'Messing About in Boats': The Heritage Livescape of Glasgow's Canal and Clydebuilt Festivals

Eleni Koumpouzi, Katarzyna Kosmala and Gareth Rice

Introduction

Heritage urban waterscapes are perceived as contested territories, where spatial politics of different scales are set in motion (Clark, Kearns and Cleland 2016; Pollock and Paddison 2014). In deprived areas, neglected post-industrial urban heritage environments experience regeneration. In Glasgow, the 'reinvention' of these environments as festival locations occurs in places where, in recent memory, people created and sustained their livelihoods (Bruttomesso 2004). Once providing the area with its livelihood and identity, the festivals' heritage waterscapes are now employed in renewing meanings of community ownership. As in other cities, Glasgow's renewal process engages culture in an attempt to solve socio-economic issues (Tretter 2009). The Glasgow Canal Festival (GCF) emerged as part of the Speirs Locks and the Applecross Street basin developments on the Forth and Clyde Canal (FCC) in north Glasgow (Gray 2018). On the north bank of the River Clyde, the Clydebuilt Festival's (CF) location on the

---

Riverside is integral to the Clyde Waterfront Project (2003–2011). Billed as the biggest regeneration project in Scotland (Pollock 2019), it also includes the new iconic Riverside Museum alongside the Tall Ship and Kelvin Harbour.

This study involved two transient and marginalised community groups and investigated the nature of their engagement with the two festivals, based at two locations along the FCC. Over twelve months from October 2019, the groups were involved in a National Lottery Heritage funded project, CanalCraft, run by the Forth and Clyde Canal Society (FCCS) and during that project, the groups engaged in boat building and boating activities. The groups took their boats to the two festivals which served as a platform for them to showcase their achievements through participation in the community and to re-activate these urban waterways.

We argue that the re-activation of the waterways, and direct community engagement with the post-industrial landscape of the River Clyde and the Forth and Clyde Canal and the barriers and tensions that derive from it, form the *livescape*. This re-activation demands an understanding of the complex perceptions of the locality. Stevenson (2013) has argued that this understanding should include the present, as well as the historical, use value of the waterways for the local community. The question of how transient and marginalised communities have fostered a sense of belonging by removing barriers of access and facilitating use of the waterways was therefore central to the study. In this context, we also examined how place-making processes and hierarchical knowledge based agency are challenged in the contested heritage livescape. Overall, the chapter focuses on the use value of participation in the festivals, the integration opportunities which they offered to the transient communities, and the livescape as an emerged framework.

The chapter is structured in the following way. First, an account of the context and methods of data collection and analysis is provided. Second, an analysis of the conceptualisation of the heritage waterscape as livescape is presented; this is linked to the identification of tensions and place activation in the festivals. We focus on the activation of these two heritage livescapes in the process of place-making, highlighting issues of agency and the impact on the transient communities in facilitating place-making in the localities they occupy. Third, we discuss the participants' interactions at the GCF at Speirs Lock and CF at the Riverside. Finally, we argue that viewing the festivals as livescapes contests knowledge ownership and agency by providing a platform for a bottom up place making process.

Context and Methods

FCCS's history of boating informed the study and its volunteers facilitated the two community groups in taking their boats to events. The two community groups in the study were recruited from Maryhill and Kirkintilloch, both

historically significant boat building areas through which the canal runs. The localities from which the groups came were significant in terms of transiency in the communities' mobility and also in respect of changes due to urban renewal (Ferguson 2011). Participants volunteered for the study by accepting the invitation to engage with the festivals with the use of 'their' boats.

Maryhill is an area in North Glasgow with high concentrations of refugees and asylum seekers, due to housing provision arrangements (Hill, Meer and Peace 2021). One of the participating groups was recruited with the help of a Maryhill migrant community organisation which included long-term residents as well as those with insecure immigration status. Achieving integration through culture is a place-making tactic where marginalised and transient communities such as refugees and asylum seekers are given opportunities to engage creatively with their locality (Ferguson 2011). Some participants took the boats to the GCF and others took them to the CF.

Kirkintilloch is an area on the outskirts of Glasgow, with strong post-industrial connections with the Forth and Clyde Canal (the town is marketed as the 'Canal Capital of Scotland'). Despite its more stable and established community setting, Kirkintilloch has acquired new spaces through canal regeneration, including a towpath development, a new marina, and even canal-front facing schools. The Kirkintilloch participants came from community youth groups in the area, with most members coming from the local LGBT+ community. They expressed an interest in the study as they did not have any opportunities to engage with the canal in general and boating activities in particular. The group built one boat and four members of the group took it to the CF. The outcomes of the boat building workshops were celebrated at the GCF and CF, in July and September 2019 respectively.

One of the authors was part of the organising committee in the CF's inaugural year. This facilitated access to the festival for the participants, and also presented an opportunity to examine whether the festival's initial values had been maintained in its third year. Most data were gathered while the two festivals were ongoing. Additionally, data collected from the CanalCraft project, starting from October 2018, were also used. Participatory action research and ethnography were the main methodological approaches adopted, with emphasis on boat handling as the core activity. This provided the platform for our observations of the community groups (hereafter 'participants') who used the boats they built to engage and interact with festival visitors. We followed Herbert's (2000, 557) approach to ethnographic research because it was suitable for 'disentangling and explaining [these] interconnections'. Observations of how the interactions took place were based on a variety of methods such as field notes (including direct comments) from activities (planned and impromptu), participation in meetings, informal conversations with professionals from voluntary organisations operating in the area, and engagement with volunteers from charities involved. Additionally, multiple text data (photographs, emails, social media and videos) were collected and analysed.

The 'multiple texts' (Keats 2009) collected were interpreted using content analysis: codes of concepts (Yin 2018), such as 'Activation', 'Familiarity' and 'Inclusion' were applied. Furthermore, as Banks and Zeitlyn (2015) point out, when analysing visual content such as researcher-generated photographs, the subject's motivations for being photographed is important, thus the analysis used triangulation of data from different sources.

Furthermore, as one of the authors had previous experience of the study area for more than four years having had a leading role in CanalCraft, the research methods were informed by a model of reflexivity and positionality discussed by England (1994). The position in CanalCraft gave the opportunity to form close working and friendship relations with a range of participants, professionals and volunteers. Reflexivity is important in this study, as, according to England, the researcher acquires a position of knowledge exchange and shared emotions with the researched.

The Heritage Waterscape as Livescape

We argue that festivals in heritage locations are not only environments celebrated because of their history, but realms where everyday, lived experiences and contemporary conflicts occur. Together, these form the *livescape*. Conflicts in the localities are manifested as transiency leading to complexities in the identification of 'local community'. Furthermore, place-making developments in the post-industrial heritage waterscape are being constantly negotiated in their everyday usage, while at the same time, processes of publicness (Varna and Tiesdall 2014) appear to operate within structures of power, finance and class.

Transience in the Activated Livescape

Evidence from observations at the festivals suggests that barriers to direct participation for transient and marginalised community groups include financial exclusion, physical barriers, lack of familiarity with the place and, connected to this, transience of community experience. The two places where the participants built the boats, Maryhill and Kirkintilloch, were chosen for their significant history of boat building and boating along the waterways. Both groups in the study exemplify local communities who, on the whole, are not currently engaged in regeneration discourses. As Gray (2018) argues, even after communities have been consulted about urban regeneration, tensions can still arise over the struggle for agency. Maryhill has a high incidence of locales that fall into the lowest quintile on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD 2020). Although Kirkintilloch is less 'deprived' overall according to SIMD measures, it includes neighbourhoods that are amongst the lowest quintile, and some of the participants came from these areas.

We argue that both groups involved in the study, migrant and youth, can be regarded as transient. The migrant community in Maryhill exhibits many transient qualities, not least their migration experiences and, for some, the possibility of further onward migration or return. The group, primarily of young LGBT+ identifying people, is transient both in the sense that, as young adults they are likely to move on, and also in the sense that the environment with which they engage is ever changing and under pressure from urban regeneration. Bauman's argument (2001) about 'aesthetic or peg' communities was relevant for the community groups here. For Bauman, aesthetic communities are short-lived groups that gather for a specific purpose, for example, to deliver a festival or event. Peg communities, whilst they may be involved in similar activities, have more established connections to an action (Bauman 2001) such as festival-making. Our observations highlighted the interplay between the two kinds of communities during the festivals, including the aesthetic community formed by participants through 'one-off' involvement with the events, and peg communities such as local residents who volunteer year on year for festival activities. The events created 'aesthetic' communities who interacted within an impermanent framework, although they were less successful in creating new 'peg' communities within marginalised groups. These communities required ease of access, familiarity and a sense of belonging in interactions with the livescapes of the festivals. Transience emerges in communities through ease of access, and as Hall (2012) explains, the interplay among 'the familiar and the unfamiliar'. As well as the participant groups studied, other local residents who were relatively new to the area also participated in the festivals. However, some of the latter residents were more successful in forming a 'peg' community as the locality in transit had been reinvented to fit this new community's needs. This was particularly evident in the GCF where the new residents of Speirs Locks formed a 'peg' community in contrast with both of the community groups' participants' transient 'aesthetic' community experience. The area has changed and according to Gray (2018), the injection of new residents in the space of the festival has created a confused notion of the locality and active engagement within it.

Manifestly, at one of the festival committee meetings, one Speirs Locks' resident and festival volunteer exclaimed:

> *What do you mean by 'local community'? We are the local community.*
> (GCF Volunteer 1)

It seems apparent that the new residents benefited from the activation of the festival livescape as it contributed to their bonding with 'their' place (through volunteering at the event or by having a cultural event on their doorstep). Observations showed that the new locals had the resources to volunteer and participate directly without having to be represented through an organisation.

The activated, contested livescape and place-making processes

According to Vallerani (2018), waterways invoke meanings of belonging. Vallerani's (2018, 2) 'fluvial sense of space' has significance in place-making, as cultural events encouraged by cultural strategies in cities aim to provide new meanings for post-industrial spaces (Hutton 2016). According to del Barrio, Devesa and Herrero (2012) cultural festivals bring together, display and reinterpret a cultural legacy, and in Glasgow, this legacy is the historic industrial activity that has defined urban waterscapes. Within this framework, the participating groups were provided with opportunities to engage directly with the waterways and in doing so engaged directly with the place-making process 'on the ground'.

In their study on issues of social 'connectivity' and access to urban rivers, Kondolf and Pinto (2017) point out that connections with urban waterways and consequently waterscapes can be blocked by road systems and constructions that raise barriers to accessing the water. The Clydeside Expressway (built in the 1970s) and a series of newly built high-rise buildings created a physical and visual barrier to the river that was further reinforced by restricted, gated access to the water from the raised waterfront development around the Riverside Museum. Parking fees and a considerable walking distance from the train station contributed to the blockade, which affected engagement with the waterfront and consequently the festival. On the River Clyde, familiarity with the place was also problematised by limited use of the waterway. The Riverside Museum and the waterfront were used for activities such as events and street sports, whereas access to the water is usually limited to boaters who are affiliated with boating clubs, and being a member involves a fee.

Familiarity with the environment and the publicness of the river and canal were central to the activation of the livescape. Both of these factors contributed to the level of festival participation, and here, participating community groups' unfamiliarity with the festivals' locations appeared to affect overall engagement. Similar findings have been noted in a study of the use of urban blue spaces. Haeffner et al. (2017) argue that access to urban waterways depends on opportunities to interact with the water and on socio-economic status, thus living and working adjacent to waterways does not necessarily indicate interaction. They go on to explain that the increased value of a blue space area affects its accessibility for communities who lack resources to interact with the urban waterways. These findings point to the contested nature of the livescape.

As part of the formation of the festivals' heritage livescape, affectual relationships (Müller 2015) between places, human and non-human, small and large-scale elements (including traditional tools and the historic river) challenge hegemonic knowledge approaches to participation, in this case through the activation of the waterscape (use of boats). Lorimer (2005) and Ingold (2000; 2012) have, in different contexts, observed how an environment is sensed and worked by interactions of matter of the 'lifeworld' (Ingold 2012). We argue

that the heritage livescapes of the two festivals have emerged and continue emerging from relationships such as boat building and boating. Consequently, departing from Ingold's notion of 'taskscapes', implying landscapes' processual nature as environments worked through time, it is suggested that the traditional craft of using boats activates the waterscape and therefore, the livescape – the (crafted) place which, continually, implicates the dweller in consistent 'life activity' (Ingold 2000). Applying this notion to the realm of the two festivals, the events activate the livescapes in two ways: through the water of the historic environment, and through the lifeworld of the festivals. Where boating occurs, this recreates knowledge and social space, as one of the Clydebuilt festival producer's explained:

> With boat building going on and also activity in the river outside with the rowing, with Clydebuilt Festival we wanted to celebrate these two things together. (CF Producer 1)

Thus, reproduction, exchange and celebration of knowledge through boating stimulates the production of a shared space (Lefebvre 1991). In this context, and developing from Lefebvre's notion of 'lived space', 'space is not a thing among other things, nor a product among other products, rather, it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity … Social space implies a great diversity of knowledge' (Lefebvre 1991, 73). As contested livescapes, the festivals challenge hierarchical knowledge over the historic environment as they develop from the idea of knowledge transmission through community participation. These are the spaces where objects such as boats, and interactions with them, form a platform where participants contribute their own knowledge and understanding of the place, by claiming use of its urban waterways. Through their acquired new craft skills participants were able to claim ownership of an unfamiliar and potentially dangerous space:

> Come and try our boat. It is safe. (GCF Participant /Boat builder 1, inviting visitors)

Agency and the activated livescape

Varna (2016) and Hall (2012) both recognise public space and its diversity in terms of community and place. This diversity and fluidity have been analysed by Neimanis (2016, 55) vis-a-vis the entitlement to knowledge: 'Somewhat ironically, unknowability refers to water's capacity to elude our efforts to contain it with any apparatus of knowledge'. We juxtapose this notion with how the public realm of the waterways underpins the livescape, being a place where the examination of macro- and micro- entanglement of matter and interactions with transient outcomes provide a challenge at a detailed and accurate level to

the less nuanced strategies of renewal processes in public space (Gray 2018). If knowledge of the watery environment is 'fluid', why is agency of heritage water-scapes hard to access, and do festivals celebrating waterways challenge this?

In Glasgow, the heritage environments of the River Clyde and its canal provide exemplars of this reality (Gillick and Ivett 2018), as the livescape is subjected to place-making processes, '[t]he impact of culture-led regeneration is clearly closely tied up to a localised sense of place' (Miles and Paddison 2005, 836). Culture has played an important role in the regeneration process of Glasgow, and particularly the Clyde's waterfront (Pollock and Paddison 2014; Gray 2018).

This interaction and knowledge exchange between visitors, participants, canal, river and boats demonstrates the transformation of the sense of place through the sharing of information and experiences, stimulating the livescape through celebratory practices (visitors at a festival, in a celebratory mood and ready to try new things). The interaction relates to Lorimer's argument that in order to understand the 'ecologies of place' one needs to recognise the processual element of the formation of the place through activities (Lorimer 2005). In this study, it implies that knowledge transmission and ownership, from the human geographical perspective, is understood by activating the livescape through the use of boats. As expressed by one CF visitor;

> *I have never been on a boat before. I don't know how to swim and this river feels big.* (CF Visitor 1)

Matter such as the river, the boat and the rope that ties the boat to the shore for extra safety, or the oars which are essential in moving it, all have a political, active role (Bennett 2010), contributing to a sense of place. According to one of the young CF's participant's comments, the use of the boat they created is their way to claim a right to be on the river, with the festival providing the motivation for the activity.

> *I built the boat so I could go on the water. Without the boat I would have never been here.* (CF Participant/Boatbuilder 2)

As the use of the boat stimulates a sense of belonging and the act of claiming space, the political implications of being on a boat challenge dominant forms of agency in the historic environment by exposing tensions in engagement with the livescape in terms of decision making. The design and delivery of the two festivals point to hierarchical attitudes, even if unintentional, because in both festivals, participants were not included in the production of the event from the outset. Decision-making powers were exclusively retained by the most 'knowledgeable' – the festival producers. In this sense, it has been observed that knowledge ownership in the livescape is contested and some participants possibly gained more knowledge about the canal and the river than the festival producers through their boating experience, challenging authority in the

livescape. Thinking about decision-making processes through the notion of the livescape being contested exposes barriers in engagement with the festivals and the sense of belonging. Subsequently, considering the festivals' livescape and its complexity in terms of authoritative knowledge, governance and on how access to participation is managed, taking the boats on the water could be viewed as an act of 'disruption' of authority (Keating, Portman and Robertson 2012). Festival participants used their new skills to reinvent the place and their own position within it, and their agency in introducing it to others.

> *Rowing the boat is more than a skill. I want to teach people to accept others by using the boat.* (CF Volunteer 1)

Additionally, the festival participants' sensory experience of the environment as a 'learned ability' (De Matteis 2018) turns the focus to the mundane and the ordinariness of everyday life in the landscape in transit, compared to the contested livescape of the festivals, as occasional occurrences. As well as feelings of ownership of the festival environment, familiarity with the livescape in everyday life provide a basis for developing a sense of belonging. An example of this notion is Hall's study of Walworth Road in London (2012), where the urban condition of another locality (or livescape), similar to the festivals', is framed. Hall argues that since nuanced margins exist in the city, there is an ever-changing environment of the locality which calls for 'the ability to live with combinations'. Hall's approach to Walworth Road is close to the conceptualisation of the livescape as she recognises that the road is a meeting place where interactions occur, and where matter and activities have opportunities to transform each other through time. Hall employs the *table* in a café as an example, where members of a family gather and interact and where conversations unravel. The *table*, in this instance, functions like the *boat*, as a place-making and belonging tactic in a livescape. Hall considers the local to be the life realm. Interaction here is significant because it occurs from repeated use of the public space. In the case of waterscapes, regular engagement with the water, whether through organised or informal activity, builds familiarity with and ownership of the space. Being in the waterways regularly, one gains familiarity and a sense of belonging in the festival and subsequently in the urban environment.

   In sum, conceiving of festival places as livescapes offers a holistic approach to understanding the historic environment which develops through contestation and negotiations of tensions over time.

The Festivals

Glasgow Canal Festival (GCF)

GCF was established in 2017 to celebrate the renewed environment of the canal and its local communities in North Glasgow. The event in 2019, as

mentioned before, was driven by Glasgow Canal Co-op with the support of Scottish Canals, the agency which manages the Scottish canal network. The festival was organised by a collective of local ventures as well as housing associations representing the locality.

In 2018, GCF ran alongside another event which had an urban games theme. During an informal conversation, a professional who participated in the event from a local voluntary organisation observed that, although the two events succeeded in advertising the area as a sought-after place to 'hang around', members from disadvantaged communities who lived, worked in and used the place around the canal were underrepresented;

> *I reckon only around 20% of the people who spoke to me came from the local community. I let the organisers [of the canal festival] know about it. One would need targeted surveys to prove that that only a small percentage of the local community comes to these events.* (Community Professional 1)

Speirs Locks is near public transport routes, however it is not a familiar place to people from the participant communities. Speirs Locks is a private development and normally limits general public access. This discourages people from casually using the place.

> *There is no point in coming here for any reason other than this time at the festival. We never come here and the cafes must be dear.* (GCF Participant 4)

In April 2019, three months before the event, the festival organisers, through social media, invited wider community involvement in the organisation of the event. It was suggested that participants in the study should respond to this call. However, many of the boat building participants were vulnerable and faced language barriers in engaging with the festival steering group. Provision of interpreters, childcare and travel expenses help in overcoming barriers in participation of marginalised groups (Ferguson 2011). As there was no such provision in place for attending the steering group's meetings, one of the authors and a professional from the participatory community group agreed to join the festival steering group meetings, while the participants themselves engaged directly with the festival activities. Because the festival was at the weekend, participants with no childcare were restricted in how much they could engage with the festival. One female participant, for example, could not interact with visitors as she had her young family with her.

The programme for the festival included free activities provided by professionals, food stalls (with festival prices), other cultural productions (ticketed but at affordable prices) and exhibitions that were already part of the core activities happening in the area. Essential costs for study participants were covered by public funding from CanalCraft and by the Maryhill community group, and this subvention was critical in enabling them to take part.

If it wasn't for the funding from the boat-building project (CanalCraft) or the refugee organisation covering travelling expenses, these people [participants] wouldn't be able to be at the festival. (Community Professional 2)

Because of a time shortage, the study group's participation was not mentioned in the festival programme and there was no signage to guide visitors to the group or to their boats. Fortunately, the tent and the boats were given a space at the edge of the festival, at a spot where there were enough passers-by to notice the group, which gave visibility to the boats. Nevertheless, the lack of signage meant that at the beginning of the festival, it was unclear to visitors that the activity was an official part of the festival, thus they reluctantly approached the boats and participants:

They (visitors) couldn't understand what it was about at first, but when they eventually figured it out, they wanted to go in [the boat]. (GCF Participant/Boatbuilder 3)

Despite obstacles to participation, participants felt confident to have visitors on their boat and those who were more confident with conversational English connected with the visitors through discussions about boat building and rowing experiences. Some visitors even allowed their children to sit in the boat with the boat-builders:

I didn't know that this group existed. It must have been very hard building a boat without understanding the language. (GCF Visitor 1)

The boat is the connection when language is a barrier; I've never been in a small boat before. (GCF Visitor 2)

The group appeared to take ownership of the space through being on boat:

I can't believe I'm in the canal in our boat! (GCF Participant/ Boatbuilder 2)

Now that we have the boat, we can get to know the canal better. (GCF Participant/ Boatbuilder 3)

Many visitors queued to get on the boat and from the participants' body language it was apparent that they felt part of the event. Although they didn't have the opportunity to be part of the organisation for the festival, they felt appreciated and accepted:

People asked if we will build more boats. (GCF Participant/Boatbuilder 3)

Although observations and other data suggested that participation in the festival induced a sense of place and integration for the transient communities

who would not have had the chance to interact with visitors in this event otherwise, it was evident that this participation was only possible with organisation from the community group's professionals and with resources unrelated to the festival's budget. Participants had limited resources to support themselves being there. Most of them were in receipt of limited government asylum support, or engaged in very low-paid employment, which excluded them from being in events away from their neighbourhoods. In summary, participants felt included in the festival event despite barriers of language based communication, resource provision and unfamiliarity with the place of the festival. Through their engagement with the festival, they felt connected with Speirs Locks and a sense of ownership in the spots where their boats were placed for that day. They expressed their desire to participate again, and there was a suggestion from the organisers that they would be open to it.

> *I think that it would be great if the Glasgow Canal Project [Glasgow Canal Coop] can build on the relationship for next year and perhaps a little further in advance of the festival.* (GCF Festival Producer 1)

Clydebuilt Festival (CF)

CF also started in 2017 and takes place in the area around the Riverside Museum, including the Tall Ship at Riverside. As already mentioned, the festival was established to mark the end of a three year project to encourage wider participation in boat building and boating activities with the aim of making them accessible to marginalised and disadvantaged communities.

> *The legacy of the project [Anchor and Sail] gave us Clydebuilt Festival, where we want to encourage people use boats, make boats accessible to all.* (CF Producer 1)

All groups' boats were transported to the area around the Riverside Museum. The group from Maryhill (with different participants from GCF as the previous participants' circumstances had changed) and the group from Kirkintilloch participated. As with GCF, the budget didn't cover travel expenses for participants, however, this time they could get food at subsidised prices. There was a mixture of private and commercial stall holders, relevant community projects, free activities for all and food venders (at festival prices).

> *On the shore, we wanted to have something for everyone, kids, women, we wanted to get away from the white beard … people connect boats with old men with white beards.* (CF Producer 1)

Access to the river from the group's tent was not as easy as it was on the canal, due to stricter rules about safe access. Consequently, festival visitors who wanted to get into the boats had to arrange to do so at a specific time.

> *We can't see the water from here; if we want to go to the boats we need to leave the tent for a while.* (CF Participant/Boat builder 1)

The fact that there was no visual connection with the water affected interaction between visitors and the community groups. Taking visitors to the pontoon to board the boats was time consuming, plus the boats had to be handled by a more experienced rower, as the river presented a higher safety risk than the canal. Due to insurance restrictions, children were not allowed on the boats. Therefore, interaction on the water was restricted as participants didn't have the same opportunities to experience the extensive interaction they had had with the visitors inside their boats at the other festival. Most interactions took place instead around the tent area, where there were discussions with visitors about boat building and the boats themselves:

> *The weather is sunny and it seems all Glasgow is here today. I'm exhausted talking to so many people but it has been rewarding. People love the boats.* (CF Participant/ Boatbuilder 2)

The event organisers visited the tent several times and met with the participants. Other community projects at the festival were also represented by their own participants, too, which created a sense of inclusion and belonging.

> *The GalGael folk came over and gave us a hand with the boats. It's good to see other people with similar projects.* (CF Participant/ Boatbuilder 3)

Accessibility to the Riverside also presented a barrier for people from outside Glasgow, as noted by participants from the Kirkintilloch group;

> *I've never been here before and I have no reason to come again.* (CF Participant/ Boat builder 4)

> *If it wasn't for the project, I wouldn't have visited the festival.* (CF Participant/ Boat builder 2)

The cost of travelling to the Riverside and further spending at the event created barriers for communities who faced financial limitations.

> *I would come again if it's free to go on the river. I love the river.* (CF Participant/ Boat builder 5)

Celebration for wider inclusion in boating activities underpinned the festival's priorities. The festival producers (officers from the Tall Ship at Riverside, officers from GalGael, and independent event producers) appeared to prioritise and encourage direct participation from community projects in the festival's programme. Nevertheless, the core activity of the festival was a river race for rowing activity that presented obstacles for independent rowers who wanted

to participate and were not a member of an established club. CF is part of the place-making process for the river waterfront encouraged by the City of Glasgow and the Lord Provost visits the event every year. Despite the intention of the producers to create an inclusive event, the festival's location still feels unfamiliar to some marginalised community groups who live in other locations, due to lack of available incentives for them to visit the area, such as directed promotions and easy access for groups who require extra resources to visit and feel welcomed (Hassanli, Walters and Friedmann 2020). Kelvin Harbour is used by rowing clubs, although for anyone to be regularly involved in a club requires resources and free time. CF organisers are boaters themselves. The Castle to Crane race at the festival meant that being on a boat and interacting with the waterway was one of the main values of the festival. However, safety on boats on the river required special training and usually membership of a club, which was prohibitive for the community groups in this study. Additionally, restrictions in 'messing about in boats' on the river – despite festival participation – creates barriers in knowledge ownership and consequently agency in the decision making of the event. Furthermore, familiarity with the livescape of the river and the wider festival itself were difficult to achieve due to the lack of access to resources and opportunities for engagement with the fluvial environment.

It could be argued that activation of the livescape during CF encouraged prolonged interaction with boats and their use, inspiring ownership and a sense of belonging. However, this study showed that to regularly engage with the river required time and resources, as access was only feasible through organised boating activities, such as being a member of a rowing club. This discourages regular engagement with the river for marginalised groups and therefore direct participation and activation of the livescape.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the festival space as a livescape, and how festivals celebrating urban waterways are employed as place-making processes, achieving a sense of belonging and ownership of spaces, particularly for community groups affected by marginalisation and transiency.

This study observed two transient and marginalised community groups' efforts to plan and directly participate in two urban community festivals by using boats they had built on the water of the canal and the river. Understanding these festivals as livescapes problematises place-making processes by exposing the complexity of the publicness of space, as this is underpinned by notions of access, familiarity and connectivity via ownership of the events. Observations of participants, visitors, organisers and others involved with community work revealed the challenges faced by the community groups in their attempts to integrate localities through participation in the festivals' environments. This was contrasted with the festival producers' aims and objectives which were manifested in terms of

knowledge ownership, a different connectivity with the places, and notions of agency and apprehension. In this context, and following a holistic approach of understanding the heritage livescape, it appears that marginalised communities (that have experienced transiency in their environment through urban renewal, forced migration and their struggle for inclusion and agency), achieved a sense of belonging by directly engaging with the festivals for the duration of the study. Their engagement showed that the livescape was the worked, activated and constantly changing environment – consisting and emerging from relationships, interactions, tensions and a distinctive sense of place. It was contested *qua* the challenges of hegemonic knowledge and ontological certainties.

Both historic places where the festivals took place in Glasgow have been significant for their regeneration initiatives (Mooney 2004; Gillick and Ivett 2018). However, there is evidence that the place-making process has been misaligned with transient communities' opportunities for engagement. This exposes tensions in the Glasgow Canal Festival and the Clydebuilt Festival livescapes, as the study suggested that each festival is itself an activated livescape presenting its own tensions, including barriers to participation, gaps in interactions with authorised decision making, and transient communities' attempts to have direct control over the engagement. Observations from these two livescapes support the notion that their activation provides a platform where expertise is asymmetrically shared between decision makers and the communities. Knowledge (and consequently agency) within the livescape depends on the vigour of bottom up interactions and activities, such as 'messing about in boats'. Considering the festive space as a contested livescape in the planning of urban community festivals has the potential to enhance the place-making process. This approach situates a sense of familiarity and ownership of social spaces with community groups who experience alienation in regenerated urban spaces.

References

Banks, Marcus and David Zeitlyn. 2015. *Visual Methods in Social Research* (2nd edn). London: Sage.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001. *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bruttomesso, Rinio. 2004. Complexity on the Urban Waterfront. In Richard Marshall (Ed.) *Waterfronts in Post-Industrial Cities*, pp. 47–58. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Clark, Julie, Ade Kearns and Claire Cleland. 2016. Spatial Scale, Time and Process in Mega-Events: The Complexity of Host Community Perspectives on Neighbourhood Change. *Cities*, 53, 87–97.

Clyde Waterfront. 2003–2011. Available at: http://www.clydewaterfront.com (accessed June 2018).

del Barrio, María José, María Devesa and Luis César Herrero. 2012. Evaluating Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Case of Cultural Festivals. *City, Culture and Society*, 3(4), 235–244.

De Matteis, Federico. 2018. The City as a Mode of Perception: Corporeal Dynamics in Urban Space. In Francesco Aletta and Jieling Xiao (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Perception-Driven Approaches to Urban Assessment and Design*, pp. 436–457. Hersehey, PA: IGI Global.

England, Kim V.L. 1994. Getting Personal: Reflexivity, Positionality, and Feminist Research. *The Professional Geographer*, 46(1), 80–89.

Ferguson, Jennifer. 2011. Weaving a New Tartan in Scotland: The Role of Arts and Culture in Refugee Integration. *Line* (formerly *West Coast Line*), 68, 24–33. Available at: https://journals.lib.sfu.ca/index.php/wcl/article/view/3688/2951

Gillick, Ambrose and Lee Ivett (Eds.) 2018. *Test Unit*. Glasgow: Glasgow Urban Lab, dpr-barcelona.

Gray, Neil. 2018. Neither Shoreditch nor Manhattan: Post-Politics, 'Soft Austerity Urbanism' and Real Abstraction in Glasgow North. *Area*, 50(1), 15–23.

Haeffner, Melissa, Douglas Jackson-Smith, Martin Buchert and Jordan Risley. 2017. Accessing Blue Spaces: Social and Geographic Factors Structuring Familiarity With, Use of, and Appreciation of Urban Waterways. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 167, 136–146.

Hall, Suzanne. 2012. *City, Street and Citizen: The Measure of the Ordinary*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hassanli, Najmeh, Trudie Walters and Ruth Friedmann. 2020. Can Cultural Festivals Function as Counterspaces for Migrants and Refugees? The Case of the New Beginnings Festival in Sydney. *Leisure Studies*, 39(2), 165–180.

Herbert, Steve. 2000. For Ethnography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(4), 550–568.

Hill, Emma, Nasar Meer and Timothy Peace. 2021. The Role of Asylum in Processes of Urban Gentrification. *The Sociological Review*, 69(2), 259–276.

Hutton, Thomas A. 2016. *Cities and the Cultural Economy*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. Routledge: New York.

Ingold, Tim. 2012. Toward an Ecology of Materials. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41, 427–442.

Januchta-Szostak, Anna B. and Anna M. Biedermann. 2014. The Impact of Great Cultural Projects on the Transformation of Urban Water-Side Spaces. *Czasopismo Techniczne*, Architektura Zeszyt 1 A (1), s. 69–87.

Keating, Richard, Kel Portman and Iain Robertson. 2012. Walking the Wateryscape: Exploring the Liminal. *Journal of Arts & Communities*, 4(1–2), 10–31.

Keats, Patrice A. 2009. Multiple Text Analysis in Narrative Research: Visual, Written, and Spoken Stories of Experience. *Qualitative Research*, 9(2), 181–195.

Kondolf, G. Mathias and Pedro J. Pinto. 2017. The Social Connectivity of Urban Rivers. *Geomorphology*, 277, 182–196.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Lorimer, Hayden. 2005. Cultural Geography: The Busyness of Being 'More-Than-Representational'. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(1), 83–94.

Miles, Steven and Ronan Paddison. 2005. Introduction: The Rise and Rise of Culture-Led Urban Regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 42(5–6), 833–839.

Mooney, Gerry. 2004. Cultural Policy as Urban Transformation? Critical Reflections on Glasgow, European City of Culture 1990. *Local Economy*, 19(4), 327–340.

Müller, Martin. 2015. More-Than-Representational Political Geographies. In John A. Agnew et al. (Eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography*, pp. 407–423. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Neimanis, Astrida. 2016. Water and Knowledge. In Dorothy Christian and Rita Wong (Eds.) *Downstream: Reimagining Water*, pp. 51–68. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Pollock, Venda Louise. 2019. Revisiting the Creative City: Culture and Regeneration in Post-Industrial Glasgow. In Keith Kintrea and Rebecca Madgin (Eds.) *Transforming Glasgow: Beyond the Post-Industrial City*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Pollock, Venda Louise and Ronan Paddison. 2014. On Place-Making, Participation and Public Art: The Gorbals, Glasgow. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 7(1), 85–105.

Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation. (revised 2020). Scottish Government. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/collections/scottish-index-of-multiple-deprivation-2020 (accessed June 2021).

Stevenson, Deborah. 2013. *The City*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Tretter, Eliot M. 2009. The Cultures of Capitalism: Glasgow and the Monopoly of Culture. *Antipode*, 41(1), 111–132.

Vallerani, Francesco. 2018. Introduction: Flowing Consciousness and the Becoming of Waterscapes. In Francesco Vallerani and Francesco Visentin (Eds.) *Waterways and the Cultural Landscape*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Varna, Georgiana. 2016. *Measuring Public Space: The Star Model*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Varna, George and Steve Tiesdell. 2010. Assessing the Publicness of Public Space: The Star Model of Publicness. *Journal of Urban Design*, 15(4), 575–598.

Walters, Trudie and Allan Stewart Jepson (Eds.) 2019. *Marginalisation and Events*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Yin, Robert K. 2018. *Case Study Research and Applications*. Washington DC: Sage Publications.