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Subject: Histories, Stories and Voices in Manchester’s Public Realm programme - update

Report of: Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods)

Summary

This report provides an update about the Histories, Stories and Voices programme, including:

- Findings of the public consultation about statues, monuments memorials, artworks in Manchester’s public realm.
- A summary of the draft Cultural and Heritage Object Review report and next steps.
- Information and context about the Public Art Strategy consultancy, which will take place over the coming months.

The purpose of the initiative is to review how the city’s historical and current day diversity is reflected in the city’s public realm and has been supported by a project board chaired by the Deputy Leader.

A consultation and engagement strategy reached out to 1439 people including residents and stakeholders with the support of heritage charity Manchester Histories. The consultation results across an online survey and focus groups indicate that there is public appetite for discussion about statues, monuments, memorials, plaques, and place names in public spaces in Manchester. The consultation findings also provide an indication of the diversity and complexity of views and feelings people hold on this topic.

A Culture and Heritage Object Review was commissioned by the council from Manchester Metropolitan University’s, Manchester Centre for Public History and Heritage. The work to date includes the creation of database of 200 objects - statues, monuments, memorials, and artworks in the public realm, which will be transferred to Manchester Archives + in September 2021. Despite increasing recognition of achievement by women, the review recognised that they are still under-represented by objects in the public realm and that most individuals represented would be perceived as white males by many people viewing them.

The Culture and Heritage Object Review report makes several recommendations for the city council and partners to consider including the proposed use of the resulting detailed database of objects as a management tool, and to make the information more accessible and interactive for the public.
The report describes plans for the preparation of a Public Art Strategy for the city and the tender process currently underway for consultancy support. The Strategy will be used to inform and guide decision-making and ensure future Public Art installations help to deliver a public realm that matches the wider ambitions for the city.

**Recommendations**

The committee is asked to consider and comment on the information in the report.

---

**Wards Affected:** All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Environmental Impact Assessment</strong> - the impact of the issues addressed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The commission for the development of a Public Art Strategy for the city includes considerations to reduce potential the environmental impacts of creating new works for the public realm and the maintenance of new and existing works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Our Manchester Strategy outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Summary of how this report aligns to the OMS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A thriving and sustainable city:</strong> supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities</td>
<td>A high-quality, interesting and distinctive public realm, including public art, contributes to the city’s growth strategy, playing a role in attracting investment, contributing to the city’s tourism offer and associated employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A highly skilled city:</strong> world class and home-grown talent sustaining the city’s economic success</td>
<td>Public art developments in the public realm can provide opportunities for local artists in delivering artworks, engaging with local communities and training or mentoring opportunities. As well as opportunities for the local supply chain to provide materials and additional specialist services (e.g., installation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A progressive and equitable city:</strong> making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities</td>
<td>Integral to the Histories, Stories and Voices programme is considering how Manchester’s culture and history as told through the city’s public realm is increasingly holistic, meaningful, and reflective of the city’s communities past and modern-day identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work and play

The commission for the development of a Public Art Strategy for the city includes considerations to reduce potential environmental impacts of creating new works for the public realm and the maintenance of new and existing works. A high quality and distinctive public realm, including arts works, makes the city attractive and engaging for residents and visitors.

A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth

A high quality and distinctive public realm, including public art works, supported and promoted by accessible, digital applications (as recommended for future development in this report) can provide international reach and support connectivity with other places.

Contact Officers:

Name: Fiona Worrall  
Position: Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods)  
Telephone: 0161 234 3926  
E-mail: fiona.worrall@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Neil MacInnes  
Position: Head of Libraries, Galleries and Culture  
Telephone: 07717 435 204  
E-mail: neil.macinnes@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Zoe Williams  
Position: Culture Lead, Libraries, Galleries and Culture  
Telephone: 07947 360 174  
E-mail: zoe.williams@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy, please contact one of the contact officers above.

- Eventure Research, Public Realm Consultation, Coding and Analysis Report, April 2021
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Histories, Stories and Voices in Manchester’s Public Realm is a project to review how the city’s historical and current day diversity is reflected in the city’s public realm. This report provides an update on delivery of the programme.

2.0 Background

2.1 Manchester is described as the world’s first industrial city, with a rich past, diverse communities, a modern outlook and a dynamic future. It is important that these characteristics are reflected by the city’s public realm. Our ambition is to ensure that the stories of Manchester’s culture and history as told through the city’s public realm is increasingly holistic, meaningful, and reflective of the city’s communities past and modern-day identity.

2.2 The City Council is reviewing what is in Manchester’s public spaces, what information is provided about it and how it gets there -- now and in the future. The programme is delivered within the context of the recent and on-going national and international debate about who and what is represented in public spaces.

2.3 There are 3 strands to the review:

- A public consultation – completed
- A review of Cultural and Heritage Objects in Manchester’s Public Realm – Draft report received
- Development of a Public Art Strategy for the city – October – December 2021

2.4 A Project Board, chaired by the City Council’s Deputy Leader, is overseeing the review. The board includes representation from both universities in the city and the civic, community and private sectors.

2.5 Whilst the city council is leading the Histories, Stories and Voices programme, through the Board, the initiative is engaging other stakeholders with a view to informing shared aims and best practice standards for the city towards achieving the programme’s ambition. Within the Council, officers from Culture, including the Art Gallery and Policy, as well as, Public Realm, Planning, Neighbourhoods and City Centre Growth & Infrastructure have been consulted and informed delivery of the programme’s 3 strands.

3.0 Consultation

3.1 A public consultation was held between 4th February and 22nd March 2021 as a starting point to find out what people living and working in Manchester think about who and what is represented in the public spaces of Manchester and to stimulate discussion about inclusion and representation in the public realm.

3.2 Manchester Histories were engaged to support the consultation process. Manchester Histories are an award-winning charity that collaborates with
communities, individuals and organisations to reveal and celebrate the histories and heritage of Greater Manchester. They also host the Manchester Histories Festival.

3.3 The scope of the consultation was informed by the Histories, Stories and Voices Project Board and a panel of individuals from the University of Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University, Greater Manchester Health & Social Care Partnership, HideOut Youth Zone, Artists and community members convened by Manchester Histories.

3.4 The agreed principles for the consultation were that it should:

- Take a discursive approach by including both closed and open questions, recognising this the start of a conversation;
- Provide space for diverse voices and opinions to be heard;
- Be used to inform the City Council’s and its partners strategic approach to memorials and artworks in the future, including community/resident involvement;
- Not just focus on statues, but also include monuments, memorials, plaques, and place names in public spaces.

3.5 The consultation took place during the 3rd Coronavirus national lockdown (January – April 2021) and therefore all consultation activity took place on-line. Officers had hoped to be able to gather opinions using a pavement survey but due to COVID restrictions this was not possible and may have reduced opportunities to canvass responses from people who were not already engaging with public heritage.

3.6 The consultation was well promoted via the city council’s and partner organisations’ community networks, social media platforms and local media, leading to 1439 people taking part consultation overall.

3.7 The consultation process consisted of; an on-line survey completed by 1285 respondents; 2 public on-line public forum discussions and an on-line focus group with Manchester Youth Council, a total of 141 participants across all these sessions; 13 Video Box contributors who provided thoughts via a filmed monologue or thought piece.

3.8 Across all consultation activity, people were asked to consider:

- If what was in the public realm was a good reflection of Manchester, its history and its communities, including their own
- What their favourite and least favourite items were and why
- What was important to them when deciding what to put in public spaces

4.0 Consultation findings

4.1 The closed questions required respondents to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statements. The results are summarised below:
• Respondents were most concerned that the public realm reflect moments, movements, or people of historical significance, were educational and accessible.

• A significant number (over 60% of respondents) also thought that it was important to ask community views, ensure high artistic quality, reflect moments, movements, or people of community significance, have a maintenance programme, and be thought provoking.

• Respondents were least concerned about creating international or outward looking designs or incorporating digital technology in planning and design.

• Most respondents were neutral about involving young people in planning and design.

4.2 The open questions in the survey gave respondents an opportunity to expand on their thoughts, which provided more context and nuanced reasoning behind preferences.

4.3 Enventure Research was commissioned to undertake the coding and analysis of all open-ended responses received to the consultation to ensure a robust and consistent approach.

5.0 Summary Enventure Research report findings:

5.1 Is what is in the public realm was a good reflection of Manchester, its history and its communities?

5.1.1 When asked to provide further comment about the objects (buildings, place names, monuments, statues etc.) currently in Manchester’s public spaces, the most common response (29%) was that the objects represent good and bad aspects of history and that it was important to remember all of history. Example verbatim quotes are included below:

“History both good and bad should be remembered. Whether we support the values of them or not. Because to erase history is to forget history and to forget forces its repeat. Add modern statues maybe but to remove old ones whitewashes the good and the bad.”

“They represent true history. I am astounded anyone could think about removing or replacing them.”

5.1.2 However, a small proportion (7%) of respondents indicated that they disliked or disagreed with certain objects and what they represent. Example verbatim quotes are included below:

“Having Gandhi is an insult for everything Pankhurst stood for. Gandhi is not a saint, nor a hero. He is a misogynist.”

“Many of Manchester’s statues have links to the slave trade. They are old. We should be celebrating not rich people but people from diverse backgrounds who have made a positive contribution.”

5.1.3 A further 18% believed that objects should not be removed, replaced, or renamed. Example verbatim quotes are included below:
“LEAVE THEM ALONE THIS IS MADNESS!!!!!”
“Nothing should be done to any of Manchester’s monuments, place names and statues.”
“I do not like the way certain groups e.g., BLM (Black Lives Matter) are trying to politicise our heritage. To get rid of statues is a negative cynical attempt to alter what has already happened before. If you want to put up new statues go ahead but please do not embark on an attack of British culture in Manchester to satisfy a vocal minority.”

5.1.4 Diversity of the objects currently in the public realm was highlighted as an issue amongst some respondents, with some suggestions focusing on the belief that any new objects should be more diverse and a better reflection of Manchester’s society in the modern day.

For example, 17% said there should be more representation of women or that there were too many men currently. A further 16% stating that the objects are not diverse, inclusive, or reflective of Manchester and that more diversity was needed. Moreover, 14% stated that there should be more representation of ethnic minorities or that there was too much focus on white individuals currently. Example verbatim quotes include:

“There are too many male Victorian industrialists. Manchester’s history is much wider. The lack of women is appalling.”
“There’s only one woman. There are statues of slavers and colonialists and those who supported subjugation of people. There’s very little representing our diverse population or our social history.”
“We need to have not only more statues which represent the African communities of Manchester. Our communities are now so diverse however our place names, statues and plaques do not represent that. Also place names should not only be in the neighbourhoods in which African, Caribbean or Asians live. They should be in all and any community so that people will learn about other communities, through using their natural inquiry skills.”

5.1.5 Subgroup analysis was undertaken to explore the results provided by different respondent groups to the consultation, such as gender, age group, ethnicity, and disability. Subgroup analysis was only undertaken where at least 100 comments were provided and where the subgroup size was at least 20.

5.1.6 Female respondents were more likely than male respondents to suggest that there should be more representation of women or that there were too many men (28% compared with 9%), or that objects are not diverse, inclusive, or reflective of Manchester or that more diversity is needed (22% compared with 11%).

5.1.7 Conversely, male respondents were more likely than female respondents to suggest objects represent good and bad history and it is important to remember history (36% compared with 19%) and that objects should not be removed, replaced, or renamed (22% compared with 12%).
5.1.8 Compared with the overall results, those aged up to 25 were more likely to say they notice or like all objects (21% compared with 12%) and that the objects are an important part of the city landscape or are tourist attractions (18% compared with 7%).

5.1.9 The following subgroups were most likely to suggest more representation of ethnic minorities/too much focus on white individuals (14% overall):

- Female respondents (19%) compared with male respondents (9%)
- BAME respondents (25%) compared with those of white ethnicity (13%)
- Those who indicated they had a disability (30%) compared with those who indicated that they did not (14%)

5.2 Favourite Objects in the Public Realm

5.2.1 Respondents were asked to identify their favourite objects in Manchester’s public spaces across four separate questions. Common responses in terms of favourite object were:

- bronze sculpture of Emmeline Pankhurst in St Peter’s Square (16%);
- Alan Turing memorial in Sackville Park, and the Queen Victoria statue situated on the Piccadilly Esplanade (11%)
- Abraham Lincoln in Lincoln Square (7%)
- Robert Peel in Piccadilly Gardens (6%)

5.2.2 Other favoured objects that do not depict an individual include the Peterloo memorial (4%), Victory over Blindness (4%), the Vimto sculpture (3%) and the Cenotaph, also known as the St Peter’s Square war memorial (2%).

5.2.3 Common reasons provided by respondents as why objects were liked included:

- that they are of historical significance or represent history (45%)
- they represent Manchester and local people (32%) (while 10% said they represent Britain or British society)
- favourite objects were an important, inspiring or an influential figure (26%)
- favourite objects were meaningful or emotive (26%) or celebrated achievement or legacy (15%)
- favourite objects were interesting, educational and informative (10%), and a further 7% suggesting they were thought provoking or a talking point.
- their favourite objects were of good design or were attractive or impressive (17%)

5.2.4 Examples of verbatim quotes about favourite objects:

“Represent untold stories that people can really connect with. Manchester is the home of radicals, revolutionaries, and rebels; built on the back of those less fortunate, these stories deserve to be told and celebrated.”

“They’re distinctively British history. Something we should be proud of and not smear and erase.”
“...They connect us to a past that was often messy and horrible and sad, but they enliven the streets and give them interest. People should learn from history not try to destroy it because it is uncomfortable for them.”

5.3 Most Disliked Objects in the Public Realm

5.3.1 Respondents were asked to identify their least favourite objects in Manchester’s public spaces across four separate questions. Common responses in terms of least favourite object were:

- The bronze statue of Queen Victoria on the Piccadilly Esplanade (12%);
- Not having a least favourite object, that they were all important and they all represent history (11%);
- Friedrich Engels, the Peterloo memorial and Mahatma Gandhi (5% each),
- Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington and the George Floyd Mural (4% each)

5.3.2 Common reasons provided as why objects were disliked included;

- that they are unsightly or of a poor design (25%)
- they have no link to Manchester (17%)
- the object depicts a controversial figure, event or ideology (16%)
- the object is outdated, irrelevant or uninteresting (13%)

5.3.3 A slightly larger proportion of respondents suggested that the objects which were disliked should be left where they were and not be removed (13%) compared with those who believed they should be removed, moved or put in a museum (10%).

5.3.4 Another common suggestion for what should be done about the existing objects was to add more signage or contextual information alongside the existing objects, suggested by 10% of respondents.

5.3.5 Examples of verbatim quotes about least favourite objects:

- “Boer War was an imperialist conflict where the British used concentration camps, it is inappropriate to memorialise it.”
- “Feels like we are celebrating monarchy and Empire, neither of which do I care about. And British Empire is responsible for so many current day problems (both in and outside the UK).”
- “All statues have a place...love them all as they all tell us something.”
- “None [should be removed]. I don’t approve of censorship or trying to rewrite history. Our present views cannot be superimposed on historical ideas.”
- “I think we should keep the Victorian statues but maybe change signage to explain their context better.”

6.0 Who completed the survey?

6.1 Manchester Centre for Public History at Manchester Metropolitan University undertook some analysis of the demographic responses to the on-line survey.
The analysis provides a useful indication about who responded to the survey, but it should be noted that:

- a proportion of respondents did not have Manchester postcodes (although this does not preclude respondents from having a connection with the city, e.g., work, visitor, in education, former resident etc).
- published population statistics for Manchester are estimates calculated from various sources.
- a percentage of respondents (7 – 9%) did not provide demographic information

Demographic analysis of the on-line survey respondents was also provided by the city council’s Performance Research and Intelligence: Data Governance team which has provided the graphics below.

6.2 Gender Identity

- Of respondents identified as Male: 45%
- Of respondents identified as Female: 43%
- 3% of respondents identified their gender as Other
- 3% of respondents in this category specified their gender as Non-Binary
- 1% of respondents identified as Transgender:
- Of those that responded to this question, 87% identified their gender as the same as at birth. 12% preferred not to say

93% Response Rate
6.3 Age

The consultation responses show a significant number of responses from the age groups 50–64 years [30% respondents v. 13% city residents] and 65–74 years [11% respondents v. 5% residents]. The 40–49 years band was slightly overrepresented at 15% v. 11% but those younger than 39 years were underrepresented.

6.4 Disability

Only 5% of respondents gave a positive answer when asked if they considered themselves to have a disability, however 13% of respondents identified as living with a specific type of disability. 4% of respondents who identified as disabled preferred not to state their disability type.
5% of respondents indicated that they considered themselves to have a disability and 19% of respondents identified as living with a specific type of disability. There is no population data available for disability to inform if these figures are representative.

6.5 Ethnicity

White British individuals were overrepresented amongst survey respondents at 73% v. 59% of residents. White Irish was slightly overrepresented (3% v. 2%). All other ethnicities were under-represented, those of African descent significantly so at 1% respondents v. 5% of the population.
6.6  Sexual Orientation

15% of survey respondents identified as LGBT+ whereas Manchester’s LGBT+ population is estimated to be 6% of the population.

6.7  The demographic analysis shows that residents were most likely to complete the survey if they were male, of white ethnic heritage, aged 50-64 years old and living in Central or South Manchester. There is underrepresentation from those under 39 years old, people living in the North or East of the city and people of ethnicities other than white ethnic heritage.

7.0  Focus Groups

7.1  The focus groups took place on-line with people who had booked places via Eventbrite. An afternoon and evening session took place on Wednesday March 8, 2021, with a total of 136 people attending. Postcodes were collected, most participants lived in or close to Manchester, with a small amount of people attending from across the UK. Most attendees identified as female (108 people), 45 people identified as male and 8 people identified their gender as ‘other’.
7.1.1 Postcode Map of attendees taking part in discussion sessions.

7.2 Both sessions opened with contributions from 4 speakers:

- Gary Younge an award-winning author, broadcaster and a professor of sociology at the University of Manchester.
- Kerin Morris an artist & youth mentor at HideOut Youth Zone (Gorton), who also runs her own business ‘Actively Mad’ which supports young people and vulnerable adults access the arts.
- Prof. Hakim Adi a Professor of the History of Africa and the African Diaspora at the University of Chichester. Hakim was the first historian of African heritage to become a professor of history in Britain.
- Alan Rice a Professor in English and American Studies at the University of Central Lancashire, Preston, co-director of the Institute for Black Atlantic Research (IBAR) and director of the University of Central Lancaster Lancashire Research Centre in Migration, Diaspora and Exile (MIDEX)

7.2.1 Each speaker introduced their work, sharing their point of view and some provocation or questions to stimulate and inform discussion. This was followed by 30 minute facilitated discussion groups comprising of 4 -8 people and a final plenary of feedback session by each discussion group to the whole meeting. Participants were randomly allocated to the discussion groups.

7.3 Both sessions and all the focus groups were recorded. A transcript was made from the plenary session and insights from a thematic reading were identified by Manchester Histories.

7.4 Of high importance to participants in the focus groups was:
Consultation and collaboration between decision makers, residents and artists, involving a diversity of people and voices;

Future commemoration and memorialisation should increase the diversity of representation in the public realm;

Developments in the public realm should be accessible;

Improving education and information resources about objects in the public realm, with many suggesting the development/promotion of trails and interactive engagement tools (e.g., digital);

Considering different ways to memorialise or commemorate that are not statues or sculptures, for example, creating green, gathering spaces, digital, performance or temporary installations. As well as encouraging innovation this theme also highlighted that considerations of cost and maintenance were important;

Artworks should be of high quality;

Artworks should encourage people to interact with the public realm, be fun, colourful and engaging;

Putting art in public spaces – bringing the gallery outside and engaging with people you might not visit an art gallery. The 50 Windows of Creativity exhibition that placed artworks in public spaces across the city centre during Autumn 2020 was cited as a good example several times.

7.5 Examples of feedback from the focus groups:

*When statues fall, we're not tearing up history we're creating new moments and memories, which creates history.*

*We talked about the fact that things don't necessarily need to be taken away but perhaps put in context when in new ways.*

*First one was about representation, and the imbalance that exists at the moment with the vast majority of older white folks that are in very permanent settings, so we definitely wanted to see more representation of working-class people and their struggles, women, people of colour, and LGBT people and disabled people, so these were all, like, missing...*  
*History is about people rather than monuments.*

...we had a really interesting discussion around interaction, and how things in your public space should, you know, invite interaction. However, sometimes that's not always positive interaction, and how do you get that, that, that balance between inviting people to be part of what's in the public realm, and at the same also protecting what's in the public realm.  
*And there should be a lot more fun. It should be a lot more fun so that people can interact and through doing things through sort of digital and digital spaces trails that kind of thing.*

8.0 Video Box

8.1 Manchester Histories also invited the public and key individuals to take part in an online video box slot to express their own views about the monuments, statues, place names and other features in Manchester's public places.
8.2 These sessions were recorded, and a short video was produced to document a selection of people’s views as part of the consultation process. To watch the short film visit: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t6TAv6iOYwo

9.0 Youth Council

9.1 Manchester Histories also facilitated an on-line focus group session with a group of young people from Manchester Youth Council. They were asked the same set of questions as in the on-line focus groups discussion to keep the consultation consistent across all sessions.

9.2 Of key importance to the group were:

- Better representation and being able to identify with history that is relevant to them;
- Celebrating the people and places of today rather than just the past;
- Using digital technologies to tell stories rather than just putting up statues;
- Talking to people especially young people to ask them what they want, don’t leave them out of the conversation;
- Things should happen in local areas not just the city centre.

9.3 Examples of feedback from young people’s focus group

I’d like to do a public forum and ask people... It’s actually good to speak to people and know what they want …rather than speaking for them
I’d definitely put something to celebrate, like the diversity of people because even though there is like a few things out there which show the diverse stuff ... there’s nothing really out there that is just like saying what kind of city we are.. it’s just like, oh these people came from our city in the past, look at them, it’s nothing like what Manchester is now
I don’t think there’s anything wrong with you know saying that, you know, we’ve done some heinous things in the past. I don’t think there’s anything wrong with admitting that.
Using digital stuff like apps and geo caching would be good, but not everyone has technology so having things in local hubs, like libraries would, be good.

10.0 Consultation – conclusion

10.1 The consultation results across the survey and focus groups are not conclusive but they do provide a good indication that there is public appetite for discussion about statues, monuments, memorials, plaques and place names in public spaces in Manchester. The consultation also provides an indication of the diversity and complexity of views and feelings people hold on this topic.

10.2 The consultation was intended to the starting point for a conversation with residents, stakeholders and other interested parties and the City Council. The consultation results and recommendations from the Culture and Heritage Object Review suggest that further involvement is wanted, and this should be included in future public art strategy. Consideration of consultation principles
that the city may want to adopt is included in the specification for the Public Art Strategy Framework, which is being developed part of the Histories, Stories and Voices programme later this year.

11.0 Review of cultural and heritage objects in the city

11.1 Manchester Metropolitan University’s, Manchester Centre for Public History and Heritage was successful in tendering for the Histories, Stories and Voices in Manchester’s Public Realm Cultural and Heritage Object Review. This piece of work is in its completing phase, the final draft project report has been received and the database of objects, including, statues, monuments, memorials and artworks in the public realm, has been created and will be transferred to Manchester Archives + later in September.

11.2 The purpose of the review was to gather information to support greater understanding of objects’ historical context and modern-day reflections, with a view to providing a good basis for informed debate, research and reflection about our current values, identity and collective histories as a city.

11.3 The review recognised that whilst cultural and heritage objects do not tell the history of the city (although that is often how they are perceived) they are illustrative of the concerns, values and influences of time at which they were commissioned.

11.4 The objectives of the review were to:

- Survey known cultural and heritage objects in Manchester’s public realm and create a database of related information sources
- Capture objects which may not already be recorded, such as modern-day memorials
- Collate information about the historical context for objects and their siting
- Identify ways to strengthen the role of public realm objects in realising the city Council’s Equality Objectives 2020 – 2024
- Highlight any objects of concern in a modern-day values context or that are the subject of significant controversy or at potential risk
- Research options for a user-friendly online information resource (database) about cultural and heritage in the public realm

12.0 Cultural and Heritage Object Database – design

12.1 The database has been designed to be a robust and scalable foundation for diverse future outputs, such as public research resources, tools for improving accessibility and inclusion, visitor maps and self-guided tours, and policies relating to existing and future public realm objects. Each object listed within the database is accompanied by a description, references to whom or what the object represents and who created it (and when), a list of archival and media resources which reference the object, PDFs of any media resources that may not stay online, and in most cases several photographs of the object. Location data has been included to connect to Geographic Information Systems software and to assist planning and management.
12.2 The database is not intended as a completed piece of work but provides a template to continue to document other objects and items of cultural and historical interest (e.g. street names) over time. Members of the public will be able to suggest additions – both for objects not captured as yet and sources of information about objects.

12.3 Diverse lists of heritage objects and cultural priorities were derived via consultation with:

DaDaFest (disability and deaf arts organisation)
Greater Manchester Disabled People’s Archive
Gender Identity Research & Education Society
Jenny Marsden (archivist, Archives+)
Karen Shannon (Chief Executive, Manchester Histories)
LGBT Foundation
LGBTPlus History Month
Manchester Art Gallery
Manchester Centre for Public History & Heritage staff
Manchester Metropolitan University staff & students
Manchester Modernist Society
Manchester Public Realm Team
Manchester Victorian Society
Nubian Jak Community Trust
University of Manchester
Peter Kalu (writer for Black History Month, collaborator with Colonial Countryside)
Rethink Mental Illness
Scope
Stonewall
Terry Wyke’s Public Sculpture of Greater Manchester
The Equality Trust
University of Manchester Special Collections, Archives

12.4 See Appendix 1 for a list of objects included in the database to date (July 2021).

13.0 Cultural and Heritage Object Review - Results and Assessments

13.1 The review assessed the 119 persons directly represented by objects on the database list and found that:

14 (12%) were female
28 (24%) were of constitutional significance (political, legal)
18 (15%) are remembered for military bravery
17 (14%) represented STEM achievements
13 (11%) were men of religion
11 (9%) signified literacy
8 (7%) were British heads of state
5 (4%) specialised in music
5 (4%) are remembered for acts of aviation derring-do
5 (4%) were what we called “everyday heroes” (firefighters, Captain Tom)
5 (4%) were active in the visual arts
3 (3%) are associated with tragic events (Holocaust, teenage suicide)
*Assessment of the ethnic and racial identities of the people represented was outside the scope of the research

13.2 Despite increasing recognition of achievement by women, they are still under-represented by objects identified by the review. Most people represented in the database would be perceived as white males by many people viewing them.

13.3 The Histories, Stories and Voices consultation generated a list of individuals who were felt to be worthy of commemoration by the consultation respondents, and which could be a useful starting point for considering future public realm objects. 89% of “people, events or movements” suggested for memorialisation by consultation respondents were not subjects that had been identified by the review of existing cultural and heritage objects.

14.0 Cultural and Heritage Objects Review - Recommendations

14.1 The report provides several short- and longer-term recommendations for the city council and partners to consider. In summary these are:

- steps that can be taken to make the project database both useful as a management tool, and accessible to the public;
- steps that can be taken to continue to update and grow the database, including contributions from members of the public;
- suggestions for longer term use of the data in combination with other digital technologies aimed at embedding the information in the public arena;
- suggestions to addresses wider issues of inclusion and diversity that have been identified during the review, in combination with the public consultation results. For example, digital interaction and fuller interpretation information and on-going community engagement and consultation.

15.0 Cultural and Heritage Objects Review - Next steps

15.1 The City Council will receive the cultural and heritage object database, which will be hosted by Manchester Archives+ in the Central Library and will explore possibilities to make the database more accessible to the public. It will also be shared with colleagues with responsibility for the public realm to develop the management tool capability in the most appropriate way.

15.2 Recommendations regarding the development of interactive digital resources for public engagement will require external funding and partnerships to engage appropriate expertise and to ensure any resource is relevant to and embedded with partners across the city so that it is well used and has longevity. We will continue to work with Manchester Histories and partners on the History, Stories and Voices Project Board and others towards this.
15.3 We will also continue to develop partnerships with other relevant initiatives we have connected with during the Histories, Stories and Voices programme, including:

In Manchester’s DNA, a project works with schools, local history groups, and creative artists to produce resources around ideas of identity, place, citizenship. The key partners are University of Manchester, MRI Library, Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre and the John Rylands University Library. The first set of projects was schools work, creating resources for students to think about identity, place, language, and migration. The resources are freely available for all to use. The project took place last school year but will run again from September-March. Other plans include securing funding for a year-long ‘Manchester DNA’ cultural festival in partnership with UNESCO City of Literature.

Manchester Museum’s Our Shared Cultural Heritage project led by Sadia Habib seeks to test and evaluate new models for engaging young people from the South Asian diaspora and their peers with heritage. The project supports young people in leading on activities and events that are relevant and useful to their lives, identities and communities, and that explore the shared histories and cultures of the UK and South Asia.

MADE, Manchester’s Cultural Education Partnership, is a collaboration between cultural organisations and schools who work together to maximise the connections between culture, creativity and education. MADE is establishing a new task group to develop new heritage resources focussing on local history and diversity. Manchester Histories will play an active role in this task group.

15.4 Recommendations to address wider issues of inclusion and diversity will be considered during the Public Art Strategy consultancy in further consultation with partners and stakeholders.

16.0 Public Art Strategy development

16.1 The third and final deliverable in the Histories, Stories and Voices programme is the development of a Public Art Strategy for Manchester. The council is seeking specialist consultancy support for this work, which is expected to be completed by the end of the calendar year.

16.2 Public art can take many forms and can be valuable in contributing to the cultural and aesthetic quality of a place, enhancing its unique character and identity. In addition to this, public art can help attract visitors, enhance neighbourhoods and support the development, economic growth and the attractiveness of a city. Manchester has a variety of public art; however, it is recognised that there is a predominance of statues and monuments that commemorate historical figures.

16.3 The Public Art Strategy will establish a coherent, strategic framework for the approach and decision making regarding high-quality public art for the city. It will articulate Manchester’s priorities for artworks in the public realm, informing
future commissioning and de-commissioning decisions; review and clarify the decision-making process; provide a guide that ensures proposals contribute to a high quality, inclusive and accessible public realm; and establishes a funding and maintenance strategy to secure the long-term viability of existing and new works.

16.4 The Public Art Strategy’s priorities will be informed by the Histories, Stories and Voices consultation and Cultural and Heritage Review, the Our Manchester Strategy and on-going dialogue with stakeholders and residents, which is why it is being undertaken as the last phase of the Histories, Stories and Voices in Manchester’s Public Realm programme.

16.5 The Strategy will be used to inform and guide decision-making and ensure proposals deliver public realm that matches the wider ambitions for the city and will look at how future commissions can better reflect the diversity of the city and help redress the historical imbalance. The framework will be a shared document, available for use by arts practitioners, community initiators, public agencies, the independent and commercial development sectors, as well as the city council.

17.0 Conclusion

17.1 The Histories, Stories and Voices in Manchester’s Public Realm programme has made some significant progress to date, including:

Delivery, despite the challenges of the pandemic, of an inclusive and engaging consultations process which has provided valuable insights into people’s views about the current objects in the city and suggestions for improvements, themes, subjects and formats for the future.

Production of the city’s most detailed review of cultural and heritage objects in the public realm, providing the most comprehensive overview of information to date and in a format that will support future digital access and public engagement activities.

A commissioning process to prepare a public art strategy for the city is underway. The resulting plan will influence future decision making about public art (including statues, monuments and memorials), ensuring that Manchester has a world class public realm that is increasingly reflective of the city’s communities past and modern-day identity.

18.0 Recommendations

Recommendations can be found at the front of this report.