

2019

# The role and values of Local Government and Developer Engagement in 'Place'



Babb, C. & Creagh, R.  
Place Agency  
2/10/2019

Prepared by:

Courtney Babb, Curtin University; and

Robyn Creagh, University of Notre Dame



For:



With the support of



This document was prepared as a teaching guide for placemaking academics to engage their students in the topic mentioned in the title. It is part of a 12 module series created through a multi-university collaboration including Curtin University, University of Notre Dame, the University of Technology of Sydney, University of New South Wales, University of Queensland, The University of Adelaide and the University of Melbourne. The module was informed by practitioners through an intensive skillset and gap analysis workshop in Oct 2017.

This module envisioned as a 1-week delivery includes:

- This template including ~10 hours of content as follows
  - A total of ~3 hours of presumed in-class exercises (no more than 1-hour lecture)
  - A total of ~7 hours of personal study time (i.e. readings/short essays/videos to watch)
- The slides/materials used for the lecture.
- List of ‘mandatory’ reading and recommended readings relevant to the module content.

The document is subdivided into two sections.

1. Section 1: Provides an outline of the aims of the module
2. Section 2: Expands on the specific topic covered by this module and the recommended exercises for tutorial activities.

# 1 Section 1:

## Overview

This module outlines the role local government and developers play in placemaking. The module frames local government and developers as key stakeholders in placemaking practices, and as drivers of placemaking initiatives and projects. We identify the value of placemaking to these actors and examine the institutional structures that frame their engagement in placemaking. Through critical reflection on current practice examples we explore successful and less successful involvement of Local Government, Council and Developers in placemaking.

## Summary of materials referred to in this Module

The following should be easily accessible through the PlaceAgency web platform, local council and developer websites, or university library databases (journal articles etc). Some are for your reference, and some are needed by students for their activities.

### Resources needed for student’s independent study outside the class room.

- Short video interviews with Western Australia placemakers, available through the PlaceAgency online portal:

Ben Kent Inglewood on Beaufort	
	<a href="#">Ben Kent Inglewood on Beaufort Town Team 1/9</a> Introduction
	<a href="#">Ben Kent Inglewood on Beaufort Town Team 2/9</a> Question 1 - What do you see as your organisation’s role in placemaking?
	<a href="#">Ben Kent Inglewood on Beaufort Town Team 3/9</a> Question 2 - What does your organisation see as the value of placemaking or what do you think developers/council see as the value of placemaking?
	<a href="#">Ben Kent Inglewood on Beaufort Town Team 4/9</a> Question 4 - What advice would you share with someone who wanted to partner with or approach a developer or council with a placemaking proposal?
Callum Prior City of Wanneroo	
	Callum Prior_City of Wanneroo_1/9 Introduction
	<a href="#">Callum Prior City of Wanneroo 2/9</a> Question 1- What do you see as your organisation’s role in placemaking?
	<a href="#">Callum Prior City of Wanneroo 3/9</a> Question 2 - What does your organisation see as the value of placemaking or what do you think developers/council see as the value of placemaking?
	<a href="#">Callum Prior City of Wanneroo 5/9</a> Question 4 - What advice would you share with someone who wanted to partner with or approach a developer or council with a placemaking proposal?
Dean Cracknell Town Team Movement:	
	<a href="#">Dean Cracknell CEO Town Team Movement 1/7</a> Introduction
	<a href="#">Dean Cracknell CEO Town Team Movement 2/7</a>

	Question 1-What do you see as your organisation’s role in placemaking? <a href="#">Dean Cracknell_CEO Town Team Movement 3/7</a>
	Question 2 - What does your organisation see as the value of placemaking or what do you think developers/council see as the value of placemaking?
<b>Emma Snow</b> City of Bayswater	
	<a href="#">Emma Snow_City of Bayswater 1/9</a> Introduction
	<a href="#">Emma Snow_City of Bayswater 2/9</a> Question 1 - What do you see as your organisation’s role in placemaking?
	<a href="#">Emma Snow_City of Bayswater 3/9</a> Question 2 - What does your organisation see as the value of placemaking or what do you think developers/council see as the value of placemaking?
	<a href="#">Emma Snow_City of Bayswater 5/9</a> Question 4 - What advice would you share with someone who wanted to partner with or approach a developer or council with a placemaking proposal?
<b>Carla Chatzopoulos</b> Element	
	Carla Chatzopoulos_Element (Place Consultant) 1/9 Introduction
	<a href="#">Carla Chatzopoulos_Element (Place Consultant) 2/9</a> Question 1 - What do you see as your organisation’s role in placemaking?
	<a href="#">Carla Chatzopoulos_Element (Place Consultant) 3/9</a> Question 2 - What does your organisation see as the value of placemaking or what do you think developers/council see as the value of placemaking?
	<a href="#">Carla Chatzopoulos_Element (Place Consultant) 5/9</a> Question 4 - What advice would you share with someone who wanted to partner with or approach a developer or council with a placemaking proposal?

- Kamvasinou, Krystallia. 2017. “Temporary intervention and long-term legacy: lessons from London case studies.” *Journal of Urban Design* 22 (2): 187-207. doi: 10.1080/13574809.2015.1071654
- Dollery, B., Grant, B., & O’Keefe, S. (2008). Local Councils as ‘Place-shapers’: The Implications of the Lyons Report for Australian Local Government. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 43(3), 481-494. doi:10.1080/10361140802267266
- Creagh, R., C. Babb, H. Farley. (2019) “Local governments and developers in placemaking: defining their responsibilities and capacities to shape place.” In D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin *Placemaking fundamentals for the built environment*. Palgrave Macmillan.

#### Resources needed for students’ in class activities.

- Paper at least A3 in size and coloured markers if possible, for all exercises.
- For exercise 1, a one-page maximum summary of the Intro to placemaking/what is placemaking chapter, or summary points from intro to placemaking module.
- For exercise 3, a placemaking case study sheet for each group. There are some Western Australian and Victorian examples available through the PlaceAgency online portal.
- For exercise 4, identify the online presence of a top down (developer or local government driven) place activation activity. This could be local to your area, or perhaps chosen from a reading or one of the case study sheets.

#### Additional resources that may support a facilitator not familiar with this topic. These directly informed the subtopic summaries.

- Healey, P. (2004). Creativity and Urban Governance. *disP - The Planning Review*, 40(158), 11-20. doi:10.1080/02513625.2004.10556888

- Lyons, M. (2007). Place-shaping: a shared ambition for the future of local government. Accessed at: <http://www.lyonsinquiry.org.uk/>
- Independent Commission Against Corruption (2002). *Taking the devil out of development: exploring corruption risks in local government administration of development applications*. Sydney: New South Wales Government.
- Fincher, Ruth, Maree Pardy, and Kate Shaw. 2016. "Place-Making or Place-Masking? The Everyday Political Economy of "Making Place"." *Planning Theory & Practice* 17 (4): 516-536.

## Objectives of the Module

To increase student understanding of:

- the role of local government and developers in placemaking;
- the value of placemaking to local government and developers; and
- the capacity of local government and developers to enhance and constrain placemaking.

## Module Content

1. Local governments and developers are involved in placemaking because they have responsibilities in the governance and management of places.
2. Placemaking has value for local governments and developers.
3. The placemaking activities of local governments and developers are constrained due to a number of factors, including their organisational objectives, frameworks and funding structures.
4. Not all developer and local government activity is aligned with placemaking objectives.

## Learning outcomes

Upon completion of this module students will be able to:

- Identify some of the key stakeholders interacting with local government and developers in placemaking.
- Explain the value of placemaking for local governments and developers.
- Discuss the contexts and capacities of local government and developers to participate in placemaking initiatives.
- Describe the various ways local government and developers can participate positively and negatively in placemaking practices.

The exercises of each sub-topic are designed in such a way that they can be adapted to assessments if desired. These could be group assessments if the students complete the activity and submit or present together. Or, they could be individual assessments if students are asked to present individual reflections on one or several of the themes of the class.

## Enhanced capabilities

Early in the PlaceAgency program development workshops were held with academics, community and industry representatives. During these, a total of 62 skills were identified from which 19 capabilities were identified as relevant within the context of this module. 14 of these were included in the final module. These are listed below and their location within the module noted.

Cognitive Skills (Head)	Affective Skills (Heart)	Practical Skills (Hand)
<p><b>Understanding the mechanics of government and business</b> (key focus of the module)</p> <p><b>Moving beyond services and amenity delivery to role as nexus and facilitator</b> – see reading Deollery et al.</p> <p><b>Identify the value of placemaking</b> – interview with WA placemakers across sectors asks this, the mini lecture in subtopic 2 summarises this.</p> <p><b>Sense of the commons</b> – might come up within some of the case studies if they include public space that is semi-privatised or in the interviews. What are the rights of private property owners/vs members of the public who don't own the space but do use it? If not, we'll cover in the mini-lectures.</p>	<p><b>Empathy</b> - all exercises focus on students understanding other's perspectives, videos support this.</p> <p><b>Honesty and ethics in communications</b> – an aspect of exercise 3 where students critique case studies.</p> <p><b>Community focused projects-</b> embed value/community and social capital in the bottom line (people over profit), Invest in intangibles – exercise 2, and within video interviews.</p>	<p><b>Facing Risk</b> – mentioned in subtopic 3.</p> <p><b>Community engagement and bottom up governance</b> – discussed in exercises and in the Deollery et al reading.</p> <p><b>Positive catalyst for change</b> – (vs meddling, marketing, corruption) introduced in exercise 4.</p> <p><b>Buy in across departments</b> – a possible 'snag' in subtopic 3 exercise.</p> <p><b>Valuation of good process</b> – evaluation introduced in exercise 3</p> <p><b>Social contract</b> (business gives right to manage to government, they agree to be regulated for public good) – mentioned in mini-lecture 2.3</p>

## Module Overview (For Students)

**Table 1: Module overview. Summary of the activities considered within this module and the time equivalency. In white content that is either delivered in-person or online but requiring some element of students listening/discussing with the group etc. In grey, self-study activities, videos, etc.**

ACTIVITY	TIME	NOTES
A	Readings	<p>3 hrs</p> <p>Creagh, R., Babb, C., &amp; Farley H. (2020), Local governments and developers in placemaking: Defining their responsibilities and capacities to shape place, In D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin (Eds) <i>Placemaking fundamentals for the built environment</i>. Palgrave Macmillan</p> <p>Kamvasinou, K. (2017), Temporary intervention and long-term legacy: lessons from London case studies. <i>Journal of Urban Design</i> 22 (2): 187-207. doi: 10.1080/13574809.2015.1071654</p> <p>Dollery, B., Grant, B., &amp; O'Keefe, S. (2008). Local Councils as 'Place-shapers': The Implications of the Lyons Report for Australian Local Government. <i>Australian Journal of Political Science</i>, 43(3), 481-494. doi:10.1080/10361140802267266</p>
B	Videos	<p>1 hr</p> <p>Review a selection of the short videos of WA Placemakers provided (as provided above). Use the follow questions to help you engage with the material.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are some of the different ways that the interviewees see their organisation's role in placemaking? How do they describe this?</li> <li>2. What value do the interviewees attach to placemaking? What outcomes or processes of placemaking are valuable to them?</li> <li>3. How do the interviewees suggest approaching local government or a developer organisation with an idea for a placemaking imitative?</li> </ol> <p><b>Some considerations for the facilitator:</b> you may like to use this as an assessment, or to ask students to post these online, and comment on other student's case studies.</p>
C	Case study review	<p>2.5 hr</p> <p>Select a placemaking case study and develop a short review. Feel free to choose a case study from your own experience, choose one mentioned by the video interviews, or in the Creagh, Babb and Farley reading.</p>

			<p>The Kamvasinou reading provides useful sub-headings to structure your review: Context and issues; initiation and project aims; policies and processes; timescales, funding and management; people and impact.</p> <p><b>Some considerations for the facilitator:</b> you may like to use this as an assessment, or to ask students to post these online, and comment on other student’s case studies.</p>
D	In class	3 hr	<p>Please see the 4 focus areas and associated exercises below for more detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sub-topic 1: Mini-Lecture (15min); Activity 1 (30 mins).</li> <li>• Sub-topic 2: Mini-Lecture (15min); Activity 2 (20-25 mins).</li> <li>• Sub-topic 3: Mini-Lecture (15min); Activity 3 (25 mins).</li> <li>• Sub-topic4: Mini-Lecture (15min); Activity 4 (35mins).</li> </ul>
E	Journal questions	30 mins	<p>Journal question 5.1. What discipline backgrounds are typical for developers and local government employees and what does this mean for placemaking? (max 150 words)</p> <p>Journal question 5.2. How can you engage government and developers to become co-custodians of local places? (max 100 words)</p>
	<b>TOTAL MODULE</b>	<b>10hrs</b>	



## 2 Section 2:

### Introduction to Module

This module outlines the role local government and developers play in placemaking practices and activities. The module frames local government and developers as key stakeholders in placemaking practices, and as drivers of placemaking initiatives and projects.

Four ‘mini-lectures’ of 15mins introduce each sub-topic and the exercise that follows. It is important that the mini-lectures do not become full lectures, as that will not leave students the time to fully engage in the exercises within the three-hour class. The exercises at the centre of this module invite students to critically engage with the topic and to seek connections, reasons and creative solutions to placemaking scenarios.

This module could be adapted to a traditional lecture (1hr) and tutorial (2hrs) set-up, but a seminar structure was our intention.

The module begins by summarising the role of local governments and developers as two of many potential stakeholders in the governance of place and the activity of placemaking. There are key reasons why local government and developers may engage with placemaking initiatives or generate their own placemaking projects. These are described in the second section. The capacity of local government and developers to act in placemaking is then explored, through identifying the various institutional norms, organisational structures and responsibilities that may shape the activity of placemaking. The module concludes with a critical look at the potential for local government and developers to interfere with placemaking practices.

### 2.1 Sub-topic 1: Local government, local council and developers all are involved in placemaking through their responsibilities for the governance of place.

The practices associated with place-making initiatives are governed by complex arrangement of actors, procedures and rules of engagement.

- **Governance of place:** Healey (2004) refers to governance as “collective action arrangements”. Governance of place encompasses the relationship between various actors and their capacity to act to meet their objectives, whether for short-term projects or more enduring collective efforts in shape place. Understanding the governance of placemaking – including the interests, motivations and responsibilities of key stakeholders – is important in being able to better comprehend the activity of placemaking as a strategic and tactical practice and also enable you to act strategically in placemaking processes.

The range of actors involved in the various incarnations of placemaking activity is diverse. However, two key actors that play a role in placemaking at the local scale are **local governments** and **developers**.

- **Local governments** are important stakeholders with a range of roles and responsibilities in place focussed activities and practices. Local government made up by a number of different actors – council, planners, engineers, environmental officers, CEO – and each of these actors may play a different role in placemaking. There is a growing expectation that local government goes beyond its role as supplier of essential services for local communities, to one that sees the development of communities and local

identity. As Lyons (2007) suggested in an inquiry into Local Government in the UK, “(a) new conception of the role for local government needs to go further, to reflect the well-being and place-shaping agenda.”

- **Developers** have an important role in the shaping the quality of place.
  - Urban developments have a range of positive and negative impacts on their immediate surrounds and sometime broader regional contexts.
  - Placemaking is increasingly used as a strategy by land developers. In urban regeneration projects placemaking can be used as a means of making use or maintaining uses of places ear marked for development – activating spaces on a temporary basis.

A network of actors are involved in the governance of place. Networks are characterised by:

- Informal and formal relationships between actors. Institutions are important (discussed in sub-topic 3)
- Relationships that are characterised by power (discussed in sub-topic 4)

Local governments and developers often actively promote and resource placemaking projects and initiatives. The next sections highlights some of the reasons why local governments get involved.

### Exercise 1: 30mins. Brainstorm stakeholders and governance relationships in a place.

Instructions	Delivery	Time	Objective of the exercise
Before you begin: Organise into small groups. Each group should identify a place familiar to the group, where placemaking or development activity is occurring.	In class viable for online group discussion with some tweaks.		This exercise helps develop understanding of the complexity of stakeholder relationships in the governance of place, and through this an understanding of the network of influence that placemaking activities occur within.
1. Brainstorm as many responses as you can to the question: Who has a stake in this place?		5 min	
2. Identify relationships between the many stakeholders to each of the following. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Government</li> <li>• Local Council</li> <li>• Developer</li> </ul>		5-10 min	
3. For each relationship you identify, draw a connecting line and discuss what responsibilities and potential resources or benefits might be involved for both parties in that relationship.		5-10 min	
Groups report back: Describe some of the key/important forces and connections for each place discussed.		10mins	

## References for this subtopic

Healey, P. (2004). Creativity and Urban Governance. *disP - The Planning Review*, 40(158), 11-20.  
doi:10.1080/02513625.2004.10556888

Lyons, M. (2007). Place-shaping: a shared ambition for the future of local government. Accessed at:  
<http://www.lyonsinquiry.org.uk/>

## 2.2 Sub-topic 2: Placemaking has value for local governments and developers.

The previous section described how local governments and developers are not just stakeholder in placemaking, they promote and resource placemaking projects and initiatives. So why do local governments and developers support placemaking? What is in it for them?

The first thing to understand is that local governments are in fact made up of a variety of parts – each with their own objectives but subsumed under the local government organisational structure. These parts include the political body – the council – and the various administrative arms of local government – charged with managing land use development, environmental assets, ranger services, economic development and so on. This complex arrangement of local government interests plays an important role in place-based community initiatives.

### **Placemaking offers a way for local government and developers to meet responsibilities working with or around organisational capacities.**

Local government:

- Local governments' responsibilities have expanded but their resources have not. Local governments are seeking ways to meet growing expectations to deliver place quality outcomes.
- Placemaking was valued because it helped tap community capacity and develop community agency to shape places, helping to deliver on local government's expanded place responsibility.
- Rich understandings of a place were seen to enable placemaking activity to build on existing investment and what is already working and in a place; to understand common 'threads' between stakeholders to establish shared visions, and to deliver on community and commercial needs – a valuable approach when capacity to act is constrained.

Developers:

- Developers are required to make a profit but are also bound by social contract. These two drivers may be met through investment in place quality which both serves users and attracts investment.
- Increasingly for developers placemaking makes 'commercial sense'. 'Making place' was presented as a focus to achieve good experiences for stakeholders – be they commercial lessors, tenants, or users.

### **For both local government and developers, placemaking offers opportunities for positive relationships with stakeholders.**

- Placemaking is seen as a novel approach that invited community into decision making and delivery. Local government and developers value the dialogue with external groups that placemaking can catalyse.

- The opportunity for enhanced communication with the community and positive media coverage were valued by both local government and developers. Local council can be particularly sensitive to media coverage.
- For developers the shared vision and improved relationships with community can help achieve community and regulatory support for a proposal.
- For local government building a shared vision for place with community is valued as part of a larger shift in operational culture and moves to re-build trust between community and local government.

**Placemaking approaches offered opportunities for organisation change and cross-disciplinary collaboration.**

- For both local government and developer organisations placemaking has value for the new approach to operations that it offers. The quick and inexpensive testing often embedded in placemaking processes were valued not only for the quick wins to stakeholders, but also the way in which this rapid prototyping enabled organisational learning.
- Thinking about place experience was understood to demand a stepping out of disciplinary specialities, and for both local government and developers, placemaking was valued as a catalyst for working across specialisations within organisations. The value attributed to working across silos to address a common goal is reflective of broader societal moves to holistically address complex situations and is increasingly understood as good business management.

**Exercise 2: 20-25 mins. Identify value of placemaking activity to Local Government and developers.**

Instructions	Delivery	Time	Objective of the exercise
<p>Before you begin:</p> <p>Provide each small group with a definition of placemaking or summary of placemaking objectives from the PlaceAgency introductory module or the introductory chapter to <i>Placemaking Fundamentals</i> (Hes &amp; Hernandez-Santin 2019);</p> <p><b>and</b> either a developer vision statement, or Local Government place plan or local area vision document.</p>	<p>In class viable for online group discussion with some tweaks.</p>	<p>Time depends on complexity of documents 5-15 mins.</p>	<p>This exercise asks students to identify alignments between the objectives of local government, or developer and the objectives of placemaking activity.</p>
<p>1. Identify any matches between objective of placemaking and objectives of developer or local government. When do the objectives of placemaking and the local government or developer vision align?</p>			
<p>2. Identify any potential conflicts. When is there a mismatch or a potential for tension between the objectives of placemaking and the local government or developer vision?</p>			

Groups report back: Class seeks to identify any key groupings or types of synergies (and conflicts).	Report back 10mins	
--	-----------------------	--

### References for this subtopic

Creagh, R., C. Babb, H. Farley. (2019) “Local governments and developers in placemaking: defining their responsibilities and capacities to shape place.” In D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin *Placemaking fundamentals for the built environment*. Palgrave Macmillan.

## 2.3 Sub-topic 3: The placemaking activities of local governments and developers are constrained due to a number of factors, including their organisational objectives, frameworks and funding structures.

The capacity to shape place will ultimately depend on amount of **resources** allocated to activities that support the place enhancing activities.

- Engaging in activities to make better places can be very resource intensive – in time, money and skills.
- The scale of a place and work required will determine what type of resources are required to invest in enhancing places.
- Resources are required to be distributed equitably across the range of their representatives, this can be particularly challenging in fiscally stressed local governments,
- The resources available to developers to be allocated to place-enhancing endeavours are primarily based instead on broader economic conditions and market factors.

Local government and developers operate within various **institutional contexts** that define the different processes, rules, laws and norms that govern their activities.

- For example, the activities of **local governments** in Australia are significantly defined the legal institutions, with powers and processes set out in State Government legislation. Local governments also operate within democratic institutions and policies and concerns are shaped in response to citizens’ concerns.
- **Developers** operate within *market institutions*.
- By a better understanding of the set of enabling and constraining factors associated within these institutions can help explain the capacity of local governments and developers to shape places.

Other institutional factors that influence the capacity of local governments to shape place are:

- **Organisational structures and culture:** The capacity to support placemaking objectives and to create great places within a local government or as part of a development largely rests on whether there is the organizational structure or culture to support placemaking activities.
  - Some local governments and developers have discrete departments and personnel whose job it is to develop placemaking strategies or support placemaking activities. In these cases place-making is considered a normal part of the duties and activities of the organization.

- For organizations without dedicated place focused roles, often leaders or change agents within the organization will be an important catalyst for a change in organizational culture.
- The **management of risk** can be an important consideration for decision-making about changes of use in public places. The responsibilities to manage risks for local government are evident in a number of forms.
  - Local governments often have, for example, laws relating to restrictions on consumption of alcohol in certain places; signage, advertising and promotion of events; the conduct of recreation activities and hobbies; the use and development of spaces of co-ownership, such as verges; and the use of spaces for street entertainment, temporary business, alfresco dining, food trucks.
  - Many of these activities are important to place-making initiatives, whether it be activating a street, putting on an event, or building a community space. Local governments can use these by-laws to effectively manage risks and ensure a quality of experience for various users of space and private property owners or they can over-regulate spaces so that temporary activities that attract people to places are outlawed.

Other institutional factors that influence the capacity of developers to shape place are:

- **Social contact:** Though financial return to their stakeholders is a key responsibility, developers are bound by a broader social contract and are responsible to the public, particularly other actors who may be impacted by their developers such as nearby property owners or users of a place.
- **Planning regulations** are key instruments that define the responsibilities of developers to act.
  - Developers are required to address various planning regulations include limiting the impact of development on surrounding places, addressing various issues such as overshadowing, access and egress from a site, privacy, aesthetics or amenity.
  - Planning regulations may contribute to the quality and functioning of places by requiring developers to contribute to the built and social infrastructure that will be impacted by their development – enhancing the building/ street interface; limiting impacts of traffic on streets; or providing physical, green or social infrastructure to offset some negative impacts created by a development.
  - Planning regulations therefore have an important role in mediating the impacts that developers have in shaping the quality of the public realm.

**Exercise 3: 25 mins. Identify possible ‘snags’ for developers or local government organisations in pursuing a placemaking project.**

Instructions	Delivery	Time	Objective of the exercise
<p>Before you begin: Provide each group with a placemaking case study, either of your own choosing or from the PlaceAgency websites.</p> <p>Each group is to take on the persona of either a developer, local council or placemaking consultant and consider the implications of seeking to undertake the case study project.</p>	<p>In class viable for online group discussion with some tweaks.</p>		<p>This exercise asks student to engage with the capacity of local government and developers to enhance and constrain placemaking – and that these capacities are constrained by their organisational objectives,</p>

Each group should present some key constraints for the following project stages, and identify some ideas about how to approach these constraints.		frameworks and funding structures.
1. Before we even start talking to groups of people about this project we need to consider:	5min	
2. When working with the stakeholders in early phases of implementation we need to consider:	5min	
3. When planning for and undertaking evaluation of the project (evaluation might occur at several points in the project not just the end) we need to consider:	5min	
Report back. What were constraints and capacities that shaped the groups' discussions?	Report back 10min	

### References for this subtopic

Creagh, R., C. Babb, H. Farley. (2019) "Local governments and developers in placemaking: defining their responsibilities and capacities to shape place." In D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin *Placemaking fundamentals for the built environment*. Palgrave Macmillan.

## 2.4 Sub-topic 4: Not all developer and local government activity is aligned with placemaking objectives.

Local governments and developers have responsibilities to shape places in positive ways, as demonstrated in 2.1, and local governments and developers value placemaking, as shown in Section 2.2. Despite this local government and developers may also in hinder placemaking activities, through masking, meddling and corruption.

- Fincher *et al* (2016) describe *place masking* as happening when improvements are made to the public realm and economic gains are made, without consideration or support for social equity concerns. Place masking is often apparent in the recent incorporation of placemaking within urban renewal schemes, where placemaking activities and resources are used as an instrument of gentrification. Masking occurs when placemaking becomes "*exhibit at the expense of those who inhabit*" (Fincher *et al* 2016, 517).
- **Meddling** occurs when local governments and developers deliberately interfere to stop or limit activities that may contribute positive place-based outcomes. Meddling can be more or less deliberate, or it can be

justified on the basis of supporting other objectives that may be mutually exclusive of place enhancing activities.

- Decision-making is ideally transparent and open to participation from communities. However, the reality is that decision-making is often acted through informal networks, characterized by secrecy and sometimes may be **corruption**.
- Local government acts set out the principles for which councillors and local government employees are to act in accordance with. Common principles include:
  - Acting according to the law
  - Transparency
  - Good governance

#### Exercise 4: 35mins. Placemaking or placemarketing?

Instructions	Delivery	Time	Objective of the exercise
<p>Before you begin. Note: This exercise could be done as a group discussion, or constructed as a debate.</p> <p>Direct students to the online presence of a top down (developer or local government driven) place activation activity.</p>	<p>In class viable for online group discussion with some tweaks.</p>		<p>This exercise helps students to consider the ways in which the discourse of placemaking can be appropriated with marketing campaigns of Local Governments and developers.</p>
<p>Ask students to prepare to debate or discuss whether this is placemaking or marketing.</p>		15min	
<p>Small group discussion could be followed by either a report in, or a debate.</p>		(20mins).	

#### References for this subtopic

Fincher, Ruth, Maree Pardy, and Kate Shaw. 2016. "Place-Making or Place-Masking? The Everyday Political Economy of "Making Place"." *Planning Theory & Practice* 17 (4): 516-536.





**Imagine. Inspire. Connect. Create.**