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Executive Summary

Creative Rural Communities, the rural regeneration arm of the Vale of Glamorgan Council, ran a pilot project during September and October 2016, to support a programme of pop up events at Dunraven Bay on the Glamorgan Heritage Coast. The pilot project was jointly funded by Coastal Communities Fund and EU funding through the rural Vale of Glamorgan’s LEADER programme. It aimed to test the market for events, together with the temporary infrastructure and other support needed, to help event organisers develop and deliver viable events.

The pilot project has been undertaken over a very short timescale, with four events held in September/October 2016:

* Crafts on the Coast – day event and taster workshops
* Lost Lands evening outdoor cinema events (2)
* Slow Food Fest day event
* Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink day/evening event

It is down to the organisation and management by Creative Rural Communities (CRC), and the collective effort of CRC, all the events organisers and other stakeholders who have helped support the events, that four successful and varied events have been delivered - to time, with mainly very positive visitor feedback.

Without the support from CRC it is highly unlikely that any events would have taken place. The pilot project and support from CRC has helped to reduce the risk of what would otherwise have been potentially high risk – an event in an untested location and with unknown viability.

*From the visitor perspective:*

* There was positive feedback on all of the four events. The event receiving the most varied feedback (although still a majority of positive comments) was the Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink – also the event most affected by bad weather and with the most variety of activities and ambitious in its scale
* The majority view was that the event experience had been very good or excellent
* The majority of responses were very positive about the practicalities of organisation and arrangements; although there were some concerns, particularly about car parking (cost especially) and the lack of marketing and detailed information about events
* Visitor feedback indicated that the location worked well
* There was positive response to holding more events again in the future

*From the event organiser and other participants (e.g. stallholders) perspective:*

* There was a strong majority view that CRC’s logistical, management and organisational support has been excellent or good
* The main concerns relate to marketing and PR, including event signage
* Organisers are now generally confident about organising an event without CRC practical support – although still have questions about viability without CRC financial support/partnership
* The location was well liked and organisers want to hold events there again
* Organisers were generally pleased with visitor numbers – and recognised the potential to grow these
* Organisers are keen to understand more about the viability, by knowing what costs CRC covered
* Qualitative business benefits have been identified
* Various learning points are noted including the need for wet weather contingency plans

*From the perspective of CRC and other stakeholders:*

* There is overall positive feedback on the whole pilot event experience from all stakeholders
* The events tested a variety of situations and their temporary infrastructure/support needs well, although with some things still untested, notably use of a marquee, formal events and sports events
* The potential for event organisers to be able to take on all elements of event organisations is there, especially if the Council (and landowner) can help facilitate this
* However a recognition that cost could be an issue, although again with opportunities to explore ways to help reduce costs such as shared infrastructure
* Opportunities identified to scale up and develop the four events already held – but also a question about the extent of scale of event and this being appropriate to the location
* Views that pilot events have raised the profile of the Heritage Coast
* Views that events had good potential for economic benefit

*In terms of costs and outputs:*

* Eight pilot events were initially envisaged when the pilot project was being developed. Four were finally delivered. These four have absorbed nearly the full budget for the pilot project of £25,000 (total actual cost £24,659)
* The four events have tested a range of different temporary infrastructures and hence costs will have been higher than might otherwise be expected. However this is the point of a pilot project
* Events in the Walled Garden have been more costly as more infrastructure had been required and events were of a larger scale and both went on into the evening
* The events have been very successful in delivering their outputs, and especially that of assisting businesses which is an important part of the Coastal Communities and LEADER Programmes

*Success as a Pilot Project:*

In terms of **efficiency** (how well the pilot project has performed in terms of the practical side of testing logistics, management and organisation and whether this has led to cost efficiency and value for money):

* There is a considerable level of detailed feedback and learning on the practical aspects of organisation, management and logistics including around access into the Walled Gardens, deploying electrics and lighting, on the day management and organization, marketing, PR, and signage to and within events
* The support from CRC is largely recognised as having been very good, more than expected in some cases and with nothing specific missing
* A key point for the future will be timeliness in terms of organisation - organising events needs a much longer lead in time than was possible with the pilot project
* It is possible that some event organisers could be over-optimistic around abilities to arrange future events without CRC support as CRC did do a lot of organisation with event organisers not fully involved in all of this. CRC’s proposed Events Organising Toolkit should therefore be very useful and could include some practical details e.g. time needed to do tasks such as put up stalls/gazebos
* In terms of value for money, the feedback from visitors is largely that the pilot events have represented good value for money given visitor spend, costs and experience of attending the event; and the outputs achieved would also indicate this (four events with around 2,700 visitors in total and an estimated 67 businesses assisted in some way either as event organisers or participants)

In terms of **effectiveness** (how well the pilot project has performed as a test of events at Dunraven Bay), the feedback has been very positive.

* Event organisers and participants indicate that events have mainly gone as planned, visitor numbers have been generally viewed as good, and costs have been covered. The main concern raised by event organisers is that of viability, looking forward
* Visitors have come to the events in sufficient numbers to demonstrate their worth, and with largely very positive feedback about a good visitor experience[[1]](#footnote-2). A number of visitors commented that they would come to similar events again in the future. They have valued aspects of the experience including the location and the size of event (not too large, not too crowded)
* Other stakeholders, notably CRC and other Vale of Glamorgan Council staff are also positive about their experience of events. Whilst noting all the challenges and issues that events have raised, they also recognise the overall positive experience and feedback that has come from visitors and the benefits/opportunities of opening up Dunraven Bay for greater use

In terms of **impacts** (community and business impacts that could enhance the economy of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast and widen the knowledge of it):

* Raising knowledge of the Heritage Coast has largely been very site specific – about the Dunraven Bay in particular; although there is potential to broaden that knowledge out in the future
* Qualitatively some economic benefits are already noted (including networking with other businesses who could be potential suppliers). There is potential for strengthening and developing the economic benefits through building up events at this location in the future

*For the Future:*

The evaluation indicates there is potential for continuing to develop events at Dunraven Bay and building its profile for this, with consequent economic benefit. There will be logistical challenges but feedback from this evaluation is that these may not be insurmountable. There could also be financial challenges in developing viable events which need to be worked through. Specific points to consider include:

* **Organising events –**put in placealonger lead in time to events; set some core objectives/criteria for selecting events; have a point of liaison and contact/some sort of event management role; have a nuanced approach to Event Agreements; have a collaborative working approach
* **Logistical support:** explore opportunities for reducing costs; set out costs clearly to help event organisers financially plan: include guidance on the scale of time inputs and manpower inputs needed; establish a car parking charging policy and keep to it; address the issue of access into the Walled Gardens; have a wet weather contingency plan; have a clear plan for set up and dismantling on the day; have a structured marketing and PR plan for both the lead up to the event and for during the event itself; make sure there is signage from the main road to the Bay and within the site for events; get structured feedback from visitors and participants
* **Types and timing of events:** make sure size and scale of each event is appropriate to the location and ambience sought; look at what is needed for a successful event in the round; make sure event organisers understand the challenges of the Walled Gardens (and the opportunities) and plan for the more logistical support that will be needed - events into the evening/night will need more logistical support

1 The Dunraven Bay Pop Up Events Pilot Project

## 1.1 Introduction

Creative Rural Communities, the rural regeneration arm of the Vale of Glamorgan Council, ran a pilot project during September and October 2016, to support a programme of pop up events at Dunraven Bay on the Glamorgan Heritage Coast. This is the evaluation report of the pilot project.

## 1.2 The Background to the Pop Up Events Pilot Project

The impetus for this pilot project stemmed from a feasibility study undertaken in 2015, to explore what commercial opportunities there might be that would help to raise the profile and use of the Vale’s Heritage Coast and through this help to improve its economic potential. Pop Up Events at Dunraven Bay and making use of the Heritage Centre already there and managed by the Council, was one of the commercial opportunities identified.

Putting this feasibility study into its wider context, the Vale of Glamorgan Council secured funding from BIG Lottery’s Coastal Communities Fund in 2015, to support activities that would help the Heritage Coast to maximise its economic potential. The feasibility study was one of the activities undertaken, alongside others that have included appointment of a dedicated Glamorgan Heritage Coast Activities Development Officer, the creation of business storage units for off and on shore activities, the replacement of the slipway at Dunraven Bay and the placing of interpretative information in the coastal area.

The feasibility study looked at opportunities for commercial activities at three locations around the Vale’s Heritage Coast with Dunraven Bay being one of the locations. One of the suggestions identified in the study as most appropriate for the Heritage Coast was the piloting of pop-up food or drink events. It was this that led to development of a Pop Up Events pilot at Dunraven Bay.

Creative Rural Communities chose to develop this idea through a pilot project which invited suggestions for events, rather than prescribing what the events would be. This fitted with the Local Development Strategy that the rural Vale of Glamorgan’s Local Action Group (who oversee the work of Creative Rural Communities - CRC) had developed for delivery of its LEADER activities (a community led rural economic regeneration approach). The proposal for Pop Up Events has therefore developed as a pilot project part funded through the LEADER Local Development Strategy and through CRC’s Coastal Communities funding from BIG Lottery.

## 1.3 The Proposal for the Pop Up Events

In economic terms it is testing out the ‘market’ for such events with visitors to the rural Vale and local residents who might be attracted there and spend their money in support of the local economy; and with event organisers and others who might participate in events (e.g. stallholders) and support/develop their business opportunities. This fits with the Local Action Group’s top priority from its Local Development Strategy, which is “ Adding Value to local identity and natural and cultural resources”. This is based on a development need to make more use of underutilised natural coastal assets and an objective “To increase the business and employment potential of the coast”. This also reflects the objective of the Coastal Communities Funding, hence there being a natural fit between the two funding streams supporting this pilot project.

In practical terms, the pilot project is testing the temporary infrastructure and support needed, to enable the events to take place; coupled with a process to select event organisers, develop and market an events programme and support the organisers in organising and delivering their events.

CRC had to apply to the Local Action Group to secure the funding from LEADER to match with Coastal Communities Funding for the pilot project. At the point of application CRC was envisaging around 8 events based on food and drink. In discussing and approving the application, the Local Action Group felt that focusing only on food and drink would be too restrictive. It therefore requested that the scope of possible events be broadened.

### 1.4 The LEADER Application

A phased programme for planning and delivering the Pop Up Pilot was proposed in the LEADER application to secure the funding for the pilot project:

* Phase One – Open call for Expressions of Interest from potential event organisers; and pilot planning by CRC (March – April 2016)
* Phase Two – Workshops, Marketing & Event planning with participants ( End of April/May 2016)
* Phase Three – Pop- up food & drink events (August / September)
* Phase Four – Evaluation and dissemination ( September 2016 – March 2017)
* Phase Five – Future developments ( March 2017 onwards)

A total budget of £25,000 was proposed, broken down as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item/Activity** | **2016** | **2017** | **Total** |
| Running costs e.g. Temporary Event licences & security | £1,000 |  | £1,000 |
| Infrastructure & event equipment | £10,000 |  | £10,000 |
| Research & Workshops | £2,000 |  | £2,000 |
| Marketing & Signage | £8,000 |  | £8,000 |
| Evaluation & dissemination |  | £4,000 | £4,000 |
| TOTAL | £21,000 | £4,000 | £25,000 |

This would be jointly funded, with £14,000 from the LEADER LDS, £10,000 from Coastal Communities Fund and £1,000 from Participant Organisations.

Outputs were also proposed. In terms of stated LEADER outputs, the following were set out in the LEADER application:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Feasibility Studies | 1 |
| Number of pilot activities undertaken/supported | 8 |
| Number of information dissemination actions/ promotional and/or marketing activities to raise awareness of the LDS and/or its projects | 2 |
| Number of stakeholders engaged | 10 |
| Number of participants supported | 8 |

Additionally, eight businesses assisted was also noted as an output.

### 1.5 Selecting the Event Organisers

An open call for event organisers was made by CRC, with the opportunity advertised as well as circulated to CRC contacts, through social media and via networks. Expressions of Interest were initially invited and assessed on the basis of some core criteria[[2]](#footnote-3), with those selected as possibilities invited to make a more detailed application. 17 Expressions of Interest were received of which 15 were invited by CRC to make an application. They covered a range of activities:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Street food  Painting  Film production  Climbing  Shopping  Music and picnic | Cinema  Craft event and workshops  Slow Food event  Theatre  After dinner speaking event  Outdoor activities  Beach Activities |

Only 6 of the 15 submitted a detailed application and, from this, four were selected. Reasons given for not submitting an application included that the timescale for delivery was too short, the time of year was not ideal and the idea was untried and therefore risky.

### 1.6 The programme of Pop Up Events

Four events were finally selected, running over a period from early September to mid October. These were:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Event** | **Brief Description** | **Dates** | **Organisers** |
| Crafts on the Coast Festival  Crafts on the Coast Workshops:   * Willow weaving (6th) * Stained Glass (7th) * Creative writing and textiles (8th) * Driftwood Art (9th) | Open event with some 16 crafts stallholders and crafts demonstrations. Estimated attendance of 600.  Bookable workshops with each of the four Coastal Communities Arts members. c80-90 people in total over four days with either two or three workshops per day | Sunday 4th September, 9.30am – 5pm.  Tuesday – Friday 6th – 9th September | Coastal Communities Art – a group of four artists/  craftspeople |
| Lost Lands Beach Cinema – The Lost Boys and The Goonies | Ticketed cinema event in the walled garden, with a large screen, theatre sound, bar and food vendor  Estimated audiences of about 200 per evening | Friday 16th and Saturday 17th September, 6 –11pm | Lost Lands Cinema |
| Slow Food Fest | Open event with some 18 artisan food and drink producers, as well as cooking, cider making and breadmaking demonstrations, and children’s activities.  Estimated attendance of 600 | Saturday 8th October, 10am – 4pm | Slow Food South East Wales |
| Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink | Ticketed event in the walled garden showcasing local, small scale independent producers of food and drink, crafts and arts (c30 stallholders), and local musicians, storytelling and children’s area.  Estimated attendance of 1,000+ | Saturday 15th October, 12noon – 9pm | Cobbles Kitchen and Deli and the Roaming Caravan Co. |

Of the four[[3]](#footnote-4) event organisers, two were businesses/groups that had previously worked with CRC; Coastal Communities Art through the 2007 – 2013 LEADER Programme, and both organisers of the Autumn Gardens Festival, through the Vale of Glamorgan Council’s Bursary scheme that provides grants to young people setting up in business. CRC had not previously worked with either Lost Lands Cinema or Slow Foods South East Wales.

### 1.7 Organising and Running the Events

It has been for the organisers of the four events selected to actually set up and manage their events, recruit and organise their stallholders and other participants and individually market their events.

However CRC has provided considerable support for this in terms of organising and paying for various temporary infrastructure needed; temporary leasing of land from Dunraven Estates (landowner) to enable the events to take place; providing support and contacts to enable organisers to make other arrangements needed e.g. securing necessary licences; and providing stewarding & security and attending events to be on hand for any issues.

Specifically CRC has:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Secured Landowner Permission | Arranged a temporary licence to rent the land from the landowners, (Dunraven Estates who own most of the Bay area) |
| Arranged temporary infrastructure | Power: organised and paid for hire of generators and electricians to set up power supplies Toilets: hire of portaloos where needed for events  Hire of Stalls; organised and paid for hire of stalls/gazebos for events  Waste bins  Tower lighting and Barriers, if required  Fridges and hand washing units ( if required)  Tables and chairs  Hire of any available event network equipment |
| Arranged hire of Council run venue | Heritage Coast Centre hire. |
| Identified licences etc needed | Briefed all events organisers on licences and permissions needed and where to obtain these  Ensured all events organisers have the appropriate insurances – public liability particularly |
| Guidance on H&S and Risk Assessments etc | Advice provided, primarily at the site visit day, with template documents provided for risk assessments, temporary event notices & event plans.  Advice also provided on fire risk assessment documents and information on food hygiene. |
| Organised (and paid for where required) personnel | Security staff needed, including Security Industry Authority (SIA) licenced Bar Stewards (provided for three of the four events)  First Aid support on site for events  Stewards on site for events  Police presence (if required)  Parking management stewards  Heritage Coast Ranger help – for opening of Heritage Centre, gates, mowing lawns, helping move equipment with the ranger van if possible, accepting deliveries & storing equipment  Council Events Officer support. |
| Undertook marketing and PR | Briefed all event organisers on the marketing and PR that CRC would undertake  Organised and paid for design and printing of a leaflet to promote all the four events  Organised website and social media promotion  Advertised the events in the following ways:   * Newspapers & magazines - The Gem - Barry & District; Penarth Times; The South Wales Echo; Western Mail; South Wales Argus; Buzz magazine * Leaflet distribution through the Council’s media & tourism teams - 15,000 leaflets to hubs outside of the Vale (Cardiff, Monmouth, Bridgend). Further 5,000 leaflets in key Vale spots such as train stations and supermarkets. Leaflets distributed to event organisers to hand out. * Social media - Paid for Facebook ad’s. Promoted through central council, CRC account and Visit the Vale account * Listing on event websites such as http://www.moretothevale.com/ and   http://www.visitthevale.co.uk/en/Home.aspx   * Database mail shot & press releases. |
| Held an Event Organiser Briefing | Held a day event at Dunraven Bay for all event organisers, to select where to hold activities and to brief organisers on what was needed, what CRC could assist with, contacts for organisers to obtain licences etc |
| CRC – A Point of Contact | Available to answer queries from event organisers, have meetings with organisers etc throughout – prior to and at events.  Acted as a point of contact between event organisers and Council and other personnel involved, and with the landowner  Liaised between event organisers and the Council’s Event Review Panel  Acted as a key holder for barriers, gates and Heritage Coast Centre. |

### 1.8 Evaluation of the Pop Up Events

Ash Futures was commissioned by CRC to work with them on an evaluation of the Pop Up Events, so that CRC could both learn from the experience about the practicalities and logistics of delivering such events, as well as the wider potential it might have for developing the commercial potential of the Heritage Coast.

The evaluation has followed a logic chain approach. This is a structured approach to evaluation that allows the connections between inputs (e.g. people, funding, the venue) and achievements (e.g. events held, visitor numbers and experience) to be fully assessed, and reflected back on the aims and objectives (testing the market for events at Dunraven Bay) and extent to which these are being met. The study addresses all three key purposes of evaluation:

* Effectiveness - looks at how/whether objectives of the intervention will be achieved, which for this project was the testing of pop up events in this location
* Efficiency - looks at outputs relative to inputs; cost efficiency, value for money and timeliness and which, for this pilot project, particularly relate to the practical and logistical support provided by CRC
* Impact - looks at the positive (and possibly negative) changes resulting from the intervention and what the consequences of these are, in this case the intention to raise the profile of the Heritage Coast and its potential for economic activity

The evaluation has been undertaken through various strands of activity:

* CRC have:
  + Distributed online surveys to visitors to events, to find out where visitors are coming from and their experience of the event
  + Asked visitors at events to fill out a very short ‘evaluation postcard’, to provide some immediate feedback whilst at the event
  + Distributed links to online surveys to residents and local businesses in the vicinity of Dunraven Bay to find out what impact the events have had on them
  + Distributed online surveys (via event organisers) to other participants at events (e.g. stallholders) to find out how the events worked for them
  + Distributed online surveys to the event organisers (complementing interviews with them)
  + Met and discussed the events with the landowner (Dunraven Estates), the Heritage Coast Park Rangers, other Council including CRC staff involved in supporting the events
  + Sought feedback from other support personnel e.g. First Aiders, Security Staff
* Ash Futures have:
  + Interviewed each of the event organisers to discuss the practicalities and logistics of developing and delivering the events, their wider experience of running the event and its business impacts for them
  + Undertaken analysis of all the survey and interview findings,
  + Drawn all the information together into this evaluation report to provide an objective evaluation of the pilot project

### 1.9 Layout of the Report

This evaluation report now reviews the four events held and draws conclusions and recommendations from the experience of participants, visitors and other stakeholders, in terms of its success or otherwise as a pilot project, its potential impacts for the Heritage Coast’s businesses and communities, its value as visitor draw and the potential for developing from this pilot project.

# 2 Experience of Visitors

## 2.1 Introduction

This section draws on the results of an online visitor survey and feedback from ‘evaluation postcards’ distributed and collected at events.

## 2.2 The Evidence for Evaluating Visitor Experience

#### The Visitor Survey

Visitors were asked to provide feedback through an online survey. This had some difficulties in practical terms, as only two of the four events were ticketed with any ticket holder information available, although for a third, there was also information for people booked onto workshops. As all visitor information was held by event organisers, the visitor survey was distributed through them. Only 20 responses were received so the results to this need to be treated more as a qualitative snapshot rather than a statistically useful result. Nevertheless they provide valuable feedback. Survey responses were split over the four events as follows:

Visitor survey responses

Autumn Festival of Food and Drink

Lost Lands Cinema

Crafts on the Coast

Slow Food Fest

Although only 20 responses, they collectively amounted to 65 visitors in groups ranging from 15 to 1, with 12 of the 20 responses being groups of 2 or 3 people including children. Average group size was 3.25 people. They also represented all ages:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Under 10 | 16 |
| 11-17 | 6 |
| 18-29 | 2 |
| 30-39 | 8 |
| 40-49 | 11 |
| 50-59 | 14 |
| 60+ | 8 |

Mostly visitors were local to the area, as indicated by their postcode with 95% saying they travelled home that same day (i.e. the events did not generate any overnight stays):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CF33 | Bridgend (Cornelly, Pyle) | 1 |
| CF36 | Porthcawl | 1 |
| CF61 | Llantwit Major | 3 |
| CF35 | Bridgend (includes Ewenny) | 1 |
| CF32 | Bridgend (includes St Brides Major and Ogmore Vale) | 4 |
| CF31 | Bridgend (town) | 2 |
| CF71 | Cowbridge | 4 |
| CF62 | Barry | 2 |
| SA3 | Swansea | 1 |
| SA69 | Saundersfoot | 1 |

Visitors were asked about their group’s spend (excluding any ticket price). 45% spend £10 or less and a further 25% spent between £10 and £20:

#### Visitor Feedback at events

Visitors were also asked to complete a short evaluation postcard actually at events, to record a brief comment about their experience and leave an email address (to which visitor surveys were also subsequently sent by CRC). A total of 163 comments were made, split over the four events:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Crafts on the Coast | 49 |
| Lost Lands Cinema | 35 |
| Slow Food Fest | 40 |
| Autumn Festival of Food and Drink | 39 |

#### Feedback to Organisers

Finally, one organiser of a pop up event also provided CRC with feedback received from visitors and stallholders left on their facebook page for their event.

This section draws on these three sets of information, to evaluate the visitor experience of the pop up events.

## 2.3 The Practical Side of organisation, management and logistics

The Visitor Survey asked questions about practicalities of finding out about and attending the events.

#### Finding out about the Event

CRC marketed the events and promoted them as did event organisers, who used their own social media, website and other routes. Feedback from the Visitor Survey indicates word of mouth and social media as the two most effective routes[[4]](#footnote-5):

Local Press

Social media

Events website

Word of mouth

Other

Marketing of events

Other methods included a flyer through the door, attendance at another local event where it was flagged up, and a visit to a local shop promoting the event.

Further (very limited) feedback from evaluation postcards at the events suggest that people had heard by various means (e.g. a flyer in Tesco, on a mailing list for one of the organisers). Comments also suggested marketing and publicity had been too limited and there should be more in future, as well as comments on difficulties of finding detailed information about the events (two comments, particularly made with reference to the Crafts on the Coast events).

#### Attending the Event

The following table summarises the results of the Visitor Survey in terms of rating a number of practical aspects of the events:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Quite Poor | Satis-factory | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Not applicable |
| Booking tickets, or pre-arrival enquiries | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Parking and traffic management, or access to public transport | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 1 |
| Toilets, hand wash, refuse, and general quality of the cleanliness on site | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| Food and drink quality and availability | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 |
| Seating, (all-weather) coverage, staging, and sound | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| General customer service quality and availability | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 1 |

In overall terms, the majority of responses have been very positive about the practicalities of organisation and arrangement. The ‘poor’ related to an Autumn Festival attendee response. The ‘quite poor’ to both Crafts on the Coast and Autumn Festival attendee responses.

There have been some issues/concerns expressed in the Visitor Survey ssuch as comments on car parking charges (from Crafts on the Coast visitors particularly), and the lower scores on seating staging and sound, and toilets/refuse/cleanliness. Comments from the evaluation postcards also pick up some of these points. Points raised include:

* The cost of car parking, and whether visitors to an event should be charged for car parking anyway
* The need for wet weather coverings – the Autumn Gardens Festival particularly suffered with a downpour in the afternoon; and for seating e.g. at the Crafts on the Coast event
* Some concern[[5]](#footnote-6) about the limited number of food stalls/producers at the Autumn Gardens Festival (given it was marketed as a Food and Drink Festival); and comment on limited food choices/lack of hot drinks at the cinema event
* Poor signage to the event, from the main road and on the way to the event - noted in relation to the Slow Food Fest and Crafts on the Coast event
* A need for recycling bins
* A lack of baby changing facilities - noted for The Slow Food Fest[[6]](#footnote-7)
* A need for a programme for the activities - noted for the Autumn Gardens Festival

## 2.4 The Visitor Experience

The Visitor Survey asked people for an overall view of the whole event experience and whether it was seen as value for money.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Quite Poor | Satis-factory | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Not applicable |
| The event experience | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 0 |
| Value for Money | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4 |

By far the majority view was that the event experience had been very good or excellent – 70% of Visitor Survey respondents - although one ‘poor’ response should also be noted[[7]](#footnote-8). This is also reflected in the evaluation postcards where some 54% of responses were very positive about their experience in an overall way[[8]](#footnote-9), with further responses being positive about specific elements. Examples of comments made include:

* *Brilliant idea – great fun for every age – hope you do it again (Autumn Gardens Festival)*
* *Came to see the Goonies. What a fantastic evening! A great end to the summer. Thank you (Lost Lands Cinema)*
* *Fantastic – lovely to see local crafts and to use this venue. Inspirational (Crafts on the Coast)*
* *Great food, super event, eaten lots, taken more home (Slow Food Fest)*

The following uses the qualitative feedback from the Visitor Survey, evaluation postcards and Facebook feedback to explore the Visitor Experience in more detail.

#### Activities and Stallholders

Each of the events incorporated different activities and a range of stallholders.

Crafts on the Coast

The Crafts on the Coast open event included different stalls, craft demonstrations and opportunities to discuss crafts with stallholders. It was focused on hand made crafts. Most of the stalls were located in the Heritage Centre with demonstrations in its training room. Feedback from visitors[[9]](#footnote-10) identifies various positive points from this event[[10]](#footnote-11) notably:

* A good selection of local crafts, with appreciation of the quality and artistry
* Friendly, informative and knowledgeable crafts people happy to chat to visitors (two respondees noted they had booked onto crafts workshops as a result of attending)

*‘Lovely craft fair, beautiful crafts and friendly people - more please!’*

*‘..selection of crafts was excellent. good to be able to meet local craft people. the workshops being offered during the week were a very good idea. more please.!’*

Four comments related to refreshments; welcoming the availability of tea/coffee and cake but also noting that more food options could be provided, as well as the opportunity for seating for tea/coffee/food breaks.

Visitor feedback for enhancing/developing activities at the event included:

* A pop up café; and seating for any tea/coffee area
* Having more stalls outside
* Increasing the number of stalls overall
* Having more demonstrations

Lost Land Cinema

Two events were held, one screening ‘The Goonies’ and the other ‘The Lost Boys’. The events were held in the Walled Garden. There were food and drink concessions at both showings, the intention being for people to purchase from these not bring their own food and drink. This was a ticketed event with tickets priced at £10. As this was more of a single activity event, feedback from visitors was supportive of this in an overall sense with 69% of responses from the evaluation postcards, being very appreciative of the overall event (with one comment particularly welcoming it being a family friendly event with suitable facilities and another welcoming the number of youngsters attending).

*‘Great set up/location. Friendly stewards/bar staff. Wicked’*

*‘Lovely time would love to see more events like this’*

Some comments were made on the food available. These were mixed – comments on ‘great food’ and also on poor food/lack of choice.

In terms of enhancing/developing the event, visitor feedback included:

* Having more choice of food including snacks
* Having hot drinks available
* Availability of blankets for hire[[11]](#footnote-12)
* More music (more than was available on the loop playing)

Slow Food Fest

The Slow Food Fest had a number of stallholders, all members of the Slow Food Movement, with stalls outside in the car park area and the road up to the Heritage Centre, Demonstrations (cookery, cider making, bread making) were held in the Heritage Centre, and activities for children were also provided. An intention to have a guided foraging walk did not happen as insufficient people booked (it would have cost £5 per head)[[12]](#footnote-13). Feedback from visitors[[13]](#footnote-14) was very positive and noted various points including:

* A good selection of vendors
* An appreciation of it not being too crowded
* An enjoyment of great food and demonstrations

*‘Enjoyed the bread making demo. Good to see so many local products and demonstrations. A great feast!!’*

*‘ Really enjoyed the variety on offer – nice manageable size!’*

In terms of enhancing/developing the event, visitor feedback included:

* Having more local producers involved
* Having more information available in advance about what’s on, e.g. the demonstrations and the children’s activities
* Having some live music as well

Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink

The Autumn Gardens Festival had the most variety of activities at its event, which was a ticketed event and held in the Walled Gardens (with two food and drink producers located outside the Walled Garden[[14]](#footnote-15)). Stallholders included food and drink producers and crafts people. Activities included children’s activities, storytelling and a schedule of live bands culminating in an early evening performance. This event was the one most affected by adverse weather – a downpour in the afternoon – meaning that activities in the later afternoon were rescheduled, with the final live band event brought forward by an hour and the overall event finishing an hour early. The majority of feedback from visitors in relation to activities was positive and noted various points including:

* An appreciation of the attention to layout and decoration of the event
* An appreciation of it being a family event with activities for children
* Enjoyment of the food and craft stalls

*‘Beautifully laid out, will come again!’*

*‘Amazing idea. A fab family day out’*

However there were also some concerns/issues:

* A small number of comments wishing to have seen more food stalls and more local food and drink producers displaying and selling their produce rather than 'street food' sellers, with one respondent considering the food merchandise to be very poor and another that some of it was pricey
* A need for programme/timetable of what was going on at the event
* A lack of availability of hot drinks
* A comment that the vans outside obscured the entrance to the Walled Gardens
* A comment that stallholders were running out of food before the end of the event

*‘…More selection of beer and food would be good, however what was there was nice’*

*‘Fab event-but most food stalls had run out by the time we arrived 2.30pm’*

*‘Very poorly organised and offer of food merchandise’*

Visitor feedback for enhancing/developing activities at the event included:

* One request for more meat stalls/options
* Programmes/timetable of activities
* More food choices
* More wet weather cover

#### The Location

Feedback from visitors about the location at Dunraven Bay indicates this played an important part in visitor enjoyment of their event, particularly so for the Cinema events.

The Visitor Survey specifically asked respondents if the event they attended worked well at this location. 85% of the 20 respondents said it worked very well, two that it worked OK (both for Crafts on the Coast) and just one that it was not a good location choice (this being for the Autumn Gardens Festival). Of the three comments made alongside this question, two related to car parking (one, its prohibitive cost), with one also concerned with poor access for people with disabilities. The third was supportive of the location.

In terms of qualitative feedback from the evaluation postcards:

* Crafts on the Coast event: just three people commented specifically on the location, with one welcoming the opportunity to visit the Heritage Centre
* Lost Lands Cinema: where eight respondees specifically commented on this being a great venue e.g. ‘excellent setting and venue – found a real gem’
* Slow Food Fest; where seven people commented on the good location e.g ‘great festival in beautiful surroundings. Will come again’
* Autumn Gardens Festival, where four comments were specifically made on it being a good venue, one asking that more events be put on in this area. Some further feedback from the event organisers facebook page also comments on the venue e.g. ’hope to see more things like this happening in the Walled Garden – great venue’

#### Value for Money

In terms of value for money, 55% of Visitor Survey respondees considered value for money to be very good or excellent.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Quite Poor | Satis-factory | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Not applicable |
| Value for Money | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4 |

One respondee considered an event to be poor value for money (Autumn Gardens Festival). Further qualitative feedback indicates value for money issues raised to be:

* A concern about the level of the entry fee (to the Autumn Gardens Festival (3 comments), and the Cinema (1 comment)
* One comment that charging an entrance fee and then also charging for activities is too much

## 2.5 Future Events

The Visitor Survey asked if respondees would be interesting in attending that event or another similar event in the future. 19 of the 20 respondents replied ‘yes’, just one ‘no’. Whilst not specifically asked this question, those completing evaluation postcards also gave a similar very positive response to future events with 22% of responses voluntarily identifying they would like to attend events again and/or see more events in the future.

*‘We have had lots of fun! Please do more events in this area – open air theatre?’ (Autumn Gardens Festival)*

*‘Great food and event. Will come again’ (Slow Food Fest)*

*Lovely time would love to see more events like this (Lost Lands Cinema)*

*‘Great craft day! So much local talent! Do again’ (Crafts on the Coast)*

## 2.6 Summary

To summarise:

* Visitors were generally local to the area, in visitor groups of an average of 3.25 people and with the majority spending up to £20 (excluding ticket money) during their visitor (from Visitor Survey)
* Word of mouth and social media had been most successful as marketing tools
* There were concerns about the lack of marketing and detailed information about events
* The majority of responses were very positive about the practicalities of organisation and arrangements. One response (from the Visitor Survey) was particularly negative
* There were some concerns too, particularly about car parking (cost especially), seating, wet weather coverings, signage, food choices/lack of hot drinks
* The majority view was that the event experience had been very good or excellent; the small minority of negative comments were largely associated with the Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink
* There was positive feedback on all of the four events. The event receiving the most varied feedback (although still a majority of positive comments) was the Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink – also the event most affected by bad weather and with the most variety of activities and ambitious in its scale
* There was a strong majority view that the location worked well (Visitor Survey)
* There was a strong positive response to holding more events again in the future

# 3 Experience of Event Organisers and Participants

## 3.1. Introduction

Each of the four events was organised by a different group or company. The event organisers organised and managed their own other participants in their events, as summarised in the table below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Event** | **Organiser** | **Other Participants** |
| Crafts on the Coast | Coastal Community Art, a co-operative of four artists and teachers based in Ogmore by Sea, Vale of Glamorgan | Stallholders and demonstrators |
| Lost Lands Cinema | Lost Lands Cinema, based in Cardiff and running a regular summer season of rooftop open air cinema events in Cardiff | Food and drink suppliers |
| Slow Food Fest | Slow Food South East Wales, a recently formed voluntary group and part of the Slow Food Movement | Stallholders and demonstrators |
| Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink | Jointly organised by two businesses, Cobbles Kitchen and Deli and the Roaming Caravan Co, based in the Vale of Glamorgan | Stallholders, demonstrators, musicians, storyteller |

The events were held at different times of the day, and largely at the weekends with the just the craft workshops for the Crafts on the Coast event as weekday events. Being open air events, they were affected (or had the potential to be) by adverse weather. This impacted on two events:

* Crafts on the Coast: strong winds on the day of the open event caused the organisers to put in place a wet weather contingency plan of putting stallholders largely into the Heritage Centre rather than outside where the wind could have taken out the gazebo stall covers
* Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink, where a sudden downpour in the afternoon caused visitors to leave, some stallholders to pack up and leave early to avoid damaging goods, and the evening’s planned music acts to be brought forward. The event ended an hour earlier than planned

This section draws on the responses to an online survey sent to all event organisers, who were asked to circulate it to their lists of participants. Only nine responses were received, of which four came from event organisers and five from participants at events. It also draws on information from telephone interviews with all the event organisers (8 interviews in total) which provided a more qualitative view of their experience. One event organiser also provided some feedback from stallholders posted on their Facebook page.

## 3.2. The Practical Side of organisation, management and logistics

The online survey asked for feedback on the practical support received from CRC. Not all categories of support were relevant to all respondents. The feedback below indicates that generally CRC’s support was viewed as very good. Where comments were made these principally related to marketing and PR (the lack of time available for marketing and PR due to the limited time between decisions on supporting events and their taking place) and a concern about the design of the events leaflet (small writing, not very legible[[15]](#footnote-16)).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Areas of CRC Support | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Poor |
| The application forms and process | 2 |  |  |  |
| Logistics such as power, water, toilets, access etc | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Licensing, permissions, insurance | 1 | 3 |  |  |
| Health and Safety, Risk Assessments | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Marketing and PR | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Opportunities to learn from others, network and collaborate | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Evaluating your event | 3 | 1 |  |  |

Further discussion with event organisers drew out other points both positive and negative:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Areas of CRC Support | Qualitative feedback |
| The application forms and process | Generally viewed as easy. A comment that the process had seemed a bit lengthy. |
| Logistics such as power, water, toilets, access etc | Generally very well organised. Some issues in sourcing gazebos for stallholders for one event noted (which CRC sorted out). Event organisers felt they were kept informed of progress on CRC’s organisational inputs. One hiccup in the power supply in one film showing. |
| Licensing, permissions, insurance | Helpful in explaining what licences were needed and where/how to obtain these, both for event organisers and also in terms of what stallholders would need |
| Health and Safety, Risk Assessments, Support personnel | Generally viewed as excellent. A concern that some information about what was needed came a little late in the day. Positive feedback about help received from the rangers e.g. helping set up events |
| Marketing and PR | This had a more mixed response, with concerns raised relating to:   * The events leaflet print being too small * The timeliness of marketing and PR e.g. whether the website was up and running at the time of the Vale of Glamorgan Annual Show (although equally there was a recognition of the time constraints of the overall pilot project) * Timing of the film showings was not as marketed as expected, creating some organisational/management issues which were dealt with * Poor signing of the events from the main road junction to Dunraven Bay and around the area to capture visitors who might be driving around   Organisers noted that they had also used their own marketing and PR tools e.g. social media which had been important in generating visitors for them.  One event organiser secured a Vale of Glamorgan Council small grant which had enabled them to produce their own publicity items e.g. fliers, event banner as signage on the road |
| Opportunities to learn from others, network and collaborate | Responses that attending the site visit to Dunraven Bay and meeting other event organisers had been very helpful and provided a wider perspective of the overall pilot project (as well as helpful for all the practical information it provided e.g. on H&S, insurances) |
| Cost of participation | A general view that this seemed reasonable. Comment made that it had not been clear what the cost would be at the start. Comment was also made that the cost seemed reasonable given that CRC had paid for some of the organisational costs but could seem high otherwise. |

Other points[[16]](#footnote-17) noted in discussion included:

* The value of having a wet weather contingency plan in place – which was implemented on the day for one event
* Organisers would not have known how to set about getting permission from the landowner for an event at Dunraven Bay so CRC’s ability to do this was important
* Good communications with CRC during organisation of events and on the day
* All the event organisers indicated that they would not (or it would have been highly unlikely) have proceeded with organising an event at Dunraven Bay without the support of CRC through the pilot project, indicating a strong additionality angle to the pilot project.

Organisers did not think that any particular element of support had been missing. In some cases they noted that it had been more than they were expecting. Equally they acknowledged some glitches, with the greatest concerns being around marketing and PR.

One aspect of concern related to timeliness of marketing and PR. As CRC’s marketing leaflet could not be produced until all four events were confirmed (as it marketed all four together), the time available for marketing and PR was quite limited, particularly for the September events. This highlights a wider view from nearly all event organisers that the time between decisions on what events to support and actual delivery of events was not long enough. The consensus was that, for the future, this should be a minimum of six months, if not more. This is needed in order to book stallholders, book the appropriate films etc and get marketing and PR underway to get dates into visitor diaries. The evidence that four events were successfully delivered in the timescale is testament to the efforts made by the event organisers and CRC in the time available to achieve this.

Discussions indicated that event organisers had different levels of experience of organising events (although all had some experience as this was a necessarily qualifying criteria for getting their event idea approved). Most event organisers felt that they could now organise an event in the future without CRC support, having learnt from this experience what was needed, although some were unsure as to whether they could organise a viable event without CRC financial support or some sort of partnership arrangement with CRC. Comments also suggest not all event organisers were fully aware of all that had to be done in order to sort out all the elements of support CRC undertook or arranged.

Organisers supported the idea of a Guidance Manual. Their requests for topics to be covered in this reflected their own event needs and knowledge:

* Logistics and amenities such as power, water, toilets, access etc and who could be suppliers for this
* Licensing, permissions, insurances needed and where to apply for these; and any other legislative requirements that need to be covered eg food hygiene certificates
* A procedure/timeline for organising an event - what to do and in what order
* The practicalities of setting up an event on the day (e.g. the scale of manpower needed to get stalls etc up)
* A full understanding of set up costs
* Key contacts in the Vale of Glamorgan Council
* Information on marketing and PR contacts e.g. for the papers, TV Radio etc
* How to write a press release
* What the Vale of Glamorgan Council could loan out
* Important ‘Do’s’ and ‘Don’ts’

## 3.3 The Location

For three of the four events, organisers[[17]](#footnote-18) indicated that they had considered Dunraven Bay as a venue for an event because it was a site they knew, but had not pursued it as they did not consider it would be viable[[18]](#footnote-19). The need for landowner permission plus the viability question had, as one organiser described it ‘put it in the too complicated box’. The opportunity to trial something as a pilot project was therefore welcomed, for reasons of the unique location as well as the opportunity for support from CRC mitigating the viability risk.

One of the event organisers had not considered Dunraven Bay as an events location before (although did know the site) and the pilot project was opportune in enabling an event to happen there which they had wanted to do somewhere anyway. The participants who responded to this question in the survey also both indicated that they had not previously considered Dunraven as a location for an event before.

All event organisers would like to run their event again, at Dunraven Bay (although with some qualification notably around looking at costs and viability). Comments noted by them about the location include:

* The Walled Garden is an ideal location for ticketed events as people are contained and music/noise does not carry too far. One organiser noted it as ‘such an unusual location’ with the success of their event being a combination of the location and the event itself
* However a big issue with the Walled Garden was noted as the lack of vehicular access which makes getting equipment and goods in and out very difficult if not impossible. For example generators had to be outside the walls with leads over the walls into the Gardens, stallholders goods had to be carried in/brought in by handcart
* For one respondent, it had been a long term ‘dream’ to do something at Dunraven Bay because it is local and an event based in the local community
* For one respondent it had been the opportunity to take an activity that usually happens in an urban setting and test it in a rural location – with positive results

## 3.4 Perceptions of the Visitor Experience

The online survey to event organisers and participants provided the following feedback, indicating that in general organisers and participants considered visitors experience had been positive (and with no significant difference between organiser or participant responses).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Poor | N/A |
| Booking, pre-arrival information and enquiries | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking and traffic management, access to public transport | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Toilets, hand wash, refuse, and general cleanliness of the site throughout the event | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Seating, (all weather) coverage, staging and sound | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Quality of customer service and availability | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Value for Money | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

One comment on poor customer service related to a participant’s experience rather than a visitor’s experience, and concerned a lack of information in advance for participants from the event organisers (e.g. about where to park, provision of tables) and no contact with the organisers on the day[[19]](#footnote-20). Comments also noted the need for wet weather cover in the Gardens and issues around inconsistency of car parking charges to visitors.

Event Organisers were asked both how they found visitor numbers and what they thought visitors’ views of their event were. Feedback included:

* Visitor Numbers
* Event organisers said they were generally pleased with the visitor numbers they received, although one noted (in the survey) they did not meet expectations. The Crafts on the Coast event had sold out of all its workshop spaces even before the Open event took place whilst both the Food and Drink events note that stallholders were running out of supplies (may have run out)
* The number of tickets sold in advance (for one event) was noted as not large. However on the day, many more people came than had pre-purchased tickets. This was the same for both ticketed events
* Event organisers were of the view that their events have the potential to take higher levels of visitor numbers – with some specifically expressing a wish to see this happen
* For two events there was a strong emphasis on creating an event for the community, and for one of these also a strong desire for it to be a family day out with activities for children and adults. One event organiser was surprised at the number of children at the event and given this, could consider this in terms of organising future events
* Visitor Perceptions of Events (Organisers mainly commented on issues)
* Some overall comments about very positive feedback from visitors e.g. fed back via facebook pages; a mix of people already known to organisers but also new people; some useful contacts made; cheering and clapping at the end of film showings
* Car parking; organisers noted visitors raised issues that car parking charges were not consistently applied. Event organiser marketing had not always included reference to charges. If organisers knew in advance if a charge would be made, then this could be included in publicity. Separately there was also a question as to whether visitors to events should be charged to park
* Signing; some concerns noted about lack of signing both to the venue and within it[[20]](#footnote-21); and some lack of communication between car parking attendants and visitors to aid signposting visitors around
* Organisers for one event noted visitor comments on a lack of tea/coffee facilities in the morning as the café in the car park was not open
* The wet weather for one event meant that some visitors arriving later in the day were disappointed about changes to the event triggered by the weather – but organisers noted refunds were made

## 3.5 Organiser and Participant views on success of the events

The online survey asked respondents to rate a range of different elements of the events to explore whether events had delivered as expected or not, as set out in the table below[[21]](#footnote-22):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceeded | As expected | Didn't meet expectations | N/A |
| Visitor numbers a | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Profitability b | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Positive feedback | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Negative feedback | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 |
| Support from Creative Rural Communities | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Support from the landowners | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Support from the site rangers | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| The venue/ location | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Lessons learnt c | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Contacts made d | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 |

a *One event organiser noted it did not meet expectations*

b *One event organiser and one participant noted it did not meet expectations*

c *One participant noted it did not meet expectations*

d *One event organiser and one participant noted it did not meet expectations*

The online survey then asked for views on various elements of ‘success’, with responses as set out in the following table[[22]](#footnote-23):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| I/we were happy with the number of visitors/ participants | 6 |
| The general feedback at the event/ on social media was positive | 5 |
| I/we delivered our event according to plan | 5 |
| The event did not encounter and significant problems | 5 |
| Our event was profitable | 5 |
| The pilot event gave me/us the opportunity to test something new | 4 |
| I/we enjoyed running the event | 5 |
| We have had customer demand to run the event again | 5 |

Although the number of responses is limited it does indicate a broadly ‘successful’ outcome for those who did respond. Comments allied to these responses add;

* A comment that craft workshops were fully booked
* A learning point for a stallholder to have wet weather contingencies to avoid damage to goods
* A comment from an organiser that stallholders seemed pleased with the outcome and footfall
* A comment that there is a desire for events in this unique location

Further discussion with event organisers provided other valuable feedback about ‘success’:

* Viability: The question of profitability/viability is linked to knowing what costs CRC covered and therefore being able to factor these into financial projections for future events. Organisers are keen to find out this information from CRC[[23]](#footnote-24). Discussions indicate organisers are considering what could be charged to stallholders, how numbers could be increased etc in order to cover higher costs for a future event. What is also valid to note is the point from one organiser that it takes more than one year to build up a viable festival or event
* Comments that although it was stressful to organise (principally due to the short timescale), the events were a good celebration and organisers were pleased to have done this
* Comments reporting positive feedback from stallholders including bookings onto their workshops/activities
* A comment that the inclusion of live music had helped to give the event atmosphere and draw people into the Gardens
* One comment from the Slow Food Fest organisers who have gained new members (stallholders and visitors) as a result of the event, a further successful outcome for them

As noted earlier, all organisers want to hold events again in this venue, possibly at different times of the year – although as one organiser noted, September/October is a good time as stallholders are less likely to be busy at other festivals. Organisers are keen to start discussions with CRC about this.

## 3.6. Business/Organisation impacts

Event organisers were asked whether there had been any business impacts for them as a result. Feedback, although very qualitative, included:

* More customers to an organiser’s shop as a result of visiting the event thus increasing the shop’s customer base
* Widening of supplier/customer base as a result of networking with stallholders at their events
* More people booking onto craft courses and more traffic on associated Facebook pages
* One craftsperson noted an increased demand for workshops, now causing a need to think about the future business direction given the limited capacity that a sole trader has
* A need to raise the profile for crafts in the Vale of Glamorgan - as craftspeople generally work from home, it is not really ‘seen’
* Built confidence in being able to run workshops and events
* Helped raise the profile of the Slow Food movement

Whilst none of these are quantitatively evidenced, they do indicate the potential for events to have business impacts for organisers. Discussions with organisers also indicate that stallholders have been positive about business benefits, with stallholders keen to participate again. It should also be noted that not all stallholders (or organisers) are entirely driven by financial profitability; for some it has been about creating a presence and profile or about supporting a cause.

## 3.7 Learning from the experience

Event organisers and participants did identify some learning points from their experience in the pilot project pop up events:

* The need for a wet weather contingency plan – for both the overall event and for stallholders/participants who are part of the event. As one organiser described it, this was ‘worth its weight in gold’ as it meant the event was going to go ahead whatever the weather
* The difficulties of both running a stall at an event and trying to run the overall event on the day as well – and therefore consideration of a need to draw in additional help for one or other task
* That it is important to identify roles for the people in the organising team, to help arrangements run smoothly and involve all organisers
* Important to have a quality assurance process for stallholders – one organiser noted this was in place this time but for next time they would make it more of an application process
* As noted earlier, the potential for more stallholders, more demonstrations, workshops and talks
* The need for careful planning of set up and taking down of stalls etc at the start and end of the event, to ensure there is sufficient support to do this. One organiser had sourced volunteers to help with this. Another noted that help had been available for set up, but by time it came to dismantle the event, stallholders, stewards and others had already left

Events organisers also commented on other types of events which the location could be suitable for. These included:

* Music events in the Walled Gardens; the sound is contained and it is easy to manage people in the Walled Gardens
* Combined events e.g. crafts and music; crafts and food
* Weddings
* Corporate business team building events
* Use of the Heritage Coast Centre room for training
* A general comment that generally it is a very flexible space with potential for lots of different types of events

## 3.8 Summary

In summary:

* In terms of organisation, management and logistics support from CRC, there is a strong majority view that this has been excellent or good
* The main concerns relate to marketing and PR in terms of timeliness, accuracy, leaflet design and event signage
* It was highly unlikely any of the events would have gone ahead without CRC support
* Organisers are now generally confident about organising an event without CRC practical support – although still have questions about viability without CRC financial support/partnership
* The location was well liked
* All organisers were pleased with visitor numbers – and recognised the potential to grow these
* Organisers and participants felt their visitors experience had been positive. Main issues related to car parking (charges), signage, wet weather cover
* Organisers and participants generally felt the event had met or exceeded their expectations in relation to different aspects of success
* Organisers are keen to understand more about the viability, by knowing what costs CRC covered
* All organisers want to hold events again in this venue
* Qualitative business benefits have been identified
* Various learning points are noted including the need for wet weather contingency plans

# 4 Other Stakeholders Views and Experience

This section looks at the views and experience of other stakeholders:

* The CRC team, including the Coastal Communities Economic Development Officer who has been the main point of contact with Event Organisers and liaison between event organisers and other stakeholders including the landowner
* Vale of Glamorgan staff who have also contributed to supported the pilot events, notably the Rangers based at the Heritage Centre at Dunraven Bay, the Events Officer and the Tourism Team
* The organisers of other personnel who provided support to the events; First Aid and Stewards/Security
* The Estate Manager for Dunraven Estates, the landowner
* Nearby residents and businesses[[24]](#footnote-25)

## 4.1 CRC and Vale of Glamorgan Council Staff

CRC has held internal meetings, including with other Council staff, to get feedback on their perspective of providing support. This subsection is based on the discussions held at those meetings.

#### The practical side of organisation, management and logistics

The following reviews feedback in relation to practical considerations arising from the four events.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Areas of CRC Support | Qualitative feedback |
| Logistics such as power, water, toilets, access etc | * Organisers need to move rubbish bins from the Gardens to the road at end of events, ready for collection * There is also a wider issue of moving other items from the Gardens at the end of events and when these will be collected – there needs to be an understanding/agreement with organisers about what, when and how this happens. There also needs to be thought given to the logistics of moving things in and out of the Walled Gardens e.g. use of a Sack Truck * The potential for using recycling bins should be explored * Electrics need to be covered/protected * Gazebos need to be weighted, and strapped together if appropriate * Use of the Heritage Centre itself needs to work with Ranger office hours * Consider what lighting is needed to the car park for evening events e.g. tower lighting * Not all stallholders have their own portable infrastructure e.g. washbasins and sometimes this needs to be provided |
| Licensing, permissions, insurance | * There is a possible issue about cost of hiring the Heritage Coast Centre which is currently £75 for a full day hire (Council’s commercial rate). However the Centre does now have a log burner fire making it more useable in colder weather |
| Health and Safety, Risk Assessments, Support personnel | * Trailing cables need to be covered to avoid being a trip hazard * Grass areas can get very slippery with rain causing cars to slip and slide. This needs consideration/management * The back entrance to the Walled Garden got very muddy in the rain and was not a safe route * Important that participants follow Steward event management requests * There are issues of security within the Heritage Coast Centre as the main room does not lock and there are some valuable items. Ways of managing this need to be explored if the Centre is used e.g. for workshops * Feedback from the Council’s Events Panel commented on a need for more detail in events plans. A suggestion was made subsequently that in future there could be a tour of the site to establish any safety specifics to pass on to event organisers |
| Marketing and PR | * There could be more local marketing in the wider area e.g. Bridgend, Porthcawl (eg for Crafts on the Coast event) * The banners used at the Crafts on the Coast event were a good way of catching people’s attention and drawing them down to the event * There is a need for marketing and PR to start earlier and before events where there are specific opportunities e.g. a nature walk |
| Signage | Need for more signage at events by organisers:   * For event activities and times of demonstrations * Signposting of toilets within event venues * Signposting from the car park to the event venue * Where events are inside and outside the Heritage Centre, signing between the two parts * Signing from the beach to the event * Signage to the event and down the road to the Bay |
| On the day preparation and clearing away of events | * Participant vehicles need to be managed when they arrive and leave on the day, with vehicles neatly parked away and not blocking entrances * There needs to be sufficient people available from the organiser side, to be able to erect gazebos and dismantle them on the day – it is manpower intensive and takes 10-15 minutes per gazebo |

Suggestions to improve/develop events:

* Crafts on the Coast: include tea, coffee, cake refreshment opportunities in the venue; and background or live music to build the atmosphere; more opportunities for visitors to sign up to future activities e.g. future workshops by crafters at the event
* Lost Lands Cinema: Include hot drink offers, consider whether blankets would be better than chairs (chairs perhaps look too formal, plus there is the problem of getting chairs into and out of the Walled Garden and arranging for them to be delivered and collected); potential to develop ticket pricing system with separate prices for adults, children and group bookings
* Slow Food Fest: Have more children’s activities and make them more prominent to help draw in visitors; advertise activities in advance to encourage visitors and get bookings
* Autumn Gardens Festival: improve the onsite management during the event on the day including set up and take down; at the scale of this event, it is not possible for event organisers to both run a stall and be able to manage the event on the day – more management resources are needed. It was seen as the most challenging of the four events in terms of organisation and management
* General:
  + consider whether there is scope to include something about the Glamorgan Heritage Coast within events (eg a Heritage Coast stall or display);
  + prepare an inventory before the day so exhibitors/stallholders know what is available to them, including any carts etc for moving equipment from vans to the venue
  + consider the potential for a combined parking and ticket price, for ticketed events
  + consider each event in the round and what is needed to make it successful, not just the specific focus of the core activity e.g. make sure some food and drink is also available if the event is focused on something else
  + Set out a wet weather plan/wet weather proof the event
  + Explore the use of bonds to cover some costs e.g. Council staff support such as the Rangers in tidying up after events[[25]](#footnote-26)

CRC identify a number of learning points in relation to practical arrangements arising from the four events. Although it seems a long list above (and CRC has further detail for each event, with the information being fed back to the organisers) the practical side is a critical part of the pilot project. The learning from this will now be written into the Events Organisation Guidance Toolkit that CRC are developing for the future.

In practical logistical terms it is the Autumn Gardens Festival which has presented the most challenges – and was also the event with the most variety of activities and number of stallholders and the most mixed visitor feedback. However all have raised points with implications for future events. Key amongst these are:

* Access into the Walled Gardens – how this can best be achieved, given the range of equipment, products and temporary infrastructure that needs to be included
* Managing set up and take down on the day, where there was a general view that organisers had underestimated the scale of manpower needed to do that, there is a need to manage stallholder/exhibitor vans for unloading/loading more effectively and there needs to be an event manager on hand throughout the event on the day
* Electrics and lighting needed and how best to provide this – again with particular challenges for the Walled Gardens

What is also apparent is that CRC and other Vale of Glamorgan Council staff (notably the Rangers), have provided considerable levels of support to event organisers, with some views that event organisers have not always taken responsibility for some elements of event organisation as expected, because CRC/Council staff has done this for them. What will be important for the future is a full understanding of this support, what it entails and its costs.

Further qualitative feedback on whether event organisers could now do this for themselves without support and whether this would be viable suggest that:

* In principle event organisers could be able to do this for themselves especially if the toolkit is in place and there are other possible support structures such as Council contracts with providers of temporary infrastructure that event organisers might be able to tap into. However organisers do need to understand the full extent of effort required (particularly in terms of event management on the day) in order to take full ownership of all aspects of organisation. They also need to think through the whole range of what is required (again, where the Toolkit should help). The question of costs will also have an important bearing on decisions
* Some concern that event organisers may not be able to take on the full level of costs that CRC has incurred. However suggestions were also made about ways in which this could be changed e.g. through some permanent infrastructure put in on site. Comment was also made that as the events become more known, marketing costs may reduce[[26]](#footnote-27); and that it is not just the monetary costs that need to be considered but also the time costs of those organising events

Overall, the feedback was that the four events collectively had been able to test a range of situations around practicalities of temporary infrastructure and other support needed for hosting events at Dunraven Bay. There were some comments about areas where further testing/development might be needed particularly related to lighting. Comments were also made about not having tested use of a marquee, a more formal event, or a sports event. However the events were driven by what applications were made and approved against the selection criteria.

#### Qualitative views of events

The qualitative feedback about the events themselves was very positive and included:

* Crafts on the Coast: noted for having good quality stallholders, a good range of workshops and an ideal event for the location
* Lost Lands Cinema: noted for great film choices, with the addition of crazy golf on the second film night being a good one; and with a number of enquiries since (to the Rangers) as to whether more outdoor cinema events are being planned
* Slow Food Fest: noted for good quality stallholders, some of whom had a following in their own right; and good attendance bringing a new audience to the location
* Autumn Gardens Festival of Food and Drink: noted for a good atmosphere, good bands and good variety of children’s activities. It was also noted that this was the one event that had received the some very negative feedback on the evaluation postcards, with some concerns about the entry fee
* General: good teamwork between Council employees; well attended events without being too busy and too crowded, attractive and appropriate vendors; potential for linking events e.g. crafts event linked with some food vendors

In terms of scale of ambition of the events, the view was that they had been appropriate in scale and ambition, with the Autumn Gardens Festival the most ambitious and all having room to improve and grow. Feedback was that these events could be scaled up and whilst this may have some logistical challenges, these could be overcome (with one suggestion made of having an events company to manage this).

At the wider level of raising the profile of the Heritage Coast and economic potential:

* A shared view that the pilot events have helped to raise the profile of the Heritage Coast. Having known event organisers such Lost Lands Cinema has helped to raise the profile to others e.g. in Cardiff. There is a question about whether it should be promoted as ‘Dunraven Bay’ or ‘Southerndown’. There is also a drawback that it has been about a very specific location within the Heritage Coast and people have been coming to an event not to the Heritage Coast as such, so the knowledge is to do with that one location, rather than a wider perspective of the Heritage Coast
* A shared view that the events have good potential for economic benefit in terms of visitors to the area and spend, and with potential to develop this e.g. through linking with campsites and other accommodation providers; although with a proviso about the potential for commercial viability of events from the event organiser perspective. Interestingly comments on economic potential from the perspective of developing local businesses was not particularly mentioned

## 4.2 Other Personnel at the Events

Both the First Aid and Bar Licenced Stewards/Security at the events were provided by external organisations and both organisations were asked for feedback.

There was very positive comment from one organisation about the events overall and the reaction from the public. There was a view that the events had been a great success with a good atmosphere. Working with CRC was also noted as very positive.

Some practical learning points for the future from both respondents included:

* Lighting along paths e.g. for the cinema event
* The need for wet weather contingency plans including cover
* Electrics on site need to be covered or protected especially if it is wet; trailing cables over the path need to be covered
* Gazebos need to be weighted to prevent being blown away; and if more than one is used together, they need to be strapped together
* Managing vehicles on and off site which needs to be planned
* Grass verges are slippery once wet – so there is a need to consider the safety implications of this
* There needs to be good working relationships between participants, stallholders etc and stewards to manage safety and working arrangements as best as possible

## 4.3. Landowner and Nearby Residents

The Dunraven Estate Manager attended pop up events, generally with very positive feedback about interesting events and an appreciation of the extent of logistics needed to make them work. There is interest to explore further events (either these or similar) in the future, including as a ‘branded’ series of events.. Key points raised in discussion and feedback related to:

* The challenges of access, particularly into the Walled Gardens
* The potential need for some infrastructure investment/improvements
* The potential for combined car parking and event tickets
* The need to for events to be of an appropriate scale for the venue (and preferably not large scale)

Four responses were received from nearby residents to an online questionnaire which asked whether there had been any noticeable changes in relation to numbers of people, noise or traffic as a result of the pilot events. Interestingly the responses were different:

* One response noted no noticeable changes for any of the events.
* One identified a noticeable increase in people in relation to the Slow Food Fest and Autumn Gardens Festival, and a noticeable increase in traffic associated with the Craft Workshops
* One identified a noticeable increase in people in relation to Crafts on the Coast and the Slow Food Fest but not in relation to the two events in the Walled Garden
* One identified no noticeable changes in relation to the Crafts on the Coast and Lost Lands Cinema events, a noticeable increase in people in relation to the Slow Food Fest and noticeable increases in noise and traffic in relation to the Autumn Gardens Festival

It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from these disparate responses, which could reflect where local residents live in relation to the venue and also do not indicate whether a change has had a positive or negative impact. However what it does suggest for the future is a need to consider whether there might be local impacts around noise, people and traffic management and to seek to minimise any adverse effects e.g. which way speakers point for evening/nightime music, where lighting is placed, where generators are placed, how traffic is managed so it is not stationary with engines running etc. Involving local residents in pre-planning of events could also be important so they are aware of what is happening and its management. Responses from the four residents indicated that two were aware of all four events in advance and two were aware of three out of four of the events beforehand.

A comment was also made that signing was poor in Southerndown and needed improving. All responses supported events again in the future, two for all four events, one for the Crafts, Cinema and Slow Food Fest and one the Autumn Gardens Festival.

## 4.4 Summary

In summary:

* There is overall positive feedback on the whole pilot event experience from all stakeholders
* There is a considerable level of detailed feedback and learning on the practical aspects of organisation, management and logistics, the most notable areas being:
  + Improving access into the Walled Gardens
  + The best ways of deploying electrics and lighting
  + On the day management and organisation of setting and clearing away events
  + Earlier and more marketing and PR, and better signage to and within events
* The view is that the events tested a variety of situations well, although with some things still untested, notably use of a marquee, formal events and sports events
* There could be impacts on local residents arising from how events are organised and run on the day
* The potential is there for event organisers to be able to take on all elements of event organisations, especially if the Council (and landowner) can facilitate this with some arrangements in relation to accessing temporary infrastructure and services needed
* However a recognition that cost could be an issue, although again with opportunities to explore ways to help reduce costs such as shared infrastructure
* Opportunities identified to scale up and develop the four events already held – but also a question about the extent of scale of event and this being appropriate to the location
* Views that pilot events have raised the profile of the Heritage Coast
* Views that events had good potential for economic benefit

# 5 Spend and outputs

This section reports on actual spend and outputs achieved against those initially proposed in the LEADER application made by CRC.

## 5.1. Projected and Actual Spend

A budget of £25,000 was projected and approved for this pilot project. In practice actual spend has been £24,659, close to budget. The following table sets out actual spend against projections by budget area:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item/Activity** | **Projected Spend** | **Actual Spend** |
| Running costs e.g. Security and stewarding | £1,000 | £3,216\* |
| Infrastructure & event equipment | £10,000 | £10,227 |
| Research & Workshops | £2,000 | £174 |
| Marketing & Signage | £8,000 | £7,938 |
| Evaluation & dissemination | £4,000 | £3104 |
| TOTAL | £25,000 | £24,659 |

*\* This does not include CRC staff costs in organising and running the pilot or costs of other Council staff inputting to the pilot.*

Main reasons for differences have been:

* Events required more stewarding/ security than was initially anticipated. The budget was set prior to the events coming forward and knowing what security/ stewarding support they would need
* Just one workshop was held on site for all event organisers, given time constraints

Discussion also noted that the two events held in the Gardens had been more expensive than those using the Heritage Centre as more infrastructure had been required. They both took place into the evening/ night time so more security and electrics were required, and both events were of a larger scale. The following table sets out the specific costs CRC incurred for each of the events in more detail. This clearly shows the different costs of additional lighting, electrics and stewarding. Crafts of the Coast incurred stall hire costs as those available at no cost through the Council were not available for this event.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Equipment type** | **Crafts on the Coast** | **Lost Lands Cinema** | **Slow Food Fest** | **Autumn Gardens Festival** |
| First Aid | £136 | £440 | £250 | £250 |
| Stall hire | £536 |  |  |  |
| Lighting and Electrics | £117 | £2025 | £600 | 2850 |
| Toilets |  | £586 | £269 | 311 |
| Bins |  | £266 | £266 | 266 |
| Event signage/ banners |  | £10 |  |  |
| Stewards/Marshalls \* |  | £1,368\* | £508 | 1140 |
| Fridge |  | £87 | £87 |  |
| Hand wash units |  |  | £180 | 180 |
| Chairs |  | Organisers own |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **£789** | **£4,782** | **£2,160** | **£4,997** |
| *NB: All costs exclude VAT \* includes car parking marshalls* | | | | |

The costs have been/will be met through £14,000 from LEADER, £755 from event organisers with the balance of £9904 from the Coastal Communities Fund.

## 5.2 Projected and Actual Outputs

The following table sets out outputs achieved for this pilot project:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Category** | **Projected Outputs** | **Outputs Achieved** |
| Number of Feasibility Studies | 1 | 1 |
| Number of pilot activities undertaken/supported | 8 | 4 |
| Number of information dissemination actions/ promotional and/or marketing activities to raise awareness of the LDS and/or its projects | 2 | 11 |
| Number of stakeholders engaged | 10 | 262 |
| Number of participants supported | 8 | 83 |
| Businesses assisted | 8 | 674 |

*1 Events Guidance Toolkit in preparation*

*2 Comprising: Event Liaison Panel – 8; Council Tourism Team – 3; CRC officer team – 8; Rangers – 6, Landowner Agent – 1. In addition to this number, 25 LAG members were also involved in that they debated and approved the application and oversee CRC activities including organising, monitoring and evaluating this pilot project*

*3 These are the businesses/organisations involved as event organisers: Crafts on the Coast – four businesses; Cinema – one business, Slow Food Fest – one organisation, Autumn Gardens Festival – two businesses*

*4 These are seven of the event organisers (one being a voluntary group not a business) plus stallholders, demonstrator and other businesses participating in all four events, as reported by event organisers: Crafts on the Coast – 16; Cinema – 3; Slow Food Fest – 18; Autumn Gardens Festival – 30+. It is possible there is an element of double counting if participants attended more than one event but the evaluation does not have the details of all the participants to determine that*

Main reasons for differences have been:

* Number of pilot activities. The pilot project has supported 8 organising bodies but not 8 events as organisers have worked together – four businesses worked as one group and two businesses were brought together to work as another organising group. The original intention was for eight different pop-up events. Although there were expressions of interest from 17 different organisers, only 6 of these applied formally to run a pilot of which only four were considered appropriate to be part of the pilot. Given the experience of the four pilot events, it is unlikely that the budget would have effectively supported eight events in practice
* The targets on stakeholders and businesses assisted were also set out before the actual nature of the four pilot events were known and the basis for these is not specifically identified in the LEADER application. In practice considerably more stakeholders and businesses have been assisted given the nature of the events with stallholders, the considerable resources put in by stakeholders who have supported their development and preparation in some way, and the number of businesses who have actually attended events as participants

## 5.3 Cost and Output Review

Although only four events were held, these have still taken the full budget. Whilst CRC acknowledge that some elements of expenditure were higher than they need to be, moving forward, this was very much a pilot to test what was needed in terms of infrastructure and support and how to best deliver this. Some experimentation around different types of infrastructure e.g. lighting was therefore an integral purpose of the project and would inevitably mean higher costs than might otherwise be the case. Nevertheless the work has demonstrated the range of costs associated with temporary infrastructure and personnel that is needed to support an event.

Understanding these costs is important for event organisers and crucial for considering viability of events given that this is a ‘one off’ pilot project by CRC. Discussions have suggested opportunities such as shared infrastructure between event organisations, having a pooled resource available which event organisers can draw on. Looking at these opportunities will be important. This evaluation has not looked in detail at the full costs of each event with each event organiser, although CRC has provided a breakdown of costs they incurred by specific event. Discussion suggests that whilst costs have been covered, there may not have been significant surpluses made, even with the CRC financial input. A full understanding of costs will therefore be critical for event organisers and landowners moving forward[[27]](#footnote-28).

What is also important to note is that the costs do not include CRC staff time in organising and managing the pilot project and being the link between all organising parties and point of contact. This has been a considerable time input. There have also been other time inputs from Council staff such as the Tourism Team and the Heritage Coast Rangers.

Although only four events were held, the nature of these events involving a wide range of different stallholders and other participants, has meant that the number of businesses supported has been far greater than initially anticipated. The events have also engaged quite a number of different stakeholders who have been part of the support structure for the events in some way. In this sense the events have been very successful in delivering their outputs, and especially that of assisting businesses which is an important part of the Coastal Communities and LEADER Programmes.

# 6 Conclusions and recommendations

This section draws out the main conclusions in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the Pop Up Events Pilot Project and make recommendations for the future. Overall the pilot project has worked well in testing the potential for events at Dunraven Bay, identified that there is a market for this with an opportunity to develop from this pilot project.

## 6.1 Conclusions: Efficiency

Efficiency relates to how well the pilot project has performed in terms of the practical side of testing logistics, management and organisation and whether this has led to cost efficiency and value for money. The pilot project overall spend has been as anticipated, with some differences between actual and anticipated spend in some sub headings reflecting the type of events that were finally approved. Outputs have largely been on target or exceeding target with the exception of number of events held – four rather than eight reflecting the limited number of detailed applications in the end and the realism of delivery of these.

#### Logistics

In terms of temporary infrastructure and personnel support the main issues that have arisen from the pilot events have been:

* Car parking; raised by visitors and events organisers and principally related to the question of cost. Visitors have commented on having to pay to park as well as pay an entry fee. Event organisers have commented on inconsistencies of whether parking is charged or not. If it were known in advance that there will be charges this can be included in publicity so visitors know what costs they will incur
* Lighting and Electrics: principally raised by stakeholders and related to questions of H&S and Risk Assessments on site on the day e.g. trailing cables as trip hazards; sufficient lighting at night for people to safely get between the Walled Gardens and the car park
* Access to the Walled Gardens: raised by stakeholders and event organisers/participants and concerned with (a) the lack of vehicular access into the Walled Gardens and the problems of therefore carrying all equipment, stalls, stock etc into the Walled Gardens; and (b) the challenges access also poses for lighting and electrics in terms of providing generators and cables for electricity and effective lighting for day and evening events
* Marketing and PR: raised by visitors, event organisers and stakeholders and related to the need for more marketing, starting marketing much earlier in advance of events, providing more detail about what’s on at events and timings both in advance and at events
* Signage: raised by visitors, event organisers and stakeholders in relation to the need for more signing to the events from main roads, down the road to the Bay and within the site itself, including information on times and location for demonstrations and other activities
* Wet weather contingencies: raised by visitors, event organisers and stakeholders in terms of event organisers having a wet weather contingency plan because of impact of wet weather on visitor numbers and stallholders (e.g. damage to stock)
* Event Set up and Take Down: raised mainly by stakeholders and also event organisers, in terms of the need for good organisation and manpower available for this – it is quite time consuming and labour intensive and requirements were underestimated
* Event management on the day: raised by stakeholders and event organisers (particularly with reference to the Autumn Gardens Festival), and where event organisers need to manage the organisation of their event throughout. This may not be easy to do if event organisers are also stall holders, as the Autumn Gardens Festival experience indicated

What is also clear is that events in the Walled Gardens are logistically more challenging than those using the Heritage Centre, because of issues such as access to get stock, stalls and equipment in and out and access in terms of providing an electricity supply. Both the events in the Walled Gardens were on a larger scale and into the evening. Both needed more electrics, lighting and stewarding and were therefore more costly. Both had considerable amounts of equipment to get into and out of the Gardens.

In planning for events, it is also important to think about any impacts on local residents. Those residents who live near/adjacent/on the site and who have provided feedback are generally supportive of the events. They do note some impacts in terms of noise, traffic and additional people. Ways of managing the events to mitigate any adverse impacts for residents where possible needs to be part of event planning.

#### CRC support

Event Organisers and participants have seen the support from CRC as largely very good, more than expected in some cases and with nothing specific missing. Event organisers note that without the CRC financial support in particular, it is highly unlikely they would have considered running an event at this location as they would have viewed it as too risky in terms of viability.

From a practical point of view, if CRC had not provided the level of organisation and support that it did, alongside the significant levels of organisation also put in by the event organisers, it seems very unlikely the events would have been organised in the short timescale that existed. There are two points to highlight that arise from the wide range of support that CRC has coordinated/provided for the pilot events:

* Perceptions of the approach to support provided are different between CRC and event organisers. Event organisers are very aware of the extent of support provided (although not of the costs of all of this as yet) and discussions suggest their approach has been to focus on what they need to do organisationally whilst also liaising with CRC over those elements that CRC has coordinated. The perception from CRC and other Council staff is that they had expected event organisers to be more involved in the elements that CRC has undertaken than they have been. Realistically and given the very short timescales to get the events organised, it was unlikely event organisers would get too involved in areas that CRC clearly had in hand. If this had been required by CRC it should have been more explicitly requested. It may also mean some event organisers have not seen the full extent of organisation that has taken place, important when thinking about future events, guidance on what is needed and their optimism on being able to organise future events (some support may still be needed)
* CRC put in place an application process to secure the pilots that did take place. The application process itself seemed to work well. However the overall timescales that everyone was working to (from application to event delivery) have been very tight. For the future there needs to be a much longer lead in time. The process of identifying what events would take place would ideally take place much earlier to ensure that events and dates are decided on at least 6 months in advance of the event to provide enough organisation and marketing time. This is particularly important where events are being organised by people where this is not their main activity and they are therefore organising the event on top of a main job. Having the application process and associated criteria helped to draw out realistic proposals for events and availability of CRC, Council staff and its Events Panel to comment on event proposals was also beneficial (and in the case of CRC support, vital).

#### Organising Future Events

A key consideration for future events is timeliness in terms of organisation. As already suggested above, organising events needs a much longer lead in time that was possible with the pilot project. That these four events were organised and delivered in the time available reflects the great effort put in by both event organisers and CRC and its other stakeholders. However for the longer term a longer timetable needs to be established which allows more time for organisation and for marketing. If a process for inviting and testing requests for events is part of this, it needs to fit within this longer timetable.

Event organisers have had different levels of experience although all now feel their experience from the pilot project has given them the confidence to organise an event again in the future, without CRC support. It is possible there is some over-optimism on this point as CRC did do a lot of organisation with event organisers not fully involved in all of this. What will therefore be important in providing guidance through the proposed toolkit in the future is to give an indication of time needed to undertake different tasks, together with some practical detail. For example, setting up and taking down stalls etc at each end of an event has been particularly highlighted as an area where time and manpower requirements have been underestimated.

There are a number of practical learning points from the pilot events for future events, main ones highlighted in 6.1.1 above and other points noted in earlier sections.

#### Cost efficiency and value for money

In terms of cost efficiency as a pilot project, discussions have not specifically identified any issues with this. From the pilot project perspective, CRC has used the budget to test providing temporary infrastructure and support services, accepting that there may be ways to reduce expenditure in the future learning from this experience. The fact that four events have been largely efficiently delivered suggests that initial budgeting and its use by CRC has been efficient (although it is important to remember that the budget did not include time costs of CRC organisation and management; and supporting eight events as was originally proposed may have been very over optimistic for this size of budget).

For event organisers, the experience has been one of at least covering costs based on what they have had to pay for – but realising this may not be the full extent of costs as CRC has paid for some elements. In order to understand potential for viability in the future they need to understand these costs. There is some concern around event viability without CRC (or some other financial support or partnership arrangement).

In terms of value for money, the feedback from visitors is very largely of the view that the pilot events have represented good value for money given visitor spend, costs and experience of attending the event.

Given the outputs achieved in relation to the budget (very crudely, four events at a CRC pilot project spend of c£6,000 per event, around 2,700 visitors in total across all four events and an estimated 67 businesses assisted in some way either as event organisers or participants), this would seem to have been good value for money. However, this has been a pilot project and any benchmarks of e.g. ‘spend per business’ or ‘spend per visitor’ as a value for money assessment are not really appropriate. Nor has this evaluation sought to investigate benchmarks or similar. What is as important is that this pilot has investigated the specifics of holding events at Dunraven Bay. It seems fair to say, from the feedback on efficiency of the pilot project, that a lot of valuable learning has taken place through the testing of these four pilot events.

## 6.2. Conclusions: Effectiveness

Effectiveness here relates to how well the pilot project has performed as a test of events at Dunraven Bay. The feedback from visitors, event organisers & participants, and stakeholders has been largely very positive.

#### Event organiser and participant experience

The feedback from event organisers and participants is a positive one about the success of testing their events. Various measures of success qualitatively indicate that events have mainly gone as planned, visitor numbers have been generally viewed as good, costs have been covered, CRC support has been good as has that of the Rangers and landowner and the location is also valued. Event organisers comment that they have enjoyed putting on their events albeit that it has been a stressful experience to organise (in a very short time) and all are interested in discussing another event in the future (subject to checking cost and viability). From this qualitative feedback, it would seem that the events have been effective for the organisers, allowing them to test an event that they all would not otherwise have done in that location, to learn from that and be interested in repeating it again. All can see ways in which they could develop their events in future.

Key learning points from the event organiser perspective include:

* Importance of quality of products of stallholders and having some way of managing this
* Having enough stock for the likely number of visitors – important for food and drink stalls in particular
* Importance of organising the stallholders on the day – at set up, during the event and at the end
* The need for wet weather contingency plans/covers

The main concern raised by event organisers is that of viability, looking forward. They recognise the extent of costs covered by CRC in this pilot project (although not the detail, as yet) and therefore the need to look at what these are, what other participants could be charged, ticket sales and other income to ensure a viable event could still be delivered. What is also important is that the different type of events have differing levels of costs and requirements for arrangements e.g. with stallholders or film supplier. Going forward, it will be important to understand what these arrangements are before agreeing on terms of hire for the future. A ‘one size only’ approach is likely to be less appropriate than a more nuanced approach which can accommodate the varying ways in which event organisers need to work.

Whilst this evaluation has not gone into the details of costings with each event organiser, discussions have indicated that costs have been covered but profitability may not have been significant. There are opportunities for greater scale of activity and more income generation through events but it may also be the case that net profitability is relatively marginal - especially whilst events build up their following as one year is not long for this. This would further support the need for a nuanced approach to arrangements and costs for events in the future. Scaling up events also needs to be set against the question of what is an appropriate size for an event in this location.

#### Visitor Experience

As a test of the market, the pilot project has shown that visitors have come to the events in sufficient numbers to demonstrate their worth, and with largely very positive feedback about a good visitor experience. A number of visitors commented that they would come to similar events again in the future. The visitor survey suggests visitors have been relatively local, although from areas beyond the rural Vale as well as within it. There is scope to extend this reach with a longer timescale for marketing and PR.

Comments made by visitors suggest they have valued aspects of the experience including the location and the size of event (not too large, not too crowded). These are both important points. The first indicates that the location is an important contributor to the overall visitor experience (with comments in relation the Walled Gardens particularly indicating this). The latter indicates a need to think carefully about scale of event so that the qualities of it are not lost.

Visitors have also identified aspects which they consider could enhance the visitor experience. These include:

* Wet weather cover
* More activities and demonstrations, and having a programme for the activities available before and on the day
* Hot drinks at events
* More stallholders to increase choice available to visitors
* Live music to enhance the atmosphere

To some extent these run counter to other comments about the smaller scale and comfortable feel about the events. Judging the scale of events will be important and it is likely that this can’t be settled in just one year of pilot projects.

#### Other Stakeholder experience

Other stakeholders, notably CRC and other Vale of Glamorgan Council staff are also positive about their experience of events. Whilst noting all the challenges and issues that events have raised, they also recognise the overall positive experience and feedback that has come from visitors and the benefits/opportunities of opening up Dunraven Bay for greater use. Stakeholder response indicates that the four pilot events have been able to test a range of event requirements. However it also recognises that some aspects of events remain untested as yet, notably use of a large marquee (which has vehicular access implications), formal events and sports events (although the cinema event is in some way similar, in having more of a ‘single activity’ focus which a sports event might also have. However, a sports event might raise the issue of activities and stewarding over a much wider area e.g. if a running event were proposed). In moving forward with further events there will still be some element of testing in a second and possibly also third year. This means ongoing support could continue to be important.

The scale of each event and extent of experience of event organisers has clearly impacted on the level of support needed from stakeholders. There has perhaps been an over optimism on the part of CRC and Council stakeholders on the extent to which event organisers would or could get involved in every aspect of event organisation, especially given the very short timescales in which all the events were organised. Equally some event organisers may have been over optimistic about their own experience in relation to scale of event. However this is what a pilot project such as this is there to explore. It is a credit to everyone that the events were the success that they were.

The practicalities of setting up, running and dismantling and tidying up from events on the day seems to have been one particular lack of experience area of some event organisers, in terms of what was needed and how much effort and time on the day this would require. For the future, it would be useful to list practical details for the day as a checklist. If there are requirements for where equipment needs to be returned to, or when equipment used will be collected, these can be specified in a checklist so that all parties involved in the event organisation know and are agreed on what is happening when.

## 6.3. Conclusion: Impacts

There are both community and business impacts potentially arising from this pilot project, linking back into the wider objectives of the Coastal Communities Project to enhance the economy of the Heritage Coast and widen the knowledge of the Heritage Coast in the Rural Vale of Glamorgan.

#### Widening knowledge of the Heritage Coast and the Rural Vale of Glamorgan

From the visitor perspective, their experience has been about the event itself and the very specific location in which it was held. For some it will have introduced them to a location they did not previously know. For others this is already a known location. The feedback from the Visitor Survey indicates a majority of local visitors with some from areas outside but relatively close to the Rural Vale of Glamorgan. As noted earlier, comment from visitors is very supportive of the location as a venue for the events they attended.

For event organisers and participants there was also very positive feedback on the location. Event organisers were aware of the site and had thought it potentially good as a venue for an event but not pursued this due to issues of risk and viability. The pilot project by CRC reduced these issues and created the opportunity. For some the opportunity was also about creating an event in their local community – a celebration of local products. Again these are very site specific reasons.

For stakeholders, who have a wider perspective, the view is that the events will have helped to raise the profile of the Heritage Coast but specifically in relation to this particular location. However there is also a question raised around scale of event and that this needs to be appropriate to the location – smaller rather than larger scale.

Overall the events have raised the profile of Dunraven Bay as a good location for events and in this way will have helped to widen knowledge of the Heritage Coast and rural Vale. What they have not done is put over a wider view of the Heritage Coast and nor was this an explicit intention. For the future it could be possible to integrate wider information about the Heritage Coast with events e.g. through a Heritage Coast stall at events, leaflets available, specific Heritage Coast exhibition.

#### Securing economic benefits

There has already been some economic benefit from the events held, both in terms of visitors to the event and their spend[[28]](#footnote-29), and in relation to businesses participating in the events – where benefits are both monetary from income gained and in relation to networking with other businesses and building up links with possible new suppliers. Both event organisers/participants and stakeholders can see the potential for strengthening and developing the economic benefits through building up events at this location in the future. Event organisers also comment on the potential for more individual business development building onto the experience of the events, either because it has provided a wider marketing platform and brought in more potential customers or because it has identified some new business opportunities and possible working with other businesses.

Overall the pilot events have been very positive in achieving some economic benefit (albeit on a relatively limited scale within the pilot project) and demonstrating the potential for developing and building on this.

## 6.4. Looking forward – future aspirations

The majority view from visitors, event organisers and participants and stakeholders is that they want to see further events at Dunraven Bay in the future. Evaluation results support that view. There is potential for developing events there and building its profile for this, with consequent economic benefit.

In practical terms there are certainly logistical challenges around hosting events and developing the scale and content of events already held. The experience from the pilot events suggests these are not insurmountable, given effective collaborative working, sound guidance and clear roles and responsibilities between all parties involved. Equally there are financial challenges in ensuring the potential for viable events once the full real cost of event organisation and logistics is passed to event organisers. Again collaborative working to find ways to reduce cost, through joint working and shared use for example, will be important to reduce viability risks.

This final section sets out some key points to consider in taking the next steps building on this pilot project.

#### Organising future events at this location

There some important points in relation to the overall organisation and management of events:

* Allow sufficient time. There is a timeline to developing an event (which the pilot project considerably shortened given the funding timetable constraints it was operating under). Ensure the timescales have the ability to identify and agree events, with sufficient time to market what is available from about six months before the event takes place (as feedback has been commonly indicated this as a realistic timeline)
* Have some core objectives/criteria for selecting events which will support the wider objectives of building up knowledge of the Heritage Coast and supporting its local economy. Supporting local/hand made quality products and crafts has been a strong theme in three of the four events in the pilot, alongside that of creating a special event in a unique location. Bear in mind that the economic benefit will arise from both visitors coming to and spending in the area and from support to local businesses helping them to maintain and grow their business activities
* Have a point of liaison and contact. It is clear from experience so far that there is still further learning to be done and support needed to build up events and get them onto a solid footing. CRC has acted as point of liaison this time. This role needs to continue as someone needs to have the oversight, be able to facilitate collaborative working between events, joint use of equipment, work with event organisers to resolve issues – in effect there is a need for some sort of event management role
* Have a nuanced approach to Event Agreements (e.g. Terms & Conditions of hire of the venue). Different types of events will have different needs in terms of temporary equipment, different partnership and other arrangements with suppliers and may need to operate in different ways to manage costs and cash flow. Whilst there could be a broad common approach to e.g. hire of the venue, it should be possible to then nuance the details of this to suit the particular type of event. For example a ticket sale split will not suit every ticket paying event
* Have a collaborative working approach. Although there have been differences in views on who and how much of different tasks event organisers and CRC with other stakeholders have undertaken (or should have undertaken), there has been a very strong collaborative ethos underlying the pilot project which has worked in its favour. It is important to maintain this as a collaborative and partnership approach is more likely to be mutually supportive and successful in terms of learning from and building on experience. Roles and responsibilities within this can then be clearly identified in the Event Agreement/Terms and Conditions or similar agreement

#### Logistical support

There are a number of practical points around equipment and other support temporarily needed for events. Main considerations are listed below but there are also more detailed and very precise points that CRC has particularly picked up and will be incorporated into their feedback to pilot event organisers and into the writing of the proposed Events Guidance Toolkit.

* Explore opportunities for reducing costs e.g. through shared or pooled equipment or negotiated deals. Ensuring events can be viable is going to be an important consideration so if ways can be found to keep costs down (with various suggestions having been made by stakeholders on this), these need to be pursued
* Set out costs clearly to help event organisers financially plan. Event organisers do not yet know the full extent of costs covered by CRC in the pilot project but need to have this information for future planning, as do other potential organisers. This could be done by incorporating information into the proposed Events Guidance Toolkit to be prepared
* Include guidance on the scale of time inputs and manpower inputs needed. Event organisers underestimated some aspects of organisation so clearer guidance building on the experience from the pilot would be beneficial. Again this could be incorporated into the Toolkit
* Establish a car parking charging policy and stick to it. Confusion over whether there would be charges or not has not helped event organisers in advertising whether this will be a cost visitors incur or not. There needs to be policy on this consistent across summer and winter parking arrangements. The policy could include a combined ticket and parking cost. It should also consider the principle of charging parking at all if a special event is being held
* Have in place a wet weather contingency plan. The one thing that can never be guaranteed is the weather. Having a contingency plan for poor weather is vital – and particularly so in the Walled Garden where there is no existing cover of any sort
* Have a clear plan for set up and dismantling on the day as part of the overall event plan. This was an issue with the pilot events. It needs adequate resources and could be linked to a checklist and agreement on roles and responsibilities, as part of an Event Agreement or similar
* Address the issue of access into the Walled Gardens. This is a particular issue for the landowner as well as event organisers, in terms of whether there is any opportunity for better permanent access arrangements. Easier ways of getting event participant equipment etc into and out of the Walled Gardens also need to be looked at
* Have a structured marketing and PR plan for both the lead up to the event and for during the event itself. This needs to include consideration of how events are labelled and described as this raises expectations for prospective visitors. It also needs to include use of PR information on the day to let people know what is happening where; and liaison with nearby residents
* Make sure there is signage from the main road to the Bay and within the site for events. Not everyone will have seen marketing and people might be attracted by signs on the day. Event participants need to be able easily find their way to the venue as do visitors. This needs effective signing. Depending on where events are being held, they also need to be signed from the car park, with other essentials such as toilets also signed
* Get structured feedback from visitors, event organisers and other participants in order to learn from experience. This pilot has been very valuable in that it specifically set out to get feedback from which it can learn for the future. Continuing to do this will be invaluable for building up knowledge, sharing this between event organisers, updating the Toolkit and building stronger events and reputation as a location for these

#### Types of events, timing of events

* Make sure size and scale of each event is appropriate to the location and ambience sought. Visitor feedback has valued the ambience of pilot events, in part due to smaller scale. Whilst it is important to grow and develop events, there needs to be a balance in order not to lose important qualities about the location and ambience sought
* Look at what is needed for a successful event in the round – not just in relation to the core activity. Event organisers need to look at all aspects of what is needed for a successful event. The experience from the pilots could begin to draw up a checklist e.g. hot drinks, cold drinks, choice of food, children’s activities, adult activities, music
* Make sure event organisers understand the challenges of the Walled Gardens (and the opportunities) and plan for the more logistical support that will be needed. The experience of the pilots is that the Walled Gardens are more challenging in terms of event organisation – but also provide a very special location which can be very successful for events and welcomed by visitors. It is important that event organisers understand the particular challenges it brings e.g. electrics, getting things into and out of the Gardens, as well as appreciate it opportunities
* Note that events into the evening/night will need more logistical support and plan for this. Events that continue once it gets dark will also bring extra logistical challenges such as lighting and stewarding, as well as issues about when equipment used will be packed up (as it may not be possible on the same day). These need to be incorporated into event planning

#### 

1. *. There were some negative comments* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. *The core criteria were: propose a quality event, accessible to the public and with an emphasis on tourism; have some experience (or a lead partner with experience) in the chosen event; be feasible within the timescale; be sensitive to the Heritage Coast environment. Other requirements included undertaking their own marketing and contributing to an overall evaluation of the pilot project.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. *Visitor numbers as provided by either event organisers or CRC* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. *Note, some respondents gave more than one method so results do not sum to 20 – the number of respondents to the Visitor Survey. Word of mouth was particularly noted for the Crafts on the Coast event.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. *One very strongly of the view that this was poor.* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. *CRC note baby changing facilities were available at the Autumn Gardens Festival.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. *For the Autumn Gardens Festival as noted earlier* [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. *Not all responses were comments on their experience as such. Some responses made comments on other aspects of their visit.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. *43% of the 49 evaluation postcard respondees gave very positive feedback specifically on activities and stallholders, as well as 57% giving positive feedback to the overall experience of the event.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. *The feedback was from the open event. There was no specific feedback from the workshops held during the week after the open event.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. *CRC note blankets could be hired at the bar at the events – so this comment may relate to not knowing this could be done* [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. *The guided walk was not advertised prior to the event, only at the event on the day.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. *38% of the 40 evaluation postcard respondents made specific and very positive comments on the food element.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. *Both had vans. There is no ready access into the Walled Gardens for vehicles.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. *A second reprint of the leaflet did seek to address this issue where possible.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. *In response to some of the comments in the table above above, CRC noted:*

    *There was a cable fault which was not part of CRC supported infrastructure.*

    * *CRC received some fire risk assessment forms from the Council’s Health and Safety Officer for one event, a week before it took place, which was passed on.*
    * *CRC marketed all four events together, as one pilot programme and therefore needed all event information from all organisers in order to do this. The list of marketing and PR that CRC did do is given in the table in Section 1.7.*
    * *Signing was an event organiser responsibility*

    [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. *One organiser, part of a wider group, had not previously considered this site* [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. *Two of the organisers of one event had previous experience of running craft workshops at the Heritage Centre* [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. *This comment related to the Autumn Gardens Festival.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. *This was an event organiser responsibility* [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. *These figures relate to eight respondents.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. *Seven of the nine respondents answered this question* [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. *CRC is arranging follow up meetings with all organisers to discuss costs and future viability of their events at the site.* [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. *Although nearby businesses were invited to complete a short online questionnaire, there were no business responses.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. *No issues of rubbish left etc were noted. Visitors were felt to be responsible in this respect. The issue related more to the need to return equipment left behind, store items to be collected at a date after the event, move rubbish bins ready for collection. In future responsibilities for event organisers around these could be more clearly stated.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. *Although in practice this might be unrealistic as visitors numbers will need to be maintained and with new visitors encouraged to attend* [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. *CRC will be holding more detailed discussions around costings with event organisers.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. *This evaluation has not sought to quantify this as survey results on visitor spend are too limited to make a robust estimate.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-29)