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Abstract
Analysis of the emergent theoretical, empirical, and planning policy studies of ‘temporary uses’ of derelict urban spaces in European cities illustrates three distinct realms where the concept of ‘creativity’ is defined and applied to urban management and redevelopment approaches: in terms of creative production, consumption of creativity, and creative governance. These concepts mesh together with a liberalization of urban planning and governance. Creative planning for temporary use suggests not just reducing the regulation of urban activity and built form, but transforming the aims and methods of planning itself to be more dynamic and more facilitative.
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INTRODUCTION

This paper examines how various definitions and applications of the concept of ‘creativity’ have been developed and deployed in the emergent theoretical, empirical and planning policy literature on ‘temporary uses’ of derelict urban spaces, in order to explore how these understandings of creativity and temporary use are influencing the purposes and methods of planning itself.

Temporary land uses have always existed in cities, ranging from circuses and squatting to materials storage and surface car parks. But until recently, such uses were not generally harnessed for the transformation of disinvested urban districts. They were epiphenomena that were never seen as part of urban development planning. Two European studies (Bürgin and Cabane, 1999; Urban Catalyst, 2001) initiated a new area of planning thinking and research by defining ‘temporary use’ in terms of economically-marginal activities that temporarily occupy and transform abandoned urban sites, and examining the potential importance of these uses for bringing new economic and social activity, jobs, and investment to cities. These studies appear to have introduced at least four new points of focus to planning thinking about temporary use. Firstly, 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 long-term physical and economic development outcomes. Secondly, actors from the ‘creative industries’ are now understood as playing an important role in undertaking these temporary reuses and transformations. Thirdly, temporary uses of sites are acknowledged by city administrations as being important opportunities for attracting and nurturing creative industries. Fourthly, planning policy, which has traditionally focused on long-term visions and permanent rules, has begun looking at ways to support and promote particular short-term uses as a mechanism for driving urban change.

To explore the discourse of temporary use and the arguments around creativity that favour and legitimate it, this paper draws centrally on a qualitative, thematic content analysis of 43 of the earliest empirical and policy studies of temporary uses in Western European cities (see References). These publications were identified through exhaustive internet searching using the key term ‘temporary use’ and its German equivalents (Zwischennutzung, Temporäre / Vorläufige Nutzung), and snowball sampling of further material cited in the identified sources. The publications examine projects and policies in Germany and in several countries surrounding it (Switzerland, Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium), a region where economic conditions, governments and entrepreneurs fostered the earliest emergence of new temporary uses of under-utilised urban spaces. All translations from German-language sources are the author’s own. The literature covers the period from Bürgin and Cabane’s pioneering study (1999) up until 2012, when the first major survey and analysis was published of emergent temporary uses elsewhere, in the UK (Bishop and Williams, 2012). While the geographical and conceptual breath of research into temporary uses has continued to expand (Henneberry, 2017; Madanipour, 2017), the sample illustrates the initial concepts, projects and evaluations of temporary uses within the economic, political and cultural context of the German/Dutch-speaking world, which have subsequently had significant wider influence on theory and practice. These analytical insights are supplemented by further arguments and evidence drawn from more recent literature.
To pursue a grounded theory of temporary use as a new area of planning thought and practice, this paper uses a qualitative content analysis of the identified set of policy and research studies to explore the following key themes:

### Table 1: Key themes in Temporary Use literature (Source: Author).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The definition of temporariness</td>
<td>Blumner, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Böhme et al, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temporal, economic and institutional contexts for temporary uses</td>
<td>Urban Catalyst, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SenStadt 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How temporary uses interact with other more permanent uses</td>
<td>Urban Catalyst, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schwarting and Overmeyer, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The aims and perceived benefits of temporary uses</td>
<td>SenStadt, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brammer, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The various types of actors who drive temporary uses</td>
<td>SenStadt 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorg, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inductive content analysis of the aims, perceived benefits and critiques of temporary uses led to the identification and analysis of two additional, more specific and critical themes that were raised in the literature:

### Table 2: Key critiques expressed in Temporary Use literature (Source: Author).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How the idea of creativity is relevant to the development of temporary uses</td>
<td>Ebert and Kunzmann, 2007;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorg, 2008;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angst et al, 2009;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colomb 2012a, 2012b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships between temporary uses, creativity, and neoliberal economics and theory</td>
<td>Kruse and Steglich, 2006;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lange, 2007, 2008;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colomb 2012a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paper focuses on examining these latter two themes. The paper does not presuppose any authoritative definition of creativity (in German, *Kreativität*), or the purpose of creativity or innovation within urban economies and urban development (cf. Landry and Bianchini, 1995; Florida, 2002). Instead, it examines three distinct but interrelated contexts where the concept of creativity is defined and deployed within the academic and policy discourse about temporary use and the management and redevelopment of abandoned and underutilised sites. These are: creative production, consumption, and governance. Finally, the paper examines how these conceptions of creativity mesh together in planning thought with the liberalisation of urban development and urban governance.

**ANALYSIS**

**Creative Production**

Creative production is seen as an increasingly-important component of urban economies (Hall, 1998; Florida, 2002). In relation to the planning and management of urban built fabric, policy and theory also sees the creative industries to have a more specific role, as an...
economically productive way to use vacant, derelict urban spaces temporarily. This is understood as both convenient and strategic. Compared to other branches of industry, creative enterprises are typically small, low-capital, and flexible about the spaces they occupy. They are seen as a branch of industry that is uniquely willing and able to start operating at short notice and relocate in a piecemeal fashion, and as able to 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 frequently portrayed as ‘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, policy on temporary use typically prioritises the development of new creative activities, rather than relocating existing creative activities from elsewhere that may not engage creatively with the new site. Temporary use is portrayed, for example, as “an attractive ‘first step’ for numerous start-up ventures in the creative economy” (SenStadt, 2007:101). 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 disinvested, vacant spaces, and to efficiently activate these potentials, and thereby add high symbolic, social and economic value to those sites (SenStadt, 2007; 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; fig. 1). Creative producers have “a feel for unconventional and creative solutions”, including experimental uses of sites (Bürgin, 2010:8).

Figure 1. Photomontage emphasizing the role of ‘Creative Nomads’ (artists and musicians) in temporary activation of unused urban sites, from *Urban Pioneers: Temporary Use and Urban Development in Berlin*, the ‘manual’ based on the experiences of Berlin’s Department of Urban Development (SenStadt 2007:66-67). Image courtesy of Urban Catalyst.
An early summary by Kloos et al (2007) finds that the 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 devalorised properties, as would temporary warehousing activities or car parking, 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). While there may be real, direct economic dividends in increased cultural production, policies often intend artistic and cultural permissiveness in such brownfield areas to be only temporary and transitional (Andres and Gresillon, 2013). 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).

Bürgin (2010:107) strikes 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; Bürgin, 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 (Bürgin, 2010; Bishop and Williams, 2012).

**Consumption of Creativity**

A second component of creativity is the interesting consumption opportunities that new, temporary uses of urban spaces are believed to offer to residents and visitors. 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 (Bürgin, 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. Under conditions of fiscal austerity following the latest global financial crisis, creative uses also have an ameliorative role. Their flexible labour and their limited financial resources are
being drawn upon to compensate for deficiencies in publicly-funded delivery of social and cultural amenities (Ferreri, 2015; Deslandes, 2013; Tonkiss, 2013; Urban Catalyst, 2001).

Temporary uses of urban sites are seen to 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 art 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; Haydn and Temel, 2006). Among 43 pioneering temporary uses showcased in a government-sponsored study of Berlin (SenStadt, 2007), 30 were novel open spaces for public use: community gardens, accessible open spaces for people and animals; sports areas; and artificial beaches.

Creative public uses of formerly-vacant sites often engage with and enrich the particularity of space and local identity. Artistic engagement with a vacant sites sometimes engages directly and critically with the dynamics of the site’s development, seeking to explore, comment on and shape those wider processes (Till, 2011). 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 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. The aim is often instead for the city and its citizens to benefit from privately-financed investments and services that enhance general quality of life.

Some innovative temporary consumption spaces indirectly serve aims for economic and property development. Berlin’s government has increasingly utilised 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: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, theatre 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 [see fig. 2] - 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, 2007:22)

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, 2007:41)

In contrast to the theorizations of creative productivity outlined in the first section of this paper, which 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 illustrate that citizens can have a participatory role in such re-activations of spaces.

Figure 2. Kulturstrand, Munich. A temporary beach installed on a pier of the Cornelius Bridge, frequently used for cultural performances and events. Image courtesy Kulturstrand.
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 (here meaning 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; fig. 3). 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, emphasis added)

Figure 3. Conceptual diagram of the relationships among the various actors that are creatively assembled to enable temporary use of a site. From left to right, and top to bottom: the trust that owns the site; a mutual fund that provides investment capital; the user cooperative Holzmarkt plus eG that developed and managed the site; tenants from small business, arts and culture; experts with ideas; local residents; and a community gardening association that maintains the open spaces.

Image courtesy of Urban Catalyst.
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. In line with broader neoliberal thinking, this discourse rejects long-range, top-down strategic approaches to urban development in favour of freeing up and encouraging individual entrepreneurial initiative and capital. Creative governance generally means less regulation. Becker (2010:27) suggests that creative uses of space are hard to plan because they thrive on spontaneity and unexpected conditions and relations, and argues for “the removal of bureaucratic hurdles, the relaxation of public safety regulations, and the use of administrative discretion” – i.e., liberalization. Temporary users of sites are celebrated 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, 2001:19). Rules and relationships are creatively 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). Creativity is employed by whichever actor is taking the initiative to encourage temporary use in a given location, according to three different scenarios: property owner seeks user, user seeks property owner, or urban developer seeks property owner and user (BMVBS/BBR, 2008).

Creativity on the part of property owners involves flexibility 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, 2007:6), and creativity in finding appropriate sets of tenants for large sites and buildings (Bürgin, 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 artistic and cultural attractions 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, requiring an openness to dialogue (Bürgin, 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” (Schwarting and Overmeyer, 2008:62), uses the German term kreatives Gewerbe (‘creative business’) rather than the usual sectoral 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, 2008:92). These two aspects overlap most clearly in the environmental design disciplines (architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, interior design), whose core creative competency is the redevelopment of built form. These businesses are often strongly 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, 2008:18), 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 (Schwarting 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 raised levels of citizen engagement in the planning and execution of projects (BMVBS/BBR, 2008; BBR, 2004).

The temporary use literature sees creative temporary uses as a conceptual inspiration for planning. The literature also sees planning harnessing temporary uses as a practical tool through which it can 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, high-visibility outcomes – mean that they provide a relatively cheap, low-risk, constrained, but also 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; Bürgin, 2010; Waldis, 2009). In addition to being ‘truffle pigs’ for later investors (Lange, 2007:136), 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 user- and goal-oriented ‘one-stop-shops’ (Schwarting 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 acquire the many necessary permissions; or of interdepartmental working groups to facilitate local government approvals for temporary projects (Schlegelmilch, 2009:498). As mentioned above, new non-governmental mediators have also sprung into existence to occupy this interface.

Healey (2004) notes that creative approaches to governance can help to foster a more creative society. But many analysts doubt the capacity of formal, ‘top-down’ planning and its tools to be creative and proactively supportive of creative temporary uses. Groth and Corijn (2005:521) note that the creative temporary uses of urban wastelands contrast with the lack of imagination and creativity shown by long-range, large-scale planning that 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. (2011:88) 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) theorization 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 run-down 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, 2010:81).

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. But these interactions are not necessarily smooth and cooperative. In the case of Zurich’s railyards, creative temporary use was apparently 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., 2009:32). The way that the temporary users engaged with regulation and order in this case also lent itself to creativity and difference within the 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.

Creativity Unleashed: Governing Temporary Uses

This closing section examines what implications the contemporary emphasis on creativity in the production, consumption and planning of temporary uses is seen to have for the role and form of planning in shaping urban redevelopment and local economic activity. In broad terms, the temporary use literature 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 analyses 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 (Ferreri, 2015; 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:244). 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, 2006:79)

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, 2011:23)

Temporary artistic uses of derelict urban sites can be seen as a case of post-fordist production: exploiting the niche of these amortized property 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 piece of software that users can “populate and repurpose” (Bishop and Williams, 2012:188). This process of renewing exchange value 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; Tonkiss, 2013). 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 misjudgement of the demand for particular uses. Economic liberalisation is thus seen to lie 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).

The creative governance approaches that the literature identifies as appropriate for entrepreneurial temporary uses covers 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 (in German, 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; Ebert and Kunzmann, 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 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). Cases have been documented where tolerated uses later receive sanction, and even eventually permanent permission (BMVBS/BBR, 2008). But a strategy of tolerance brings into question the relevance, predictability and consistency of the entire planning process.

Policies and studies identify a range of creative technical instruments that can be deployed to govern 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 remain 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-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 (2004:98) notes, “risky, experimental governance requires some redundancy (short-term inefficiencies) and learns from failure as well as success”. As noted earlier, the understood justification for operational risks and potential failures is the potential capacity of creative uses to increase land value, 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.

The literature identifies a range of proactive roles that governments can play, 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” (Kruse and Steglich, 2006:17). This suggests a characteristically
neoliberal coupling of subsidies and deregulation. Planning’s encouragement of temporary uses 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 (Lange, 2007:142). 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. Ebert and Kunzmann (2012) suggest that policy may seek to improve the sustainability of certain clusters of creative industries in the face of gentrification, through careful policy choices such as controlling uses and rents, with particular attention to whether, which, and over what time frame such precincts might maintain a role in nurturing new, experimental practices and enterprises.

The academic and policy literature identifies a wide scope of roles and modes through which the public sector can shape temporary use projects so as to provide public benefits and minimise negative impacts; this extends well beyond traditional adversarial regulation. Governance of temporary uses is in numerous cases also enacted cooperatively by the public sector as one of many actors within a complex network. The public sector is also 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 (2008:72) 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.

CONCLUSION

Recent calls to support creativity through planning also often advocate more creativity in planning, which means approaches that tolerate more varied land-use activities and that help to identify and support a wider range of goals for a greater range of actors. The kinds of urban development actors and interests identified in this paper were often undervalued or excluded by earlier planning practices. The key traits of creativity and temporariness point toward groups of actors - artists, ethnic minorities, young people - who typically have neither the political nor economic power to see their interests prevail in ordinary property markets or through standard urban development practices (Ferreri, 2015).

The discourse of creativity also tends to suggest an emphasis on use rather than on built form. The focus of attention has moved away from pre-defined physical visions, and towards the processes and impacts of urban development. One line of thinking about the role of creative temporary uses in urban planning suggests that such practices are not merely a new and powerful mechanism for urban development, but that creative, artistic practice can be a new way to stimulate public engagement and critical reflection on urban development and

Calls for planning to introduce new forms of control over new and untested temporary land uses are greatly exceeded by demands for more permissive planning tools that free up the unrealised potential of creative actors. The emergence and spread of temporary use thinking in the German-speaking world appears to not only reflect the decline of former urban industrial areas, but also to respond to the particular rigidities of German-style planning systems. The conceptual 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 (Tonkiss, 2013; Mould, 2014). Policy tools such as 'creative shackles' can potentially benefit these ostensibly precious creative workers by clarifying how particular temporary use arrangements align to their own long-term visions and needs.
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