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Dear Reader,

SECOND CHANCE – From Industrial Use to Creative Impulse. This slogan encapsulates the vision of five European cities to bring new life to former industrial sites and transform them into vital, creative and successful cultural spaces.

During the last 50 years, the economic structure in Europe has changed from an industrial, manufacturing-based economy to a post-industrial, service-based economy, with significant effects on the labour markets. Since the 1990s, thousands of factories have been shut down and more than 50% of the manufacturing jobs in Europe have been lost. Consequently, in every country and almost every city of Europe, one can find brownfield areas in need of revitalisation providing a chance to preserve or improve the quality of urban living conditions. Within the Central European project SECOND CHANCE, public, public-equivalent and private partners from Krakow (PL), Leipzig (DE), Ljubljana (SI), Nuremberg (DE) and Venice (IT) have developed innovative concepts and strategies to transform derelict sites into the cultural linchpins of their cities, while at the same time enhancing the attractiveness of the neighbourhoods where the sites are located and spurring urban development in these areas.

The questions this brochure deals with are crucial for many local and regional authorities in Europe: How can we succeed in such important challenges as creating new employment and stimulating local economies within the context of the sustainable development of Europe and the Agenda 2020? How can we reuse urban brownfields and integrate creative industries in order to revitalise and modernise our cities? And last but not least, how can cooperation between public and private partners as well as with other cities in Europe help us to achieve these objectives? We are delighted that the guest authors Prof. Dr. Klaus R. Kunzmann (DE), Dr. Matjaž Urišič (SI) and Dr. Katrin Fischer (DE) have agreed to contribute to this publication and to our search for answers.

This publication summarises the outcomes of the first 30 months of the project, highlighting the strengths of the approaches taken, without concealing the problems that arose during this period. In our experience, the best answers and solutions derive from our transnational cooperation, from the study of best practices and from exchange at the European and international level. We hope that this brochure will encourage cities and cultural entrepreneurs to give more brownfields in Europe a ‘second chance’.

Jürgen Markwirth
Head of the Department for Culture and Leisure, City of Nuremberg
Head of the SECOND CHANCE project
I. Cultural and Creative Regeneration
At the turn of the millennium, urban planners in Europe and beyond preached the paradigm of sustainable urban development with missionary fervour. They aimed to integrate environmental concerns in their planning approaches. They protected greenfields by legal regulation and postulated the re-use of derelict structures and brownfields. They preached the paradigm wherever they were able to find investors willing to bear higher costs for revitalisation. They favoured the compact city as a means to abolish the functional division of space and reduce the need for physical mobility, they promoted public transport to reduce car dependency, and they cheered the efforts of industries to invest in energy efficiency, low-emission cars and all kinds of green technologies that could contribute to the reduction of energy consumption in cities and regions.

However, the implementation of these and other sustainable development policies turned out to be more cumbersome than expected. Moving from ambition to practice, planners learned that implementation was constrained by the value systems of consumer-driven households and opposed by the neo-liberal stakeholders of market-driven economies. Given the complexity of sustainable development, and the gargantuan challenges of implementation, it is not surprising that sustainability, over time, lost some of its attractiveness for urban planners and urbanists turned architects. They had to accept that the physical, spatial and design dimensions of sustainable development were just one of...
many ways to achieving sustainability, and that other professions were much more successful in contributing to and accomplishing resource conservation in cities and regions.

Searching for a way out of the obvious discrepancy between vision, illusion and reality, between ambition and practice, the community of city adepts and planners discovered urban creativity as a new field of action to be explored. This coincided with the fact that in the beginning of the 21st century, creativity became a much talked about concept in economic milieus as well as in social development circles all over the world. Within a very short period of time, creative cities became a new paradigm for city development, replacing the old vision of the sustainable city.

The new vision is a liveable and convivial city; one where culture is thriving and cultural events meet the demand for entertainment and educational advancement and where iconic cultural infrastructure attracts tourists. It is a city where creative and cultural industries provide jobs for all those urbanites who lost employment as a consequence of deindustrialisation and structural change and where design products and computer games are bought by local and regional consumers and exported to the world. The great illusion reduced the urban reality to a few urban spaces where features of this vision were real and visible – city centres in larger metropolitan cities, creative quarters in gentrifying urban neighbourhoods, waterfront developments replacing obsolete harbours and single urban pockets where planners, developers and squatters, though for quite different reasons, invested time, money and passion into derelict industrial buildings and brownfields, turning them into creative locations. Creativity has become a much-used buzzword in urban policy.

What were the reasons for this astonishingly sudden rise of the creative paradigm? Why have creative cities become the darling of urban development? There are at least eight reasons why the creative city has become so popular.

1. The Globally Communicated Message of the Creative Class and the Creative City

Ostensibly two books triggered and inspired the now global discourse on the creative city: Richard Florida’s empirical study of the rise of the (American) creative class and Charles Landry’s comprehensive account of creative projects in cities and the role of culture in future-oriented development of cities (FLORIDA, 2002, 2005, 2008; LANDRY, 2003, 2006). The controversial and much discussed concept of the creative class has thrilled (and amused, annoyed or upset) the community of architects, urbanists, planners, sociologists, economists and journalists worldwide; Richard Florida justifies it as follows:

The economic need for creativity has registered itself in the rise of a new class, which I call the Creative Class. Some 38 million Americans, 30 percent of all employed people, belong to this class. I define the core of the Creative Class to include people in science and engineering, architecture and design, education, arts, music and entertainment, whose economic function is to create new ideas, new technology and/or new creative content.

... Around the core, the Creative Class also includes a broader group of creative professionals in business and finance, law, healthcare and related fields. These people engage in complex problem solving that involves a great deal of independent judgement and requires high levels of education or human capital.

In addition, all members of the Creative Class – whether they are artists or engineers, musicians or computer scientists, writers or entrepreneurs – share a common creative ethos that values creativity, individuality, difference and merit. For the members of the Creative Class, every aspect and every manifestation of creativity – technological, cultural and economic – is interlinked and inseparable (FLORIDA, 2002: 8).

At least from a European perspective this definition is very controversial, as it includes those who have successfully passed any form of undergraduate and graduate higher education in any field of science and engineering, from law to medicine, from civil engineering to architecture, but excludes many others, particularly craftsmen without an academic certificate, though they are often more creative than bankers or lawyers or medical doctors.

Embedded in an environment where creativity has become a new hope and policy arena for municipal and regional planners and policy makers, these two best-selling and much translated books, together with subsequent follow-up publications by both authors, have promoted creative urban development. Not surprisingly, the books have caused continuous debate and controversies. They were much criticised for their over-simplistic messages and their non-transferable conclusions. Nevertheless, the books and the celebrity-like global book-
promotion tours of the authors, followed by translation into other languages, made the concept of the creative class and creative city known the world over. Hardly any other discourse in the field of urban and regional development triggered such a worldwide movement in academia as well as in policy arenas. Numerous research projects on the theme were initiated. Hundreds of academic seminars and conferences in spatial planning, geography, social and cultural studies, urbanism and local urban or regional economic development treated the theme. More articles and books were written, not just in the Anglophone world (Montgomery, 2007; Ong, O’Connor, 2009), but in Germany (Behr, et al., 1990; Kunzmann, 2004; Lange, et al., 2009), France (Vivant, 2009) and Italy (Carta, 1996, 2008). For progressive newspapers and trend-journals the creative city paradigm became a much-covered topic. In an increasingly complex globalising world, experiencing increasing economic and social disparities, stories about creative action in cities were written and read to satisfy the desperate search for the positive and examples of success. Even the sustainable development paradigm could not raise more interest, enthusiasm and passion in the community of urban planners.

2. The Broad and Open Concept of Creativity

The broad and open concept of creativity has favoured the rapid dissemination of the creative city paradigm. What is creativity? There are hundreds of books telling readers how to be or become creative or more creative or how to succeed in a profession with more creativity. It helps enormously that creativity is a rather open concept and allows a broad range of interpretations. It seems that any action that aims at solving a problem or improving a situation is seen as an act of creativity.

Edward de Bono, one of the most prominent specialists in the field, defines the fuzzy term creativity as follows:

Creativity is a messy and confusing subject and seems to range from devising a new toothpaste cap to Beethoven’s writing his Fifth Symphony. Much of the difficulty arises directly from the words ‘creative’ and ‘creativity’. At the simplest level ‘creative’ means bringing into being something that was not there before. In a sense, ‘creating a mess’ is an example of creativity. The mess was not here before and has been brought into being. Then we ascribe some value to the result, so the ‘new’ thing must have a value. At this point we can begin to have artistic creativity because what the artist produces is new and has value (De Bono, 1992: 3).

Another definition comes from Csikszentmihalyi; he says:

Creativity is any act, idea, or product that changes an existing domain, or that transforms an existing domain into a new one. And the definition of a creative person is: someone whose thoughts or actions change a domain, or establish a new domain. It is important to remember, however, that a domain cannot be changed without the explicit or implicit consent of a field responsible for it (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996: 28).

Generally, creativity is seen as a positive concept, at least as long as it is not connected to chaos, something that occasionally comes along with creativity. Everybody wants to be creative. Creative people are admired: creative kids in kindergarten are commended, and creative students at universities are praised. Creative people are considered to be individuals who succeed in their profession and in their personal life. Artists, teachers, psychiatrists and business consultants all conceive of creativity quite differently. For some creativity is simply linked to the arts, for others it is a term describing the ability and capacity of someone to adapt to new conditions or to anticipate future developments – a researcher is creative when he or she explores unchartered territories in his or her discipline. Obviously, there are infinite problems in city development to be handled with more or less creative ambition. Hence, the creative city is a city where action is taken continuously to improve the quality of life of its citizens, attract investment and businesses and promote the city as a magnet for qualified labour, tourists, conventions and event organisers.

Charles Landry describes the openness of the concept as follows:

Creativity has different qualities. It goes with and against branded experience. It subverts the readily accepted. It tests convention. It seeks to be its own author of experience, rather than have ‘experience’ imposed in a pre-absorbed way. Experiences are often contained within a preordained template or theme that leaves little space for one’s own imagination. Instead, the city of creativity wants to shape its own spaces. It relaxes into ambiguity, uncertainty and unpredictability. It is ready to adapt (Landry, 2006: 14).
3. The Discovery of the Creative Economy

New information and communication technologies and new logistics have created new production systems and structural change. In Europe, with few exceptions, traditional large-scale industries are gradually disappearing. They are increasingly replaced by small and medium-sized industries, shifting to specialised, tailor-made production, complimented by a wide range of production-oriented services. One of the fastest growing fields of services is those that deliver design and marketing to meet the growing demand of consumers for well-designed products. Beauty has become a rediscovered value in the post-industrial society. Creative industries offer their competence in marketing these products in print and electronic media and in public and semi-public spaces around the world. This, in turn, spurs the continuous growth of creative and cultural industries in cities and regions, gradually changing the structure of local economies. It has taken some time for stakeholders in the local and regional economic development community to become aware of this change (MYERSCOUGH, 1988; HEINZE, 1995; HAWKINS, 2001). For too long, even the academic community neglected and belittled this segment of the economy, instead focusing their research interest on macro-economic theories and econometric modelling. Within less than a decade, however, the creative economy has become a new field of interest, providing new hope for local economies and employment in times of deindustrialisation and the shift of production to Asia.

In the early days of the new discovery, no reliable data were available to appraise the creative economy. This has been one reason, most likely, why the sector has been very much ignored. In the meantime, such data have become available. As a rule the British definition of the creative economy is now taken as a standard:

Creative Industries are those activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property. Creative industries are based on individuals with creative arts skills, in alliance with managers and technologists, making marketable products whose economic value lie in their cultural (or ‘intellectual’) properties (UK DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT, 2000).

The creative industries include:

› advertising
› architecture
› crafts and designer furniture
› fashion clothing
› film, video and other audiovisual production
› graphic design
› educational and leisure software
› live and recorded music
› performing arts and entertainments
› television, radio and internet broadcasting
› visual arts and antiques
› writing and publishing.

However, the definition of which branches belong to the creative and cultural industries is still disputed and varies from country to country. In France, for example, segments of up-scale gastronomy are included in the creative economy and in Denmark, even sports is included. In Germany, creative and cultural industries are defined in a different way; in addition to the broad and fuzzy field of cultural industries, certain branches of the economy are included that are not considered cultural by other countries.

Melbourne (AU): beautifying an inner-city backyard to help market the city as a lively place and global centre for the arts, 2012
of cultural industries as defined above, the gaming and software industries are added to the sector.

Whether the definition really matters is subject to individual understanding. It concerns those who have been commissioned to carry out empirical studies to support policy-making. In defining the sector, all kinds of compromises are made in the end to turn hard figures into soft arguments for local and regional policies. Planners in Europe have learned that it makes sense to adapt the definition to local conditions and to the respective local indigenous potential for strategies if they wish to promote the creative economy in a city and region.

There is another reason why creative industries have garnered so much interest in the developed world. In post-industrial times, modes of work and production are changing, and, with such change, location factors are adjusting. The traditional concept of separating workspaces and living spaces is no longer valid. Creative industries favour inner-city locations where face-to-face communication is easy and fast, where personal networks can be established, where creative milieus nourish innovation, where access to clients is comfortable and where they are visible. City planners, promoting the 24-hour city and searching for new users for derelict inner-city buildings and brownfields, cheer such development. Similarly, the tourist industry welcomes the creative industry fever, knowing that cultural quarters raise the urban attractiveness of the inner city and consumption of local design products and services.

4. The Return of Culture to the Political Agenda

Driven by growing urban competition and higher educational levels of the population, culture as a policy field in cities and regions receives more and more political attention and support. Cultural flagship, spectacular art exhibitions, film festivals and the like have become important image and location factors for attracting qualified labour, media coverage and conventions. Consequently, the modernisation and development of cultural infrastructure and the promotion of cultural festivals and events has become an important field of action in urban development. In the precincts of prestigious museums, clusters of museums and art institutions are developed. They trigger or speed-up the transformation of urban neighbourhoods into creative quarters, accommodating the growing demand for spaces for creative industries. Although budgets for culture policies are not really augmented, the new appreciation of culture in cities prevents local policy makers from cutting the respective budgets. Even institutions of higher education in the fields of fine and performing arts, music or media and design are receiving more public support. Private sponsorship of the arts joins public policy to raise the cultural profile of cities. All this is linked to the fact that the cultural life in a city, the quality of its cultural infrastructure and events and its cultural profile are essential elements of a city’s local identity building and global image branding.

5. The Appeal of the Creative City Concept to Marketing and Tourism Managers

Not surprisingly the creative city image thrills the local tourism community and urban marketing managers. They know that a creative city image, and all the fuzzy images linked to it, attracts journalists and media interest, tourist corporations exploring the map for new targets for city tourism and convention managers searching for suitable locations for international conventions. A creative city is considered to be a particular strong magnet for young tourists, who wish to discover uncharted urban territories, beyond the traditional tourist circuits. Often supported by special sponsoring programs, such as artist-in-residence schemes, a creative city attracts young as well as renowned writers and artists, who seek the creative environment of such a place. There, they hope to find new inspiration for their artwork, musical compositions and literary writing – and new networks of similar-minded people. The results of their work in the creative city add to the fame of the place, and, communicated beyond the place, attract more interest in experiencing the spirit of the location. It is a self-reinforcing process, which has significant economic effects, particularly for the hospitality industries, cultural facilities and tourist-dependent souvenir shops in a city. There are many pertinent examples of how the creative city profile has raised the international image of a city. Berlin is a good example; Bilbao, Glasgow and Lille are others. The interest of cities around the world in getting the UNESCO seal as a creative place, such as city of literature, city of music, city of design or the competitive race of cities to become cultural capital of Europe for a year, shows how much the creative and cultural image of a city is valued politically, culturally and economically. The web-sites of self-proclaimed creative cities tell the story.

6. Demographic Change, New Values and ‘Urban Renaissance’

Changing demographic structures and new values have considerable impact on the locational behaviour of households in cities. In many city regions in Europe,
suburbanisation is stagnating. This results from a number of trends (zuKIN, 1988). A growing number of single households – in many European cities their numbers are approaching more than 50 percent of the total number of households – and young, double-income households with no kids prefer inner-city locations. They no longer wish to spend long hours in morning and afternoon traffic jams. They prefer living near their workplaces and having better access to inner-urban shopping and entertainment districts, knowledge complexes and creative quarters, as well as their work-related networks and friends and colleagues. Senior citizens, in turn, suffer from growing isolation in suburban communities and from a gradual erosion of public and private services in such communities. Whenever they can afford it, senior citizens sell their suburban villas and return to the urban quarters of densely built-up cities. There they have better access to healthcare facilities and places where they can enjoy the amenities of urban life together with family and friends, without using a car. The growing number of highly-educated households with different value systems prefers the spirit of urbanity to the burden of taking care of a suburban garden. The evolving cosmopolitan mix of citizens in European cities is an additional factor that explains the rediscovery of the virtues of urban life. All this leads to what is now branded as ‘urban renaissance’. Cultural infrastructure and creative quarters in inner-city districts are, in turn, intrinsic elements of this.

7. New Uses for Abandoned Industrial Structures and Derelict Brownfields

When searching for suitable locations for cultural and creative activities, obsolete factories, warehouses, derelict industrial structures in the built-up urban landscape and the like are the preferred objects of desire of creative young entrepreneurs, now often named ‘culturepreneurs’ (LANGE, 2007). Usually, such structures have a particular flair, character and profile. Often protected as industrial heritage, they have a different identity and appeal to architects, artists, musicians and creative entrepreneurs. They differ from average office buildings or prefabricated production spaces and warehouses in industrial districts, and they offer flexible and, as a rule, affordable space. More than once such buildings have been illegally squatted by pioneering artists desperately looking for experimental space and affordable studios for working. Initiated by the new occupants, such areas are often used as spaces for innovative cultural events, performances and off-exhibitions. Once such structures are re-qualified and revitalised by cultural activities, they become cultural hot spots in a city, magnets for communities of culture, for tourists and young entrepreneurs who are searching for spaces to start new production or services. They are followed gradually by architects, young developers, publishing outlets, and soon by clubs, coffee-shops and restaurants. More than once, such quarters have been the result of a grassroots movement in a city, with occasional media-covered conflicts between user groups, activist groups, the property owners and the city administration.

Planners in more open and innovative cities, in turn, lead initiatives to support the reuse of inner-urban brownfields for cultural and creative use. They have learned that a new cultural hot spot in a city is a good opportunity to raise the image of a quarter, which otherwise tends to be branded as a no-go area. In this process, they have to face the fact that such developments tend to trigger and nourish gentrification processes in an urban quarter, inevitably causing social controversies and media-covered political conflicts (SMITH, 1996).

8. The Opportunity to Bridge Urban Policies and the Revival of Strategic Planning in Urban Development

There is yet another reason why planners, policy advisors and city managers alike are so pleased by the creative city concept. After years of separate action, the creative city paradigm seems to bring city planning, local economic planning and cultural development together. Aware that the aims of creative city development cannot be achieved by sectoral approaches, they are compelled to seek cooperation through communication with the respective other departments in the city. Thus separate logics, which used to dominate the action in urban planning, local economic planning and planning for cultural development, have to be overcome when selecting and implementing projects and programmes for creative city development. The common interest in revitalising a brownfield, improving an urban piazza, launching a cultural festival or applying for a major cultural event, helps enormously in overcoming departmental jealousies in a city and avoiding the red tape and usual communication strategies used to defend vested departmental interests. Given that creative city development is less ideologically loaded than other concepts, such as, for example, sustainable development, it is much easier to achieve mutually beneficial cooperation and concerted actions. Finally, the creative city concept is a new reason to initiate longer-term strategic planning in a city, giving day-to-day incrementalism a new perspective.

All these reasons make the creative city a perfect plug-in concept for those who wish to promote their city as an attractive and competitive place to live and
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work in the post-industrial era. They demonstrate that the creativity concept offers a complex set of densely interwoven justifications. These reasons explain why the creative city concept has received so much publicity in quite different academic communities and policy arenas beyond cultural and language boundaries.

Metropolitan cities in Europe seem to have a particular interest in raising the creative dimension of their city image, as it complements perfectly, and above all positively, other image factors. Cities such as Berlin, Paris, London, Amsterdam or Milan welcome the new interest in the creative economy and refer to their traditional role as centres of culture and creativity. Even cities like Zurich, better known for their profile as banking centres, try to incorporate the creative dimension in their local development strategies (heider, et al., 2009). Smaller and medium-sized cities are more hesitant to follow the fashionable trend, unless they can demonstrate, like Salzburg, Florence or Aix-en-Provence, that culture and the arts have always been a key element of city development. As a rule they prefer not to jump on the creative city bandwagon, claiming that good and creative governance committed to citizens and the local economy has always been essential for successful local urban development.

What Is a Creative City?

Still, one question has not yet been answered. What is a creative city? Can a city as a whole be creative? Why are some cities considered to be creative and others not? Can one make a city creative? Such questions may be asked, though the answers vary. Some of the reasons for this have been given above.

One of the first attempts to study the importance of culture was made as early as 1979 by Harvey Perloff for the city of Los Angeles. In his landmark study, The Arts in the Economic Life of a City, Perloff and his team identified nine essential factors for a city aiming to communicate its paramount role as a cultural centre in the emerging media-dominated world. These factors are knowledge, image, identity, cultural life, townscape, architecture, parks and public spaces, urban heritage, and food and conviviality. In one way or another, all subsequent writings about the creative city come back to these factors, of course with different emphases (PERLOFF, 1979).

Another important book anticipated the later excitement for culture in urban policies by exploring the economic dimensions of culture in a city. The book The Cultural Economy of Cities by Allan J. Scott, exploring culture-related segments of local economies in Los Angeles and Paris, did not describe and market the creative city, but highlighted the fact that culture in a city ‘is one of the leading edges of the post-Fordist economic revolution and can also be big business’ (scott, 2000: cover).

In his influential book, written in the same year, Charles Landry offers the following definition of a creative place by referring to creative milieus:

A creative milieu is a place – either a cluster of buildings, a part of a city, a city as a whole or a region – that contains the necessary preconditions in terms of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ infrastructure to generate a flow of ideas and inventions. Such a milieu is a physical setting where a critical mass of entrepreneurs, intellectuals, social activists, artists, administrators, power brokers or students can operate in an open-minded, cosmopolitan context and where face to face interaction creates new ideas, artefacts, products, services and institutions and as a consequence contributes to economic success (LANDRY, 2000: 133).
This well-worded definition, however, does not really show the way to make a creative city. This is done rather in an earlier study on which his book is based (Bianchini, et al., 1996). There, the ‘ingredients’, or rather the criteria for assessing the creativity of a city and, hence, the success factors of creative cities, were given as follows:

› **hard factors are a precondition to unleash potential creativity.** Museums, exhibition halls, theatres, concert halls and other visible elements of a city’s cultural history and profile as well as culture-related institutions like galleries, auction houses or educational institutions that are known beyond local boundaries.
› **history.** The cultural dimension of a city’s history; the urban heritage; citizens, particularly architects, artists, musicians or poets, who have been influential in advancing culture and creativity and whose names are closely linked to the city.
› **the importance of individuals.** Local opinion leaders, stakeholders, political leaders, cultural stars, journalists, academics and personalities who serve as drivers for cultural development in the city.
› **open communication.** The socially liberal climate of cosmopolitan milieus and open discourse in a city, allowing controversial communal dialogues and debates on cultural projects and issues.
› **networking.** The physical, social and economic preconditions in a city that allow cultural networking and enable local actors in the field to cooperate.
› **organisational capacity.** Public and private organisations that have the competence and manpower and the political support to manage cultural and creative projects and events, and that are flexible and open for new strategies to promote creativity in a city.
› **the recognition that there is a crisis or challenge to be solved.** Experience shows that a challenge or even a local crisis helps to nourish creative action.
› **catalyst events and organisations.** Cultural events that attract cultural communities, media and visitors to a city, events that require the cooperation and facilitation of public and private institutions.
› **creative spaces.** The existence of creative spaces, such as cultural districts, museum quarters or locations that determine the cultural and creative image of a city.

These criteria for assessing a creative city were formulated 15 years ago – long before the creative fever that has spread through European cities and infected planners and policy makers. Since this paradigm started inspiring cities and planners, many cities have tried to enhance their creative capital and market their real or illusionary location. Experience shows that creative city development requires a few more ingredients for successful creative city policies. They are:

› **an established cultural image.** The cultural image of a city, its cultural infrastructure and cultural events are an essential factor in attracting the creative class, as well as media to communicate the image nationally and internationally.
› **established clusters of cultural industries.** Creative industries require networks and seek clusters for inspiration and benchmarking and for surviving in competitive markets.
› **institutions of advanced art and media education.** The quality and reputation of art and media institutions in a city is an important dimension in attracting talent and in educating the next generation of creative artists and culturpreneurs.
› **a broad spectrum of innovative high tech milieus.** This provides new technologies and technical competence for creative production and services.
› **affordable housing and low costs of living.** Young creatives require access to affordable housing and studios in highly accessible and alluring locations.
› **a spirit of conviviality.** For the creative class, a place to be, a place to be identified with, a place to find cosmopolitan community and a place to enjoy the quality of life with others are essential location factors.

All this makes a city a magnet for creative people, searching for locations where they can find inspiration for their work, where they can work and find work, where they can earn their living and where they are able to plug into networks of creativity.

**Can One Make a Creative City?**

Given the appeal of the creative city concept, it is not surprising that the diagnosed creative fever across the globe has led academic and professional planners alike to explore whether the creative city can be planned (Chapain, et al., 2009). They all come to very cautious conclusions. They tend to agree that
a creative city cannot be planned, that no city as a whole is creative or not and that local policy planning can only work to provide good or better conditions for creative industries to flourish.

Urban development policies can facilitate conditions for developing attractive and communicative public spaces in a city, creative quarters in a city for residents and tourists or providing attractive locations for new iconic cultural infrastructure. Local economic development agencies can contribute by shifting their attention to locally embedded creative industries start-ups and tailoring their support instruments to this segment of the local economy, which they have neglected or belittled for so long. Cultural managers responsible for cultural development in a city can point to the need for more local, and above all, sustainable budgets to invest in cultural infrastructure and to support cultural events and activities. In addition, they can point to economic importance of the local cultural capital.

All three local policy corridors towards a more creative city are highly interrelated and require time to mature and show synergies. Obviously, it is unrealistic to believe that visible, longer-term achievements can be accomplished within one or even two election periods. Conditions and decision-making cultures in a city cannot be changed overnight. Time is a crucial factor in turning a city into a more responsive creative environment. Creativity is deeply rooted in the history of a city, in the local society living and working and consuming in a city.

Cities in Europe that take the creativity paradigm seriously, or just aim to be branded as creative cities, undertake a bundle of measures to promote culture and creativity in the city, to raise the creative dimension of urban and economic development. They commission reports and studies to identify the indigenous creative potential of the city, they explore real and potential creativity, they invest in cultural infrastructure and public places, and, in decorating the urban stage with designer architecture, they promote cultural events. They raise the status of art schools and support media-related higher education, they take initiative to form creative clusters and networks, they offer affordable space for studios and rehearsal space, and they promote and develop creative quarters, cultural boulevards or other projects to make creativity visible in the city. By doing all that, cities review and qualify their urban policies and local economic development strategies, stabilise their expenditures for cultural activities to meet the growing demand for cultural education and entertainment, sensitise and qualify their administration, and augment the awareness of citizens. In the end, apart from maintaining the quality of life and urban competitiveness, the creative city paradigm encourages cities to make use of and instrumentalise the creative city fever by implementing a better, more holistic, more comprehensive and more strategic form of urban development. For planners it is a challenging balancing act between serving a mainstream fleeting fashion and a more serious approach to urban development and creative governance in times of globalisation.

All over Europe and beyond, cities are either adding the well-established creative image to their urban marketing profiles or they are exploring ways and means to join the list of creative cities. What are they doing to sharpen their creative profiles?

First, benefiting from the generous plug-in feature of the new city development paradigm, they communicate the creative dimensions of the place to the media and different target groups within or beyond the city. As a rule, cities start the branding process with commissioning surveys of the creative capital of the place and publishing creative and/or cultural industries reports, which quantify, assess and document the importance of these sectors for the local economy. Cities define cultural and creative industries based on established categories of national statistics or they assign selected branches. With such quantitative information they aim to impress policy makers, investors, developers and the members of local creative communities. In selling the creative dimension of a city, city managers and policy advisors are well aware that praising the creativity of a place does not mean that the city is really a paradise for artists, creative entrepreneurs and cultural consumers.

A second field of action is the opening up of local economic development policies to target groups who, in the past, have not profited from the plethora of well-established instruments and support programmes for local enterprises and start-ups. In the last decade of the 20th century, innovation has been the magic formula for attracting investors and financial support to places. In the beginning of the 21st century, the innovation formula, it seems, is being replaced more and more by the creativity hype. The fuzziness of the creative paradigm helps enormously in this. It justifies almost any form of support for individual firms and enterprises in new technology domains.

Third, urban planners, tired of routine land-use control processes and tied up in conflicts about infrastructure development, welcome the creative fever, which
is paralleled by the recent interest in inner-city development, the euphorically proclaimed urban renaissance. It gives them a chance to regenerate inner-city districts, develop creative quarters and focus on public spaces and brownfields in the city. The interest in the visual and design dimension of urban landscapes gives the architecturally trained planners among them a chance to re-establish a role in urban policies and to promote iconic architecture.

Fourth, the coincidence of creative urban development and gentrification processes, eagerly exploited by local media, obviously alarms local politicians and socially minded planners. With mixed feelings, they observe the gradual transformation of inner-city quarters in less attractive locations by students, artists and investors searching for new locations. On the one hand, they praise the increasing attractiveness of these quarters for the creative class. On the other hand, they know that over time gentrification processes will force less privileged citizens as well as students and artists to leave the quarters and discover and occupy new locations for affordable urban living. And they know that in market-led economies hindering gentrification processes is almost impossible. Any intervention or control is a political tight-rope act.

Fifth, in the wake of creative city policies, cultural planning benefits from growing public interest in the creative branding of a city. Requests for more generous budgets for cultural infrastructure, for art centres, iconic museums and theatres receive more political and financial support. Similarly, cultural events targeted to visitors from outside the city are considered to be essential features to attract media coverage, culturally minded consumers and mobile creative labour.

Sixth, universities of applied and performing arts, music academies, design colleges and fashion schools are experiencing increasing recognition as essential cradles of creativity. They are no longer considered to be just luxury enclaves of a fully urbanised society, enjoying music and the arts, beauty, décor and design. Increasingly art-related institutions of higher learning are encouraged to open up to the city and to combine their art ambitions with projects in non-artistic fields. On the other side, established universities introduce more and more interdisciplinary programmes in cultural studies and management.

Seventh, acknowledging that local policies to promote the creative city need institutional backing, organisational power and the thematic coordination of established sectoral policies, city governments are establishing special units, agencies or bureaus to promote the creative city policies and the local creative economy. Such public or semi-public institutions are then entrusted to communicate the creative paradigm to local stakeholders and target groups, to coordinate or moderate sector policies and to network among the numerous local segments of the creative economy.

All this is done, with more or less courage and efficiency in cities like Berlin, Hamburg, Leipzig, Cologne or even Dortmund, in Nantes, Bordeaux or Lille, in Vienna, of course, and in Copenhagen and Helsinki, in Amsterdam and Maastricht, in Milan and Bologna, in Liverpool and Newcastle upon Tyne, as well as in many other large and medium-sized cities across Europe.

Creative Cities: Vision, Enthusiasm and Reality

The creative city is a magnificent vision for the city of the future. It promises an urban world dominated by culture, optimism and beauty, inhabited by citizens who enjoy a high quality of life and love their work and their city. Creativity always has a positive association, and when promoting the creative city, all negative dimensions of urban life and post-industrial work in increasingly
The enthusiasm for the creative city is based on individual experiences and perceptions of creative places and actions in a city. Consequently, the concepts differ considerably. If asked to plan for the creative city, the construct will reflect individual desire.

Moving from vision and enthusiasm to reality, however, is hard work, and the more so, if local physical, economic and cultural conditions do not offer many opportunities to follow the available guidelines and suggestions. The processes require passionate, courageous and committed staff in local governments and leadership and political support beyond election periods. The creative city paradigm fits well with the mainstream urban renaissance and knowledge society ambitions, which in the beginning of the 21st century are competitive and urban competitiveness.

The creative city fever will pass. Cities, city managers and planners will realise that the creative city paradigm is not a remedy for all urban challenges. It does not solve and does not address all the challenges of city development in market-led economies. However, carried out with patience, passion, cooperative spirit and commitment, it is a local survival strategy in times of globalisation and urban competitiveness.

Bibilography


Vivant, Luisa, Qu’est-ce que la ville creative, Collection: La ville en débat, Puf, Paris, 2009.

The Importance of Culture in Urban Regeneration Practices

Introduction: Culture and Globalisation of Cities

With the increasing importance of globalisation processes, marked by a shift from the era of Fordist to post-Fordist flexible capital accumulation, many cities and towns are currently compelled to increase their distinctiveness, uniqueness and attractiveness in relation to other competitive cities. Due to the so-called ‘space of flows’ (Castells, 1989) characterised by increasingly faster flows of information, people and products and the improved interconnectedness of spaces, cities – if they are to maintain their advantages – will have to offer more varied and unique spaces and more socio-cultural services if they intend to improve their position in regard to similar cities.

In these circumstances, where global context plays an important role for the future of the city, ‘culture’ becomes an extremely important factor that supports reorientation from economies of scale to high-value industries and a key element of transition from the modern to the post-modern phase of urban development. In other words, cities have become aware that culture (in all possible meanings of the word) has the possibility of providing distinctiveness in relationship to other cities, by localising network flows, constructing representational images, enabling events, promoting the development of interesting...
public spaces and allowing the formation of unique situational settings. In this sense, culture complements other social services (e.g. provision of education, child care, homes for the aged, ecological sustainability) that add to the general quality of life in the city.

It is important to mention that culture was, for a long time, an unfairly neglected element of spatial planning with important long-term effects on the well-being of a community. When analysing the role of culture in urban regeneration concepts, the majority of past approaches tended to focus mainly on cultural production schemes, where culture, the arts and other creative production were regarded as important supportive elements that added to the functioning of society and economy. Bianchini (1999) described such use of culture and creative potential in urban policies as the ‘age of city marketing’ where culture was ‘increasingly seen as a valuable tool to diversify the local economic base and to compensate for jobs lost in traditional industrial and services sectors’ (see also Hesmondhalgh, 2002; Howkins, 2002). Characteristic of this perception of culture are the definitions formulated by the UK’s Department of Culture, Media and Sport (2001) to describe the concept of creative industries. In contrast to this perspective, newer approaches (e.g. UNESCO, 2009; UNESCO, 2010; Agenda 21 for Culture 2004, 2008, etc.) tend to perceive and include culture as a constitutive element of the basic decision-making process that permeates the whole structure of the spatial planning mechanism. In the context of urban regeneration, planning for culture should be based on the principle of economic and cultural sustainability, heterogeneity and inclusivity. It should strive to assure a high quality of life for all possible population groups (see Lash, Urry, 1994; Landry, Bianchini, 1995; Landry, 2000, etc.).

In today’s cities, high quality of life and cultural, ethnic and economic heterogeneity may very well be considered important aspects of urban diversity, affecting local production and consumption. Authors like Jacobs (1966) or Featherstone (1991) see economic diversity as the key factor of a city’s success. Similarly Sassen (1994) studies global cities (e.g. London, Paris, New York and Tokyo) by examining their strategic role in the development of global economic activities. Bairarch (1988) and Scott (2000) see cities and their diversity as the engine of economic growth. In a familiar context, Florida (2002, 2005) argues that culturally diverse and tolerant cities are more likely to attract creative people, i.e. ‘the creative class’, and industries such as high technology and research. Culture is in this sense understood as a combination of heterogeneity and diversity of population that represents vital elements of a city’s socio-economic structure as they enable social interaction between a variety of personality types and allow heightened mobility of the individual that brings him within the range of stimulation by a great number of diverse individuals and subjects him to fluctuating status in the differentiated social groups’ (Wirth, 1938, 2000: 98–100).

The Changing Role of Urban Regeneration and Revitalisation in Spatial Planning

In the primary plan, urban regeneration should not be understood as mere physical renovation to restore the attractiveness of the city, but rather as a process that motivates and enables the accumulation of heterogeneity, i.e. offers a range of opportunities for expressing various individual and collective needs and allows the so-called urban experimentation that is impossible to notice in closed, standardised and more or less socially uniform suburban areas. The idea of urban regeneration is to a certain extent related to the processes and concepts of restoration,¹ (re)urbanisation² and gentrification. While concepts like restoration or refurbishment are oriented towards the physical or constructed environment, ideas like urbanisation and reurbanisation are focused on the demographic aspect of changing the urban structure. The idea of revitalisation is very close to that of regeneration as both view the processes of urban transformation from a more general perspective. Although very similar, a thin line can be drawn between the two on the basis that regeneration puts emphasis on economic aspects and public-private partnerships during the urban transformation process, while revitalisation emphasises the social components and reanimation³ of the city to a greater extent. It should be noted that, in some cases, regeneration may also imply the negative processes of the impoverishment of the city or can represent a form of urban gentrification.¹ The listed descriptions suggest that regeneration simultaneously includes elements from all listed processes and at the same time cannot be reduced to any one of them. It is conceived as a multi-directional approach to spatial analysis that encompasses an extensive, socially integrative strategy for the entire region of the city, and particularly for the city centre with all its precious tangible (physical, built) and intangible (non-material) cultural heritage.⁴

According to Kletzander (1995) the processes of regeneration and revitalisation include social, economic, architectural and ecological restoration of devalued, abandoned urban areas. Carmon (1999) described three stages of regeneration policies, all related to various approaches and plans for the metamorphosis
or transformation of the cultural identity of areas in the city. All three stages can be identified in the US, UK and several other European countries, although not always precisely in the same form or at the same time. The first stage (1930–1950) was characterised by physical determinism, focused on the built environment and was less attentive to social/demographic aspects of regeneration. These were stressed to a greater extent in the second stage (1960–1970), which emphasised the importance of revitalisation of neighbourhoods and the analysis of social problems in the city. The third stage (1970–1980) was characterised by the entry of economic players and public-private partnerships into the revitalisation processes of central city areas. In this stage, special attention was devoted to spaces of consumption and cultural consumption that have played a central role in the urban regeneration and revitalisation processes from the 1970s onward.

Urban spaces of cultural consumption differ from ordinary spaces of consumption primarily in regard to the products they offer. In a retail outlet, e.g. a shopping centre, a consumer exchanges his money for physical goods and derives some enjoyment from the transaction. In spaces of cultural consumption, on the other hand, money is normally exchanged for non-material products, which however also bring personal satisfaction. Spaces of cultural consumption should be distinguished from spaces of (general) consumption, because they focus more on the offer of cultural goods (most revenue is generated by sale of cultural products) that are also enjoyed or consumed in these same spaces.

A similar concept linked to spaces of cultural consumption was introduced by Bourdieu (1986), who advances the notion of cultural capital. Cultural capital is a source of wealth that can function as an alternative to economic (financial and industrial) capital. It can be understood to include education, artistic artefacts or entire cities with their accompanying cultural infrastructure (spatial and urbanistic conception of the city, architecture, museums, etc.). Economic capital can be derived from cultural capital by means of marketing and promotion. This is best exemplified by some cities with rich cultural and historical heritage, such as Florence, Rome or Venice, where cultural capital is already in use for centuries. Historical spaces of culture, i.e. the objectified cultural capital in these cities, are a part of the cultural consumption process and have long been a vital segment of the municipal economy and lucrative source of revenue.

Due to the strong role of the historical city centre in creating cultural identity and representing the trademark or brand of a city, planners and policy advisors in several European cities have attempted to combine contemporary consumption and revitalisation of city centres. Some particularly advanced and economically developed cities approach the problem of combining regeneration, revitalisation and consumption in the city centre with drastic spatial interventions that at the same time try to preserve the cultural composition of the city and minimise the processes of elite gentrification. Unfortunately, in many cases, during these attempts to renovate the city, it is not completely clear which renovation strategy is to be used and what consequences it will have on the neighbourhood, its social structure and local community. In this sense, it is possible to speculate that there will be collateral damage in this process, represented by a certain degree of diminishment of the cultural heterogeneity of the location. Moreover, in some cases, the unique local characteristics of cultural capital and heritage and its communities are used by urban managers for gentrification purposes. Distinctive features which give character to the neighbourhood and are embedded in the everyday life of local communities (offers of services, practices and structure of the population) are sometimes used as part of an ‘interim development’ strategy i.e. warmly welcomed temporary guests or ‘bridging gentrifications’ that with their character and cultural capital incidentally cultivate the area and make it ‘cool’ and attractive, but which, due to their low-income status, are not protected when the value of the real estate begins to rise.
During those processes, classical urbanity, whose impetus has been lost, is replaced by new post-modern urbanity characterised by the re-installation of consumption activities and global actors (economic entities, tourist facilities) in the city. As such, cities attempt to attract different groups of people by utilising the role of consumption in the processes of urban regeneration and revitalisation. During the course of this type of re-development, a certain degree of standardisation, i.e. diminishment of diversity in inner-city consumption spaces, can be witnessed, and the same retail shops found in any high street will have replaced many specific local establishments that helped contribute to the vibrancy and interest of particular locales, but were not perceived as profitable by interest groups. This heightens our awareness of a process of urban cultural regeneration that is mainly concerned with economic renovation and financial revitalisation, a process that tries to attract affluent newcomers, consumers, tourists and other high-income groups but at the same time diminishes the level of heterogeneity in the city. By displacing lower-income groups, it destroys the creative milieus, informal spaces and unique urban settings that represent the basis for cohabitation of diverse cultures in the city. In this sense, the institutionalisation or sanitisation of local cultural or subcultural spaces helps the inner city to raise the level of consumption and to recoup some vibrancy, but it has not really succeeded in integrating important parts of urban culture, which instead tend to be pushed out from the central areas of the city.

Conclusion: Ensuring Social Inclusivity in Urban Regeneration Practices

We may conclude that each specific case of urban regeneration gives rise to a variety of questions that are related not only to physical-spatial interventions but to more important socio-cultural factors in spatial planning. The danger of pseudo-planning or small-step incrementalist planning derives from its restrictive stance which focuses on physical transformations without looking for links to cultural systems, local community and wider society. In the context of more sustainable urban planning, urban regeneration processes inevitably must include various dimensions of cultural planning that should be based on the principles of inclusivity and strive to give voice to all possible population groups. Bianchini describes cultural planning strategies oriented toward urban sustainability as a tool that helps to synthesise – to see the connections between natural, social, cultural, political and economic environments. Consequently, the final product of such urban cultural sustainability policies should be ‘the development of “open minded” public spaces for social interaction and of “permeable borders” between different neighbourhoods; encouragement of multiculturalism and intercultural exchange and recognition of potential of participatory cultural projects within sustainable urban development strategies’ (BIANCHINI, 1999: 43–45).

I. Cultural and Creative Regeneration
The Importance of Culture in Urban Regeneration Practices
1 Fordism represents a modern type of production that includes standardisation, mass production and worker stability, whilst post-Fordism represents a post-modern flexible mode of production where capital is circulating and searching for the best conditions to maximise profits (see Harvey, 1989).

2 Restoration processes are spatially and socially bounded, i.e. oriented towards redevelopment of deprived neighbourhoods for middle and upper classes, while the socially deprived groups simply move to another area of the city (see Lees, 1993).

3 According to Haase and Steinhauser (2003), reurbanisation represents a process of ‘creating high-quality apartments and living conditions in the city by employing new forms of enrichment of the urban life’ (see iPch, 1991, 1998: 189–206).

4 Reanimation in the sense of revitalisation of the central city involves the establishment of social networks between inhabitants, the creation of a new cultural identity and the realisation of major construction (urban renewal) projects that locate the city centre within global networks or differentiate the city in its relation to its national and global competition.

5 Gentrification is in the majority of cases described as a process of social-spatial transformation of degraded areas where processes of intensive restoration and renovation of neighbourhoods have brought about the increased departure or displacement of lower social groups of the population (working class) and an influx of middle and upper classes of the population taking their place, as they are able to afford the increasing cost of living in these areas (see Smith, 1980; Hamnett, 1998; Downes, 1993).

6 While tangible (material) heritage is made up of individual buildings, groups of buildings, areas, objects and collections of objects, intangible (non-material) heritage comprises knowledge, skills, customs, beliefs and values as recognised and realised by people and connected with creation, use, understanding and transmission to current and future generations (see oxc, 2011).

7 Bourdieu (1992) lists the following three states of cultural capital: 1) embodied (or material) state (style of presentation, mode of speech, beauty etc.); 2) objectified state (cultural goods – paintings, books, machines, buildings, etc.); 3) institutionalised state (education, qualifications).

8 For example, the cities that were part of the standard itinerary of ‘the grand tour’, such as Edinburgh and Glasgow, have been the strategic ‘interim development’, i.e. warmly welcomed temporary guests (non-stayover tenants).

9 According to hamnett (1998, 1997) describes the processes of ‘deindustrialisation’ of city centres and port docks that are gentrified by the middle-class population, and developed into spaces of tourism and cultural consumption.

10 Local cultures or subcultures are one of the decisive factors in the first phase of gentrification of deteriorated and abandoned areas. In the next phases, subcultures were/are due to their ‘marginality’ often pushed out of the neighbour- hood as developers try to realise the potential for economic exploitation of the area. In this sense, subcultures have the role of bringing gentrifier that temporarily occupies or ‘reserves’ the area until the political authorities or economic interest groups define the function of the area. Subcultures are used by ‘urban managers’ (1991, 1977) as part of the strategy of ‘interim development’.

11 The often-used term ‘city life’ does not indicate only someone’s residential location in a densely populated urban environment and connection to a specific form of employment. More importantly, it presupposes a specific lifestyle, the so-called ‘urbanity’ or ‘urbanism as a way of life’ presented as an active engagement in city activities, spontaneous street vitality and described by Wirth (1938) as the widening of social and behavioural characteristics of the urban life of an individual.


II. Project Second Chance
Project Structure

**Halle 14 | Leipzig**
- Production hall at former Leipzig Cotton Spinning Mill
- Halle 14 - non-profit art centre
- Project partners: Aufbauwerk Region Leipzig GmbH, Halle 14 e.V.

**Auf AEG | Nuremberg**
- Buildings 3 and 14 at former AEG factory
- Kulturwerkstatt cultural centre
- Project partners: City of Nuremberg, MIB - Fünfte Investitionsgesellschaft mbH

**Arsenale | Venice**
- Torre di Porta Nuova at Venice Arsenale
- Research and exhibition centre
- Project partners: City of Venice, Arsenale di Venezia Spa

**Rog | Ljubljana**
- Former Rog factory
- Rog - Centre of Contemporary Arts
- Project partners: City of Ljubljana, Museum and Galleries of Ljubljana

**Depot | Krakow**
- Former tram depot
- Museum of Municipal Engineering and cultural centre
- Project partners: City of Krakow, Museum of Municipal Engineering

**Methods and Tasks of the Project**

**JAN 2010 – JUN 2012**
- SWOT-Analyses
- Stakeholder Workshops
- Development Visions
- Utilisation Concepts
- Pilot Projects
- Transnational PPP Concept
- Site-Specific PPP Concepts

**JUL 2012 – SEP 2013**
- Peer Review Visits
- Transnational Marketing Study
- Moving Exhibition
- Cultural Exchange
- Management Plans

www.secondchanceproject.eu
In the SECOND CHANCE project, ten partners jointly foster the regeneration of five brownfield sites in major Central European cities through the integration and promotion of cultural activities. The project gives the former AEG factory in Nuremberg (De), HALLE 14 of the former Cotton Spinning Mill in Leipzig (De), the former Rog factory in Ljubljana (Si), the Porta Nuova tower on the site of the Arsenale in Venice (It) and the former tram depot in the St. Lawrence district in Krakow (Pl) a “second chance”.

SECOND CHANCE is implemented through the CENTRAL EUROPE Programme, co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). CENTRAL EUROPE is a European Union programme that encourages transnational cooperation with the aim of improving innovation, accessibility and the environment and enhancing the competitiveness and attractiveness of the cities and regions in Central European countries. The German Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBW) co-finances the project on a national level.

In SECOND CHANCE, different approaches to the revitalisation of former industrial complexes with arts and culture are discussed and implemented. Public authorities and the operators and owners of the sites are jointly developing concepts and strategies for such conversions. Besides the reuse of these historically important buildings, a common objective is to increase the attractiveness and competitiveness of the surrounding urban districts by transforming the shut-down factory sites into lively cultural centres.

For the process of developing and implementing long-term utilisation and financial concepts for the participating sites, several obligatory methods and tools were included in the design of this three-and-a-half-year transnational cooperation project. This structure aimed to create a framework in which the five development processes could be compared. This was especially necessary since the five sites are at very different stages in their development – some sites started their revitalisation with the beginning of the project while others were awaiting the next step in redevelopment after a previous period of cultural activities. Differing legal and administrative situations in the countries involved have made it difficult for some partners to fulfil these tasks, and while some countries have a history of regenerating brownfield sites, in other countries the work of SECOND CHANCE is pioneering.

The starting point of the project work was a Europe-wide analysis of positive examples (“best practices”). This helped the project partners identify new forms of utilisation of former industrial sites, learn from similar settings and determine transferable solutions. A SWOT analysis was conducted for each city and site, identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for the revitalisation. The analyses’ relevance for the work on the regeneration concepts varied tremendously. Some partners faced basic difficulties concerning usable data, or found the results to be too general or to have a less useful focus than expected. For other partners, the SWOT analysis was a helpful first step towards the development of their sites.

Stakeholder workshops with various target groups followed. Ideas and issues central to the revitalisation activities were communicated to and discussed with local authorities, potential partners, citizens and neighbours, and with individuals and institutions from the field of art and culture – to name just a few. These workshops helped to include the public, learn from their expectations, and become aware of possible objections. The results were documented and formed a crucial input for the development vision, another key method and task for all project partners.

The development vision provided a general sketch of what owners and operators expected from revitalising their former industrial sites. It identified hopes, ideas and first solutions, as well as potential obstacles and problems. To translate the vision into a realistic concept, a utilisation concept was commissioned and written for each complex. The work on this concept was a crucial step for all partners, since it defined the whole revitalisation process and described in detail the pilot investment as a part of the project.

SECOND CHANCE allows for a pilot project in each participating city. Within the development of each former industrial site, a pilot investment was identified to test the use of the site and building for the planned cultural activities.

The development of public-private partnerships (PPP) for the sustainable financing and management of the sites is a crucial element of SECOND CHANCE. Partnership models will be tested in connection with the pilot projects. As a first step towards this innovative approach, a transnational PPP concept was commissioned, describing the different models possible in arts and culture and comparing different national settings for public-private partnerships. Katrin Fischer gives a summary of this concept in chapter ‘III. Research on Public-Private Partnerships’. The development of site-specific PPP concepts marks the second step. These are still in-progress at the time of publishing this brochure. The implementation of PPP models is a major goal of SECOND CHANCE. Comprehensive marketing strategies and tools are planned to attract partners and sponsors for PPP contracts. Other major goals are detailed management plans for all sites and a lively cultural exchange between the cultural centres. Thus, through SECOND CHANCE the project partners plan to develop transferable solutions and financing instruments for new uses of urban brownfield sites.

Throughout the SECOND CHANCE project, periodic meetings bring together all participating partners. Most of these have been used to organise public conferences and symposia. External experts were invited to present and discuss issues relevant to the project. They imparted their experience and know-how to the project partners and local stakeholders. At the same time, these public events introduced SECOND CHANCE and its outcomes to a wider public. Summaries of all public SECOND CHANCE conferences are included in chapter ‘IV. International Conferences in the Project’.
appliances sector and the factory in Nuremberg. Less than ten years later, they announced the closure of the long-standing AEG factory in Nuremberg and shifted production to other European countries. The last AEG washing machine from the Nuremberg factory was produced in March 2007, and the factory was closed shortly thereafter. With the site's closing, an almost 16 ha estate in direct proximity to the city centre lay idle, joining a second industrial brownfield on the Fürther Straße, the 5 ha Triumph-Adler grounds. In 2009, with the bankruptcy of Quelle, a further industrial estate with almost 11 ha of space in Eberhardshof, the district opposite, joined the list of derelict industrial sites. This was a huge problem for the City of Nuremberg, as these closures led to skyrocketing unemployment rates in the surrounding districts.

The AEG-Electrolux property was bought in June 2007 by MIB Fünfte Investitionsgesellschaft mbH. The investment company is a subsidiary of MIB AG and has the task of developing and operating the AEG complex in Nuremberg.

The site comprises a total of 168,000 m² and is located in the western part of Nuremberg, well-connected to multiple means of transportation. The south AEG complex is a homogeneous ensemble of buildings with the character of a major commercial production site. Partial demolition of indoor manufacturing spaces has created courtyards and parking areas to open up the grounds. In addition to the headquarters of Germany-Electrolux AG and Siemens PTD, other companies have moved in during the revitalisation process.

The north end of the AEG complex encloses a 1930s residential development with a potential area of 70,000 m². It is especially interesting that, in this part of the complex, many rooms are being rented out as artists’ studios. 78 artists – painters, photographers, installation artists and sculptors – currently work there. The single-storey production halls are rented to craft firms and service companies. The northern area is dominated by the former Logistics Hall of AEG. In total, over half of the available space in the entire complex is now again in use. Altogether roughly 80,000 m² are rented, part of which will be dedicated to the field of art and culture.

The City of Nuremberg recently bought building 3 from the site’s owner, MIB Fünfte Investitionsgesellschaft mbH, and is planning to renovate the 4,400 m² of useable space to develop it into the Kulturwerkstatt, a multifunctional cultural centre, located in the ‘Quartier Vier’. The Kulturwerkstatt will house the Akademie für Schultheater und Theaterpädagogik (academy for theatre at schools and theatre pedagogy), the long awaited headquarters of the Musikschule Nürnberg (music school), the KinderKunstRaum (a children’s art organisation which may develop into an art school for kids and teenagers), the Centro Español (the oldest migrant association in Nuremberg) and the Kulturbüro Muggenhof (city cultural office for the district). Furthermore, it will collaborate closely with Zentrifuge, which offers all the necessities of a centre for culture and cultural education. The Kulturwerkstatt guarantees that culture will be a crucial component of the future of the AEG site and will have an identity-establishing impact on
the district. Ideally, the institution will also gain city-wide relevance.

Developing the Concept

The results of the SWOT analysis for the Auf AEG site and the planned cultural centre can be summarised as follows:

The City of Nuremberg has neither strongly pronounced strengths nor weaknesses in the field of cultural and creative industries as reflected quantitatively in the employment figures of the respective subsectors. Lines of business considered art- and culture-related, such as the design industry in particular, are available to an extent; however, they do not display a clearly recognisable profile is missing, as well as a poorly developed market (buyers, gallery owners, etc.).

Looking at the former AEG complex itself, the strength obviously lies in the location of the grounds. It can be easily reached by public and private transport from both Nuremburg and Fürth and provides room for many possible uses, offering options like temporary artists’ studios or exhibition spaces. Zentrifuge in particular has proven itself to be an innovative space for the creative industries to explore new ways of working and as a contact point for many different groups and interests. It offers space for exhibitions, discussions and events. An opportunity exists in maintaining and fostering this quality. In this context, it is important that civic commitment as well as public and private funding guarantee that such rooms for experimentation are not dictated primarily by economic concerns.

Based on the SWOT analysis, the following starting points for developing sustainable forms of usage in the field of art and culture for the further development of the Auf AEG site have emerged:

1. strengthen the existing structures in the area in the field of visual arts with activities in the performing arts and socio-cultural offerings;
2. develop professional support and promotion for the location from sectors within the creative industry.

Cooperation between artists, private companies, Zentrifuge, the municipal Kulturwerkstatt and the stakeholders already present will bring about important synergies for the Auf AEG site.

The City of Nuremberg, as represented by its cultural department, and MIB have created a common development vision for the site by asking themselves: What will the Auf AEG site look like in 2020?

Auf AEG in 2020:

› Business related to the field of art and design has become established at a high-quality level at Auf AEG. In the buildings on the site, approximately 4,500 m² have already been occupied by nationally and internationally respected art galleries and agencies, providing the art and culture scene in the whole region with new connections to the market and at the same time improving the image of the city.

› Art, culture and crafts play an important role in Auf AEG. Over 150 artists from the fields of visual and performing arts, the Kulturwerkstatt, Zentrifuge as experimental exhibition space, communication and event room, the Comedy Lounge at Meister Robrock and the cultural association Winterstein offer diverse, high-quality programmes that, particularly in connection with the companies present at Auf AEG, provide an immense potential for creativity, communication and business relations. The annual open house and artists’ exhibition (‘Offen Auf AEG’) now has national and international relevance.

› Within this cosmos, the Kulturwerkstatt is an established cultural and socio-cultural institution. Various stakeholders offer a continuous programme of events, courses and projects. The Kulturwerkstatt has become an engine for the whole neighbourhood and the city of Nuremberg.
In collaboration with the Akademie für Schultheater und Theaterpädagogik several theatre groups have rented rehearsal rooms at Auf AEG. The result of their work is presented every year at an international theatre festival in Nuremberg.

The cultural and creative industries get special attention at Auf AEG. With the development of building 14 as a place for companies in the cultural and creative industries, and with the establishment of Zentrifuge as a focal point in the metropolitan area, the creative potential of the region has been enhanced and inspired by Auf AEG.

An exemplary practice of European integration exists at Auf AEG through the regular exchange of artists and an international artist in residency programme. The SECoND CHANCE project initiated the Kulturwerkstatt and these exchanges. The AEG community of cultural institutions, artists and galleries has initiated other European projects from which the city and the region benefit visibly. Auf AEG in Nuremberg is seen throughout Europe as a best practice for the culture-led revitalisation of a former industrial site.

The SWOT analysis as well as the development vision and the results of the stakeholder workshop ‘Creative Impulses at Auf AEG’ have shown that the following points are vital for the positive development of the former AEG site and the western part of Nuremberg. Thus they are the central issues in the utilisation concept for Auf AEG:

- establishing socio-cultural offerings at Auf AEG in cooperation with the local artists,
- connecting with the already existing socio-cultural institutions in the quarter,
- creating opportunities and activities at the site for local residents,
- encouraging the establishment of businesses and start-ups from the creative industries,
- utilising the range of skills and specialities existing at Auf AEG through, for example, collaborative projects.

The newly planned cultural institution Kulturwerkstatt is of great importance concerning the implementation of these goals.

Implementing the Concept

As pilot project within SECOND CHANCE, a first phase of the Kulturwerkstatt starts in building 14, since the future space in building 3 is not yet ready for use. A part of the ground-level hall in building 14 is being developed into a multifunctional hall and will serve as the location for various institutions and programmes. The cultural exchange with the project partners of SECoND CHANCE will also take place in this space. During the first half of 2012, the hall has been equipped with electric wiring, a stage and seating, stage lighting, sound system and ventilation.

After the completion of these improvements, the Kulturwerkstatt begins its work. All activities and cooperations that are essential to the concept of the Kulturwerkstatt will start with this pilot project, named ‘Werkstatt 141’.

The multifunctional hall will offer rehearsal and performance spaces to the Musikschule Nuremburg, the KinderKunstRaum, the Centro Español and the Akademie für Schultheater und Theaterpädagogik. Spaces and rooms will be available for non-public events such as rehearsals and private meetings; however, the hall can be opened up for public events such as music, theatre and film performances and shows as well.

A multifaceted programme of cultural and socio-cultural courses, workshops, projects and services will be offered to the citizens in the districts surrounding the AEG site and citizens from Nuremberg in general by the institutions involved and additional stakeholders. In combination with the public events, this programme will help to enliven the former industrial site.

Close partners with the Cultural Department of the City of Nuremberg is Zentrifuge, also located within building 14. Zentrifuge offers a range of programmes and events related to cultural and creative industries. Various points of contact
between the Kulturwerkstatt and Zentrifuge will enhance the variety of activities.

The Kulturwerkstatt will encourage all institutions involved to collaborate with national and international partners and to initiate exchanges with like-minded cultural stakeholders, e.g., exchange among theatre groups and experts in theatre pedagogy at the regional, national or European level. The hall and the entire site provide an ideal context for international conferences and festivals. The international visibility and recognition of the revitalisation activities in Nuremberg will be a positive side effect.

The transnational cooperation between the SECOND CHANCE project partners will also benefit from this setting, since the cultural exchange activities between the cities participating in the project will take place in the Kulturwerkstatt, as well as additional spaces on the premises. The exchange of artists coming to AEG for a residency, exhibitions presented at the open house once a year and ideas for further collaboration can develop within this diverse and promising cosmos.

The site-specific PPP concept for the cultural activities at Kulturwerkstatt will be tested in the SECOND CHANCE pilot investment. It is based on three pillars:

Structure: An agreement between the private investor MIB and the City of Nuremberg will be made regarding how to best work together in the renovation and development of building 3, the future home of the Kulturwerkstatt. This cooperation is already being tested in building 14, the pilot project space of the SECOND CHANCE project.

Content: An agreement between Zentrifuge and the City of Nuremberg has already been set up. The city will collaborate with Zentrifuge to explore new activities for the project space in building 14, with a focus on cultural and creative industries. During this process both organisations will collaborate with the artists already present at the AEG site.

Logistics: Cooperations between the city and the companies present at the site to provide logistic services for the Kulturwerkstatt will be explored in the context of the SECOND CHANCE pilot investment. Agreements for catering, public relations, technical infrastructure, sponsorships, etc. could be made as forms of property management and general management PPPs.

The Auf AEG site represents a post-industrial transformation that offers ample space for artistic and creative development. The arts-sensitive approach of MIB Fünfte Investitionsgesellschaft mbH creates considerable positive effects for Nuremberg and the region as a whole. Today nearly 100 visual artists, Zentrifuge, Werkstatt 141 and the creative clusters in building 14 make Auf AEG a lively place for art and creativity that is well-known and considered exemplary beyond professional cultural circles or the city of Nuremberg. Companies like Siemens, research projects like the E|Drive-Center (Bavarian Centre for Electric Drive Technology) or the Energie Campus coming in 2013 also bring the highest levels of business, research and development to the site. Exciting synergies between research, business, art and creativity are to be expected at Auf AEG in the coming years. The SECOND CHANCE project provides a far-reaching and lasting impetus for this as well as international attention and reflection, lending an appropriate significance to this forward-looking process.

www.aufaeg.de
www.kuf-kultur.de
History and Current Situation

Founded in 2002, the art centre HALLE 14 is housed in a huge, five-storey, 20,000 m² production building on the grounds of the Leipzig Baumwollspinnerei (Cotton Spinning Mill). This former industrial site consists of 20 buildings on approximately 10 ha of land. The site is situated in Neu-Lindenau, in the southwest of Leipzig, very close to the districts of Plagwitz and Lindenau, neighbourhoods that were once home to the factory workers.

The Spinnerei, as it is called today, was built between 1884 and 1907 after its founding by a joint-stock company determined to compete in the European cotton market. Within a few years, it grew to be the largest spinning mill in continental Europe and eventually employed up to 4,000 workers. Cotton spinning continued until 1993, when several production buildings were shut down and most employees were let go. The last production line – cord for car tires – finally ceased operation in 2000.

Beginning in 1993, during the step-by-step process of closing production halls and buildings and selling off the machinery, the Spinnerei administration opened up the empty halls and rooms to alternative users. A summer academy was opened, the first artists set up studios, and architecture firms, workshops and exhibition spaces gradually moved in. This marked the beginning of the internationally recognised art cosmos that the Spinnerei is today, and it laid the groundwork for the idea of turning HALLE 14 into a non-profit art centre.

The present owner of the Spinnerei, a shareholder company called Leipziger Baumwollspinnerei Verwaltungsgesellschaft mbH, bought the entire site in July 2001. At that time, 6,000 m² out of 90,000 m² of usable space was being used by about 30 artists, craftspersons, engineers, a
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The results of the symposium served as the basis for a ten-year plan set up by the Federkiel Foundation in 2002. Most of these results are still relevant and helpful today; however, the last nine years of practical work in HALLE 14 have shown that the revitalisation of an industrial building through arts and culture needs much more than good ideas and grand visions. The opportunity to participate in the SECOND CHANCE project, which enables transnational exchange and cooperation with European partners with similar developments and experiences and with comparable questions and problems, was a logical, reasonable and valuable next step.

Until 2006, the enormous production building with its thousands of square meters of empty space, its ‘luxury of emptiness’, was used in its original state – rough, cold and humid. For the exhibitions of the Federkiel Foundation from 2003 to 2006, curator Frank Motz and a small group of freelancers and interns worked with the existing character, size and condition of the spaces. They organised five large, widely recognised exhibitions of international contemporary art and demonstrated their professional approach. It was not until 2007 that the first architectural vision was implemented. The visitor centre was the first area to be developed, and it marked the beginning of the process-oriented, step-by-step work on the building. The restoration of the 4,000 m² roof, the renovation of the façade and the construction of various project and exhibition spaces were the main building activities between 2008 and 2011. All works were realised by Kim Wortelkamp and Hauke Herberg from the Leipzig architecture firm quartier vier.

The restoration work continued intermittently, and while the building changed gradually, the cultural work of HALLE 14 continued to grow and develop. As an independent art centre, HALLE 14 is a place for the presentation of contemporary art as well as a space for reflection and communication. It serves...
Halle 14 has been publishing its own newspaper, vierzehn (fourteen), since 2002. Detailed information about projects, exhibitions, artists and current developments is presented in text and images. Since 2009 (issue 6), vierzehn has been modelled on the format of the former Spinnerei company newspaper, Der Weiße Faden (The White Thread).

Alongside the exhibitions, art education, library and Lounge 14 series, the international fellowship programme Studio 14 is the fifth core project of Halle 14. For more than five years, the setup of the programme was planned and discussed, but there were no studios or individual work spaces in the building. However, the pilot investment of the SECoND CHANCE project made the establishment of Studio 14 possible.

Despite the great variety of activities and public events organised by Halle 14, it was understood from the very beginning of the development that all 20,000 m² could not be used by one association. The enormous size of the building can also be seen as burden; however, all involved tend to value the space’s potential and luxurious emptiness. Nevertheless, Halle 14 has found it necessary and useful to cooperate and share spaces with other institutions and projects. This fits well with Halle 14’s mission to promote independent artistic and intellectual exchange. Since 2006, project and exhibition spaces have been provided to partners from the non-profit art world (associations, foundations and academies, as well as artists and cultural professionals with innovative ideas). Acquiring long-term exhibition and studio partners is the primary goal.

Developing the Concept

The SWOT analysis for Halle 14 showed that the art centre has accomplished much in terms of...
creating high-quality cultural activities, securing funding, implementing renovation efforts and garnering public attention. The analysis also showed that HALLE 14 lacks a clear and strong public image; some programmes are better known than others, and the overall concept of the institution is not easily understood by outside observers. Refining the profile and improving its communication to the public was recommended, as well as broadening the institution’s network. In terms of the SWOT analysis, one of HALLE 14’s biggest threats is its dependency on individual private supporters like the Federkiel Foundation, which funded most of the activities from 2002 to 2010.

In contrast to most of the other sites in the SECOND CHANCE project, HALLE 14 already has a history of revitalisation through arts and culture. The challenge is different yet similar: HALLE 14 needs to learn to stand on its own feet. A sustainable financial and management structure, the completion of the studios, the formation of studio partnerships and residency programmes as well as the cooperation with new exhibition partners on the basis of a clear concept are crucial objectives to reach to ensure the art centre’s future.

Due to this situation of starting the development in the middle of an ongoing journey, the stakeholder workshop held by HALLE 14 on May 3, 2011 was called ‘The Future of HALLE 14’ and invited those people most involved in the past and future of the space. Accompanied by an external expert, the owners of the Spinnerei, the chairman of the Federkiel Foundation, a member of the HALLE 14 team and its managing director met for an intense discussion. The financial situation of the institution, funding for the next restoration activities, partner acquisition and future fundraising strategies were the main topics of this workshop. The most important issues and outcomes were the strengthening of HALLE 14’s economic position while continuing to follow the non-profit concept, the support from the Spinnerei for further renovation and infrastructure activities and operation costs and finally the intention to step-up the acquisition of exhibition and studio partners who can contribute to HALLE 14’s concept and budget.

In keeping with the results of the stakeholder workshop, the development vision for HALLE 14 identifies three areas with large development potential and demand. While not to be neglected, the exhibition and activity programmes call for only minor structural, organisational and financial improvement. The crucial aspects for the art centre’s future are:

- the development of the building,
- the financial situation in general,
- and the search for partners.

These aspects were named in the development vision. The utilisation concept deals with them in more detail.

Implementing the Concept

The development of the building was unexpectedly accelerated in 2011. The funding awarded in 2009 by the City of Leipzig to the Spinnerei and HALLE 14 for renovating the roof and façade (first and second phases of the renovation, total investment: 1.1 million Euros, public funding: 920,000 Euros) demonstrated recognition of HALLE 14’s significance within Leipzig’s cultural landscape. The wide variety and high quality of the projects at HALLE 14 and the partners’ programmes along with their draw for local citizens as well as national and international visitors were and are well-regarded by city and state officials. The idealistic dedication of the board and team of the HALLE 14 association and the continuing support of the Federkiel Foundation and the owners of the Spinnerei, combined with their financial commitment, were additionally convincing to the decision makers. The participation in the EU-funded project SECOND CHANCE finally assured them that HALLE 14 deserved ongoing institutional and capital support.

Thus, in 2011 – parallel to the pilot investment as part of SECOND CHANCE – the third phase of renovation was made possible by a 65 % funding from city, state and federal governments (total investment: 1.2 million Euros). The installation of infrastructure and all fire security requirements, the construction of a third staircase and the development of several spaces were the main activities, carried out between August 2011 and April 2012. The remaining 35 % of the investment had to be financed by the owners of the building, the Leipziger Baumwollspinnerei Verwaltungsgesellschaft mbH. A convincing concept for further building development and a strategy for securing the medium- and long-term financial situation of the art centre were needed to make this possible. This was reached by a revision of the existing utilisation concept and a strengthening of the partner concept.
The partner concept rounds out HALLE 14’s activities and helps to guarantee a workable financial situation. Through cooperations with exhibition and studio partners as well as some partners for storage and workshop spaces, it outlines a solution for continued economic stability.

There are four spaces – between 1,000 and 3,800 m² in size – for exhibition partners. These partners are expected to implement an autonomous programme of contemporary visual art with ambitious exhibition and outreach concepts. Ideally, the partner brings a team for exhibition installation, technical assistance, visitor service, public relations, etc. HALLE 14 is interested in long-term cooperations; three years has proved to be a good period in the past. With their programmes, the partners contribute to the building’s new function and development. They are asked to pay a usage and coordination fee for their space; in accordance with the non-profit concept of HALLE 14, this fee is very low. However, due to the enormous size of the spaces, these fees still help to finance a portion of the operating costs.

As HALLE 14’s partner from 2008 until 2010, the Columbus Art Foundation (Ravensburg, DE) used an exhibition space on the second floor to host group shows like Wollust (2008) and schrötterrain (2010) as well as exhibitions linked to its grant programme. Adjacent to the Columbus Art Foundation, the ‘Installation and Space’ class of the Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig used the exhibition platform Universal Cube from 2006 to 2011. Universal Cube presented curated class exhibitions and student projects, as well as collaborations with other European art academies (Geneva, Linz, Lyon).

Now new partners need to be found. As part of the site-specific PPP concept for HALLE 14, strategies are being developed for how to search for medium- and long-term non-profit partners. An open call might be one option, while relying on the existing network of curators, museum directors, artists and art professors is another.

Partnerships for the artist studios are the second main objective. As pilot project within SECOND CHANCE, 11 studios were erected and developed on the first and second floor of HALLE 14. This marks the first construction of smaller units in the building, made for individual use and equipped with heating, light, external sanitary facilities, internet and – in some cases – furniture. There will be 14 artist studios in HALLE 14 altogether.

One or two studios will host the international fellowship programme Studio14. International artists can apply for a four-month research and work period in Leipzig. Artists are invited to apply through an open call with a changing thematic focus, and an external jury of experts selects the fellows.

The other studios are available for the use of partners. Different kinds of studio partnerships are possible. Residence14 aims to cooperate with national and international cultural institutions, municipalities, academies or galleries. The partner institution provides the financial means to send an artist from its city or country to Leipzig for several months. Ideally, the partners pay for travel, accommodations and a coordination fee, as well as giving the artist a stipend. The selection process for the guest artist is defined jointly by the sending and the hosting institutions. Studios at HALLE 14 can also be provided as a form of support to artists by the HALLE 14 association, the Federkiel Foundation or one of the exhibition partners. They can also be made available to international guest artists. Another type of studio partnership is the collaboration with other residency or fellowship programmes.

The pilot investment was completed in April 2012. Some of the studios were already finished in February, so the first artists could move in then. Currently, 11 out of 14 studios are used by guests and supported artists, two residency programmes and a residency partnership with the City of Košice (sK). These first experiences are being used to develop the partnership concept that is included in the site-specific PPP concept. It has already been remarked how the short- and medium-term visiting artists complement the internationalisation of the Spinnerei and the activities of the art centre HALLE 14. Though yet to be defined, cross-fertilisation between the visiting artists and the existing projects is a possibility.

It is essential that all partnerships – exhibition, studio or storage and workshops – follow the non-profit concept of HALLE 14. According to the art centre’s mission statement and the conditions of the public funding for all restoration activities, no commercial companies or activities are allowed inside the building. The non-profit status and the non-profit management are mandatory. Still, the low usage and coordination costs that all partners are asked to pay help to cover a part of the operational costs. Thus, the degree to which HALLE 14 depends on private support and public funding will be reduced to a realistic and workable percentage.

The owner of HALLE 14, the Spinnerei GmbH, will remain an important partner, less so financially than conceptually and strategically. This is another central topic in the site-specific PPP concept. The management of the additional partners as well as the ongoing acquisition of exhibition and studio partners asks for a multi-level collaboration, if for no other reason than to give the management and team of the art centre HALLE 14 the possibility to focus on what they do best: develop and organise ambitious, engaging and multifaceted exhibitions and projects of international contemporary art.

www.halle14.org
www.spinnerei.de
www.aufbauwerk-leipzig.com
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The Arsenale of Venice is a monumental complex with an extraordinary historical value: the entire area has around 478,000 m² of space, including 136,380 m² of covered areas and 224,620 m² of open areas encircling 117,000 m² of water docking spaces. The Arsenale was built in the 12th century as the main shipyard for the Venetian Republic. It was developed to become the most important shipbuilding factory in the world, and for centuries it was.

The buildings and production sites maintained their original purpose and were constantly adjusted, physically and functionally, until the beginning of the First World War. At this time, the impossibility of adjusting the spaces of the Arsenale to accommodate the needs of rising industry made it no longer sensible to maintain the production activities in the lagoon; this determined their relocation to the mainland.

The Italian Navy remained at the Arsenale, continuing some of its activities. The shipbuilding plants, on the other hand, have been progressively abandoned, and the entire Arsenale has been neglected and in a progressive state of deterioration for some time.

The Venice Biennale’s entry into the Arsenale in 1980 on the occasion of the first Architecture Exhibition organised in the Corderie (the building where ropes were made) represented the first important initiative to convert the former factory into a place where art and creativity could occur and be presented. In 1997, Thetis, a company active in the field of marine technologies, settled in the north area of the complex, confirming the Arsenale’s assumption of a new role as the scientific and cultural centre of the city. The first example of this role was the creation of Spazio Thetis, whose mission is to organise exhibitions with both an artistic and a scientific dimension. In addition to research activities, also developed by the CNR (National Research Centre), there have been several expositions on environmental issues.

The area of the Arsenale is owned by the State through the Ministry of Defence-Navy (62 %), the historical and artistic branch of the government department for state-owned land and property (36 %) and the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transports (2 %).

Following the recent law named ‘Spending Review’ (August 2012), the ownership of the Porta Nuova Tower passed from the State to the Municipality of Venice. The city intends to hand over management of the tower to the company Arsenale di Venezia.

The Porta Nuova Tower was built between 1809 and 1814 during construction for the revitalisa-
tion of the Arsenale, on the initiative of the second French dominion. During this construction, Porta Nuova, a new entrance from the lagoon, was created in the eastern perimeter fence of the Arsenale, next to the tower of the same name. The impressive 35 m high tower was built to place the masts of large ships. Recently, the state of neglect of the tower’s structures was so advanced that visits were not allowed for safety reasons. In 2006, Arsenale di Venezia conducted a design competition for four works to be realised at the Arsenale. Following the competition, the architects Traudy Pelzel and Francesco Magnani developed the revitalisation plan. The works, carried out under the superintendence of Beni Culturali (Cultural Heritage), were finished in 2010. The objective of the project was to guarantee the conservation of the historic building, combining these actions with the needs arising from its new function as an exhibition and cultural centre.

The renovation of the Porta Nuova received the Piranesi Honorable Mention, an international award for architecture organised in Slovenia. It also received the Torta Prize, an important prize in the world of building restoration.

Developing the Concept

The SWOT analysis, conducted in 2010, is based on the opinions and ideas of stakeholders surveyed through a questionnaire and the direct participation of two focus groups. The questionnaire was sent to 110 stakeholders from different personal and professional backgrounds: research centres, cultural associations and local administration and investors. The following aspects summarise the evaluation of the questionnaires and the issues raised at the focus groups.

Generally speaking, all those interviewed agreed that the Porta Nuova Tower project will have a positive impact on the nearby quarter and on the historic city centre. Transportation is a critical element, as the tower is far from the access points to Venice, the railway station and the Piazzale Roma. The increased attractiveness of the Arsenale could create the necessity for improvements to the transport system, creating demand for better accessibility solutions, such as faster connections.

Opinions about the impacts that the Arsenale/Porta Nuova Tower may have on the tourism sector are quite contrasting. Some people think that it can contribute in a positive way by attracting experts and interested visitors who create economic and cultural input for the city. Others feel that an increased cultural offering means a further increased tourist presence, which would be an unsustainable situation. There is, however, widespread agreement in considering the project a positive development for residents.
All those involved recognise the need to create a management plan for the Porta Nuova Tower in order to guarantee public use of it and to promote permanent and diversified activities. During the wait for the finalisation of the different relationships, Arsenale di Venezia has started activities involving local partners. To achieve this objective, it is suggested to involve those already present at the Arsenale to allow them to become active players in managing the spaces of the Porta Nuova Tower.

In terms of management, there is the question of the administration of the site and consequently the issue of the different operating models that it can assume. Nearly everyone involved prefers the option in which Arsenale di Venezia is the ‘Intelligent Administrator’, involving the partners of the project through leasing spaces for permanent and temporary use. In this case, Arsenale di Venezia becomes the only responsible party towards the concessionaire, and it will have to find the economic balance of the activities.

Finally, these considerations come from statements that stakeholders made in the questionnaire:

> the Arsenale can become the propulsive centre of a ‘new town’ in Venice as an art and science heartland, with highly qualified users as the target audience;
> it can spur the creation of an international network of similar centres;
> a strategic vision for the future of the Arsenale is the basis for integrating the area into the metropolitan and regional dynamics, favouring the settlement of high-quality enterprises.

As described in the development vision, the planning of activities and artistic and cultural events should be realised in cooperation with experts and cultural promoters – and, of course, with the administrator of the Porta Nuova Tower. The activity scenarios focus on two areas with multiple activities:

> permanent activities, for example teaching laboratories and research;
> temporary events like exhibitions, cultural and artistic events and performances.

Both permanent activities and temporary events can create sources of income. The objective is to reach a balanced, sustainable budget.

The partners involved in the future utilisation of the tower and in the elaboration of the utilisation concept include:

> bodies and institutions working in the area of the Arsenale in the artistic and cultural sector as well as in the field of scientific research, including:
  > Thetis and Spazio Thetis. Thetis is an engineering and consultancy company providing projects and innovative technologies for environment and territory, civil engineering, energy plants, mobility management, forecast and modelling services. Thetis’ expertise in the field of sustainable development and resilience engineering has grown operating within the Venice Lagoon, a unique socio-economic and environmental system in the world having maintained its identity during its evolution. Spazio Thetis was born as an initiative to promote and enhance contemporary knowledge. It was conceived as a place to experience and compare ideas, to develop the arts and culture of our time and as a place where engineering and contemporary art could profitably interact.

> The Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) is the largest institute of the National Research Council (CNR) devoted to marine and oceanic scientific research. ISMAR conducts research in polar, oceanic and Mediterranean regions, focusing on the evolution of oceans and their continental margins, the influence of climate change on oceanic circulation, submarine habitats and ecology, the evolution of fish stocks and natural and anthropogenic factors impacting economically and socially on coastal systems.

> The Venice Biennale has been one of the most prestigious cultural institutions in the world for over a century. Since its foundation in 1895, it has been at the avant-garde, promoting new artistic trends and organising international events in contemporary arts. It is world-renowned for the International Film Festival, the International Art Exhibition and the International Architecture Exhibition. It continues the great tradition of the Festival of Contemporary Music, the Theatre Festival and is now joined by the Festival of Contemporary Dance.
bodies and institutions that, despite being located outside the Arsenale area, have a previous working experience in scientific research and communication applied to the history of Venice and the Arsenale;

- local artists and cultural associations that are interested and ready to contribute to the development of artistic and cultural activities in the area of the tower.

The various partners have been involved through specific debates and discussions and through a survey based on open-ended questions.

One of the main features of the SECOND CHANCE project is the involvement of local artists and cultural associations in the programme for the revitalisation of the Porta Nuova Tower and its surrounding area. Contact and communication with the Venetian artistic and cultural community has characterised the whole project and given a significant impetus to the revival of the area in terms of artistic production and experimentation.

The underlying idea is based on the conviction that the originality and distinguishing features of Porta Nuova Tower can successfully suit various types of activity: events for meeting and exchanging cultural and artistic experiences, artistic workshops, dance and theatre performances, music events, visual arts and exhibitions.

Some of the mutually developed ideas come from potential cooperations and partnerships with local artistic and cultural institutions and associations, including the Bevilacqua La Masa Foundation, an institution founded in 1898 and focused on supporting new artistic research by emerging artists. The idea is to develop a partnership with the Porta Nuova Tower for use of the exhibition space, as well as participating in the SECOND CHANCE cultural exchange of artists by sending selected artists to SECOND CHANCE partner cities and welcoming artists from these cities in their studios. Other institutions such as the Venetian Centre for Baroque Music and the Venetian University Centre for Theatre have also expressed interest in using exhibition areas or offices within the Porta Nuova Tower. Agreements are being finalised with the Music Academy of Venice and the Fondamenta Nuove Theatre to stage concerts and dance events in the Tower.

Another suggestion is to develop a ‘distinguishing focus’ that could create a new identity for Porta Nuova Tower. A valuable path in this direction could be found in relating the field of contemporary art, both visual and performance, with the geographical areas that are historically linked to the Arsenale, like the Mediterranean basin or Eastern Europe. This concept is inspired by existing programmes, like UNESCO or the Marco Polo System, and could be developed to link examples of the defence and fortification systems of the Laguna, e.g. Forte Marghera on the main land, Torre Massimiliana on Sant’Erasmo Island in the Laguna and the Porta Nuova Tower in the Venice Arsenale.

The planning of cultural and artistic activities to be held inside Porta Nuova Tower will be developed by an expert committee composed of members of Arsenale di Venezia, representatives of the Municipality of Venice and appointed experts. In the interim, the coordination of activities is entrusted to the project structure of SECOND CHANCE. Activity planning will be structured in compliance with the bilateral agreements between the managing party and the body or institution interested in using the tower, through the signing of specific contracts.

Implementing the Concept

The results of the SWOT analysis, the utilisation concept and especially the development vision have generated new ideas for the role and functions of Porta Nuova Tower, suggesting the use of all spaces within it. For this reason, we have decided to invest in not only one exhibition space for the pilot project, as originally proposed, but in all the tower’s spaces, in order to develop it as the ‘brain for arts, science and culture’ of the Arsenale. The exchange of ideas within the SECOND CHANCE project and the stakeholders groups have made it clear that the exhibition space should be more flexible and adaptable to the needs of different cultural and artistic forms. It was decided not to invest in permanent structures, but to use the available resources to design the additional spaces in order to enable a wider range of activities.

The building is divided into three separate spaces. The ground floor is subdivided into three sections: a large central section flanked by a long and narrow rectangular space with a lift and services on one side, and a trapezoidal space equipped to host seminars and conferences on the other. The height of the rooms is 8.57 m. The first floor consists of one large space, characterised by two large ogival arches. The first floor space (ceiling height: 22 m) is to be used as an exhibition hall and performance space. Exhibition spaces will also be made available to artists interested in taking advantage of the potentialities inherent in the tower’s unique architecture. It is no coincidence that Renato Meneghetti’s Optional, dedicated as a ‘brain for Arsenale’ by the artist, was the first work of art to be housed in the tower on the occasion of the 12th International Architecture Exhibition in 2010. During the Biennale of Contemporary Art 2011, the Porta Nuova Tower hosted the South African Pavilion. Far from being a simple museum, the tower will be a centre for the production of knowledge and the promotion of coordination between the various actors of the Arsenale.

The restored Porta Nuova Tower is destined to become a research centre devoted to the study of the scientific, historical and artistic heritage of the Arsenale. It will also serve as a showcase for the Arsenale’s cultural activities. The Tower’s offices are already occupied by researchers from the IUAV (University of Architecture of Venice) with whom the company Arsenale di Venezia has already signed an agreement. The research aims to identify and develop digital tools to visualize the long history of the Arsenale of Venice, including its growth and subsequent transformations, its construction techniques, innovations that were developed in the state shipyard, as well as the main relationships which were established over time between the urban complex and the surrounding neighbourhood. Multimedia installations will then be hosted in multiple locations within the Tower. In this way, communal spaces are earmarked for the use of both Venetians and visitors with an interest in the Arsenale’s past history and future development.

www.arsenaledivenezia.it
www.comune.venezia.it
Established in 1998, the Museum of Municipal Engineering in Krakow gathers, preserves and presents unique technological objects: landmarks of the Polish automobile industry (the largest collection in a public museum in Poland) and municipal transportation and other urban technology including printing presses, household and office technology. The museum also presents interactive exhibitions on the history of science and technology. It is the first museum of its kind in Poland.

The museum is located in the Kazimierz district, in the Quarter of St. Lawrence. It is a building complex consisting of tram depots, bus garages, administration buildings and technical facilities, located at 15 St. Lawrence Street in Krakow. It encompasses eight historical buildings and two temporary metal sheds, providing a total usable space of over 4,000 m², as well as a courtyard with an area of 3,500 m². The buildings were erected between 1882 and 1929 as timber-frame and brick construction (wooden posts and beams with braces). They were designed by the prominent Belgian and Polish architects H. Geron, Karol Knaus, Franciszek Maczynski, Tadeusz Stryjenski and Eugeniusz Ronka.

The museum was founded by the City of Krakow as a municipal cultural institution and separate legal entity. The municipality is the owner of the land and the historical tram depot complex. In 2005 it handed over both the land and the complex to the museum for a period of 25 years. The city also co-funds the museum’s daily activities and investments.

The Kazimierz tram depot was in use until the 1960s, when almost the entire track layout was removed. Converted to warehouses and workshop facilities and bus and special vehicle garages, the buildings gradually lost their original function, which negatively influenced their condition.

Because of its unique historical and architectural features, the historical complex with its courtyard was registered as a UNESCO World Heritage site in 1978 and is also considered a Historical Landmark, according to an Ordinance of the President of Poland from the year 1995.

Restoration of the depot started in 1985; however, public assets designated for this purpose were limited until 2007, leading to a limited use of the potential of both the landmark urban-architectural complex and the existing museum. Intensive renovation processes began only in 2007.

Between 2007 and 2010 a thorough conservation and adaptation of the post-industrial complex for cultural functions took place as part of a pilot programme for the revitalisation of Kazimierz. Seven historical buildings (B, C, D, E, F, H and J, see p. 77) and the historical courtyard were included in the programme. An additional four buildings (B, C, E and F) underwent construction-conservation activities, and two buildings (J and H) underwent conservation of the elevation wall. Conservation of building D was limited to the basements. The renovation of the courtyard has been completed.
A tramway traction has been laid between the museum (hall F) and the railway at St. Lawrence Street, which enables the use of historical wagons (the museum could venture outside) and the animation of the space around the museum. Hall F is being used as an active depot for landmark tramway cars, restored between 1985 and 2008, and as space for exhibitions and other cultural projects.

The majority of these activities were completed as a part of the project ‘Sw. Wawrzyńca Quarter – building of a cultural centre in Krakow’s Kazimierz’, co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund.

Developing the Concept

A review of the data concerning the cultural sector in Poland for the SWOT analysis shows that public sector institutions play a dominant role. Private entities get very little support from the public budget, which is why the role of the events they create is only complementary to the offerings of public institutions. While public sector authorities still do not pay enough attention to the development of cultural industries, they are increasingly aware that culture is strongly linked to the city’s attractiveness and economic growth and that it has a great impact on the quality of life, attracts tourists, makes the city more friendly, fosters the creativity and development of citizens and makes the city more competitive. They are also aware that the creative industries significantly influence the growth of GDP.

As a revitalised post-industrial area, the Museum of Municipal Engineering and the Quarter of St. Lawrence have great potential to develop into a modern area for culture, art, leisure and the individual creative activities of artists and authors.

Revitalisation projects in the Quarter of St. Lawrence have their spatial, socio-economic and legal justifications in strategic documents and revitalisation programmes defined and implemented by the City of Krakow, e.g. ‘Old Town’ the Local Revitalisation Plan’ and ‘Strategy of Cultural Development in Krakow for the years 2010–2014’.

Projects in the Quarter of St. Lawrence are assumed to be complementary to projects realised in other post-industrial areas of Krakow, including the Zablocie district with Oskar Schindler’s factory, Podgorze Power Station and the former Rakowice-Czyżyny airport. Revitalised post-industrial and post-military areas in Krakow are becoming a fashionable and useful base for cultural and creative industries.

The necessity of subsidising events taking place in Kazimierz (and the Quarter of St. Lawrence) from public budgets is one of the main challenges to the realisation of our plans. This is due to the absence of habitual expenses for art and culture by citizens on one hand and the lack of effective private sector cooperation models on the other.

These issues have been brought to light at the two stakeholder workshops, conducted in Krakow in December 2010 and June 2011. The participants – representatives of local government, cultural institutions, cultural NGOs, businessmen and scientists – discussed methods of adapting the existing infrastructure to cultural use to establish...
The Museum of Municipal Engineering — with a modernised infrastructure and broadened offering and cooperating with other cultural institutions — will become an important component of the leisure time and cultural industries and their impact on the socio-economic animation of Krakow and Malopolska.

From a long-term perspective, the Quarter of St. Lawrence will support regional economic development based on cultural and creative industries, particularly the development of cultural tourism. It will be achieved through popularisation of interdisciplinary forms for the presentation of culture and development of the educational function of cultural institutions.

The implementation of a new programme in a new post-industrial space will contribute to the popularisation of science, technology and cultural undertakings, as well as present the revitalisation of the landmark post-industrial space — the Kazimierz tramway depot — with a practical aspect.

The development vision for the Museum of Municipal Engineering can be summarised as such:

The museum is a cultural institution, functioning in a citizen-friendly space, recognised nationally and internationally thanks to its assets and to the quality and attractiveness of its educational-recreational offerings. It is an institution that documents and promotes knowledge about the influence of science and technology on the development of urban civilisation in a contemporary way, with the particular inclusion of the heritage of Krakow and Malopolska.

The fundamental tasks included in the utilisation concept, ‘Strategy for Development of the Museum of Municipal Engineering’, in the context of the SECOND CHANCE project are as follows:

Functional development of the institution as a museum of science and technology:

- systematic enrichment of the museum as an institution that gathers and exhibits landmarks of industrial culture and documents connected to the development of urban civilisation;
- research on industrial heritage in Krakow and the region, as well as its national and international presentation through publications and educational activities: the museum as a place of education through entertainment;
- intense cooperation with science and technology museums and NGOs in Poland and abroad, especially in the fields of promotion of the museum’s activities.

Revitalising public life in the Quarter of St. Lawrence through an institution with a strong impact on the surroundings and integration of the local community:

- building the cultural centre in Kazimierz and the effective promotion of it through artistic projects;
- integration of the local community through outdoor art events.

Raising the level of self-financing of the institution:

- effective use of modern management methods specific to service business management;
- obtaining public or private partners (entities functioning in the cultural sector, among others) and sponsors for the implementation of proprietary projects;
- obtaining European funds for the activities and development of the institution.

Implementing the Concept

The pilot investment of the SECOND CHANCE project consists of purchasing the necessary equipment for cultural activities: touch screens connected to the Internet, audioguides, LED board, screen and projector for outside presentations, electronic information board, etc. Space in building D will be renovated for use as a conference room, including the necessary installations and furnishing as well as renovation of the roof.

The following summary of preliminary strategic possibilities for the Museum of Municipal Engineering aims to reinforce it as an institution operating in the quarter. These events will take place on the outside square or in the conference room, in the case of unfavourable weather conditions; some events will use both spaces. It also includes ideas presented and developed during the stakeholder workshops:
1. Increased participation in the Sacrum Profanum Festival, an international contemporary music festival in Krakow, organised once per year in autumn. The museum will provide the festival’s social backroom, practice room and catering area as well as space for courtyard concerts.

2. Museum lessons for primary school students – safe route to school; the idea is to familiarise pupils with the rules of safe pedestrian movement as they form a part of the city traffic. The classes, depending on weather conditions, take place in the courtyard (with diagrams simulating crossings, roads and their nearest surroundings) or inside (screenings and workshops).

3. Monthly lectures about the history of technology aimed mainly at the elderly living in the 1st District.

4. Monthly meetings of council members with the district community; recurrent assemblies aimed at resolving day-to-day problems of the district, implementing community initiatives and prompting the community to participate in the life of the district.

5. Jewish music concerts.

6. Social events for the whole family (concerts, competitions, happenings at the square).

7. Outdoor exhibitions of local artists and art gallery open days.

8. Annual exhibitions of train models for children and young people, presented by Krakowski Klub Modelarzy Kolejowych (Krakow Model Train Club).


10. Summer cinema: outdoor cinema showing educational movies on technology, as well as artistic projects.

Thanks to SECOND CHANCE, the Museum of Municipal Engineering in Krakow began cooperating with an association of historic trams enthusiasts in Nuremberg, Freunde der Nürnberg-Fürther Straßenbahn e.V., which resulted in the exhibition entitled: Nuremberg – Krakow – back and forth (Nürnberg – Krakow. Hin und Zurück). The exhibition opened in Krakow in June 2012 and was presented in Nuremberg afterwards.

The site-specific PPP concept for the Museum of Municipal Engineering in Krakow states that an engagement in one or more public-private partnerships is seen as beneficial by the decision makers. As a public partner, the Museum of Municipal Engineering offers few risks to a public-private partnership. The municipal institution is a reliable, experienced and predictable public partner. For a private partner, a public-private partnership guarantees a steady income and facilitates commitment within the context of municipal activities. Some risks were identified in the PPP concept, most of which centre around the organisational structure, chosen financial strategy and the scope of activity of the private partner.

The appropriate selection and recruitment of private partners will be an especially important issue, so that the concluded public-private partnership can realise the museum’s goals, strategy and mission in an optimal way. The most desirable groups among possible private partners are entities providing services or with profiles similar to the museum (both commercial and non-profit).

In the restored and modernised depot, the museum becomes a cultural centre. The first activity under the SECOND CHANCE project is to test it as a platform for various international activities – exhibitions and performances, meetings, conferences, workshops and concerts (festivals) for residents and guests. A particular emphasis will be on family-friendly projects and activities. The pilot investment of SECOND CHANCE will lead towards the implementation of the basic ideas of the project: creating the Quarter of St. Lawrence – a place with a rich socio-cultural offering, meeting the needs of its constituents.

1. www.mimk.com.pl
2. www.krakow.pl
History and Current Situation

Industrial use of the area and construction of the Rog factory began in 1871 when the Janesch (Janež) tannery started operations. After 1900, the tannery was bought by Carl Pollak who renovated and extended the factory building and expanded the leather production. The rebuilt factory is the first example of a visible iron-concrete skeleton construction in Ljubljana. The Pollack factory operated successfully until the economic crisis of the 1930s. Beginning in 1938, the factory was managed by the Indus company, a leather and leather products producer, which was still in operation during World War II. After 1952 the Rog factory started manufacturing bicycles and (at first) typewriters at the site. It continued operating until the early 1990s, when production was closed down.

In the 1990s, the abandoned building was occasionally used for cultural events such as art and design festivals. It was also repeatedly recommended to dedicate this area to public cultural programmes as well (e.g. the international colloquium ‘Eurocities,’ hosted in Ljubljana in 1995). In 2002, the City of Ljubljana signed a lease for the Rog factory grounds with the site’s owner at the time, the LB Hypo Bank. Since 2006, the premises have been rented by users who develop cultural, artistic, urban sport and social activities on a temporary basis.

The Rog factory represents one of the last preserved quality examples of old industrial architecture in the city of Ljubljana, and at the same time it is a decaying post-industrial area in the eastern part of the city centre. According to the city’s plans and as a consequence of the planned renovation of the Rog factory area, this quarter is anticipated to transition from neglect into an important development axis of the city centre. The renovation of the Rog factory also represents an important element in the city’s redevelopment of the Ljubljanica riverbanks, through which city life will be reconnected to the Ljubljanica River.
In 2007, the City of Ljubljana focused intensely on the project of revitalising the whole Rog factory area and renovating the factory building into the Centre of Contemporary Arts. On the basis of the parameters given by the City of Ljubljana in 2007, a group of experts made a draft programme for renovating the old factory and turning it into a centre for architecture and design. The draft programme was modified by the City of Ljubljana, and visual art was also included to create the Centre for Contemporary Arts. Within the new spatial plans for the city, the area of the Rog factory was redefined as an area for housing, business and culture. In 2008 there was an open call to architects and urban planners for designing the site, and a proposal by the MX_SI studio of Barcelona (ES) was selected. As required by the City of Ljubljana, the selected plan includes: the renovation of the listed Rog factory building into the Centre of Contemporary Arts and the construction of a new extension for a large exhibition venue (total space of ca. 12,000 m²); an underground car park (578 spaces); a hotel (at Trubarjeva Street); apartments (at Rozmanova Street); and commercial spaces on the ground floor of the former Rog factory on the side facing the Ljubljanica River. The renovation project should have been implemented on the basis of a public-private partnership model that was accepted by the City Council in 2009; however, the initial investment sum was reduced in 2011. According to the reduced investment plan, the public portion of the plan now includes the Rog Centre with the new extension and the appertaining underground car park (50 spaces), while the private part of the partnership contains the business premises, underground car park (528 spaces) and the right for the private partner to build a hotel and/or apartments (at Trubarjeva Street).

The planned Rog Centre will be dedicated primarily to activities in the fields of architecture, design and visual arts, their mutually connecting and cross-sector collaborations (economy, education, science, environment, space) as well as international networking. It will offer Ljubljana the public infrastructure that has so far been missing for installing larger exhibitions and for artistic and creative production. As a production, exhibition, educational and social space, the new centre will combine the large exhibition hall, studios, artists-in-residence, laboratories, workshops, presentation and social spaces. The city’s goal is to develop a dynamic international centre where different disciplines as well as the public, civic and private sectors will not just coexist, but also synergistically collaborate and generate creative and innovative programmes.

Developing the Concept

Three years after the City of Ljubljana began the revitalisation of the Rog factory area, it joined the SECOND CHANCE project. Since urbanistic and architectural plans for revitalising the former factory and its surrounding area were previously completed, and the main purpose of the future cultural centre was already defined, the activities related to the SECOND CHANCE project focus on the development of a new cultural institution: its programmes and possible forms of organisation. In this sense, this EU-funded project presents a rare opportunity of a processual and participatory cultural planning in Slovenia.

The goal of the SWOT analysis was to review the existing plans for revitalising the former Rog factory area. Completing a SWOT analysis at the beginning of the SECOND CHANCE project was a natural step, but the analysis also confronted us with the...
independence. The SWOT analysis confirmed the Rog revitalisation project in all its crucial points (location, architectural and urbanistic plans, content/orientation of the new cultural institution); however, many findings did not coincide with the experiences of the stakeholders. This led to a lively discussion and resulted in valuable comments on the SWOT analysis, as well as constructive critique and suggestions for the revitalisation plans.

At the 3rd stakeholder workshop (April 2011) we presented the PPP model for the physical renovation of the Rog factory area and the results of the transnational PPP concept (cf. p. 88), an analysis made by the researcher Dr. Katrin Fischer of Alfen Consult Weimar (DE). Participants were invited through an open call and specific invitations to professionals involved with PPPs in culture.

At the 3rd stakeholder workshop (April 2011) we presented the PPP model for the physical renovation of the Rog factory area and the results of the transnational PPP concept (cf. p. 88), an analysis made by the researcher Dr. Katrin Fischer of Alfen Consult Weimar (DE). Participants were invited through an open call and specific invitations to professionals involved with PPPs in culture.

The 4th stakeholder workshop (September 2011) focused on the people living or working in the neighbourhood of the Rog factory. It was developed in close cooperation with the District Community Ljubljana Centre and the Institute for Spatial Policies. The neighbours demonstrated keen interest in the development plans. They were curious about the activities and services the new centre would offer, stated their wishes, proposed ideas for the future design of the cultural institution, public park, parking house and commercial areas and expressed regret that they were not addressed in the earlier stages of the development process.

For us it was crucial to include the stakeholders’ ideas and comments in the output of the SECOND CHANCE project and to show in which ways their contributions influence the development of the revitalisation project. That is why we have conceived the development vision as a working document that consists of many layers, based on the results of different stages of the development project. The
document is based on: the ideas and goals for the future Rog Centre from its founder, the City of Ljubljana; the Programme Outline made for the Rog Centre in 2007; and the results of the first analysis from the SECOND CHANCE project, as well as the feedback from the stakeholder workshops.

The development vision served as working material for preparing the utilisation concept draft, the purpose of which is to provide a blueprint for further development of the former factory site and the pilot investment within the SECOND CHANCE project. Based on the responses to the development vision, we aimed to check the feasibility of the existing development plans for the future Rog Centre. Instead of outsourcing the analysis, we chose a method of work in which we were actively involved. In consultation with the urban sociologist Dr. Matjaž Uršič, we chose a focus group method. We formed six focus groups: 1) current users of the Rog factory; 2) creative (artists, designers, architects); 3) cultural producers from the public and NGO sectors (Museum of Architecture and Design, Monochrome, International Graphic Centre, PARASITE Institute); 4) decision makers (representatives of the City of Ljubljana, Ministry of Culture; Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology; Ministry of Economy and Ministry of Foreign Affairs); 5) business sector; 6) international group of cultural professionals (representatives from Vienna Design Centre [A], Santralistanbul [TR], Halle 14 from Leipzig [DE], LABoral from Gijon [ES], Fablab Amsterdam [NL]). We sought to include a diverse structure of stakeholders and interest groups to help us identify key elements and aspects of successful social, cultural and economic revitalisation for the Rog factory.

A complex question lay at the centre of the focus group discussions: How can local and international interest groups (artists, local creative small and medium enterprises, industry, civic and public organisations) be mobilised, and how can their interests and needs be optimally linked with the programme of the future Rog Centre to boost local creativity, growth and innovation? We tried to answer this question, at least partly, by identifying and explaining the interests and needs of significant groups of stakeholders. The resulting study provides a bottom-up insight and analysis that can contribute to the development of a cultural institution that responds to the needs of its stakeholders and future partners in an ideal way, while identifying and preventing possible conflicts that can occur during a too rapid implementation of predetermined generic measures and programmes (‘top-down’ approach).

Implementing the Concept

As a result of the delayed renovation of the Rog factory premises, the originally planned pilot project investment had to be adjusted. RogLab, as the name suggests, will be a space for developing and testing programmes and activities envisioned for the future Rog Centre. The focus is thus on professionals and creative people from the fields of architecture, design and visual arts. RogLab is conceived as a production, education and presentation space in an attractively designed 30 m² modified shipping container, which will be positioned on the Petkovško riverbank in proximity to the former Rog factory. Due to limited space, production activities will be primarily possible within the newly established 3D Workshop which will offer rapid prototyping technology and services. The RogLab programme (prototype manufacturing, workshops, lectures, exhibitions and screenings) will be developed within a newly established partner network consisting of companies and NGOs as well as cultural, research and educational institutions. The first partners will be chosen in autumn 2012 following a public call for potential programme partners.

The transnational PPP concept gave us insight into the different possibilities of applying the PPP idea within the cultural field. The examples of this analysis have shown that organisations from civil society are often long-term partners of public institutions. This was an important starting point for the development of the Rog Centre, since the new institution will have to integrate different private, civic and public partners in order to pursue its ambitious mission: to become an important reference point for creativity and innovation. The challenge of how to include all those partners under the same roof and determining which kind of legal and economic relationships are the most appropriate for their engagement in the new cultural institution will be further addressed through the activities of the pilot project and with the help of the site-specific PPP study and the management plan.

Conclusion for Now

At this point, more than 300 stakeholders have participated in the SECOND CHANCE project in Ljubljana. On the one hand, many expressed regret that we did not start the SECOND CHANCE activities before the final phase of the Rog revitalisation project; they doubt that with the SECOND CHANCE project we can do more than just cosmetic corrections of the already existing revitalisation plans. On the other hand, stakeholders often commented that the future content and programmes of Rog Centre are not yet precisely defined. It is exactly in this controversial situation that the Ljubljana SECOND CHANCE project team tries to act as an interface between the needs and ideas of the City of Ljubljana and of the potential users and partners of the new institution. But, the SECOND CHANCE project in Ljubljana is not just the crossroads of a variety of interests; it offers a possibility for a more sustainable spatial and cultural development on the basis of analysis and active involvement of stakeholders as well as a pilot project. In this way, development is being gradually defined and tested – an approach which is an exception in the Slovenian cultural context.

www.roglab.si
www.mgml.si
www.ljubljana.si
III. Research on Public-Private Partnerships
The ‘Transnational Public-Private Partnership Concept’ describes possible approaches to be selected for each site of the SECOND CHANCE project and serves as a basis for developing site-specific public-private partnership actions. The Transnational Public-Private Partnership Concept defines public-private partnership in culture as a sustainable, long-term contractual cooperation agreement between the public and the private sector, as well as other institutions of civil society, for the initiation, financing, funding or management of a cultural institution or activity, under which the partners contribute financial, material or immaterial resources.

In conventional PPPs, the partners usually involve one partner from the public sector and one partner from the private sector. However, for PPPs in culture there is a close connection to civil society through donations of time, services and money by individual citizens and groups of citizens. In general, the partners have different reasons for involvement in cultural activities. Some fundamental motives of the potential partners are described below.

For public sector partners, PPP arrangements are often driven by limitations in public funding but also by the desire to increase the quality and efficiency of public services or public functions. Usually the public partner is a public body such as a governmental or municipal administration. Civic institutions can, however, also act as the public partner. Civil society comprises the totality of voluntary social relationships, civic and social organisations and institutions. As user or initia-
Application of PPP Models

Three areas of commitment to cultural activities and institutions can be defined for PPP concepts in culture: property management, general management and programme management. Examples of each can be seen in the SECOND CHANCE project.

The vision of the SECOND CHANCE project is to transform disused industrial sites into cultural and creative work and activity spaces; in some of the sites, restoration of the former industrial buildings is necessary. A PPP in this case would aim at a partnership between private and public partners to design, construct, renovate and operate the premises (property management) so they can be used as conference, production or exhibition areas or for other commercial and non-commercial services. At the AEG site in Nuremberg, the rehabilitation of the area has been identified as a key priority in Nuremberg’s urban development plan for the western part of the city. The site-specific PPP will focus on the pilot investment – a multifunctional cultural space with a focus on theatre and music. In contrast, the renovation of the historical tram depot in Krakow’s Kazimierz quarter was already completed in 2010. Their SECOND CHANCE pilot project consists in redesigning the open space in front of the museum and building a conference room. In the former Rog factory in Ljubljana there is a huge demand for investment. A public-private partnership might be an attractive model for the extensive restoration activities there. This, however, will not be directly connected to SECOND CHANCE.

The art centre HALLE 14 in the former Leipzig Baumwollspinnerei can be considered an example of a PPP in general management of a site. The private owner of the site dedicated one of its buildings, HALLE 14, to non-profit activities. The art centre that was initiated in 2002 is run by an independent association. This public-equivalent body and its private partner, the owner of the site, are and will be cooperating closely in the acquisition of new exhibition and studio partners. Additionally, the private partner has become an important ally in the general and financial management of HALLE 14 and the further development of the art centre’s concept.

The third approach to PPP in culture focuses on programme management. This is not only important to the Rog factory and to Porta Nuova in Venice’s Arsenale but to all project partners and sites in many respects. Programme management includes:

- management of cultural and artistic activities, including innovative concepts for planning and organising an institution’s programme;
- management of programme related activities like technical work (i.e. collaboration with private companies in stage lighting, sound, etc.);
- marketing (i.e. collaboration with private companies to promote activities, to search for private partners and to identify and involve media partners in a PPP, etc.);
- management of secondary activities such as additional services or activities that fit into and serve the global concept, content-wise and even financially, e.g. shops, bookshops, rent-a-desk projects, restaurants, bars and other services that attract a variety of people to the site.

Urban development and sustainable urban development are frequently catalysts for public participation in the growth of cultural institutions. A wide range of cultural facilities increases location factors and the quality of life of an area. Urban development projects can have different effects on cultural institutions through direct actions against building vacancies or efforts to preserve historical heritage and thus increase the reputation of an entire region.

When committing to a partnership with a public or civic body, the private sector partner does not necessarily build on economic value in the form of unlimited profits. While the partnership is still expected to be economically feasible, the creation of value and benefits in other forms might be more important. Self-promotion and public profile are highly relevant considerations for companies. Enhancing the corporate image in order to attract more customers is a common and popular approach under the ideas of corporate responsibility and corporate citizenship. Last but not least, in companies worldwide there are philanthropists, art lovers and culturally interested managers who like to contribute to culture.
The development of PPP arrangements is a comprehensive task. During the inception phase, minimum requirements comprise extensive knowledge not only in cultural management, but also in finance, legal framework, risk management and oversight. The private as well as the public partner should be enabled to participate at any stage in the life cycle to unleash synergistic effects. Because the expected revenue stream is limited, the private partner might be attracted by prestigious projects with high local or even national or international reputations. Participation can release marketing and public relation potential for the private partner, which enhances their public reputation. The aim of the public or civic partner is to develop a good, successful and sustainably financed cultural programme.

For all types of public-private collaboration, the soft skills of communication, interaction and participation are crucial assets. The equality of involved partners as well as high-quality and transparent communication are essential factors for success. The ongoing participation of civil society helps to lower any resistance towards the partnership and encourages support for the cooperation.

Financing of the Projects

Direct support to culture and arts from the public sector consists mostly of subsidies, grants or awards. The distribution of funds differs among European countries due to their respective cultural priorities, legal conditions and, last but not least, financial situations. Furthermore, in some countries, like Germany or Poland, the autonomy of regions and municipalities allows them to contribute significantly to culture at the local level. In some states, public financial support for culture is distributed through foundations, art councils and other so-called ‘arm’s length’ bodies. In many countries, e.g. in Italy, lottery funds for culture are very important. These lottery funds are primarily channelled to capital investment. However, as with many other forms of public support, the contributions cannot be guaranteed and can vary tremendously.

Financial support for culture and arts from the private sector is mostly motivated by social responsibility or marketing goals. Generally, the private partner contributes to cultural activities through funding them. In many Eastern European countries, sponsorship is still regarded as generosity. This differs from the notion in the other parts of Europe, where sponsorship is a commercial transaction, linked to business objectives. Commercial sponsorship serves to promote individuals, groups of people, organisations or events. It can be in the form of money, property or services. Sponsorship is operated by a company (sponsor) and is often part of the company’s public relations, with the aim of promoting products and services. So sponsorship is support with expectation for returns, directly or indirectly. The benefits of sponsoring can include approaching target groups in non-commercial situations. In many cases, sponsorship provides a higher quality of contact than classic means of communication, such as advertising, or creates an opportunity to approach target groups who otherwise could not be reached. Moreover, the image of the person or group can be used for business purposes or transferred to the reputation of the sponsor.

The benefits of a sponsorship are usually defined in the contractual agreement between the sponsor and the recipient of services (sponsorship deal contract), in which the nature and extent of the services of the sponsor and the receiver are also regulated. They can be subject to tax incentives for companies.

NGOs, non-profit organisations, as well as private persons are ‘institutions’ of civil society. Donations or patronage are other ways that financial resources for cultural projects can be allocated by the institutions of civil society that value a vivid cultural life. National or local tax benefits encourage such private support. In many European countries, legal measures for tax benefits connected to donations to the cultural sector have been or are currently being introduced. Civic bodies and citizens are thus encouraged to donate money, material or even time.

All partners can contribute to the cultural partnership by putting effort into the joint activities, creating good ideas, mobilising civic engagement, providing resources such as buildings or land, facilitating approvals and permissions from public authorities and enhancing the awareness of cultural activities.

Implementation of Site-Specific PPP Concepts

When developing site-specific PPP concepts, it is helpful to think of four steps. The first step is developing an institutional plan that clearly describes the vision of the project, the needs of the visitors and users, the content and the programme for the institution. The visions and programme ideas need to match the facility. This has been already done by the partners of the SECOND CHANCE project.

The next step is setting up an operational plan. This includes undertaking a market analysis to develop a thorough understanding of the needs and demands of the public, civic or private users and partners. In addition, it is necessary to think about the operational aspects such as services needed, opening hours, etc. The third step is to bring together all the information concerning costs, revenues, funding and other financing issues by developing a business plan for the project. In many cases this happens in parallel to setting up an organisational structure for the project. It includes...
the allocation of tasks and responsibilities to the different partners, the development of contracts or setting up project companies. Applicable organisational models include short-term contracts for public-private collaboration, long-term public-private partnership contracts and public-private joint ventures.

The three basic activities within cultural PPP concepts – property management, general management and programme management – use specific patterns of organisational structures. Whereas programme-related activities are often subject to public-private collaboration models, property management (designing, building, operating) increasingly uses the public-private partnership contract model. Public-private joint venture structures seem to be appropriate for general cultural management activities. All of the projects involved in SECOND CHANCE show that it is difficult to obtain sufficient financing. Projects in the cultural sector are often financed by multiple sources such as local public budgets, donations and gifts from individuals or companies, national and European funding and, in some cases, revenues from ticket sales or other secondary services.

A clear vision and mission and the possibility of aligning the interests of various stakeholders in the respective cultural activity is of particular importance in finding partners, especially since many cultural activities compete against each other for the attention of companies and private and public funds. PPPs in culture face the additional difficulty that there are no generally accepted standards for cultural programmes. Before entering into a PPP project, it is essential to initiate an opinion-forming process involving the users of cultural activities (civil society) and analyse the cost-benefit relation of the different concepts.

III. Research on Public-Private Partnerships

Developing the Transnational Public-Private Partnership Concept into Site-Specific PPP Actions

The Columbus Art Foundation was exhibition partner of HALLE 14 from 2008 to 2010, using a 1,000 m² space for their programme; shown here is an exhibition of Heike Katharina Barath, kommst du? 2008
IV. International Conferences in the Project
SECOND CHANCE Opening Conference

NUREMBERG, 15 JULY 2010

The SECOND CHANCE Opening Conference took place at Zentrifuge, in building 14 of the former AEG factory complex, Auf AEG. It was organised by the Department for Culture and Leisure of the City of Nuremberg and the MIB AG Immobilien und Beteiligungen in cooperation with Zentrifuge. The project partners and the public were invited.

In this opening conference, the SECOND CHANCE project and the project partners were introduced. In presentations and a panel discussion, the following questions were discussed with experts from different professional fields: How can culture spur the development of former industrial sites? How can public-private partnerships (PPP) be structured to increase investment in such areas? What is the value of transnational cooperation in revitalising brownfield sites? Successful examples of the re-use of brownfield sites as cultural, creative and living spaces were presented by representatives from ufaFabrik in Berlin (DE), Kaapelitehdas in Helsinki (FI) and Het Paleis in Groningen (NL).

The conference was the first public event within SECOND CHANCE and provided an opportunity to introduce the project’s objectives and methods as well as the five sites participating in this transnational cooperation. The conference also explored the possible synergies between the revitalisation of brownfields, the opportunities offered by culture and creative industries and the needs of urban development.

During the morning session, the introduction to SECOND CHANCE was followed by a panel discussion addressing the question ‘How can urban development be influenced and promoted by culture?’ Three perspectives were given by the invited speakers. Timo Heyn from the empirica institute, a research institute for creative industries and urban development in Leipzig, Bonn and Berlin (DE), spoke about the opportunities created through the integration of culture and creative industries in urban development. The strengths and weaknesses of the standard PPP models as means of cooperation between the public and private sector were pointed out by Hans-Joachim Wegner from DfK, Deka Kommunal Consult GmbH, Düsseldorf and Berlin (DE). Jens Kurnol from the Department of European Spatial and Urban Development in the German Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development, Berlin (DE), provided insight into the importance of European cooperation in the growth of new strategies in urban development. Kurnol highlighted the method of ‘peer review visits’ that is part of the pilot investment process in SECOND CHANCE. In the best sense of transnational cooperation, the partners visit each other to analyse and discuss the project’s outcomes on site and help each other with recommendations.

In the afternoon, these topics were illustrated through examples of current European projects. Petra Koonstra, managing director of the incubator building Het Paleis, a former chemical laboratory in Groningen, described how creative industries served as the impulse for the development of the former industrial area there. (www.hetpaleisgroningen.nl)

Sigrid Niemer, director of ufaFabrik International Center for Culture and Ecology in the former UFA-Film Copy Centre in Berlin, demonstrated the importance of sustainable strategies for the development of former industrial sites. She explained the four factors essential for a community’s well-being that have been relevant in the development of ufaFabrik: cultural vitality, social equity, economic property and ecological sustainability. In 2004, ufaFabrik was listed in the UN-Habitat Database of best practices for improving living environments. ufaFabrik offers a wide range of cultural and social activities and events for people in the neighbourhood as well as Berlin as a whole. A heterogeneous collection of facilities and programs coexists on the 18,500 m² site, creating a unique atmosphere. (www.ufafabrik.de)

Kaapelitehdas Cultural Centre, a former cable factory in Helsinki visited by more than half a million people per year, was presented by its managing director, Stuba Nikula. Nikula reported that he found thorough planning, research studies and opening celebrations to be the wrong approach to revitalisation activities. In his experience, a process-oriented development and step-by-step usage of buildings and spaces have been most successful. Kaapelitehdas offers permanent and short-term space for different fields and forms of art and education. It brings together a historically unique building and uncommon tenants in order to create an internationally, nationally and locally significant multidisciplinary cultural centre. With 53,000 m² of space, Kaapelitehdas is the largest cultural centre in Finland. (www.kaapelitehdas.fi)

The presentations were followed by a tour through the former AEG complex, where the participants could get direct insight into the area and the planned development strategies for the site.
The public symposium ‘How To Survive?’ took place in the visitor centre of the art centre HALLE 14. The HALLE 14 association was the organiser of the two-day-event.

The symposium focused on sustainable strategies for the survival of public and private art institutions as part of post-industrial revitalisation projects. Speakers and panel participants from throughout Europe brought valuable experience and information from their own projects to contribute to an exchange of ideas and methodologies.

The symposium began on the evening of October 25 with a presentation from Frank Motz, artistic director of HALLE 14, and a keynote address by Raoul Bunschoten of CHORA architecture and urbanism in London and Amsterdam (UK/NL). The second day featured three panel discussions on the themes of gentrification, governance and energy balance.

Frank Motz offered a look back to HALLE 14’s beginning and the symposium ‘How Architecture Can Think Socially?’ The symposium, held in December 2002, featured 18 lectures and 7 panel discussions. It focused on how the re-use and reconstruction of former industrial spaces can support cultural activities that truly engage and serve audiences and create places that serve as ‘spaces of negotiation’ where ‘organisers, artists and the public often exchange roles’. He spoke about the other former industrial sites that HALLE 14 staff and the Spinnerei partners visited in preparation for the opening of their own space: MassMOCA in North Adams, Massachusetts (US), the developments in the shipyards pivotal to the Solidarity movement in Gdańsk (PL) and the site of a planned art complex on an island in the south of Paris (FR). From this research and the symposium, a book was published, collecting the many speeches and discussions and attempting to summarise what was learned. Motz presented these ‘rules’ to the symposium attendees. They include the need for artists and developers to recognise their responsibilities in the gentrification process, the need to ‘train’ politicians to see the value that art and culture create for a city and the need for public (state) support for cultural spaces in order to generate private support. Motz said that commerce and the common good can be compatible, however, sometimes a clear line must be drawn between these activities. For example, non-profit and for-profit cultural activities can be geographically close, as they are at the Spinnerei, but not located in the same building.

Motz’s speech ended with a vision for an art space described by Jean-Philippe Vassal, architect of the Palais de Tokyo in Paris: a square in Marrakesh that is really just a void crossed by the streets of the city. However, early each morning, the plaza begins to be filled by various artists performing. Audiences gather around these artists until the plaza is filled with clusters of people focused on various performances and happenings. In the meantime, the plaza is still being crossed by traffic, but now the traffic must negotiate these clusters, forming a space of interaction and reaction, a space open to all, with boundaries that are constantly re-negotiated between users.

In his keynote address, Raul Bunschoten took a more literal approach to the question ‘How to Survive?’ Bunschoten focused on the climate and energy challenges that are facing our cities and the efforts by large corporations such as Siemens and IBM to dominate the development of the so-called ‘smart cities’ of the future. Bunschoten empha-
sised the need for sustainable development to come from below, though he admits that we may well have to work with these large corporations in order to achieve significant results – they too are stakeholders in the process.

Bunschoten described several of the projects he is working on in China, Germany, England and the Netherlands. He described in detail CHoRA’s method of approaching these projects through the development of an inventory of the projects, businesses and organisations that already exist in an area and can be harnessed to produce sustainable solutions. Through meetings with local stakeholders, CHoRA can then collect enough information to develop a plan that weaves together the existing resources and culture of a place, it is essential to sustainable development. Without a thorough analysis of the existing resources and culture of a place, it is impossible to have a long-term, meaningful and sustainable development process. Sandy Fitzgerald presented the object lesson of the Temple Bar district in Dublin. After the area became popular with artists, the city implemented a top-down redevelopment plan. The area has now become a party district for tourists, no longer a sustainable living quarter, yet it is seen as a success internationally because it brings money to the city. Lia Ghilardi also spoke of the danger of cultural quarters being used as selling points to outsiders instead of responding to the needs of residents. Ghilardi is a proponent of a method known as placemaking, where any development is preceded by the identification of what makes a place unique and builds on these existing resources with the existing assets or resources, rather than a problem. Fitzgerald pointed out that the group must be very clear internally about its vision and mission before talking with officials. He also suggested that international support for the project is an important factor in impressing the importance of the project on the city.

The question of legitimacy was an important point of discussion for all panellists and the public, focusing on how a project like Gängeviertel does not become simply another private interest group, but truly a representative for the district. Transparency and open platforms for communication are key elements of this. Fitzgerald pointed out that it is not just about traditional forms of discussion like round tables and public forums. If one wants to reach people who see themselves as disempowered and shut out of the process, the arts can often play a role through creating other platforms for participation.

The first panel focused on how cultural projects can be active, empowered and self-aware participants in redevelopment processes. Sandy Fitzgerald and Lia Ghilardi took more theoretical perspectives based on what they have learned through their past experiences, while Ulrike Sitte spoke about current events in the Gängeviertel in Hamburg.

In their opening presentations, both Sandy Fitzgerald and Lia Ghilardi spoke about the importance of city development that is true to the spirit of a community and the idiosyncrasies of a place’s existing identity. Without a thorough analysis of the existing resources and culture of a place, it is impossible to have a long-term, meaningful and sustainable development process. Sandy Fitzgerald presented the object lesson of the Temple Bar district in Dublin. After the area became popular with artists, the city implemented a top-down redevelopment plan. The area has now become a party district for tourists, no longer a sustainable living quarter, yet it is seen as a success internationally because it brings money to the city. Lia Ghilardi also spoke of the danger of cultural quarters being used as selling points to outsiders instead of responding to the needs of residents. Ghilardi is a proponent of a method known as placemaking, where any development is preceded by the identification of what makes a place unique and builds on these existing resources with the existing stakeholders in the process.

Ulrike Sitte presented a short history of the Gängeviertel in Hamburg, a relatively recent project that is still in flux. In 2009, real estate speculation was driving the residents out of the district. When an investor bought a group of 12 buildings but could not pay for them, a group of artists decided to occupy the buildings with the intent of creating a model for alternative forms of living. Sitte stressed that unlike a traditional squat, the group has worked to keep their actions open to other residents and users of the area. Events like festivals create publicity for the project, as well as inviting other localities to become involved. The project has been able to generate enough publicity to be acknowledged by the city, though there are still questions as to the future of the area since the city has repurchased the land. The challenge now is to remain a partner in the development process. With this in mind, a cooperative was formed to create a stronger presence in negotiations.

Thyra Veyder-Malberg began the discussion by asking the other panellists how they would advise the Gängeviertel. Ghilardi raised the question of whether the project is able to be a legitimate spokesperson for the district – how much contact with and support from other residents and tenants do they have? She also suggested that it is often a matter of presentation in discussions with the city. The project should present itself to the city as an asset or resource, rather than a problem. Fitzgerald pointed out that the group must be very clear internally about its vision and mission before talking with officials. He also suggested that international support for the project is an important factor in impressing the importance of the project on the city.

The panelists were also asked to respond to the question of whether the project is able to be a legitimate spokesperson for the district – how much contact with and support from other residents and tenants do they have? She also suggested that it is often a matter of presentation in discussions with the city. The project should present itself to the city as an asset or resource, rather than a problem. Fitzgerald pointed out that the group must be very clear internally about its vision and mission before talking with officials. He also suggested that international support for the project is an important factor in impressing the importance of the project on the city.

Panel 1

GENTRIFICATION IN DISPUTE

**Panel**

**Sandy Fitzgerald**  
Cultural consultant, writer and partner in Olivearte Cultural Agency, Dublin (IE)

**Lia Ghilardi**  
Noema Reserach and Planning Ltd., London (UK), connected via Skype conference

**Ulrike Sitte**  
Gängeviertel e.V., Hamburg (DE)

**MODERATOR**

**Thyra Veyder-Malberg**  
Journalist, Leipzig (DE)

The first panel focused on how cultural projects can be active, empowered and self-aware participants in redevelopment processes. Sandy Fitzgerald and Lia Ghilardi took more theoretical perspectives based on what they have learned through their past experiences, while Ulrike Sitte spoke about current events in the Gängeviertel in Hamburg.

In their opening presentations, both Sandy Fitzgerald and Lia Ghilardi spoke about the importance of city development that is true to the spirit of a community and the idiosyncrasies of a place’s existing identity. Without a thorough analysis of the existing resources and culture of a place, it is impossible to have a long-term, meaningful and sustainable development process. Sandy Fitzgerald presented the object lesson of the Temple Bar district in Dublin. After the area became popular with artists, the city implemented a top-down redevelopment plan. The area has now become a party district for tourists, no longer a sustainable living quarter, yet it is seen as a success internationally because it brings money to the city. Lia Ghilardi also spoke of the danger of cultural quarters being used as selling points to outsiders instead of responding to the needs of residents. Ghilardi is a proponent of a method known as placemaking, where any development is preceded by the identification of what makes a place unique and builds on these existing resources with the existing stakeholders in the process.

Ulrike Sitte presented a short history of the Gängeviertel in Hamburg, a relatively recent project that is still in flux. In 2009, real estate speculation was driving the residents out of the district. When an investor bought a group of 12 buildings but could not pay for them, a group of artists decided to occupy the buildings with the intent of creating a model for alternative forms of living. Sitte stressed that unlike a traditional squat, the group has worked to keep their actions open to other residents and users of the area. Events like festivals create publicity for the project, as well as inviting other localities to become involved. The project has been able to generate enough publicity to be acknowledged by the city, though there are still questions as to the future of the area since the city has repurchased the land. The challenge now is to remain a partner in the development process. With this in mind, a cooperative was formed to create a stronger presence in negotiations.

Thyra Veyder-Malberg began the discussion by asking the other panellists how they would advise the Gängeviertel. Ghilardi raised the question of whether the project is able to be a legitimate spokesperson for the district – how much contact with and support from other residents and tenants do they have? She also suggested that it is often a matter of presentation in discussions with the city. The project should present itself to the city as an asset or resource, rather than a problem. Fitzgerald pointed out that the group must be very clear internally about its vision and mission before talking with officials. He also suggested that international support for the project is an important factor in impressing the importance of the project on the city.

The question of legitimacy was an important point of discussion for all panellists and the public, focusing on how a project like Gängeviertel does not become simply another private interest group, but truly a representative for the district. Transparency and open platforms for communication are key elements of this. Fitzgerald pointed out that it is not just about traditional forms of discussion like round tables and public forums. If one wants to reach people who see themselves as disempowered and shut out of the process, the arts can often play a role through creating other platforms for
communication as exemplified by Augusto Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed and Forum Theatre. This communication is also tied to the question of how to remain a truly public space and how to convince a general public of the importance and success of grassroots development. Fitzgerald raised points that would be repeated later in the day: the city is not a monolith, and politicians get their power from the people – it is often a matter of realising our own power as citizens and capitalising on that, as well as having a clearly defined strategy. Ghilardi suggested that there are two strategies – one is to remain in the area, embed yourself into it, organise events and become indispensible to the local community. The second option is to become mobile, to become a movement, and leave the space to enact community. The second option is to become mobile, to become a movement, and leave the space to enact your model of living somewhere else.

Panel 2
ENERGY BALANCE – RENEWABLE ENERGIES IN ARTS AND CULTURE

Werner Wiartalla
engineer and co-founder of ufaFabrik Berlin e. V. (DE)

The moderator Kerstin Faber opened the panel with a series of questions about the relationship between energy concerns and cultural enterprises: How sustainable is sustainability? Is the second chance really a second chance? How can art and cultural institutions open up new ways of thinking in development processes? The presentations from panel members offered overviews of their current areas of concern, as well as both concrete examples and theoretical approaches to the question of integrating sustainable energy into redevelopment projects.

Claus Anderhalten presented three projects from his architecture firm that transform former industrial buildings. The new uses – as a museum, a vocational school and a dance studio – each presented a different set of challenges in terms of finding energy efficient solutions for heating, lighting and water use. Freddy Paul Grunert contrasted his optimistic perspective from five years ago, when he saw information technology as a unifying force, with his current belief that we need to adopt hydrogen as an energy source because it is not built on a scarcity model. Raoul Bunschoten briefly recapped the idea from his keynote address, and that it was the duty of those at the conference to find the tensions and opportunities through bringing together stakeholders. He noted that discussions starting with energy management can lead to other more fundamental discussions about ways of living. Kerstin Faber wrapped up the discussion with the observation that the projects of all four panel members are test fields and noted the need for further examination of the issues raised by the intersection of ecological sustainability and arts in city redevelopment.

Panel 3
GOVERNANCE – BOTTOM-UP OR TOP-DOWN

Werner Wiartalla
engineer and co-founder of ufaFabrik Berlin e. V. (DE)

The discussion questioned how some of the theoretical approaches represented by Bunschoten or Grunert could be used on a small scale or on projects that are already in progress. Bunschoten emphasised the need to think utopian and then work to put these visions into practice. Wiartalla echoed this sentiment, saying that we should not only think about how we can sustain our current model of living, but strive to develop new models that integrate new cultural, social, ecological and economic values. He feels strongly that we need to recognise that ‘politicians only have a job because of us’ as a way of overcoming hurdles facing sustainable development projects. When asked how to publicise the results of these projects, Anderhalten stressed the importance of not only conferences such as ‘How to Survive?’, but also the need for professors to be active in their fields, bringing their experiences into the classroom for a new generation to learn from. As a final word, Bunschoten said that even in his short time in Leipzig he had seen many of the resources he mentioned in his keynote address, and that it was the duty of those at the conference to find the tensions and opportunities through bringing together stakeholders. He noted that discussions starting with energy management can lead to other more fundamental discussions about ways of living. Kerstin Faber wrapped up the discussion with the observation that the projects of all four panel members are test fields and noted the need for further examination of the issues raised by the intersection of ecological sustainability and arts in city redevelopment.

Kerstin Faber
ExRotaprint gGmbH, Berlin (DE)

Marko Brumen
New Times New Models, Pekarna Magdalenske Mreže, Maribor (SI)

Irene Wigger
Kantensprung AG, Basel (CH)

Stefan Rettich
KARO Architekten, Leipzig (DE)

The final panel presented three forms of organisation for cultural projects utilising former industrial spaces. In each case, the protagonists of each project have different relationships to the space.
they occupy, providing an interesting spectrum for audience members to contemplate.

Pekarna, a cultural centre in Maribor, exemplifies the classical struggle between bottom-up and top-down development. It began in 1994 as a squat in a former military compound; the buildings themselves are owned by the city. Though the organisation was semi-officially recognised, there was a crisis when the mayor of Maribor decided that the best method for dealing with the decaying buildings was to relocate Pekarna and commercially develop the compound. The organisations banded together to stay on the compound and are continuing to work with the city to develop a renovation approach acceptable to both parties. In January 2010, the international conference ‘New Times New Models’, organised by Pekarna representatives, discussed the role of independent culture in the development of civil society while focusing on inventive, dynamic and sustainable models of governance that do not obstruct autonomy and artistic flexibility.

(www.pekarna.org/ntnm/)

ExRotaprint is a former factory complex for the production of printing machines in the Wedding neighbourhood in Berlin. The protagonists were originally renters in the complex, which included commercial businesses as well as artists’ studios. Three artists were irritated by the neglect of the complex and formed a non-profit association of the tenants with the goal of buying the buildings. When the buildings went up for auction by the city, the association was the only bidder. This opened negotiations with the city, leading to the idea of a long-term lease of the grounds and purchase of the buildings for 1 Euro. This plan was threatened by the ‘packet purchase’ of 45 parcels of land by an Icelandic investor. After extensive politicking, press work and research into feasible financing models, the complex was removed from the packet purchase. The final financial solution was the purchase of the land by foundations that explicitly seek to prevent land speculation. The land is now leased to the non-profit corporation ExRotaprint for 99 years. The lease agreement stipulates that one-third of rentals go to social organisations, one-third to art organisations and artists and one-third to commercial tenants. Expenses are financed through the rent paid by tenants. The non-profit association of renters still exists and is a member of the corporate board, providing an important level of transparency in the management.

Kantensprung is a development originating from outside protagonists in a heavy machinery factory complex in Basel. Three architects were interested in the industrial site and had resolved to try to purchase it if it ever became available. When the sale of the complex was announced, they came together and formed a plan within one week. They were able to find three private investors as well as three socially responsible retirement funds that were willing to invest in the complex. The buildings themselves are owned by a real estate corporation, and the Kantensprung corporation has a 99 year lease on the land. Kantensprung pays interest on the loan and collects rent from tenants. To finance the renovation, they looked to banks oriented toward community development. Commercial investors require a specific management structure with clear roles as well as regular financial reporting to the real estate corporation and investors. Kantensprung is in the process of starting a non-profit foundation to ensure the future of the complex beyond the lifetimes of its initiators as well as for the tax benefits it offers.

Discussion focused on the differing conditions that led to each of the projects. Daniela Brahm talked about how anger at the poor management of Rotaprint was their inspiration – they were already in the space and wanted to do something to improve it. Marko Brumen described how the idea of an ‘alternative capitalism’ driven by socially responsible investing is not an option in Slovenia, so culture is still dependent on the state for funding. The question was posed whether ExRotaprint could be a model for the Gängeviertel in Hamburg. While some methods of management may transfer across projects, it was agreed that the individual situation of each project must be carefully considered. Additional points included the need for models beyond top-down or bottom-up, and Raoul Bunschoten expressed the need for good visualisations of the management models described so that they can be easily communicated to others.
The successful development of creative industries is based on the knowledge of the potentials and specific characteristics of the city.

Dr. Tom Fleming is an adviser and strategist on cultural policy, creative economy, arts and innovation. He is also director of Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy (www.tfconsultancy.co.uk), an established international consultancy company. In his lecture, Fleming presented the key steps in the development of creative industry, put forth the arguments for encouraging the establishment of creative clusters and offered examples of successful English and international creative industries. Fleming believes that the development of creative industries in cities and regions can bring numerous positive effects to the regional economy and co-create an attractive image of the city. Creative industries can be successfully developed in metropolises and in smaller towns, but, often, cities use generic solutions from other cities to support creativity, without taking into account the local specifics, which can distance the creative city project from the local inhabitants, that is, the locals do not perceive it as their own. Such projects are, as a rule, unsuccessful, Fleming pointed out. This is why it is essential that the development of creative industries is based on the potentials and specific characteristics of the place.

The development of creative industries can be facilitated.

What examples of successful development of creative industries have in common is that they are developed as a mixture of policy-making and incentives by development institutions, decision-makers on the local and regional level and spontaneous actions of creative individuals and groups. Decision-makers and capital and development institutions must be aware that the incentive to develop cultural industries is based on the concept of facilitating, and not on determining the content these industries want to develop or the location or mode of their development.

Let’s encourage creative talents in the city and the region.

Although attracting creative people to settle in a city is often emphasised as a crucial process on the way to the creative city, Fleming stressed the need to focus on the inhabitants of the city and those who have perhaps moved away in the past, pointing out that cities are not commodities to be consumed, as theorised by the American sociologist Richard Florida, for example.

Creative industries are a development opportunity for contemporary cities, but not the solution to all development challenges of cities and regions.

Prof. Dr. Klaus R. Kunzmann, professor emeritus for spatial planning and a widely acknowledged international advisor in the field of spatial policies, presented a growing trend: creative city fever. The fever is taking hold of postmodern cities, which all want to become creative hubs and thus form a new identity. In numerous examples, the creation of a creative image serves to brand the city, but does not necessarily lead to a successful development.
of creative industry with real economic and social effects.

Creative cities are a trend.

The creative city fever in Europe and the world is, as Kunzmann notes, a reflection of the changes in the planning of city development. To a certain extent, the creative city marks a change from the traditional urban, economic and cultural development to a more open, dynamic and integrated process for securing post-industrial employment and quality of life for citizens. Certainly, creative and cultural industries are pioneers in developing new modes of work, and pioneers in the process of structural urban change, ranging from the functionally divided city to the multifunctional compact city. However, not every city has the territorial and human potential to turn conditions around, to change the mindsets of local stakeholders and citizen values within short time periods. It cannot free itself from supra-local economic and political influences. And, given the limited means available for organising related policy processes, and admitting a limited demand for cultural products and services, expectations are as a rule much too high, explained Kunzmann. The development of creative cities is also not a comprehensive answer to all sustainability challenges (societal, economic and environmental) that post-industrial cities face today.

In cities, creative areas form the nuclei.

Kunzmann pointed out that a city is not creative as a whole; there are areas where such development takes place due to specific local conditions. The condition for the development of creative industries is good communication: it is cooperation and dialogue between various interest groups, political and business actors.

The idea of a creative city and Slovenian economic, spatial and cultural policies

The lectures were followed by a panel discussion, moderated by sociologist Dr. Marjan Hočevar, professor in the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. In addition to Dr. Tom Fleming and Prof. Dr. Klaus Kunzmann, Miran Gajšek, M. Sc., Head of Department for Spatial Management, City of Ljubljana; Dr. Pavel Gantar, sociologist at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana and President of the National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia; and Dr. Stojan Pelko, State Secretary at the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia also participated.

The idea of the creative city originated in the concept of the creative class, conceived by sociologist Richard Florida. It implies that – in addition to individuals – activities, societies and consequently cities can be creative. Creative cities should have a high share of creative jobs, especially in advertising, art, culture and high technology, while the basis for them is appropriate infrastructure, explained Marjan Hočevar at the beginning of the discussion.

Pavel Gantar characterised as especially problematic the theses on the creative class and mobility. In his opinion, there are too few common denominators across the creative class as defined by Richard Florida to actually speak of a class in the sociological sense. Also, in Europe, the thesis that jobs follow people and vice versa does not hold or holds only to a certain extent.

Stojan Pelko explained that the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia decided to include the concept of creative and cultural industries in national cultural policies since, in view of the current trends in European and Slovenian policy-making, this is the only way that culture can fight its way into development strategies and the allocation of funds. Creativity, innovativeness and sustainable development are empty concepts that produce real effects, said Stojan Pelko. He pointed out that the key actors in the development of creative industries at the state level are the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Economy and the Ministry of Higher Education.

People need to be educated and given an opportunity to enter the creative sector and co-create it, said Klaus Kunzmann. Regarding the infrastructure, Tom Fleming pointed out: ‘What is needed is not so much buildings as the conditions we provide for the creative people to work where they are. We should, however, by no means deliberately force them into a certain place. It is people themselves with their work that make a place creative.’ Fleming believes that creative spaces have to be conceived in a dialogue with artists and not for them.

Miran Gajšek brought up the future development of Ljubljana along the Ljubljanica River, where the future Rog Centre will stand, as part of a broader plan to bring the city closer to the river. In Ljubljana, there is a strategic spatial development plan that includes answers to numerous current challenges in the city, but it will definitely need to be adapted to new needs arising in the future. We can never include everything in the plans, some things develop by themselves, said Gajšek.

Kunzmann concluded the discussion with the thesis that the spatial locations of creative industries cannot be planned and determined; city planners can only provide the conditions for the development of creativity. We should let creative people do what they want to and creativity will flourish by itself. This does not mean that everyone can do whatever they like in urban planning, but that in certain places where people start producing and working, this autogenous development should be left alone.”

Source: The Regional Development Agency of the Ljubljana Urban Region
Increasing European Regional Potential for Growth: Culture as Key Driver for Urban and Territorial Regeneration

The public conference ‘Increasing European Regional Potential for Growth’ was held at the Thetis Amphitheatre on the site of the Arsenale. It was organised by the Arsenale di Venezia Spa with the support of the City of Venice.

The public conference was part of the local initiative ‘Europe in my City’ linked to Open Days 2011, organised by the European Commission. This year’s Open Days theme was ‘Investing in Europe’s future: Regions and cities delivering smart, sustainable and inclusive growth’.

As seen within the Europe 2020 strategy, culture and the economic activities related to it can indeed offer important support in the creation of new job opportunities, the development of talents and entrepreneurship competences and the valorisation of social and human capital, thus contributing to regional development and territorial cohesion.

This Venetian event aimed at the in-depth examination of the following two themes: (1) the recovery of post-industrial sites and their revitalisation through cultural activities addressed to local citizens and (2) the exploration of possibilities to create local partnerships with private investors.

These themes were developed from territorial, economic and institutional points of view within the framework of activities that Venice has started to undertake in view of its candidacy for European Capital of Culture 2019. The conference brought together high-level experts and professionals in the field of culture, urban development and other disciplines to discuss scenarios and challenges for culture and art in sustainable city development.

Sustainability was defined in its broadest sense, including social, economic and environmental aspects.

The public event addressed issues from a theoretical perspective as well as presenting case studies of innovative uses of culture in territorial development. The issues addressed included culture and local development, culture and happiness and revitalisation and creativity. The conference focused on these issues during major urban renovation projects in Venice, the other cities of the SECOND CHANCE project and elsewhere. It took place during the European (and beyond) financial and social crises, when new methods and solutions for the management of public assets were desperately needed and sought after.

The conference started with a welcome and introduction by Stefano Beltrame, Diplomatic Advisor for the Veneto Region, and Ambra Dina, Manager of the Venice Arsenale Company and one of the partners in the SECOND CHANCE project. Round tables defined morning and afternoon sessions.

The first round table focused on the theme ‘Culture and the City’. The discussion centred on developing the definition of a friendly environment for culture, which is crucial to the development of the city. Methods of creating this environment include the creation of spaces – giving a second chance to existing buildings – but also new policies and strategies to promote various forms of creativity and fighting against factors that make culture passive and not creative.

Tiziana Agostini, the Deputy Mayor of Cultural Activities of the City of Venice, moderated the morning session. She strongly emphasised that the most crucial asset in the urban development of Venice is its citizens, not, or at least not exclusively, its tourists. The Professor of History of Architecture at the IUAV University Venice Marco De Michielis underscored Agostini’s point, speaking about culture as a crucial element for the daily quality of life of Venetian citizens. He stressed the importance of cultural innovation as opposed to exclusively protecting cultural heritage and conserving historical value.

Gian Paolo Manzella, the Delegate for Innovation from the Province of Rome (IT), introduced the concept of ‘RomaProvinciaCreativa’. In a time of reduced public finances, the Province of Rome has defined three simple but effective strategies: (1) connecting people through networking and documentation, (2) supporting small companies with initial funds and counselling and (3) turning empty spaces and buildings into centres of creativity and innovation (teaching, presentation and production).

Also present at the first round table was Marco Trevisan, the director of the Affordable Art Fair (www.affordableartfair.com) in Milan (IT). This extraordinary art fair was founded in 1999 and works with a large international network of rotating locations, usually taking place in former industrial spaces. In 2011, 200,000 visitors came to the fair, which focuses on young artists and inexpensive works. Finally Francesco Giavazzi, Professor of Economics at the Bocconi University, Milan (IT) and Member of the Board of the Venice Arsenale Company, rounded out the discussion with a look at the interrelation between economics and arts and culture. Giavazzi proposed that the museum character of many European cities harms their economic growth. While there is an essential connection between innovation and economic growth,
preservation and imitation can cause stagnation. To blossom and create growth, cultural innovation needs cultural diversity.

The round table during the afternoon session was dedicated to ‘European Capitals of Culture’. The expectations and hopes of the Venice and the Northeast Candidature for the European Capital of Culture 2019 were presented by the committee’s director Maurizio Cecconi. This forward-looking perspective was complemented by the past experiences of the city of Turku (FI). Cay Sevon, CEO of the Turku 2011 Foundation, spoke about the successes of Turku’s year as European Capital of Culture. These two speakers were joined by Francesco Sbetti, urbanist and director of Società Sistema di Bolzano e Venezia; Mattia Agnetti, the organisation secretary of the Fondazione Musei Civici di Venezia; Fabio Achilli, the director of the Fondazione di Venezia and M9 Mestre Museum project; and Enrico Bettinello, the director of the Teatro Fondamenta Nuove di Venezia. The round table was moderated by Pierfrancesco Ghetti, the Deputy Mayor for Strategic Planning of the City of Venice.

Conclusions

The relationship between the city and culture is complex, particularly when the effects of art, historical heritage and tourism are taken into account. The valorisation of cultural heritage and mass tourism can create difficulties for cultural production and cultural policies. Cultural production, creativity and innovation need new centres, places, symbols and modalities. Status as a European Capital of Culture can be used as a development tool when leveraged to increase employment in the cultural sector, to enable innovation and integration in all sectors and to take the risk of mixing quality and quantity tourism. In this way, public participation is increased and, at the same time, culture is used as a sustainable development tool. Marco de Michelis summed it up nicely in his contribution: ‘Culture should not be a passive victim of mass tourism or cultural heritage, but should encourage sustainable development, urban identity and multi-sector strength.’
The transnational project SECOND CHANCE connects public entities, public-equivalent institutions and private companies from Germany (Nuremberg, Leipzig), Italy (Venice), Poland (Krakow) and Slovenia (Ljubljana) that are redeveloping former industrial sites. Common goals are the use of art and culture as the new contents for the 'second chance' of these sites and the creation of sustainable operational and financial structures through public-private partnerships.

This mid-project publication introduces the development and implementation of the revitalisation concepts and documents the international conferences within the project. Guest authors Prof. Dr. Klaus R. Kunzmann, Dr. Matjaž Uršič and Dr. Katrin Fischer provide a broader view of the current context for cultural and creative regeneration projects.