

# 1

## Introduction: Temporary Uses as Alternative Practices

John Henneberry

*Department of Urban Studies and Planning, University of Sheffield, UK*

---

### Vacant land and temporary use

*The longer the time frame within which buildings are viewed, the more impermanent they seem: less as solid forms and more as transient manifestations of human activity.*

(Barras, 2009, p. 2)

Cities are subject to continuous change and restructuring. There arises, *inter alia*, a fundamental tension between the rigidity of the urban built environment and the relative fluidity of the socio-economic processes that produce and are accommodated by it. The relations between the former and the latter affect urban development. Land and buildings must be adapted to meet new requirements. Such adjustment is achieved through various combinations of change of use, renovation, alteration, demolition, new construction and so on. However, physical, social, economic, political, institutional and cultural factors frequently cause a hiatus between the decline and obsolescence of land uses and buildings, on the one hand, and their redevelopment and/or reuse on the other. Thus, vacancy and dereliction are common stages in the urban development cycle. But the problem faced by many cities is that they have experienced a dramatic growth in vacant and derelict land and buildings. Two opposing trends have been identified as the cause of this.

Bishop and Williams (2012) argue that European cities have gradually become more formalised and 'permanent'. In medieval settlements, essential infrastructures, such as street systems and substantial administrative

and religious buildings, were surrounded by much smaller, less significant, less enduring buildings and spaces. Increasing levels of legislation (some with a long history but most introduced in the twentieth century) covering building construction, fire prevention, public health, building conservation and land use planning have 'solidified' the urban built environment. Planning, for example, is pre-disposed to the status quo. Its starting point is the existing pattern of land uses and buildings. It reinforces established interests (Whitehand, 1987). Consequently, important elements of building layout and design – individually and in relation to other buildings – and of urban areas are 'fixed'. This makes it more difficult for cities to change.

At the same time, the activities that constitute cities have become more volatile and provisional. A huge rise in vacant urban land and buildings has resulted from technological advance, economic re-structuring and demographic change such as migration (Hollander *et al.*, 2009; Bishop and Williams, 2012; Burkholder, 2012; Oswalt *et al.*, 2013). This has been exacerbated by a re-organisation of the way that people live and work and the more intensive use of space by business and commerce (Lehtovuori and Ruoppila, 2012). Consequently, the amount of space that is used and the way that it is used have changed rapidly and significantly. Space use is more temporary, flexible and episodic (Oswalt *et al.*, 2013). The uses of space are less defined and stable, and more mixed, overlapping and changeable. In addition, economic, social, political and environmental uncertainty has been increased by the global financial crisis and its aftermath. Municipalities have experienced massive budget cuts, reducing their capacity to act (Bishop and Williams, 2012; Beekmans and de Boer, 2014).

Urban policy makers have long considered vacant land and buildings to be secondary (Lehtovuori and Ruoppila, 2012), problematic (Till and McArdle, 2015), irrelevant, marginal and of no economic use; unwanted wastelands, burdens representing the ghosts of the past (Colomb, 2012; Moore-Cherry, 2015). The rhetoric of re-urbanisation and densification, with its focus on longer-term futures (Tonkiss, 2013), stressed the need for such voids to be filled (Colomb, 2012). The temporary use of such spaces was "generally considered to signify a time of crisis or a failure to develop" (Bishop and Williams, 2012, p. 19). It was seen as "taboo ... 'uncontrolled growth' which at best had to be kept at bay" (Oswalt *et al.*, 2013, p. 7), or as disruptive, in contrast to the model of a regulated, well-functioning, clearly defined city (Ziehl *et al.*, 2012). In short, "The opinion was that informal use would only interfere with urban development" (Oswalt *et al.*, 2013, p. 7).

In the face of these attitudes, practitioners of temporary urbanism<sup>1</sup> have pointed out the many advantages of temporary or interim uses. Engagement in temporary uses offers a new route to community participation for a

<sup>1</sup> 'Tactical urbanism', 'DIY urbanism', 'guerrilla urbanism', 'user-generated urbanism' and 'emancipatory practices' are some of the other neologisms for this approach (Stickells, 2011).

wider range of people (Graham, 2012), giving citizens the chance to become more active in shaping their neighbourhoods (Blumner, 2006). It contrasts with formal public participation in planning that is often limiting and frustrating. It permits DIY urbanism (Oswalt *et al.*, 2013). Ziehl *et al.* (2012) argue that second-hand spaces allow experimentation at low cost. New users can improvise individual aesthetics by drawing on the spaces' history, atmosphere and remaining physical resources. They can test new ideas, support social interaction and allow cheap start-ups, showcasing creative talent (Blumner, 2006), encouraging entrepreneurship (Graham, 2012) and contributing to economic development (Colomb, 2012). For owners, temporary uses may reduce the costs of vacancy and improve the physical condition of buildings (Graham, 2012; Ziehl *et al.*, 2012) and their security (Blumner, 2006), avoiding decay and vandalism (Colomb, 2012). This will promote stability and uphold the value of adjacent property (Hollander *et al.*, 2009). Finally, the greening involved in some temporary uses may contribute to social objectives and environmental sustainability through the provision of new public open spaces at little cost (Blumner, 2006; Colomb, 2012).

The dramatic increase in the scale and variety of temporary uses, together with their apparent benefits, has led to major claims being made for their role in urban development. The growth of temporary uses is "proof of a paradigm shift in how city-making happens, leading to changes in how cities are conceived, designed, and built" (Beekmans and de Boer, 2014, p. 7). Temporary uses may be "a manifestation of the emergence of a more dynamic, flexible or adaptive urbanism, where the city is becoming more responsive to new needs, demands and preferences of its users" (Bishop and Williams, 2012, pp. 3–4). This "new approach [to temporary use] has the potential to fundamentally alter the way we think about our role as architects, designers, city administrators or investors" (Christiaanse, 2013, p. 6, square brackets added). These claims need to be analysed and assessed rigorously to increase our understanding of urban change and to inform the development of temporary use policy and practice. For this, the help of theories and concepts is required.

## Theorising and conceptualising temporary use

Land and building vacancy and temporary use are elements of the process of urban development and change. However, mainstream urban economic theory has little to say about vacant or derelict land or buildings, or about the evolution of new uses and the new types of buildings that accommodate them. Rather, the focus is on obsolescence and redevelopment. One of the earliest applied treatments was that of Needleman (1969). He argued that, in purely economic terms, housing rehabilitation is a better approach than housing redevelopment

*if the cost of rehabilitation, plus the present value of the cost of rebuilding in  $\lambda$  years' time, plus the present value of the difference in annual running costs and rents for  $\lambda$  years, is less than the present cost of rebuilding.*

(Needleman, 1969, p. 198)

Subsequently, this approach has been generalised to cover different uses but is based on the same principles. Thus, "redevelopment will occur when the price of land for new development exceeds the price of land in its current use by the cost of demolition" (Munneke and Womack, 2014, p. 5).

The existing building is superseded by another building or use as obsolescence (economic, physical, technological and so on) reduces the value of the previous use relative to that of the potential new use. It may be inferred that the necessary additional value may be created through new development that embodies: (i) a simple increase in density (replacing a two-storey building with a four-storey building in the same use and of the same general design); (ii) the provision of a building of greater functional efficiency (that allows more of the same activity to occur in a new building of the same size); (iii) a change to a more valuable use (for example, replacing industrial with office use within existing building conventions); (iv) the introduction of a novel, higher value use in an extant or new type of building or (v) some combination of these factors. Such (re-)development is dependent upon the existence of the necessary demand for the new buildings and uses. Nothing is said about the costs of vacancy or the values of temporary uses, other than what might be incorporated in standard assessments of their impact on the owner's holding costs or the financial viability of the new development. The theory is also silent about the role of temporary uses in the evolution of novel new uses.

The literature on property development is little better. None of the models of the development process, whatever their perspective or degree of sophistication (sequential/descriptive, behavioural/decision making, production-based/macro-economic and structures of provision), consider vacancy. All focus on how a new, long-term development or redevelopment project occurs (Gore and Nicholson, 1991). Vacancy is treated simply as a precursor of development, not as an influence upon it (Healey, 1991). The exception is Gore and Nicholson's (1985) variant of the 'development pipeline' model. This conceptualises development as a cyclical process where long-term trends result in a stock of vacant, redundant land and buildings that may be subject to short-term uses that are "partial, residual, temporary" (Gore and Nicholson, 1985, p. 182, fig. 1) prior to redevelopment when this is feasible. But nothing more is said about temporary uses or their role in the development cycle.

A conceptual framework within which to consider temporary uses is Healey's (1992) institutional model of the development process, suitably adapted for this purpose. She defines the development process as

*the transformation of the physical form, bundle of rights, and material and symbolic value of land and buildings from one state to another, through the effort of agents with interests and purposes in acquiring and using resources, operating rules and applying and developing ideas and values.* (Healey, 1992, p. 36)

If one allows that development may consist of one or some but not necessarily all aspects of 'transformation', then temporary use clearly falls within the definition. The model is sufficiently broad to accommodate the variety and complexity of development actors and their relationships, of the elements and stages of the development process, and of the different natures, conditions and contexts of development projects. This breadth is an essential feature, given the highly variegated forms of individual developments and of the wider political economies within which they are pursued.

The conceptual framework focuses on four levels of concern. The first is the *development project* and covers the events in the production process, the actors involved and the outcomes produced. The second relates to the *social networks involved in the process*, including the actors' roles in the production and consumption/use of the development and the power relations between them. The third considers the *actors' motivations*: their strategies and interests; the resources, rules and ideas they draw upon; and how these govern the way different roles are played and relationships are developed. The fourth focuses on the *societal circumstances* of the development: the nature of the 'local' modes of production and regulation, the nature of ideology and of the relations between them, and the way that the development process reproduces, reinforces or transforms these social relations.

Healey's model has been applied predominantly to mainstream, long-term developments (for example, she used it to analyse a major urban regeneration project on Tyneside). Consequently, attention needs to be paid to the following issues related to its use as a conceptual framework. The treatment of time should be made explicit (rather than implicit to a process whose events take place over time). Less stress should be put on the production of outcomes because they imply a defined end product (the end of temporary uses is often far from clear). Consideration must be given to the relation of one development (a temporary use) to another, subsequent, development (another temporary use or a long-term use). This, in turn, raises questions about the nature of and the relations between transience and permanence. While the framework covers the transformation of social relations, the potential for alternative groupings within societies to use temporary development to challenge dominant forms of social relations needs more emphasis. Finally, the framework is just that. It allows research to be related to different aspects of temporary uses. However, more detailed work on particular aspects of such uses may adopt various theoretical perspectives, as necessary and appropriate. Without this, work on temporary uses will extend little beyond structured description.

## **Describing and analysing temporary uses**

There is a recent, large and mainly practice-related literature on temporary uses. Most reports and publications take the form of surveys of temporary users and uses and associated actors, practices and policies. Many consider the barriers to the development of temporary uses and how these might be avoided, reduced or removed. Thus, we know that, apart from the temporary users themselves, the *main actors* are central and local government, property owners, private sector agents (normally professionals and intermediaries) and the local resident and business communities (see, for example, Blumner, 2006; Dakin and Lang, 2012). A wide range of *users* is engaged in a wide range of *uses* for equally varied objectives. These include: local community or voluntary groups and social enterprises trying to strengthen the local community or economy; artists seeking cheap studio space close to artistic communities; entrepreneurs looking for space for a start-up and proximity to other new, small businesses; and individuals wishing to pursue alternative lifestyles or to make personal or political statements (Blumner, 2006; Segal Quince Wickstead, 2010; De Smet, 2013).

There are many *obstacles* to successful temporary uses (see, for example, CABE, 2008; English Heritage, 2011; Perkovic, 2013). Landowners may be averse to temporary uses because of the potential legal and social difficulties of removing them to make way for long-term development. Overly rigid and demanding regulations – relating, for example, to planning, building construction and public health and safety – that were designed for long-term uses may severely restrict short-term uses. Potential users' lack of knowledge and finance often inhibits the establishment and development of temporary uses. The studies that identify these obstacles often make recommendations for improvements in related *practice* and *policy* (see, for example, Blumner, 2006; CABE, 2008; Segal Quince Wickstead, 2010; De Smet, 2013; Perkovic, 2013). Thus, model 'meanwhile leases' and appropriately designed community engagement policies will address owners' legal and social concerns; officer guidelines, advice to applicants or even legislative reforms may reduce the impact of regulatory inflexibility; and government grants or loan guarantees and the establishment of specialist intermediary and/or user organisations would offer further support for temporary uses.

Clearly, these surveys of practice have provided much up-to-date and detailed information about temporary uses. This material largely takes the form of structured descriptions relating to temporary use projects, particularly the agencies involved and the outcomes produced (in terms of the types of temporary uses that are pursued). They also provide some basic treatments of actors' roles and motivations. However, very little is said about the production process; that is, how temporary uses are established and developed. Nor do they consider in any depth the power relations

between actors or how these relations are affected by the actors' strategies, interests and resources. And they say nothing about the relations between the local political economy and temporary use developments.

Fortunately, there is some substantive practice-driven work that extends our understanding of temporary uses beyond the immediate. Perhaps the most significant examples of this are the studies by Bishop and Williams (2012), Ziehl *et al.* (2012) and Oswalt *et al.* (2013; this is the culmination of work also described in Oswalt *et al.* (2003), (2009) and elsewhere). As Parris (2015) demonstrates (and is summarised in the body of the relevant paragraphs below), Bishop and Williams (2012) and Oswalt *et al.* (2003; 2013) develop 'similar but different' conceptualisations of temporary uses and users.

Bishop and Williams' (2012) study "does not seek to expound a new theory of urbanism. ... Neither is it a manual. ... Rather, it is an enquiry ... and an exploration of ... more transient urban phenomena" (p. 4). Pursuing an inductive approach applied to a set of more than 70 case studies, they examine the origins of temporary uses and their social, economic and technological drivers that are described within a six-fold typology. *Creative milieus* consist of cultural and creative industries. They cluster in urban fringe areas and develop in a bottom-up, spontaneous way that requires cheap space, freedom from constraints and the absence of formal planning. Individual *activists and community users* form new enterprises and participate in new forms of work and self-expression that sometimes manifest themselves as a temporary structure, event or activity. *Counter-cultural* spaces expand and diversify the creative scene, allowing culture to be offered and consumed in new ways. Temporary users are becoming active players in the shaping of new *urban spaces* that are used in new ways. *Consumerism* is the driver behind the proliferation of temporary retailing – pop-up shops, restaurants and galleries – that offers new ways to target customers and tailor and deliver goods and services to them. Finally, *private sector initiatives* exploit the cost savings, commercial experimentation and short and long-term value creation that can be achieved by supporting temporary uses.

Ziehl *et al.* (2012) use a similar exploratory methodology. They draw on case studies of their own and of their contributors to demonstrate the importance of three factors for the development and success of temporary uses. Users need appropriate premises (a good *backdrop*) that offer both stability and openness with owners and regulators who are flexible, tolerant, supportive and patient. The *actors* – the users of second-hand spaces – often operate in precarious circumstances, adopting different forms of work and acting collectively. Second-hand users and uses often produce more sustainable outcomes – termed *atmosphere* by Ziehl *et al.* (2012). These arise from the more effective and efficient exploitation of the resources of existing land and buildings. Structures and uses are related to individual needs, cultures and aesthetics.

Oswalt *et al.*'s (2003; 2013) work is the most substantive. They draw on a wide range of case studies (some from their 2003 study and some from other contributors to their 2013 publication) to portray temporary use as a relatively informal activity. This is reflected in the characteristics of temporary users. These include ideologically motivated system refugees; dropouts who may be petty criminals, homeless people or illegal immigrants; migrants not currently integrated into stable social relations or employment; part-time activists who have regular employment but want to develop other interests; and start-ups who want to start businesses that will ultimately become part of the urban economy. Temporary uses flourish with the minimum of investment and are mainly organised in clusters and networks. Unpaid agents often initiate temporary uses through their mediation between users, owners, municipalities and other interests. Temporary uses can test new cultures and economies, and, because of the great variation in users' characteristics, motivations and requirements, specific sites attract specific temporary users and uses. Temporary users adopt a variety of tactics depending on their own requirements and the challenges posed by the context within which they operate. Some exploit the gap between previous and subsequent long-term uses and then move on, others aim to transform their temporary use into an established long-term use, and there are many variations in between.

These studies present a deeper and more nuanced picture of temporary uses than that derived from the practice surveys. They tell us more about the temporary use process and about actors' roles in the production and consumption/use of temporary developments. We also learn something about the strategies, interests and resources of the various players. However, little is said about the power relations between the actors. The studies identify experimentation and the development of alternative lifestyles and activities, ways of working and products and services as important aspects of temporary uses. But this does not amount to an assessment of the way that such uses reinforce or transform social relations. This is not surprising. The authors are rooted in practice. Practitioners examine what is there, what works or does not work, normally at the level of individual cases or sets of cases. Lessons may then be drawn from these cases to support the development of better practice and policy. This makes it difficult to examine the structural position of the phenomenon under investigation, not least because the argument is constructed from the bottom up – from the particular case(s) outwards.

There is also a degree of advocacy in the work. "Urban Catalyst[s] have succeeded in generating an international public discourse on temporary use, and in developing their research findings into a new form of professional practice" (Christiaanse, 2013, p. 5). This is understandable because an important aim is to encourage the wider adoption of the recommended approaches. However, it raises another problem. A lack of understanding of the political economy that underpins and shapes urban reality and provides its logic "may shadow from view the radical and transformative socio-spatial potential of



urban interventions ... reducing architecture and urban design to 'local' or 'objectual' embellishment without any broader social role" (Lehtovuori, 2012, p. 74).

## Critical analysis of temporary use

The focus of rigorous, critical analysis and appraisal of temporary uses has been on precisely this point; on "the potential of new urban movements or initiatives to offer 'alternative urban futures'" (Groth and Corijn, 2005, p. 506) from those offered by market-led urban development.

Andres (2013) considers how temporary uses might transform longer-term urban forms and processes. In a context where established institutions cannot achieve the changes that they desire – for example, in economic down-turns when there is little or no demand for development – planning is weak (Couch *et al.*, 2005, cited in Andres, 2013, p. 763). The resultant lack of control, co-ordination, objectives and strategies creates 'differential spaces' (Lefebvre, 1991, cited at p. 762) that disrupt the usual power relations between landowners, municipalities and occupants. Temporary users and uses may exploit these circumstances to shift power from place-making decision makers to place-shaping occupants through opportunistic tactics (de Certeau, 1984, cited at p. 764). However, if such users are to transform long-term social relations, they must develop their tactics into strategies that are adopted by mainstream actors. Failure to do so will result in the displacement or co-option of the temporary uses as growth allows the return of master planning.

As in Lausanne and Marseille, so in Berlin, where Colomb (2012) describes how political and industrial restructuring exacerbated by the economic down-turn combined to create many 'transgressive spaces' (MacLeod and Ward, 2002, cited in Colomb, 2012, p. 135) within which alternative temporary uses flowered. However, instead of indicators of economic weakness, the Berlin Senate re-branded these spaces as signifiers of opportunity and strength for attracting creative and cultural entrepreneurs and industries (and tourists and consumers) to the city. Thus, temporary uses were

*valued as a 'means to an end' rather than as alternatives to dominant (capitalist) forms of urban development. The interim spaces deemed too radical and politicized ... too subversive of the existing order or too threatening ... [were] often repressed or suppressed by Berlin's 'Red-Red' coalition government.*

(Colomb, 2012, p. 143, square brackets added)

These studies raise questions about what are 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' temporary uses and users (Deslandes, 2013) and about their claims and effects on the city. The activities of some users – such as DIY urbanists, creatives and artists – mirror the consumption habits of the urban middle class.

They bring ‘deserving’ groups, like tourists, (back) to the city (Pugalis and Giddings, 2011). In contrast, the actions of other users – graffitiists, vandals, squatters, rough sleepers, beggars (Pugalis and Giddings, 2011; Deslandes, 2013) or minorities such as Roma (Bermann and Clough Marinaro, 2014) or Bedouin (Jabareen, 2014) – are often perceived by the state to be illegal and undeserving of support. The former, through the use of meanwhile leases/licenses and other tactics, have become ‘lawful squatters’ who do not threaten established property interests. Yet, the informal, amateur nature of their work reduces the wages of cultural labour at the same time as cities embrace the rhetoric of creativity. And, Tonkiss (2013) argues, by these means such forms of urban activism provide an alibi for conventional urban development. The latter are punished (Jabareen, 2014) and “removed from the public gaze to appropriate interstitial spaces at the socio-spatial margins” (Pugalis and Giddings, 2011, p. 282). The application of DIY urbanism by the users of these abject spaces (Deslandes, 2013) is tolerated, if at all, only “to the extent that it is ‘light’ ... any attempt at permanence is quashed” (Bermann and Clough Marinaro, 2014, p. 411). Thus, these actors are prevented from exercising their ‘right to the city’ (Stickells, 2011), foreclosing the possibility of spatial justice (Deslandes, 2013).

These critical analyses connect temporary use to wider urban theory. Such theory allows the temporary use agenda to be interrogated rigorously. It places temporary uses within larger economic, social and political processes. It begins to assess to what extent and in what manner temporary uses may engage with or challenge extant social relations – and thereby reinforce or transform them. However, two aspects of this appraisal should be noted.

First, where any political position is adopted – whether implicitly or explicitly – this has tended to view alternative approaches more favourably than mainstream approaches (and the mainstream is equated with neoliberal private market capitalism).

*[T]he scant literature on the topic primarily glorifies the DIY approach as both a form of social protest against anachronistic planning processes as well as a form of philanthropic provision of social goods by creative activists. What is almost wholly absent is a discussion of how municipalities might balance the positive aspects of DIY urbanism with its potentially deleterious effects.*

(Finn, 2014, p. 390)

The term ‘the right to the city’ is sometimes used in a totalising manner. Yet “Rights are multiple and can be contradictory, producing conflict” (Pugalis and Giddings, 2011, pp. 282–283) between, for example, individual, exclusive rights and common, inclusive rights. Alternative urbanists, no less than other urban actors, may pursue some (their) rights at the expense of other (others’) rights. It is the state’s role, locally and inter/nationally, to balance these rights while trying to manage cities in a way that achieves

appropriate levels of equity, efficiency, consensus, coordination and public safety (Finn, 2014).<sup>2</sup>

Till and McArdle (2015) argue strongly against the polarised nature of current academic debate. They urge resistance to the conflation and false dichotomy inherent in the opposition of temporary use/vacancy/crisis against permanence/development/recovery, and of the larger political economy, which is permanent and important, against local initiatives, that are transitory and marginal. This almost leaves one “with the rather bald ‘choice’ between being in support of the status-quo (i.e. neoliberalism) or being committed to an alternative political agenda that includes no market features at all” (Till and McArdle, 2015, p. 47). Furthermore, it blinds us to the many, often intangible, benefits of temporary projects (Campo, 2014; Moore-Cherry, 2015; Till and McArdle, 2015) and to the potential for many ‘little victories’ to accumulate and to effect change (Pugalis and Giddings, 2011). It also leads to labels such as ‘co-option’, ‘manipulation’, ‘corruption’ and ‘compromise’ being applied in circumstances where temporary uses have been absorbed into the mainstream. This has resulted in little attention being paid to the way that the processes of engagement and absorption may work, the impact that they have on existing modes of production and regulation, and how those processes might be managed to best effect.

The second point is that the analysis of temporary uses and users has been pursued mainly by urban geographers and urban sociologists. It has prompted some response from planners and political scientists, but has received little acknowledgement from the disciplines of economics, finance, law and real estate, for example. The fragmented nature of research in this field is unfortunate. A more rounded, less partial consideration of the subject is required. A diversity of disciplinary perspectives may prompt new thinking about vacancy, dereliction and temporary uses.

## **The coverage of the book**

The aim of the book is to begin to address these gaps in the literature. It provides a theoretically informed, empirically grounded and academically rigorous contribution to the debate over temporary urban uses. It adopts a range of disciplinary perspectives, including the law, sociology, human geography, urban studies, planning and real estate. It draws on experience and expertise from Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Turkey, the UK and the USA.

The first three chapters conceptualise or theorise the temporary and the permanent. Bennett argues that the dominant orientation towards vacancy and dereliction is actually that of a powerful fear and disgust – a

<sup>2</sup> There is, of course, much debate about the definition of this task, about how to undertake it and about the potential efficacy and likely outcomes of different approaches.

'ruinphobia'. Preoccupations with reuse and regeneration have lain quietly, but powerfully and pervasively, at the heart of urban law and policy since at least the mid-nineteenth century, expressed in myriad measures to encourage or force property back into productive use. Livingstone and Matthews use the work of Lefebvre and Foucault to reconsider temporalities and their spatial expression through notions of liminality. Liminal spaces are transitional and in-between. What was permanent can become temporary and marginal; what was temporary can become permanent, reflecting many and various relationships and conflicts. Lehtovuori and Ruoppila outline a theoretical plane that treats urban space as a tensioned and dynamic field of interlinked, simultaneous differences. This allows the two established positions – that view temporary uses either as instrumental 'tools' of urban planning and management or as intrinsically valuable spaces and processes – to be brought together.

The next three chapters consider the tensions between the short and the long terms, between displacement and endurance, and between the symbolic and the actual. Kamvasinou describes a historical and theoretical framework within which to consider the evolution of temporary uses. Theories of temporary urbanism and alternative urbanity conceptualise the nuances of temporary uses in practice. Complex systems theory addresses the socio-ecological dimension of temporary uses. Collaborative planning theory frames the way in which the latter can be portrayed and used as tools by the community. Perry, Walsh and Barlow illustrate the Janus faces of urban socio-ecological experimentation. They question the dynamic tensions between engagement and enterprise within localised experiments and ask 'What endures?' History, rootedness and engagement sit alongside novelty, innovation and risk. They show that the success of such experiments depends as much on the mundanity of governance and business planning as it does on entrepreneurship and vision. Tanulku approaches urban voids as essential parts of living cities that reflect the latter's unique characteristics. Using Istanbul as her example, she considers abandoned historic houses that become 'ghost' homes, vacant buildings occupied by different types of squatters, and places and buildings regarded as symbolically vacant because of their meaning in Turkish society.

Next there are five chapters that examine different aspects of temporary uses and their potential to survive in the long term. Foo analyses the ways in which municipal governments strategically employ temporary and permanent methods to stabilise and build land values. She concludes that the political will for land-based greening initiatives appears to be counter-cyclically related to the strength of the city's land market. Colomb discusses the paradoxes and dilemmas arising from the mobilisation of temporary uses as a tool of urban revitalisation. She looks at the various

trajectories of temporary uses over time (survival *in situ*, displacement, disappearance and/or transformation) and at the conflicts and forms of resistance that have occurred when such uses are threatened with eviction. Drawing on relational theory, Thorpe, Moore and Stickells explore the relationships between transient interventions and processes of displacement, exploitation, inclusion and exclusion, transformation and commodification. They consider how specific practices might contribute to efforts towards both planning reform and spatial justice. Gebhardt uses the framework of the 'tragedy of the anticommons' and informality to illustrate the ambiguous legal and regulatory position of temporary uses and the complicated task of navigating this environment to create viable activities. He notes that the process of formalising informal uses can be a new avenue for the exercise of power by authority. Crosby and Henneberry consider the long, contested process of the emergence, diffusion and acceptance of new uses and built forms. These can only be valued accurately and supported by effective policy when they have become formalised. They highlight some of the challenges temporary uses must meet to become established.

Finally, there are three chapters that consider the inter-relationships between policy, vacancy, temporary use and redevelopment. Muldoon-Smith and Greenhalgh show how new policies of decentralised finance in England are excluding existing business properties from contemporary models of urban finance in favour of a system reliant on the construction of new and repurposed business floor space. This will result in higher rates of transience and impermanence in the built environment. Adams argues that hardcore vacancy has become a semi-permanent feature of the urban landscape as much because of institutional barriers as of economic or physical ones. Among the most problematic of these are unrealistic owner expectations of what the land is worth. He proposes a radical solution, grounded in property rights reform. Using Rome and Budapest as examples, Patti and Polyak consider the legal frameworks necessary for the short and long-term reuse of vacant properties; ways to establish transparency and a participatory framework around a chosen site and its potential reuse; and the modalities of cooperating with municipal offices and NGOs. Finally, the conclusion assesses the contribution made by the book to the debate over temporary urban land uses.

## **Acknowledgement**

I am grateful for the helpful comments that contributors to the book made on an earlier draft of this chapter. However, the opinions expressed here remain mine, as does the responsibility for any errors.

## References

- Andres, L. (2013) Differential Spaces, Power Hierarchy and Collaborative Planning: A Critique of the Role of Temporary Uses in Shaping and Making Places, *Urban Studies*, **50**(4), 759–775.
- Barras, R. (2009) *Building Cycles: Growth and Instability*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester.
- Beekmans, J. and de Boer, J. (2014) *Pop-Up City: City-Making in a Fluid World*, BIS, Amsterdam.
- Bermann, K. and Clough Marinaro, I. (2014) 'We Work It Out': Roma Settlements in Rome and the Limits of Do-It-Yourself, *Journal of Urbanism*, **7**(4), 399–413.
- Bishop, P. and Williams, L. (2012) *The Temporary City*, Routledge, London.
- Blumner, N. (2006) *Planning for the Unplanned: Tools and Techniques for Interim Use in Germany and the United States*, Occasional Papers, Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik, <http://www.difu.de/english/occasional/>
- Burkholder, S. (2012) The New Ecology of Vacancy: Rethinking Land Use in Shrinking Cities, *Sustainability*, **4**, 1154–1172.
- CABE (2008) *Public Space Lessons, Land in Limbo: Making the Best Use of Vacant Urban Spaces*, CABE, London.
- Campo, D. (2014) Iconic Eyesores: Exploring Do-It-Yourself Preservation and Civic Improvement at Abandoned Train Stations in Buffalo and Detroit, *Journal of Urbanism*, **7**(4), 351–380.
- Christiaanse, K. (2013) Preface, to Oswalt, P., Overmeyer, K. and Misselwitz, P., *Urban Catalyst: The Power of Temporary Use*, DOM Publishers, Berlin, 5–6.
- Colomb, C. (2012) Pushing the Urban Frontier: Temporary Uses of Space, City Marketing, and the Creative City Discourse in 2000s Berlin, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, **34**(2) 131–152.
- Couch, C., Karecha, J., Nuissl, H. and Rink, D. (2005) Decline and Sprawl: An Evolving Type of Urban Development Observed in Liverpool and Leipzig, *European Planning Studies*, **13**(1), 117–136.
- Dakin, A. and Lang, M. (2012) The Pop-up Movement, *RICS Commercial Property Journal*, November–December, 14–15.
- de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. S. Rendall, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- De Smet, A. (2013) *The Role of Temporary Use in Urban (Re)Development: Examples from Brussels*, Brussels Studies, **72**, 12 November.
- Deslandes, A. (2013) Exemplary Amateurism: Thoughts on DIY Urbanism, *Cultural Studies Review*, **19**(1), 216–227.
- English Heritage (2011) *Vacant Historic Buildings: An Owner's Guide to Temporary Uses Maintenance and Mothballing*, English Heritage, London.
- Finn, D. (2014) DIY Urbanism: Implications for Cities, *Journal of Urbanism*, **7**(4), 381–398.
- Gore, T. and Nicholson, D. (1985) The Analysis of Public Sector Land Ownership and Development, in Barrett, S. and Healey, P. (eds), *Land Policy: Problems and Alternatives*, Gower, Aldershot, 179–202.
- Gore, T. and Nicholson, D. (1991) Models of the Land Development Process: A Critical Review, *Environment and Planning A*, **23**(5), 705–730.
- Graham, S. (2012) *Temporary Uses as Tools for Urban Development*, MA dissertation, Department of City Planning, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Groth, J. and Corijn, E. (2005) Reclaiming Urbanity: Indeterminate Spaces, Informal Actors and Urban Agenda Setting, *Urban Studies*, **42**(3), 503–526.
- Healey, P. (1991) Models of the Development Process: A Review, *Journal of Property Research*, **8**, 219–238.
- Healey, P. (1992) An Institutional Model of the Development Process, *Journal of Property Research*, **9**, 33–44.
- Hollander, J., Pallagst, K., Schwarz, T. and Popper, F. (2009) *Planning Shrinking Cities*, Working Paper, Tufts University, Medford, MA.
- Jabareen, Y. (2014) "Do It Yourself" as an Informal Mode of Space Production: Conceptualizing Informality, *Journal of Urbanism*, **7**(4), 414–428.

- Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Lehtovuori, P. (2012) Towards Experiential Urbanism, *Critical Sociology*, 38(1), 71–87.
- Lehtovuori, P. and Ruoppila, S. (2012) Temporary Uses as a Mean of Experimental Urban Planning, *Serbian Architectural Journal*, 4, 29–54.
- MacLeod, G. and Ward, K. (2002). Spaces of Utopia and Dystopia: Landscaping the Contemporary City, *Geografiska Annaler*, 84B, 153–170.
- Moore-Cherry, N. (2015) Re-thinking the Post-crash City: Vacant Space, Temporary Use and New Urban Imaginaries? *Irish Geography*, 48(1), 6–12.
- Munneke, H. and Womack, K. (2014) *Neighborhood Renewal: The Decision to Renovate or Teardown*, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2423647> or 10.2139/ssrn.2423647 DOI:10.2139/ssrn.2423647#\_blank
- Needleman, L. (1969) The Comparative Economics of Improvement and New Building, *Urban Studies*, 6, 196–209.
- Oswalt, P., Overmeyer, K. and Misselwitz, P. (2003) *Strategies for Temporary Uses – Potential for Development of Urban Residual Areas in European Metropolises*, Final Report, Studio Urban Catalyst, Berlin.
- Oswalt, P., Overmeyer, K. and Misselwitz, P. (2009) Patterns of the Unplanned, in Schwarz, T. and Rugare, S. (eds), *Pop-Up City*, Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative, Cleveland.
- Oswalt, P., Overmeyer, K. and Misselwitz, P. (2013) *Urban Catalyst: The Power of Temporary Use*, DOM Publishers, Berlin.
- Parris, S. (2015) *Temporary Use Practice, SEEDS Workpackage 3 Report*, South Yorkshire Forest Partnership / Sheffield City Council, Sheffield, <http://www.seeds-project.com>
- Perkovic, J. (2013) *Rethinking the Inflexible City: What Can Australian Planning Learn from Successful Implementation of ‘Temporary Uses’ across the World?* MA thesis, Melbourne School of Design, University of Melbourne.
- Pugalis, L. and Giddings, B. (2011) A Renewed Right to Urban Life: A Twenty-First Century Engagement with Lefebvre’s Initial “Cry,” *Architectural Theory Review*, 16(3), 278–295.
- Segal Quince Wickstead (2010) *Meanwhile Use: Business Case and Learning Points*, SQW Consulting, Cambridge.
- Stickells, L. (2011) The Right to the City: Rethinking Architecture’s Social Significance, *Architectural Theory Review*, 16(3), 213–227.
- Till, K. and McArdle, R. (2015) The Improvisational City: Valuing Urbanity beyond the Chimera of Permanence, *Irish Geography*, 48(1), 37–68.
- Tonkiss, F. (2013) Austerity Urbanism and the Makeshift City, *City*, 17(3), 312–324.
- Whitehand, J. (1987) *The Changing Face of Cities: A Study of Development Cycles and Urban Form*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Ziehl, M., Osswald, S., Hasemann, O. and Schnier, D. (2012) *Second Hand Spaces: Recycling Sites Undergoing Urban Transformation*, JOVIS Verlag, Berlin.

