



THEORIES OF TEMPORARY USE, CREATIVITY, AND PLANNING

Quentin Stevens¹

Abstract

This paper examines various definitions and applications of the concept of 'creativity' within recent theoretical, empirical and planning policy studies of 'temporary uses' of derelict urban spaces in European cities, in order to articulate how these understandings of creativity and temporary suggest a transformation of the aims and methods of planning itself. Temporary land uses have always been tolerated by urban planning, but it is only very recently that they have come to be seen as important to cities' economic vitality and future growth. Creativity has, similarly, always been a defining characteristic of urban economies, but the conscious objective of urban planning to attract, stimulate and support particular creative actors is relatively new. Through analysis of field studies, policies, and academic critiques, the paper articulates three distinct contexts where concepts of 'creativity' contribute to planners' theories about temporary use and the redevelopment of abandoned and underutilised sites: creative production, consumption of creativity, and creative governance. These three contexts are argued to be mutually reinforcing. Actors from the 'creative industries' are drawn to the low rents, distinctive architecture and dynamic atmosphere of derelict buildings; they also contribute to the material and symbolic transformation of these spaces. Existing temporary uses attract and nurture additional creative workers, and are felt to add to the general quality of neighbourhood life. Planning is proactive in nurturing temporary creative uses; but these uses also require and inspire new planning tools and approaches. This paper's distinctive focus on examining various actors who are creative, what particular interests and abilities they bring, and how they engage with each other in the urban development process, sets it apart from many academic critiques of 'artist-led' gentrification of former industrial areas, which emphasise the social and economic impacts of artists' activities on future investors and existing residents, reducing creativity to 'symbolic capital'. The paper closes with an examination of how the concepts of creative production, consumption, and governance mesh together with broadly neoliberal approaches to urban governance, highlighting that creative planning for temporary use means not just reducing the regulation of urban activity and built form, but also more dynamic planning, through continual engagement with a wider range of actors. In this context, the focus of planning shifts away from permanent built outcomes and toward social activity. Planning itself begins to increasingly resemble a temporary creative use.

¹ University College London, UK / RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia - q.stevens@ucl.ac.uk

1. Introduction

This paper examines various definitions and applications of the concept of 'creativity' within recent theoretical, empirical and planning policy studies of 'temporary uses' of derelict urban spaces, in order to articulate how these understandings of creativity and temporary use are changing the idea and methods of planning itself.

Temporary land uses have always existed in cities, ranging from circuses and squatting to warehousing and surface car parks. Such uses were tolerated, but they were seldom believed to be central to the vitality and future of urban districts. They were epiphenomena that were never seen as part of the plan. Two European studies (Bürgin and Cabane, 1999; Urban Catalyst, 2001) initiated a new area of planning thinking and research by examining the potential importance of temporary uses or *Zwischennutzung* - economically-marginal activities that temporarily occupy abandoned urban spaces - for developing economic and social activity, jobs, and new investment in cities. These studies appear to have introduced at least four new points of focus to planning thinking about temporary use. Temporary re-use is now seen to be an important economic and planning strategy for the redevelopment of former industrialised areas, one which takes place before, alongside, or instead of large-scale, long-term masterplans, and which contributes to the long-term development outcomes. Actors from the 'creative industries' are now generally understood as playing an important role in undertaking these temporary reuses and transformations. Thirdly, and conversely, such temporary occupations of sites are acknowledged by city administrations as being important opportunities for attracting and nurturing creative industries. Fourthly, planning policy, which generally focuses on long-term visions and permanent rules, has thus begun looking at ways to support and promote particular short-term uses.

2. Analysis

This paper draws upon the discourse of temporary use as it has developed through public policies, empirical research, and academic literature in Europe and to a lesser degree in North America. The paper outlines three distinct but interrelated contexts where concepts of 'creativity' contribute to planners' theories about temporary use and the redevelopment of abandoned and underutilised sites, namely: production, consumption, and governance. The paper then closes with an examination of how these concepts mesh together with broadly neoliberal approaches to urban development and urban governance.

2.1 Creative Production

Creative production is in itself seen as an increasingly-important component of urban economies. In relation to the planning and management of urban built fabric, the creative industries are also seen to have a more specific role, as an economically

productive way to use vacant, derelict urban spaces temporarily. This has elements of both convenience and strategy. Compared to other branches of industry, creative enterprises are typically small, low-capital, and flexible about the spaces they occupy. Few other branches of industry are willing and able to start operating at short notice or relocate in a piecemeal fashion, and can rapidly adapt their work practices to a wide variety and quality of existing sites, structures and infrastructures when they become available, without major capital investment (Becker, 2010). Today's creative actors are portrayed as largely 'footloose' or 'nomadic'; their production activities are not often fixed to physical and representational attributes of particular sites (MA18, 2003; Urban Unlimited, 2004; Dienel and Schophaus, 2005). However, the theory of temporary use tends to prioritise the development of new creative activities, rather than existing creative activities that might relocate from another site, but which may not engage creatively with the new host site. Temporary use is portrayed, for example, as "an attractive 'first step' for numerous start-up ventures in the creative economy" (SenStadt, 2007, p.101). A major study of temporary uses in Switzerland highlights that the percentage of creative workers engaged in temporary businesses in Zurich's former rail yards was four times the national average, and almost half the companies on the site had been founded there (Angst et al, 2009).

Strategically, it is believed that creative actors such as artists and architects are particularly well suited to utilizing disinvested, vacant spaces temporarily. They are able to perceive distinctive aesthetic, historic, and functional characteristics within derelict sites, as well as activate these potentials (BMVBS/BBR, 2008). They are 'pioneers', 'truffle pigs' who unearth valuable, latent opportunities for the benefit of other investors who follow them (SenStadt 2007; Lange, 2007, p.136). Creative producers have "a feel for unconventional and creative solutions", including experimental uses of sites (BAFU, 2010, p.8). A summation provided by Kloos et al (2007) is that existing planning policy literature on temporary uses embraces both this pragmatic view of the creative industries' capacities to make use of brownfields, as well as a more idealistic view of creative activities as having a positive influence on the wider development of local economy and urban form. More than just providing rent returns on devalourised properties, as would temporary warehousing activities or carparking, creative workers add significant symbolic and social capital to these disinvested sites, thereby accelerating their recuperation into the wider property market (Becker, 2010; Smith, 1996; Zukin, 1982). In exchange for low rents, many creative workers invest a lot of their labour and expertise in modifying these spaces and bringing the public's attention to them (Bishop and Williams, 2012). Because artistic projects often pursue goals beyond the purely economic, they will also often be driven forward even in the absence of profits (Becker, 2010). BAFU (2010, p.107) strike a rare note of caution, pointing out that 'impetuous' creativity in temporary use can be disadvantageous for later users, if it brings adverse changes, damage or excessive wear to the building stock. Creative users may be wilful and unrealistic, making it difficult for landlords to manage properties and transfer them to new long-term tenants. Urban Catalyst (2001, 86) notes that creative

workers at the end of their temporary tenancy of Berlin's *Haus des Lehrers* were "stubborn, explosive and radical", and fought against relocation.

Inspiration in the creative use of vacant properties runs both ways. Original, creative activity is believed to be stimulated by vacated urban sites: their location, architecture, and former uses; the mixtures of new actors that are accommodated within the given configuration such sites; the dense communication networks and collaborations that often arise among these actors; and the new and temporary nature of site occupation. These conditions inspire new artists as well as established ones (Bürgin and Cabane, 1999; Angst et al, 2009; BAFU, 2010). The large scale, openness, and specialized infrastructure of many former industrial sites, which can present impediments to their recuperation for other long-term uses, is often attractive for the production and display of creative works, whether plastic arts, performance, media, or architecture (BAFU, 2010; Bishop and Williams, 2012). Jacobs (1961) argued that the lower rents of older, disinvested buildings enable creative, risky experimental tenancies, but it is not the low rents in themselves that encourage creativity; low rents can also attract and support marginal businesses that are not creative.

2.2 Consumption of Creativity

A second component of creativity is the innovative consumption opportunities that new, temporary uses of urban spaces can offer to residents and visitors. Different economic uses for derelict urban spaces are not necessarily in themselves novel activities or directly useful and interesting to the wider public; an architecture studio in a former factory is still a private architecture studio. Whereas creative production emphasizes the tenants' practices, the emphasis here is on innovations in the products of creativity, and in particular consumers' experiences in and of the temporarily transformed urban spaces themselves.

Creative temporary uses are valued because they enhance the general cultural diversity and vitality of urban areas, by adding to the range of open space, social, cultural and commercial amenities (BAFU, 2010), and enabling new combinations of such activities, as well as providing them in new and interesting locations where existing urban form, property values, government regulations and private management policies had previously precluded them. These uses also compensate for deficiencies in publicly-funded delivery of social and cultural amenities (Urban Catalyst, 2001). Temporary uses of urban sites can be more experimental than permanent projects that require larger budgets and face larger risks. They can cater to smaller and more specialized audiences. Unconventional and controversial uses are more likely to be tolerated if they are only occupying marginal spaces that were previously out of use, and only of relatively short duration (Bishop and Williams, 2012; Havemann and Schild, 2007).

Temporary uses of industrial brownfields and other derelict land often centre on the physical redevelopment of those spaces for public access and use. Many

temporary uses are publicly-accessible sculpture or landscaping projects which have no intrinsic commercial function, although they may serve as attractions that stimulate spontaneous spending or long-term investment in their surroundings. This includes the provision of new kinds of informal, accessible spaces where the public can act, perform and interact: temporary places for relaxation, participative sports and games, commemoration, and protest (Bishop and Williams, 2012; Franck and Stevens, 2007; Haydn and Temel, 2006). Among 43 pioneering temporary uses showcased in a government-sponsored study of Berlin (SenStadt, 2007), a majority were novel open spaces for public use: community gardens (9), accessible open spaces for people and animals (8); sports areas (7); and artificial beaches (6). Such spaces and activities are, in contrast to creative industries, inherently unproductive, and therefore of relatively little interest to the mainstream economy. Their transcendence of the means-end rationality which governs long-term land use planning underscores their inherent worth and meaningfulness to culture. Temporary gardening is one oft-documented creative form of user engagement with urban brownfields which is nominally productive (SenStadt, 2007; Becker, 2010), but this productivity falls well short of what urban property market prices would demand.

Creative public use of formerly-vacant sites often engages with and enriches the particularity of space and local identity. For example, intensive, varied temporary uses of Berlin's *Palast der Republik* prior to its demolition sought to critique and experiment with the history and future of the building and of the East German society that produced it, to encourage a broad political, cultural and practical re-evaluation of its legacy (Urban Catalyst, 2007; Colomb, 2007). Creative temporary uses are thus argued to be 'identity-giving' (*identitätsstiftend*) (Krauzick, 2007).

In all these respects, the creativity of temporary uses is primarily seen in terms of its benefits to social development, rather than property development. Temporarily unused spaces provide physical and temporal windows of opportunity for public appropriation of real estate for alternative cultural needs that are not met by the open market. These temporary uses might not in themselves be profitable. Indeed, the aim is that the city and its citizens reap the advantages of private capital investments in the provision of services that enhance general quality of life.

Some innovative temporary consumption spaces do indirectly serve aims for economic and property development. Berlin's government has increasingly used entertainment- and leisure-oriented temporary uses as a form of city marketing, presenting such projects as "new playgrounds for artists, creatives, young travellers and tourists, thus shifting the focus (away) from the iconic sites of inner city redevelopment such as Potsdamer Platz" (Colomb, 2012a, p.243). Such offerings attract creative workers who seek a high degree of quality, variety and novelty in urban leisure offerings (Jorg, 2008). A report commissioned from Munich's city department of employment and business puts this clearly:

Quality of life and a climate of openness and diversity are key criteria for the attractiveness of a location for highly skilled and creative workers... varied lifestyles create an inspiring and stimulating environment for creative working people... Arts and Culture are of particular importance for the quality of life of creative knowledge workers. Because the highly skilled especially demand art and culture in their spare time, a comprehensive cultural offering in the city presents highly creative people with a source of inspiration for their own creative production... Whether high culture in opera, theater and museums or the cultural scene in bars, in temporarily used army barracks, old factory buildings and brownfield sites, or temporary events in the summer such as Corso Leopold, the Streetlife Festival, and the "beach" on the Cornelius Bridge of the Isar River - these are all appealing pastimes for creative knowledge workers. In addition, they help highly creative people with ideas for new products and services that are economically viable and that set new trends. (RAW München, 2007, p.22, author's translation).

Similarly in Berlin, pioneering temporary use projects "personify unusual but attractive urban lifestyles and hence cater to a demand that traditional urban structures fail to meet... The broad range of temporary use projects in Berlin has become a PR and economic factor for the city... a catalyst for the relocation of international companies (and) an attraction for tourists" (SenStadt, 2007, p.41).

Where the theorisations of creative productivity outlined in the first section of this paper emphasise tangible material benefits, through increased economic activity and reinvestment in the built environment, creative consumption activities on disinvested urban sites are believed to enrich the general quality of urban life, in both the short and long term. The example of sport and leisure activities shows that citizens can have a participatory role in such re-activations of spaces.

2.3 Creative approaches to urban development

A third distinct aspect of creativity in the theorization of temporary use of brownfield sites links directly to urban planning practice. It is argued that governments, planners, property owners and temporary users all need to be more creative - i.e. innovative - in the rules, processes and investments they use to shape current activity on urban sites and future property development. This conforms to the broader historical case argued by Hall (1998), that in addition to cultural, intellectual, and artistic creativity, cities also thrive and develop through the technical and organisational creativity of city managers, particularly in terms of their engagements with local entrepreneurs (Jorg, 2008). In the context of temporary uses, urban planning is not merely a supportive conduit for creativity, but its target:

Here a fundamental distinction must be made... The first thing that can be observed is the creativity and innovation within temporary uses. This

means that within temporary uses, innovative things may arise. Secondly, temporary uses can contribute to innovative urban planning. This occurs particularly through the experimental nature that temporary uses often exhibit, which through the resultant urban development can demonstrate alternative solutions for various problems (Waldis, 2009, p.48, author's translation).

This latter conception of creativity as innovative planning centres on an expanded decision-making role for the users (i.e. tenants) of urban spaces, vis-à-vis their owners and regulators. Temporary users of sites are celebrated in theory as 'pioneers' who lead and demand the attenuation or renegotiation of official planning strategies and controls and lease terms, and the opening up of both urban spaces and planning processes to a diversity of visions and inputs (SenStadt, 2007; Groth and Corijn, 2005). Some analysts go so far as to portray creativity as a general characteristic of temporary uses (Dransfeld and Lehmann, 2008). With temporary uses, creative agents are able to demonstrate "not only the possibility but the necessity to overrule conventions, guidelines and red tape and conquer the murky terrain of legal and social obligations" (Kreuzer, 2001, p.19). Rules and relationships are negotiated across a broad scope of conditions including lease duration, uses, rent levels, guarantees, insurances, and utility costs. The public sector and site owners provide many kinds of direct and indirect financial and professional advice to attract and enable new users. New kinds of leases and permits are developed to suit tenant needs and capabilities (SenStadt, 2007). The need for creativity inevitably rests with whichever actor is taking the initiative to encourage temporary use in a given location, according to three different scenarios: user seeks property owner, user seeks property owner, or urban developer seeks property owner and user (BMVBS/BBR, 2008).

Creativity on the part of property owners involves flexibility and innovation in how they seek to meet their short- and long-term financial goals. This means "engaging in 'creative' (sic) reactivation of brownfields and underused sites beyond the typical economic recovery patterns of property" (Kloos et al, 2007,p.6), and creativity in finding appropriate sets of tenants for large sites and buildings (BAFU, 2010). "Creative rental concepts" may include short-term or even provisional leases, low rents supplemented by business profit-sharing, and cost-only rents to entice key attractors from art and culture to a location to enhance the marketability of other properties (Rosic and Froessler, 2009). Such innovations require that landlords become more exposed to short-term market risks. The flexibility, creativity and spontaneity of actors from the creative industries often clash with the expectations and existing approaches of property owners and managers. Such mental barriers require openness to dialogue (BAFU, 2010). On the positive side, temporary creative uses allow landlords to test out and demonstrate the feasibility of new uses, which also helps market sites to potential long-term users (Becker, 2010). Creativity is also applied to the place marketing process itself: temporary uses of derelict areas provide new techniques

and new imagery to attract new groups of consumers and producers (Colomb, 2012a).

These various kinds of creativity in land marketing, planning and management processes may or may not involve tenants from the creative industries. One analysis, of the redevelopment of a former slaughterhouse for “research-oriented, innovative companies, creative business and cultural institutions” (Schwartzing and Overmeyer, 2008, p.62, author’s translation), uses the German term *kreatives Gewerbe* (‘creative business’) rather than the usual term *Kreativwirtschaft* (‘creative economy’), and notes that less financially successful artists can no longer afford the rents at this site. A major German government guide to temporary uses is careful to differentiate between the roles of ‘creative industries’ and innovative ‘entrepreneurs’, and uses the expression ‘artistic-creative temporary uses’ to clarify one case where both aspects are brought into play (BMVBS/BBR, 2008, p.92). These two aspects overlap most clearly in the environmental design disciplines (architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, interior design), where the core creative competency is the redevelopment of built form. These businesses are often heavily represented in the temporary use profiles of brownfield sites (Bürgin and Cabane, 1999). These actors are often forming small, new firms to pursue new kinds of projects, clients and funding. They can readily imagine, enhance, and capitalise on both the productive usefulness of individual properties, for their own business, and on the wider spatial and symbolic potential of the surrounding brownfield area and the redevelopment processes going on within it, when selling their services to other temporary and long-term users (Lange, 2008).

The dual aims of creatively utilising brownfield sites and facilitating the creative industries have also given rise to a new category of non-governmental, entrepreneurial mediating organizations whose role is as a conduit of information and negotiation between actors who need affordable space, the potentials of vacant buildings, and planning policies that regulate the development and use of those sites (Oswalt, 2002; Kruse and Steglich, 2006; Brammer, 2008; BMVBS/BBR, 2008; Angst et al, 2009). These organisations include ‘Urban Residue’, ‘Golfstromen’ and ‘Urban Resort’ in Amsterdam, ‘SpareSpace’ in Groningen, ‘Precare’ in Brussels (Jorg, 2008), ‘k.e.i.m.’ in Basle, and ‘Coopolis’ and ‘Stattbau’ in Berlin (SenStadt, 2007; Blumner, 2006).

For government planners, temporary uses of urban spaces by the creative industries can support the development of innovative planning strategies and policies in three distinct ways: as stimulus, delivery mechanism, or goal. As an inspiration or need for planning, temporary uses “can stimulate the creative process of urban design” (Bornmann et al, 2008, p.18, author’s translation), by suggesting new combinations of uses and end-user groups, and demonstrating alternative physical development potentials. Temporary uses also inspire a rethinking of planning processes through a creative understanding of how development happens, particularly in terms of the engagement of a wide variety of

actors in decision-making and risk-sharing (Schwartzing and Overmeyer, 2008). Because creative use projects on brownfield sites are often interdisciplinary, they require interdisciplinary action and policies from local governments (Becker, 2010). The complexity of creative temporary uses tends to necessitate the development of innovative forms of supervision, mediation or 'brokering' between and among government agencies, property owners and site users, and to inspire higher raised levels of citizen engagement in the planning and execution of projects (BMVBS/BBR, 2008; BBR, 2004).

In addition to seeing creative temporary uses as a conceptual inspiration, planning harnesses such uses as a practical tool to shape and test longer-term options for planning processes, regulations and physical development. Creative uses' typical attributes - small scale, low capital investment, flexibility and orientation toward rapid, visible outcomes - mean that they provide a relatively cheap, low-risk, constrained but extendable way of bringing innovations into urban planning. They present opportunities for cities to try out new policies and management approaches for urban development. Such 'laboratories' or 'test phases' develop the competence of various actors (including the government itself) and build trust between them (Becker, 2010; BAFU, 2010; Waldis, 2009). In addition to being 'truffle pigs' for later investors (Lange, 2007, p.136), artists are thus also guinea pigs for planners.

The two drivers of planning innovation outlined above can be applied in pursuit of many different planning goals, and the promotion of many kinds of land use, whether temporary or long-lasting. Although existing literature seldom identifies tools and policies that are focused on facilitating temporary creative industry tenancies specifically, suitable instruments appear to include giving creative users advice, financial support, and preferential access to sites, and providing detailed databases of available sites (SenStadt, 2007; Böhme et al, 2006). Oft-mentioned is the desirability of a user- and goal-oriented 'one-stop-shop' (Schwartzing and Overmeyer, 2008) where potential temporary users - many of whom have little experience with the world of urban development and its regulation - can get advice and acquit the many necessary permissions; or less eloquently, a '*fachämterübergreifender Arbeitskreis*' (interdepartmental working group) to facilitate local government approvals for temporary projects (Schlegelmilch, 2009, p.498). As mentioned above, new non-governmental mediators have also sprung into existence to occupy this interface, often with a normative orientation toward encouraging fledgling uses.

Healey (2004) notes that creative approaches to governance and governance that fosters a creative society are not incompatible. Many analysts nevertheless doubt the capacity of formal, 'top-down' planning and its tools to be creative and proactively supportive of creative temporary uses. Groth and Corijn (2005, p.521) contrast the creative temporary uses of urban wastelands against the lack of imagination and creativity shown by long-range, large-scale planning which has allowed such wastelands to arise in the first place: "creative environments do not

spring into being as a result of top-down measures... they occur in the temporary lack of planning". Similarly, Larsen et al (2011, p.88) suggest "a possible alternative to the conscious design for creativity... sometimes creative practices emerge in the spaces that only wait for future development... sometimes the temporarily empty spaces make room for surprising innovations that otherwise would not emerge".

Bishop and Williams (2012) note that creative uses are difficult to create 'top down' because these uses are themselves intrinsically 'bottom up'; the most important prerequisites are cheap rents, flexible spaces, and freedom from constraints. In keeping with Jacobs' (1961) theorisation of the role of old buildings in ensuring city diversity, it is the absence of commercial attention to urban spaces that allows new, creative actors, who have different, risky ideas and who are not purely motivated by profit, to inhabit and operate in lively parts of the city, and thereby contribute to the processes of re-imagining, re-using and re-developing these areas. Becker (2010) suggests that the spontaneous, unplanned, short-term uniqueness of temporary creative uses is at odds with planning's general focus on fixed long-term visions. He argues that the emphasis needs to be on processual aspects: local governments showing openness to experiment; setting a clear basic framework of roles that creative actors can play, to provide clarity and certainty to their efforts; and 'creative support', rather than control, through new, flexible 'instruments of liberation and toleration' (Becker, 2010, p.81, author's translation).

Hall's (1998) emphasis on the importance of exchanges between cultural, intellectual, artistic and managerial creativity highlights that innovations in the practices of the various actors are connected: their interactions stimulate their creativity. This process is not necessarily smooth and cooperative. Angst et al suggest that in the case of Zurich's railyards, creative temporary use was inspired dialectically, through opposition to the interests of planners, government and the property industry: "the erstwhile forbidden nature of the former industrial zones and the illegal appropriation of many factories was part of the subculture that established itself (there) against speculation, discrimination and exploitation and in favour of alternative culture" (Angst et al. 2009, p.32, author's translation). The way that the temporary users engaged with regulation and order in this case also lent itself to creativity and difference in outcomes. Colomb (2012b) points to fundamental tensions between the increasing profitability and marketability of successful temporary leisure uses of urban sites, government policies that rigidly prescribe the desirable range of creative temporary uses, and the great wealth of informal, experimental, often unconventional practices, not all of which can achieve political or economic traction.

3. Analysis - Creativity unleashed: governing temporary uses

This closing section examines the implications of the contemporary emphasis on creativity in the production, consumption and planning of temporary uses, as

outlined above, for a general theorisation of the appropriate role and form of planning in shaping urban redevelopment and local economic activity. In broad terms, theory suggests the desirability of a liberalisation of both economic activity and strategic decision-making, by encouraging the participation of a wider range of small-scale private investors, producers, and consumers. More diverse inputs and less regulations imply the introduction of new ideas and approaches.

The emphasis within recent theorisations of temporary uses in European cities such as Berlin, on the key role of pioneering, artistic individuals who revitalise urban spaces and define new leisure lifestyles for highly-mobile urban residents, has ample parallels to earlier waves of gentrification that have been documented in post-industrial New York and London (Colomb, 2012a; Zukin, 1982; Hamnett, 2003; Pratt, 2009). Creative actors are portrayed within the context of a 'new frontier' that demands self-sufficiency, initiative, and independent action (Smith, 1996). Both artists and the unused spaces they discover and transform are seen as among "the few remaining pools of untapped resources" that define this particular frontier (Colomb, 2012a, p.244, citing Peck, 2005). Successful exploitation of such opportunities rests on governments allowing and encouraging mobile, creative minds to rush to these new goldfields of symbolic capital. Temporary artistic uses of urban space fit well to neoliberal demands:

informal, spontaneous (temporary uses)... whose primary characteristic is the use of available urban, programmatic, economic open spaces... also have other features that make them perfectly compatible with the neo-liberal economy, from shifting risk to individuals to accelerating the use of space. (Pogoreutz, 2006, p.79)

Persons engaged in the cultural sector and temporary users coincide with the current principle of short, fast utilisation cycles... the frameworks of both temporary use and subculture activities demand the same characteristics as contemporary entrepreneurial thinking: flexibility, cost-consciousness, environmental friendliness, efficiency, innovation, contemporary thinking, connectedness and liberality. (Erismann, 2011, p.23, citing Bürgin und Cabane, 1999)

Temporary artistic uses of derelict urban sites can indeed be seen as a rather practical case of post-fordist production: exploiting the niche of these amortized investments; accelerating their recommodification; optimising their economic potential by enhancing their variegation and cultivating new consumer groups; distributed networking of production; and minimal capital outlays on construction and infrastructure, focusing instead on 'mediatisation' of the product, which gives urban space the status of a service or an event (Ioannides and Debbage, 1997; Gale, 2009), or a web page or piece of software that users can "populate and repurpose" (Bishop and Williams, 2012, p.188; SenStadt, 2007). This reproduction process is best achieved if there is a reduction of structural rigidities in the property and labour markets and in land use regulations (Haydn and Temel,

2006). Urban Catalyst (2001) note that in parallel to economic forces and technological development, two other significant causes of long-term vacancy on urban sites are the political and bureaucratic inertia of the planning system and mis-judgment of the demand for particular uses. Economic liberalisation thus lies at the core of the phenomenon of creative temporary uses. This liberalisation also brings about more rapid and widespread availability of sites for temporary occupation, by accelerating the amortization of existing investments in land (Oswalt, 2001; MA18, 2003). The dynamics and diversity of disinvested urban spaces stimulates artistic creativity, which in turn serves consumers' rapacious desire for novel products (Bishop and Williams, 2012, citing Jameson, 1999 and Klanten and Hübner, 2010).

The 'creative' (i.e. new) governance approaches that have been identified as appropriate for entrepreneurial temporary uses appear to cover a spectrum of levels of agency, from permissiveness through facilitation to direct participation. 'Creative' planning for temporary uses often appears to mean less planning, allowing more flexibility in land use, construction, and risk management. One proposed strategy is increased toleration (*Geduld*) of temporary projects, even when they have no formal planning permission. Such a stance implies that a creative re-use is recognised as being somehow beneficial, even when it falls outside the framework of the local government's and landlord's understandings of their own objectives and interests, or when it is technically illegal (SenStadt, 2007; Dransfeld and Lehmann, 2008). Such judgments depend on careful distinctions and calibrations between short-term and long-term benefits and negative impacts, and the availability of appropriate alternative mechanisms to measure and control these. Prevention of temporary uses that are undoubtedly undesirable is acknowledged as an important tool in ensuring that sites remain available for other potential temporary uses that might offer more benefits (SenStadt, 2007). The question arises as to if or how the potential benefits and impacts that a discovered temporary use has on its site and surroundings might be assessed, and by whom, if not through standard planning approvals. Although cases have been documented where tolerated uses later receive sanction, and even eventually permanent permission (BMVBS/BBR, 2008), a strategy of tolerance brings into question the relevance, predictability and consistency of the entire planning process.

The technical instruments available for governing temporary uses include specification of temporary uses for particular locations within local development, land-use and redevelopment plans, and permits for so called 'flying buildings' which, once approved, can be relocated repeatedly, with time restrictions on any given site. Several other tools are rather new and untested in the German context: uses that are permitted 'as of right' without need for inspections and permits, the granting of time-limited and conditional planning permissions, and the revocation of existing permissions when a building is demolished or a longstanding use ceases, as a way of opening up spaces for other short- or long-term use options (SenStadt, 2007). Many of these tools illustrate planning and its instruments

themselves becoming more temporary, focused on fine-tuning of current, localised performance outcomes instead of defining general long-term certainties. Such creative approaches are potentially complex, resource-intensive, disruptive and imperfect, but as Healey (2004, p.98) notes, “risky, experimental governance requires some redundancy (short-term inefficiencies) and learns from failure as well as success”. As noted earlier in this paper, the justification for operational risks and potential failures is seen to lie in the capacity of the creative uses thereby facilitated to increase productive output, enhance local quality of life, and reform planning approaches themselves. As also already noted, the limited temporal and spatial scope of these experiments also confines their risks.

Facilitative and proactive roles for government include supporting, commissioning, financing, partnering, and marketing temporary uses. The creative potential of planning to facilitate temporary use includes “financial and creative enthusiasm for investment” (*monetärer und kreativer Investitionsfreudigkeit*) (Kruse and Steglich, 2006, p.17, author’s translation). This suggests a characteristically neoliberal coupling of subsidies and deregulation. Planning’s encouragement of the temporary use of urban spaces by creative actors fits the wider neoliberal shift from stable government-led urban service provision and regulation to flexible, facilitative governance, and increasing reliance upon entrepreneurial efforts and short-term, footloose private investments (Blumner, 2006; Groth and Corijn, 2005). In a time of reduced public spending, the vision of artists as “entrepreneurial self-starters” and “role models for a neo-liberal society” is not without its problems. These actors carry significant costs and risks; relatively few reap great rewards from success, and successful exploitation of an urban area forces out unsuccessful artists who cannot afford increasing rents (Lange, 2007, p.142).

The scope of roles and modes through which the public sector can shape a temporary use project so as to pursue public benefits and minimise negative impacts typically goes well beyond more-or-less antagonistic regulation. Governance of temporary uses is also enacted cooperatively by the public sector as one of many actors within complex networks. The public sector is often landlord, manager, funder, guarantor, and/or provider of goods, services, staff and expertise for temporary uses, and therefore contractual agreements provide significant scope for steering or hindering the development and operation of those activities in the public interest. Creative planning does not inevitably mean not planning. Dransfeld and Lehmann (2008, p.72) suggest that creative production should not go unregulated. To prevent temporary creative uses from unexpectedly becoming permanent and displacing envisaged long-term uses, they argue that governments and landlords should develop “creative shackles”: contractual agreements between landlords, users and other stakeholders to consensually define targeted scopes and timeframes for temporary uses. Rather than just holding out carrots or sticks, planning can thus act creatively to govern temporary uses by wearing different hats, negotiating complex relationships and developing new frameworks.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the recent development of theory and practice related to temporary uses illustrates Healey's argument that governance is not incompatible with creativity:

too much risk and uncertainty may inhibit creative responses ... This implies that governance processes which seek to encourage creativity and innovation ... need to perform a delicate 'trick' of taking risks themselves in order to lessen the risks and uncertainties for others... Over-management... destroys more capacity than it builds (Healey, 2004, p.91).

Recent calls to support creativity through planning and creativity in planning tend to imply not just different land uses and ways of administering them, but more permissive approaches that tolerate more varied land-use activities and pursue a wider range of goals for a greater range of actors. These actors had presumably been excluded or undervalued by earlier planning practices, and both traits of creativity and temporariness point toward groups of actors (artists, ethnic minorities, young people) who have neither the political nor economic power to see their interests prevail in ordinary property markets and through standard urban development practices. The discourse of creativity also tends to suggest an emphasis on use rather than on built form, even when the practices in question often involve creative reinterpretation of the urban fabric. The focus of attention is clearly on the processes and benefits of urban development, rather than on pre-defined physical visions.

Calls for planning to introduce creative forms of control, or tighter guidance for the many kinds of new and untested land uses, are greatly exceeded by demands for more permissive planning tools that free up the unrealised potential of creative actors. It can be argued then that the emergence and spread of temporary use thinking in the German-speaking world reflects not only the decline of former urban industrial areas (which is less prevalent in Austria and Switzerland), but also as a response to the particular rigidities of German-style planning systems, with temporary uses, creative or otherwise, merely being a spur for this reaction. The specific theorised connection between temporary use and creative industries would appear to be twofold: artistic people are good at adapting how they work to new spaces that lack tenants, and they are good at enhancing those spaces. But conceptually conjoining creative enterprise and temporary tenancy implies that creativity is economically precarious and expendable. If the ultimate goal for many creative workers is long-term employment, that should also be the goal of public policy. In this context, policy tools such as 'creative shackles' can be beneficial in clarifying for these ostensibly precious creative workers if and how particular temporary use arrangements benefit their own long-term visions.

The other side of the same coin is that even the most optimistic and selective data shows that the vast majority of urban work is not creative, in the narrow defined sense of artistic production. Innovation, on the other hand, is a desirable trait in most work practices, and attention to not-creative, but innovative, and even thoroughly commercial temporary uses of urban sites could probably reveal significant scope for enhancing land utilisation, economic productivity and benefits to end-consumers, which would suggest a very different range of objectives and potential planning tools for temporary use.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a Senior Research Fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Germany.

5. References

Angst, M., Klaus, P., Michaelis, T., Müller, R. and Wolff, R., 2009. *Zone*imaginaire: Zwischennutzungen in Industriearealen*, Zürich: Vdf Hochschulverlag.

BAFU = Bundesamt für Umwelt, Switzerland, 2010. Leitfaden Zwischennutzung. [online] Available at: <http://www.zwischennutzung.areale.ch/images/pdf_D/varianten/pdf_alle_bsp_d.pdf> [Accessed 12 March 2012].

BBR = Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, 2004. *Zwischennutzung und neue Freiflächen - städtische Lebensräume der Zukunft*. Berlin: H. Heenemann.

Becker, C., 2010. Kreativwirtschaft als Chance der Brachflächenreaktivierung. In: F. Dosch and S. Glöckner, eds., *Neue Zugänge zum Flächenrecycling (Informationen zur Raumplanung 1/2010)*. Bonn: Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, pp. 71-82.

Bengs, C., Hentilä, H. and Nagy, D., 2002. *Urban Catalysts: Strategies for Temporary Uses – Potential for Development of Urban Residual Areas in European Metropolises*. Espoo: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Helsinki University of Technology.

Blumner, N., 2006. *Planning for the Unplanned: Tools and Techniques for Interim Use in Germany and the United States*. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik.

BMVBS/BBR = Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung and Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, eds., 2008. *Zwischennutzungen und Nischen im Städtebau als Beitrag für eine nachhaltige Stadtentwicklung*. Bonn: BBR.

Böhme, C., Henckel, D. and Besecke, A., 2006. Brachflächen in der Flächenkreislaufwirtschaft (Expertise). Berlin: Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung.

Bornmann, F., Erbeding, D. and Froessler D., 2008. Zwischennutzungen: Temporäre Nutzungen als Instrument der Stadtentwicklung. Düsseldorf: Innovationsagentur Stadtumbau NRW.

Brammer, M., 2008. Zwischennutzung in Berlin Neukölln: Kreativwirtschaft als Motor in einem sozial benachteiligten Binnenquartier. Standort – Zeitschrift für Angewandte Geographie, 32, pp. 71-77.

Bürgin, M. and Cabane, P., 1999. Akupunktur für Basel: Zwischennutzung als Standortentwicklung auf dem Areal des DB-Güterbahnhofs in Basel. [online] Available at:

<http://www.arenal.org/arenal_alt/download/zn_mb.pdf>

[Accessed 11 April 2012].

Colomb, C., 2012a. Staging the New Berlin: Place Marketing and the Politics of Urban Reinvention Post-1989. London: Routledge.

Colomb, C., 2012b. Pushing the urban frontier: Temporary uses of space, city marketing, and the creative city discourse in 2000s Berlin. Journal of Urban Affairs, 34(2), pp. 131–52.

Colomb, C., 2007. Requiem for a lost Palast. Revanchist urban planning and burdened landscapes of the German Democratic Republic in the new Berlin. Planning Perspectives, 22(3), pp. 283-323.

Dienel, H. and Schophaus, M., 2005. Urban wastelands and the development of youth cultures in Berlin since 1945, with comparative perspectives on Amsterdam and Naples. In: A. Schildt and D. Siegfried, eds., European cities, youth and the public sphere in the Twentieth Century. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 119-33.

Dransfeld, E. and Lehmann, D., 2008. Temporäre Nutzungen als Bestandteil des modernen Baulandmanagements. Dortmund: Forum Baulandmanagement NRW.

Franck, K. A. and Stevens, Q., eds. 2007. Loose Space: Possibility and Diversity in Public Life. London: Routledge.

Gale, T., 2009. Urban beaches, virtual worlds and the end of tourism. Mobilities, 4(1), pp. 119–38.

Hall, P., 1998. Cities in civilization: culture, innovation, and urban order. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Hamnett, C., 2003. Gentrification and the Middle-class Remaking of Inner London, 1961–2001. *Urban Studies*, 40(12), pp. 2401–26.

Havemann, A. and Schild, W., 2007. You can use my tights or: The phenomenon of temporary solutions. *Landscape Research*, 32(1), pp. 45-55.

Haydn, F. and Temel, R., eds., 2006. *Temporary Urban Spaces: Concepts for the Use of City Spaces*. Basel: Birkhäuser.

Healey, P., 2004. Creativity and urban governance. *Policy Studies*, 25(2), pp. 87-102.

Ioannides, D. and Debbage, K., 1997. Post-Fordism and flexibility: the travel industry polyglot. *Tourism Management*, 18(4), pp. 229–41.

Jacobs, J., 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.

Jameson, F., 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. New York: Verso.

Jorg, J., 2008. *Make Use: A comparison between temporary- use strategies of intermediary organizations with the goal of using vacant buildings as workplaces for social and creative entrepreneurs*. unpublished masters thesis, POLIS MA in European Urban Cultures, Amsterdam/Brussels.

Klanten, R. and Hübner, M., eds. 2010. *Urban interventions: personal projects in public spaces*. Berlin, Gestalten.

Kloos, M., Knüvener, T. and Wachten, K., 2007. *Freiräume auf Zeit: Neue Konzepte für Grünflächen in Stadterneuerungsgebieten*. Aachen: Internationales Institut für Gartenkunst und Landschaftskultur Schloss Dyck.

Krauzick, M., 2007. *Zwischennutzung als Initiator einer neuen Berliner Identität?*, Berlin: Universitätsverlag der TU Berlin.

Kreuzer, S., 2001), *Temporäre Freiräume: Szenarischer Replik zum Vortrag des Soziologen Peter Arlt*. *Zolltexte*, 38, pp. 18-19.

Kruse, S. and Steglich, A., 2006. *Temporäre Nutzungen: Stadtgestalt zwischen Selbstorganisation und Steuerung*. Lüneburg: Fakultät III – Umwelt und Technik, Universität Lüneburg.

Lange, B., 2008. Accessing markets in creative industries: professionalization and social-spatial strategies of culturepreneurs in Berlin. *Creative Industries Journal*, 1(2), pp. 115-35.

Lange, B., 2007. Entrepreneurial Temporary Use: An Incubator for the Creative Economy. In: SenStadt, ed. 2007. Urban Pioneers: Temporary Use and Urban Development in Berlin. Berlin: Jovis, pp. 135-42.

Larsen, J. L., Elle, M., Hoffmann, B. and Munthe-Kaas, P., 2011. Urbanising facilities management: the challenges in a creative age. *Facilities*, 29(1-2), pp. 80-92.

MA18 = Magistratsabteilung 18 Stadtentwicklung und Stadtplanung, Stadt Wien, 2003. Urban catalyst: Strategien für temporäre Nutzungen - Entwicklungspotentiale für urbane Residualflächen in europäischen Metropolen; Amsterdam - Berlin - Helsinki - Neapel - Wien. Vienna: City of Vienna.

Oswalt, P., 2002. Die Stadt stimulieren: Standortentwicklung mit kapitalschwachen Akteuren und temporären Programmen. *Werk, Bauen, Wohnen*, 6, pp. 44-49.

Peck, J., 2005. Struggling with the Creative Class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4), pp. 740-70.

Pogoreutz, M., 2006. Urban Intelligence. In: F. Haydn and R. Temel, eds. *Temporary Urban Spaces: Concepts for the Use of City Spaces*. Basel: Birkhäuser, pp. 75-80.

Pratt, A. C., 2009. Urban regeneration: from the arts feel good factor to the cultural economy: a case study of Hoxton, London. *Urban Studies*, 46(5-6), pp. 1041-61.

RAW München = Referat für Arbeit und Wirtschaft, Landeshauptstadt München, 2007. München – Standortfaktor Kreativität. Munich: Referats für Arbeit und Wirtschaft.

Rosic, N. and Froessler, D., 2009. Leerstandsmanagement: Konzeptpapier zur Durchführung eines Leerstandsmanagements in Steinheim. Düsseldorf: Innovationsagentur Stadtumbau NRW.

Schwarting, H. and Overmeyer, K., 2008. Suboptimale Nutzungen lieben lernen: Eine Schlüsselstrategie der integrierten Stadtentwicklung. Wiesbaden: Hessischen Ministeriums für Wirtschaft, Verkehr und Landesentwicklung.

SenStadt = Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin, ed., 2007. *Urban Pioneers: Temporary Use and Urban Development in Berlin*. Berlin: Jovis.

Smith, N., 1996. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. New York: Routledge.

Urban Catalyst, 2001. Analysis report Berlin study draft. Berlin: Technische Universität Berlin.

Urban Catalyst (Philipp Oswalt, Philipp Misselwitz, Klaus Overmeyer), 2007. Patterns of the Unplanned. In: K. Franck and Q. Stevens, eds. Loose Space: Possibility and Diversity in Urban Life. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, pp: 271-88.

Urban Unlimited, eds. 2004. The shadow city, freezones in Brussels and Rotterdam. Rotterdam: Urban Unlimited.

Waldis, S., 2009. Zwischennutzung urbaner Brachflächen und Nachhaltigkeit: Theoretisches Konzept zur Verbindung von Zwischennutzungen und Nachhaltigkeit. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Basel.

Willinger, S., 2005. Leerstand als Möglichkeitsraum. Urbanistische Strategien zur Revitalisierung in den Innenstädten. Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 6, pp. 397–407.

Zukin, S., 1982. Loft Living: Culture and capital in urban change. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.