plans to increase their participation programme. Planned activities range from increasing visitor engagement (through archaeological digs, community cooking lessons and gardening projects) to extending interpretation facilities and capacity (through documentary research groups and more training of volunteers). Some audience data is collected, (often just visitor numbers) but full segmentation and analysis of the audience/user profile was not available. The considered improvements range from the restoration of existing, but "at risk" structures to extending existing infrastructure and equipment to increase community interaction, school groups' engagement and visits. For more details on each asset and any planned projects please refer to the gazetteers in the appendix.

5.12   <u>H: Conservation areas</u>

Conservation Areas are a measure of the significance of historic parts of settlements. They are defined by local planning authorities and provide certain protections and constraints on change and development. There are 166 Conservation Areas within the SDNP, nine of which are on the Heritage at Risk register (SDNPA 2012). However, the vast majority do not have up-to-date Appraisals and Management Plans and this gap is being gradually addressed by SDNPA. At the outset of this audit it was intended for all conservation areas to be surveyed in the same way as other types of cultural heritage assets. However, as they are governed, controlled and developed through planning policies and local development plans, no direct organisational or representative contacts were available who could have elicited further details and any potential plans for their

future. Nevertheless those without Appraisals and Management Plans have been spatially represented on the GIS map (see Appendix 12.8) and, of course, some surveyed cultural assets in this audit are located in these conservation areas.

5.13   I: Infrastructure

We received two survey responses for assets falling under the category of "infrastructure", the disused railway lines and Magdalen Hill Cemetery. The identified disused railway lines are only partly under management and therefore only limited information could be gathered for those. The planned improvements range from improved surfacing, signage etc. for existing paths open to the public to major works, such as cycle route creation for others not yet accessible to the public, so that walking, cycling and volunteering activities can be increased. Some of them have no current improvements or projects planned, which mainly coincides with those having no formal management (see below). It was highlighted that some assets will be at risk of destruction or development if they are not protected by any planning policy or designation.

The Magdalen Hill Cemetery is currently in the process of extending its site but has no imminent other improvement or development plans apart from undertaking an ecological survey. They do not collect any information on users and do not offer any events or activities.

Identified assets in need of management

5.14   We did not find many of the audited cultural assets in need of a more formal or more active management but we did come across a small number of sites and types of infrastructure, listed below, which do not seem to be under a current management organisation. It would seem that their status would benefit from active management and exploitation of its cultural heritage value.

a) Disused railway lines: Midhurst to Chichester (only a part of it, the Centurion Way Railway Path, is managed by SDNPA), Midhurst to Pulborough and Midhurst to Petersfield
b) Canals: only the Wey and Arun Canal is currently under management.
c) Roman roads: Most, but not all are scheduled monuments.

5.15   The survey questionnaire has not been completed for these heritage infrastructure assets, but the principal ones have been included in the "infrastructure" GIS map.

Inclusion of historic houses as art galleries

5.16   An important record of SDNPA's cultural heritage and works relating to the SDNP is held in a variety of collections in museums and art galleries, and in the archives of record offices. Some are also housed in other heritage sites, such as historic houses.

5.17   The cultural infrastructure guidance by the Arts Council England, as government agency responsible for museums, archives and libraries as well as the arts, defines six main categories of cultural provision (libraries, archives, multi-use arts spaces, production and rehearsal spaces, galleries and museums). This categorisation, which has been followed in the present audit, misses, however, significant art collections that are held in historic houses open to the public. These historic houses provide the function of an art gallery, by providing facilities for temporary or permanent exhibitions and having permanent collections and related storage, curatorial and education functions, and therefore should be included in this audit as art galleries as well.

5.18   For the purposes of clarity and especially the explicit spatial and iconic representation of the cultural heritage assets on the GIS maps, it was decided in agreement with SDNPA, to allocate only one category to each asset of this audit, equating its principal and foremost function. If a historic house has therefore been categorised as a "historic house" and not as an "art gallery", this should not be construed as a judgement on the quality or the value of the collections held in the historic house.

5.19   List of assets surveyed in this audit that have been categorised as historic houses, but also function as art galleries:

URN	Cultural Asset	Organisation
54	Arundel Castle & Gardens	Arundel Castle & Gardens
122	Monk's House	National Trust

Evidence of usage – audience distribution and participatory activities

5.20   One of the South Downs National Park's "special qualities" relates to great opportunities for recreational activities and learning experiences (SDNPA 2012). These are often linked to the cultural heritage assets surveyed in this audit, as they offer recreational activities and also arts learning and participatory activities.

5.21   The DCMS' continuous national survey, "Taking Part", whose aim is to collect information on attendance at and participation in a wide variety of arts events, museums, galleries, libraries and heritage sites, is broken down by district/borough council area and cannot therefore be adjusted to the SDNP's boundaries.

5.22   We found that although most surveyed cultural assets collect audience and user data to some degree, mostly in the form of audience and outreach participant numbers, they do not further segment their audiences. This is especially the case for smaller organisations that may not have the in-house capacity, technology or resources to do so. Some organisations, which did declare to have more detailed audience and segmentation information available, were not able to share their audience data with us, despite several requests.

5.23   As a consequence of the incomplete audience data (such as detailed visitor surveys or user postcodes analysis) a detailed analysis of and subsequent conclusions on the distribution of current audiences and their pattern of use in terms of events and participatory and learning activities across the SDNP was not possible.

5.24   However, some clues to the audience distribution lie in the information and the few more detailed responses recorded in interviews. One surveyed producing theatre, for example, stated that their audiences are drawn from a wide geographical spread including West Sussex, Hampshire and Surrey (77%) areas and they are predominately rural, White British and with ABC1 social groups dominating. The theatre's general annual audience numbers, which exceed the total population the National Park by 50%, and their demographics highlighted at interview would suggest that they have a significant non-local audience. The same might apply to other nationally recognised cultural assets, such as one of the surveyed stately homes and parks whose annual audience numbers also exceed the National Park's total population by 34%. Without better evidence in the form of postcode analysis this remains pure speculation. Other cultural organisations on the other hand, such as one of the surveyed museums, have stated to attract a hyper-local audience with over 50% of visitors coming from the local town.

5.25   The producing theatre mentioned above also stated that the majority of their audiences are highly engaged with the arts as part of their leisure interests ("Traditional culture vultures", Arts audiences: Insight 2011) and consists of people who have disposable income to spend on outings ("Dinner and a show", Arts audiences: Insight 2011). However, they noted that recently there has also been a significant growth in audiences seeking new cultural experiences and /or family and community focused experiences. Whilst older people are dominant (62% at 55+), the attendance from

younger people is encouraged with a discounted tickets scheme, a strategy being adopted by other major multi-use arts spaces both in the SDNP and outside the SDNP.

5.26   This information is obviously specific to the kind of cultural organisation and cannot be applied generically to all the audiences of the SDP's cultural assets, their pattern of use and distribution. For that, one would need detailed audience data through postcode and visitor behaviour analysis for each individual asset.

5.27   Similarly, the results of our audit only allow us to give an indication of the existing forms of participatory activities currently on offer across the National Park, as reported by the individual organisations, but do not permit conclusions on the origin of visitors or patterns of user change.

5.28   The arts learning and participatory activities offered by cultural heritage assets in the SDNP span from hubs for youth theatre members and community archaeology projects to arts and crafts activities and special school holiday workshops. For more details on the outreach offer of each individual asset, please refer to the asset's individual gazetteer in the appendix.

5.29   The likely need to increase participatory and learning activities to meet the demands of an increased population due to developments both within the National Park and in the adjacent urban areas cannot at this stage be substantiated with empirical data due to the lack of more detailed audience data and the future population projection for the SDNPA region. Gathering fuller information on the people engaged with the SDNP's cultural assets and activities would be a very useful exercise, not only for the individual organisations to understand their audiences and users better, but also for SDNPA's strategic and sustainable support of cultural heritage assets and their projects for the future.

6   Appraisal of planned project information as supplied

Filtering criteria explained

6.1   As part of the audit commission Currie & Brown, Cost Consultant members of the audit team, reviewed the information gathered on planned capital improvement or development projects across the National Park and analysed and appraised that information.

6.2 The following criteria were used to appraise the status of the proposed projects:

A. **Does the project meet the criteria and purpose of the ITT?**
   - The project falls within the cultural heritage sector.
   - The project will be delivered in the period 2014-2019.

B. **Does the project fit with the National Park's purposes?**
   - To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.
   - To promote opportunities for and increasing access to the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Park by the public.

C. **Does the project proposal meet the required standard of quality?**

D. **What is the project's state of readiness? How viable is the project and what are the risks involved?**

Note: The following criteria will be determined by SDNPA at a later stage:

E. **Does the project benefit social and economic wellbeing of people living in the park?**

F. **Does the project meet the outcomes of the SDNPA's management plan and other policies?**

Projects identified in the audit process

6.3   From the 142 cultural assets included in the cultural heritage audit survey we received responses with identifying information for 24 potential capital projects across 16 different assets. The range of projects identified includes repairs/restoration to historic buildings, archaeological assessments and enhancement of functional spaces in a variety of settings including museums, galleries and performing arts studios.

6.4   The values of the proposed capital schemes range from numerous small projects of less than £5,000 in value at Café des Artistes to potential multi-million pound schemes at Chichester Festival Theatre, Brighton Royal Pavilion and Gilbert White's House. The distribution of asset categories with planned projects is predominantly within category D (multi-use arts spaces) and category F (museums and historic sites), but there are also proposed schemes at two libraries, three historic houses/parks and one art gallery.

6.5   Currie & Brown have carried out a review of all 24 potential projects focusing on the quality and depth of information provided and the creditability and detail of the proposals and budget costs. From this they have made an appraisal, together with Business of Culture, of each scheme's compliance with filtering criteria A, B, C and D for prioritisation of the projects and in addition have presented a statement on the state of readiness and viability (criterion D) for each scheme. Their findings are

illustrated by means of a traffic light system, which ranks each project red through green, on the quality of information provided and against each of the criteria A-D. A summary spreadsheet of the rankings and the individual supporting reports for each project, providing further details of the schemes and the appraisal of their readiness and viability, are included in a summary in appendix 12.7.1. Each project has an individual appraisal report. These can be found at appendix 12.7.2.

7   Current provision of cultural facilities

7.1   22 of the 142 assets surveyed reported back on the floor area they occupy and use. Those assets and the extent of floor space occupied are shown in the table below together with – in blue - the floor space assumptions made by BoC for their approximations.

URN	name	site area ACRES	site area HECTARES	gross FA sq m	GIA sq m	BoC assumption	BoC notes
74	**Amberley Museum**	36	14.57	145,700		1,457	1% of site area.
54	**Arundel Castle & Gdns**	40	16.19	161,190		0	not incl in ACE bencmarkin
27 to 40	**Brighton & Hove City Libraries**			3,600		3,600	
62	**Phoenix Place**			1,900		1,900	
66	**Chichester Festival Theatre**			2,801	2334	2,334	add 20% to get GEA
20	**Lewes Library**			1,138	948	948	ditto
43	**E Sussex Record Office -The Keep**			4,900		2,450	shared facility
63	**The Opera House Glyndebourne**			23,733		5,933	25% taken for arts buildings only
7	**Petersfield Library**			1,194		1,194	
41	**Hampshire Record Office**			3,255		1,700	shared facility
130	**Magdalen Hill cemetery**		7.4	74,000		0	not incl in ACE bench-marking
123	**Newhaven Fort**	10	4.05	40,500		0	not incl in ACE bench-marking
44	**Pallant House gallery**			1,350		1,350	

73	Petersfield Museum The Old Courthouse			238	198	198	
46	Petworth House			6,500	5600	5,600	
111	Petworth Park	650	263	2,630,000		0	not incl in ACE bench-marking
79	Royal Pavilion and Museums			7,180	5983	5,983	public FA only
88	Lewes Castle & Barbican House Museum			465		465	
45	Towner Gallery				1250	1,250	
109	Twyford School		0.25	400		0	excl from ACE bench-marking
42	W Sussex Record Office			2,623		1,312	shared facility
149	Cass Sculpture Foundation	26	10.52	105,000		1,050	1% of site area
	Total			**3,217,667**		**38,724**	

Notes & assumptions

AVERAGE F. A. FOR 22 ASSETS = 38,724/ 22 = 1,760 sq m

NO OF ASSETS ANALYSED X 1,760 = 183,040 sq m

% of building footprint to large estate or garden within which the building is situated, is taken as a ratio of 1% based on Petworth House: Petworth Park ratio.

Comparison of number of square metres per 1,000 people

7.2   The online survey asked for the floor area of each cultural asset. Preferably this would have been expressed as gross internal area but responders gave a wide range of floor areas including total floor space of their buildings in both gross internal area, GIA, and gross external area, (GEA) in sq. metres or sq. feet and site areas in acres and hectares. Where the reported floor areas were in other definitions like GIA or NIA or where only partial floor areas were supplied or indeed where only site areas were given we have adjusted the floor area calculation using reasonable factors and RICS guidance.[3] In particular we have eliminated or reduced garden and park areas, which are not included in the ACE (Elson) benchmark methodology categories. Out of 142 cultural assets only 22 survey responses indicated the floor area of their cultural asset. This return demanded a series of reminder and explanatory telephone calls or was picked up at visits to a sample of the assets originally contacted. Some of the floor areas reported were of cultural facilities outside of the SDNP area, but within

---

[3] See Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors Code of Measuring Practice

the 2 miles buffer zone described above, that is, within a wider catchment area than just the SDNP itself.

7.3 According to the South Downs National Park Authority, the 2011 population of the SDNP was 112, 000. We have not been supplied with any update on this figure and there is no available population projection as yet going forward. The SDNP 5 kilometre buffer zone used in the 2011 SDNPA Local Economy publication[4] estimates a population of 1,970,000 but includes a number of major South Coast towns including Brighton and Eastbourne. Clearly the low density population of the SDNP itself is boosted by a significantly greater number of visitors and wider audience catchment areas for its cultural offers. We have therefore in our approximations used a wider catchment population than the SDNP boundary itself. Our assumption has been that the population served by the SDNP's cultural assets is approximated as a ratio between the 2011 Local Economy buffer zone of 5 kilometres and that used by the audit of 2 miles i.e. 3.22 kilometres. The approximation population is then 1,268,680.

7.4 We do not have sufficient evidence to report conclusively on the balance of cultural asset provision across the SDNP either in terms of quantity or genre, e.g. is there enough in total and are there deficiencies in different types of cultural provision? However, it does appear that the actual quantity of overall provision for the size of the current population is likely to meet if not exceed the ACE guideline benchmarks. But there does appear to be an under-supply of available production and rehearsal spaces across the SDNP, especially for community uses. What is also not known is whether the figures collected on floor area provision reflect the demands of the region or the peculiarities of the regional pattern of cultural activity even if the floor areas calculated are accurate across all assets – which we know they are not. It does seem a subject worthy of further study outside the scope of this commission. We cannot claim that the analysis and conclusions on the cultural provision of the SDNP can be anything other than approximations. A comparison with the ACE benchmarks for cultural provision recommended in the ACE guidance described later in 7.6 is offered below based on these approximations, projections and the assumptions also outlined below.

Analysis and assumptions for benchmark comparison

7.5 The SDNPA brief asked that "*the audit demonstrates the current provision as a total square metre of arts facilities per thousand population…………. The types of facility depend on local circumstance and existing provision and there is a recognised need to take account of local circumstances. For instance, the dispersed and rural nature of some parts of the SDNPA needs to be taken into account in calculating provision. The*

---

[4] See SDNPA Local Economy – Current Economic Indicators for the Local Economy , Sept 2011

consultant should propose a reasoned number of square metres per 1000 population for the South Downs National Park."

Accordingly we have made a number of assumptions in order to arrive at a reasoned approximation and judgment of:

- Existing provision as it stands
- Whether the ACE benchmark is a fair reflection taking into account the SDNP's circumstances

The **assumptions** are:

1. That where necessary floor areas given in GIA terms are converted to GEA using a 20% factor for external structure, corridors and lobbies/foyers, internal support structure etc. GEA is the normal planning measurement convention for community category buildings.

2. That where large estate areas only are given, that 1% of that site area is used to account for the buildings on the site in use as cultural assets. The assumed percentages are explained in the table above. This is the case with 4 assets which have a URN designation.

3. That all parks, landscapes and linear, heritage infrastructure such as old railway routes, canals, registered pathways etc. and all categories not included in the Elson/ ACE are excluded. There are 4 URNs excluded from the calculation

4. That the average floor area across the 22 assets which responded with floor areas, is extrapolated across a total of 104 analysed survey response organisations (excluding the large parks etc.) assets all of which are recorded on gazetteers.
   That average is 1,760 sq. m x 104 (total assets responding to survey) = 183,040 sq. m total

5. That a reasonable allowance is made for the wider catchment area population by including some of the urban areas within the 2 mile (3.22 km) zone around the SDNP boundary to match the returned floor areas from major assets just outside the SDNP. This population would be a proportion of that estimated for the 5 km Buffer Zone explained above, as follows:-
   An allowance of 3.22/ 5 (km) x the population estimated in the SDNPA Local Economy population. That is 3.22/5 x 1,970,000 = 1,268,680 as an approximated SDNP catchment population.

Calculations using assumptions explained above

7.6   *>AVERAGE F.A. OF THE 22 ASSETS WHICH RESPONDED WITH THEIR FLOOR AREAS IS THEREFORE = **1,760** SQ M*

      >EXTRAPOLATED TOTAL FLOOR AREA FOR 1O4 ASSETS RESPONDING TO THE AUDIT SURVEY WITHIN THE SDNP + 2 MILE ZONE BOUNDARY IS THEREFORE
      *= 104 X 2,030 = **183,040** SQ M*

>*TOTAL POPULATION WITHIN THE SDNP + 2 MILE BUFFER ZONE AREA IS*
= 1,268,680

>*TOTAL CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION IF USING ELSON/ACE BENCHMARK*
= 1,268,680/ 1000 X 109 = 138,286 SQ M

> *ACTUAL ESTIMATED PER CAPITA CULTURAL PROVISION BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS*
MADE = 183.04 sq m / 1000 POPULATION

ACE / Elson Benchmark for Cultural Infrastructure Provision

7.7 We have used the 2012 ACE publication '*The Community Infrastructure Levy: advice note for culture, arts and planning professionals*' and the benchmark provisions recommended in there, as comparison with the projected, current cultural floor space within (and nearby) the SDNP. The recommended areas are expressed as sq m per 1,000 head of population. This is obviously a general factor across the demographic profile of any area and it has not been segmented into age, gender, ethnic, rural/ city or any other area specific category. Benchmark areas are expressed across 6 categories of cultural provision. These are set out in the table below:

Type of facility	Benchmark sq metres per 1,000 people
Public Library	30
Public Archive	6
Arts-Galleries **Arts – Multi use venues & theatres** **Arts- Production, rehearsal & education**	45
Museums	**28**
Total	**109**

source: ACE/Elson, 2012

Cultural Provision Conclusions

7.8 Our audit of the total cultural asset provision suggests a current total of **183.04 sq. m** of floor space **/** 1,000 population[5]. This is some **67%** greater than the ACE/ Elson benchmark factor of **109** sq. m per 1,000 population. Perhaps this is not so surprising because although the SDNP area has a very low density – lowest in the South East – it is undoubtedly significantly bolstered by visitors and audiences to the rich cultural provisions of the SDNP and its adjacent urban areas. Indeed the SDNP area contains

---

[5] The sample of returned information on floor space was not large enough to allow for a representative break-down by category as in Elson's benchmark.

some of the UK's highest profile cultural destinations. For example Glyndebourne Opera Festival alone has a reported audience of 98,000 a year[6], 77% of whom are from outside the area and 5% of whom are from outside of the UK. It appears that the SDNP area punches well above its weight as far as cultural and visitor attractions are concerned and that equally as it is so well know it <u>must</u> continue to provide for a much larger catchment audience base than the SDNP area only. The quantity and high quality of many of the regional assets – galleries, historic house, monuments, theatres, opera houses, cinemas and libraries /archives - will conspire to distort the comparison with the ACE/ Elson benchmarks. It could also be that the ACE / Elson benchmark has not kept up with contemporary cultural provision and particularly of the provision in the South East which is likely to be above average (around which there has been some debate within the arts and heritage sector recently).

7.9   Of course our assumptions could easily be inaccurate and to provide another scenario in which the SDNP + 2 mile (3.22km) buffer zone comes close to the ACE/Elson guide provision of 109 sq. m / 1000 head of population we have back calculated that the population catchment figure would be in the order of 1.83 million, very close to the population approximation used of 1.27 million and possibly with the margin of error of the assumptions used. Clearly therefore we would conclude that more accurate data is required on both provision and population but that it is likely that the SDNP and wider buffer zone is a special case even if it is an unusually well provided for region.

7.10 We have not been able to calculate the cultural provision for either the 2014 population (we used the available 2011 figures) or the future projected population. However it would seem highly unlikely that major additional provision in terms of floor area will be needed for quite some time if the SDNPA is to follow the ACE/Elson advice population trends in this region have increased significantly since 2011.

7.11 We should however point out some imbalances in the provision. The ACE benchmark factor guidelines are essentially for local planning purposes, presenting only an overall target floor space. The gross floor space does not, of course, reveal local imbalances or gaps in types of cultural provision or indeed changes in demand in the fast moving cultural world.

7.12 In any case 'sufficient' per capita cultural provision is not usually enough to transform a region into a culturally vibrant place, attractive not just to its residents but visitors and tourists alike. We know of no other national park that has carried out an audit similar to this so it is speculative to read too much into the case of SDNPA. The amount and type of provision may be exceptional in the case of the SDNP or it may be the norm for national parks. We would like have more evidence of the situation in other national parks but this is presently beyond the scope of this audit.

---

[6] The Economic Impact of Glyndebourne January 2013

General comments on gaps in arts provision

7.13   E: Production, rehearsal and participation/learning spaces

As mentioned above, this audit has, for the purposes of clarity and especially the spatial representation of the cultural heritage assets on the attached maps, allocated only one category to each asset, equating its principal and foremost function. Most cultural assets in the SDNP offer participatory and learning activities, but don't necessarily have specific spaces allocated to them. Some assets, especially multi-use arts spaces, also contain production and rehearsal spaces, which are often used for their own purposes and not rented out to third parties.

This audit therefore finds that there is an apparent lack in the provision of publicly accessible production and rehearsal spaces. Lack of provision in this area may well impact on the ecology of the arts scene in the SDNP if emerging creatives and young artists and creative cannot find the infrastructure they need where they want it have to move out of the SDNP area.

8   Evaluation of the methodologies and lessons to be learnt

Obstacles

8.1 Initially, not very many organisations replied to the online survey and it took a good number of follow-up emails and phone calls to convince them of the utility and benefits of being part of this audit. This was despite the fact that SDNPA had both forewarned the cultural organisations on their database and had explained both the reasoning behind the audit and the benefits of responding.

8.2 Our questions in the online survey were deliberately detailed and extensive; nevertheless the fine grains of information were difficult to get hold of, as many respondents did not fill in the questionnaire with sufficient explanatory information. This required extra time and resources to gather the outstanding information.

8.3 Some organisations seemed wary of sharing data with us, especially financial and audience data which made the analysis of planned projects, current audiences and audience distribution more difficult and in most cases impossible.

8.4 As some assets do not seem to be under a current management organisation, they could not be audited in our survey and no further information, apart from their location, could be established.

Opportunities

8.5 If this audit was to be extended in the future or replicated elsewhere a stronger form of incentivisation might be useful to gain a higher return of responses.

8.6 With more time and resource, more one-to-one interviews and visits could have been completed to establish more detailed information on the state of the cultural heritage sector.

8.7 Based on the results of this research we can provide sign-posting only to planned projects in the cultural heritage sector to date, but once the CIL delivery plan is in place and more details regarding the application process and criteria as well as the available funding are known, it would be important to return to the organisations surveyed in this audit and gather updated plans.

8.8 As outlined above, an analysis of the current audiences and users of the cultural assets in the SDNP, their spatial distribution and their pattern of use in terms of events and participatory and learning activities was not possible because of the lack of detailed audience data. It would be very useful not only for the cultural organisations themselves, but also for the National Park as a whole, to undertake a park-wide and detailed audience research to understand the local facilities' users and audiences, their interests and spread better in order to be able to plan better for the future. This would also give an insight into the patterns of usage, providing an indication of how many people from outside the park are attracted by the SDNP's cultural heritage offer and how many residents of the park travel outside the National Park in order to satisfy their needs for cultural interaction, entertainment and participation.

9   Recommendations for future actions

General recommendations

9.1   Many surveyed assets have some sort of improvements planned, either in terms of capital projects or in terms of increasing or extending their participation and learning programme. However, these plans are in many cases still at an early stage and it is therefore recommended to return to the organisations surveyed in this audit once the SDNPA Infrastructure Development Plan has been finalised in order to gather more and updated details.

9.2   Most assets identified throughout the course of this audit are under management apart from a small number of infrastructure assets, such as disused railway lines, canals and

roman roads. These might be at risk if they are not protected by any planning policy or designation.

Production, rehearsal and participation/learning spaces

9.3   The results of our audit suggest that there is a lack in the provision of publically accessible production and rehearsal spaces and that this may impact on emerging and younger creatives or on voluntary groups and hinder the development of skills and enterprise within the SDNP.

9.4   Martin J. Elson identifies in his "Community Infrastructure Levy advice note for culture, arts and planning professionals" that across the UK "there is a growing trend towards shared or multi-use facilities, [which] include flexible multi use arts venues and arts space within educational establishments, wider civic complexes or local community facilities" (Elson 2012). Across the SDNP there are only a few multi-use arts venues which "truly" function across different art forms and share their facilities, including production and rehearsal spaces, with other organisations. This might be an area that SDNPA wishes to support in the future to enhance the development of the cultural infrastructure.

Evidence of usage – audience distribution and participatory activities

9.5   This research has found that although most surveyed cultural assets collect audience and user data to a certain degree, often in the form of audience and outreach participant numbers, many assets do not analyse or segment their audience surveys further. This is especially the case for smaller organisations that may not have the in-house capacity or resources to do so. Some organisations, which indicated having more detailed audience and segmentation data available, seemed wary of sharing their audience data with us, despite our reassurances of data protection.

9.6   It might be that SDNPA, via CIL, could consider supporting cultural organisations in undertaking detailed audience research in order to fill the gaps in their knowledge about their users and audiences. It would also be extremely beneficial to commission a park-wide audience research to understand the users and audiences of the local cultural heritage, their motivations and distribution better in order to be able to plan better and more strategically for the future.

9.7 As a consequence of the lacking audience and user data also only a small number of potential non-capital projects, i.e. projects to increase levels of participation and learning work, could be identified. These would also need a different form of appraisal or evaluation, which would be an interesting addition to any future research undertaken on audience distribution, participatory activities and usage.

10 Conclusions

10.1   The present audit identified a proportion of cultural organisations across the SDNP and their potential projects, visually represented by GIS mapping, showing the park-wide spatial distribution of the cultural heritage assets by types. The mapping is supported by a detailed gazetteer for each cultural heritage asset as well as a list of planned projects, including indicative costs (at 2014 prices). The data set submitted to SDNPA can be complemented with additional assets in the future and should be reviewed annually for updates, especially with regards to projects that are being developed across the national park.

10.2   The findings of this research and the present report can be used to inform SDNPA's and other external funders' decisions, such as CIL funding strategies as the IDP are developed.

10.3   Some historic houses across the SDNP occupy the role of an art gallery, by providing facilities for temporary or permanent exhibitions and having permanent collections and related storage, curatorial and educational functions. For the purposes of clarity and especially the spatial representation of the cultural heritage assets on the GIS maps, it was decided to allocate only one category to each asset of this audit, equating its principal and foremost function and some historic houses have therefore been categorised as either "historic house" or as an "art gallery".

10.4   The principal conclusion from appraising the available information on planned projects is that the majority of the proposed capital projects remain at feasibility stage and the details of the schemes in most cases are limited. There are four projects[7] that Currie & Brown believe, in principle, subject to further particulars, would represent, on the basis of the information presented, viable projects for funding. But there are also a number of schemes that have the potential to develop into projects which may fulfil the funding criteria and some that would benefit from funding towards professional consultancy fees to enable the schemes to develop and progress. Currie & Brown have made a recommendation in the supporting reports for actions that should be carried out to further interrogate each scheme and where a scheme falls into one of the two 'potential' categories above this is indicated in the statement on the state of readiness and viability. In all instances further details would have to be provided before funding could be sanctioned and we would advise that further advice is sought on the viability and risks inherent in the schemes once details have been provided and before funding is sanctioned. For details of the 24 project appraisals please refer to Appendices 12.7.1 and 12.7.2.

---

[7] These are at Petersfield Library (URN 7), Café des Artistes (URN 62), Glyndebourne Opera House (URN 63) and Petworth Park (URN 111).

10.5   There are a few other local planning authorities who have undertaken similar audits. We have carried out a similar audit using ACE benchmarks for the City of Cambridge in 2013 and for North Lincolnshire District in 2006. The ACE/Elson benchmarking is a useful guide for this sort of audit, but the factors and multipliers are generic and therefore need to be adapted for local specificities, such as particular catchments and profile reach, and possibly need updating for contemporary and even future audience demands.

10.6   We are not aware of any other similar audits undertaken in national parks, although there are also significant cultural programmes in other national parks. Hence, there are definitely opportunities, even a need, to audit other national parks and rural areas.

10.7   Continuous or regular collection and updating of audience data (including catchment areas and user profiles) would be useful for cultural planning and allow a strategic and consistent approach in the future in order to best support cultural organisations in their development. For example, we are aware that since our audit of the City of Cambridge arts and museums provision an online feedback service is being set up by the local authority to update the changes and development in infrastructure and provision.

11 References

Arts Council England and Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (2009) *Arts, museums and new development: a standard charge approach*

Arts Council England (2011) *Arts audiences: Insight 2011*

Audience South, Cultural Consulting Network, et al (2010) *South Hampshire and Hampshire Cultural Infrastructure Audit*

Communities and Local Government (2009) *Looking after our town centres*Department for Communities and Local Government (2010) *Community Infrastructure Levy. Guidance-charge setting and charging schedule procedures*

Department for Communities and Local Government (2011) *The Community Infrastructure Levy: An Overview*

Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) *National Planning Policy Framework*

East Sussex County Council (2013) *East Sussex Cultural Strategy 2013 – 2023. A County of distinction, igniting the power of culture*

Elson, M. J. (2012) *The Community Infrastructure Levy: advice note for culture, arts and planning professionals*

English Heritage (2013) *Infrastructure Delivery Plan* (letter to SDNPA)

Hampshire County Council (2008) *Shaping our future together. Hampshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2008–18*

MLA (2010) *Arts, museums and new development - A standard charge approach*

Office for National Statistics (2012) *2011 Census*

SDNPA (2012) *State of the National Park 2012*

West Sussex County Council (2009) *West Sussex County Council Cultural Strategy 2009–2014*

12 Appendices (see separate documents)