Temporary Uses as Tools for Urban Development

By

Shelagh Graham

A Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

Department of City Planning
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Abstract

Temporary uses generally have a low profile in urban planning; there is not much research on them at this time and they are not a conventional tool within planners' "tool kits." The purpose of this practicum is to explore the effectiveness of temporary uses as tools for reanimating underutilized spaces and supporting strong urban design, especially in a slow growth city like Winnipeg. The argument put forward is that a better understanding of temporary uses and how they can be encouraged will make planning and design in downtown Winnipeg more flexible and adaptable to changing urban conditions while making better use of available space. The objectives of this research are to provide an overview of contemporary theory and practices regarding the temporary use of urban spaces; to develop recommendations for encouraging effective temporary use in Winnipeg; and to highlight gaps in the literature and to suggest directions for further research. Specific questions are asked regarding the claimed benefits and drawbacks to temporary uses of space, regarding the applicability of experiences in other cities to Winnipeg's planning context, and regarding changes that could be make to Winnipeg's policies practice in order to support and encourage a wider range temporary use projects. Several research methods, including a literature review, precedent studies, context analysis and policy document review, and stakeholder consultations, provide information to help develop eight recommendations suggesting improvements that could be made to the way in which temporary use projects are currently handled in Winnipeg.

Acknowledgments

Any time I pick up one of these documents, I instinctively turn to the acknowledgements page. The opportunity to publicly recognise those who have helped you accomplish a goal does not arise often enough. With that said, it is not surprising that this section will be a bit longer than one might expect.

It is essential that I acknowledge organizations that have provided funding to support my studies. The University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship fund, EH Price, and the International Students' Centre have been generous in their support. I would not have had all the opportunities I did without their help.

A special thank you to those who participated in this research. Thank you for your willingness to explore an uncommon topic and for sharing your thoughts and experiences with me.

I would like to thank Gerry Couture for his enthusiasm and for all the discussions over coffee. Molly Johnson and Alan Freeman for their unique perspectives and for their willingness to jump right in. Dr. David Witty provided guidance and advice throughout my academic career.

Other professors and instructors have inspired and encouraged me to keep going and have helped keep me well-rounded. Dr. Richard Perron, Dr. Marcella Eaton, and Jean Trottier have been generous with their time, especially to a student not in their department! Jeffrey Garcia's enthusiasm and positive energy have cemented my love of teaching. Ole B. Jensen and Henrik Harder, my advisors at Aalborg University, encouraged and challenged me to produce work I am truly proud of.

On exchange at Aalborg University I was a member of the best group ever. Eva, Simon, and Dorte, thank you so much for a full semester of excellent discussion. You can never talk too much! Kaeley and Vicky have kept me on track and have been great friends at the same time.

Yvonne Helden and Rosemary Visevic were patient and friendly despite all my questions and extra paperwork demands.

Finally, my family. Alex, Heather, Erin, Mom and Dad... How can a person ever thank their family enough? Mine is truly wonderful.

Table of contents

Part 1: Introduction & background

This work is inspired by a combination of frustration, hope, and curiosity. Frustration in seeing properties boarded up, unused, and abandoned until they fall into disrepair and cannot be salvaged. This is a situation that arises fairly often in Winnipeg's downtown area. At the same time, people and groups are looking for affordable and flexible spaces to run programs and to hold events. The sense of hope comes from seeing the creative solutions, interventions, and partnerships that are being developed to make ideas work. And curiosity comes from seeing what is being done elsewhere and wondering "Could that work here?"

Flipping through two books in particular provoked me to **need** an answer to that question. *Urban Pioneers* by Overmeyer (2007) and *Temporary Urban Spaces: Concepts for the Use of City Spaces* edited by Haydn and Temel (2006) describe dozens of projects, mostly in European cities, that excited and inspired me. They tell of the temporary uses of buildings and open spaces being encouraged both as experiments suggesting directions for physical and social changes and as gap-fillers in cities. In cities around the world, people who see an opportunity where others do not are using unused spaces both legally and illegally. But are the benefits described by these authors too good to be true? Do the benefits of temporary uses outweigh any costs that might be associated with them?

A provisional definition of the term *temporary use* could be a use of space that is not intended to be permanent. In this practicum, temporary uses in general will be explored, with particular attention paid to how they are being used in other cities. From this exploration, recommendations on how temporary uses could be used more effectively in planning practice will be put forward.

1.1 Introduction

Planning is not only for transforming places but also for transforming the imagination of those who live in these places. (Petrescu, 2005, p. 60)

Canadian planners could benefit from an exploration of the potential applications for temporary uses in optimizing underutilized spaces and in supporting strong urban design, as this is a topic about which little has been written. At the same time, they need strategies to mitigate potential concerns that may come out of the encouragement of temporary uses.

Temporary uses, which can present land use and permitting issues, tend to be seen as bureaucratic hassles rather than being celebrated and supported as tools to strengthen the public realm and urban street frontages. Temporary uses generally have a low profile in most cities; there is not much research on them at this time and they are not a conventional tool within planners' "tool kits." Planners are in a position to promote temporary uses of available space, but require strong examples of how to do so in a way that captures the potential benefits while respecting the diverse needs and concerns of all those who may be affected by or involved with these projects.

The entire neighbourhood of Transvaal in The Hague is slated for "restructuring," or demolition and reconstruction. People and businesses began relocating as quickly as possible. But what effect will this transition have on the residents? And what can be done with the buildings until they are demolished? Since 2002, OpTrek, a temporary organization of artists, has had a mobile office in the district. OpTrek initiates, commissions, and supports projects that engage the public in this process of change. One example is Hotel Transvaal. Hotel rooms with 1-5 star ratings are scattered throughout the neighbourhood in empty buildings. Rooms are relocated as buildings are demolished. The local community is involved in the project, with neighbourhood shops and restaurants providing all the services one would expect at a boutique hotel within walking distance of the hotel room. The entire district is the hotel. By

bringing attention to the community, the project seeks to link the past to the future and to highlight local history and social structures. (Hotel Transvaal, n.d.; OpTrek, 2005; Haydn & Temel, 2006)

The list of social, cultural, and economic benefits claimed by proponents of temporary uses is extensive. Some of the most commonly noted benefits include increasing the diversity of people participating in the planning process (Haydn, 2006; Mackey, 2007; Blumner, 2006), creating opportunities for new directions and for challenging the status quo (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007; Temel, 2006), attracting interest (and people) to a site (Blumner, 2006; Overmeyer, 2007), creating employment opportunities (Overmeyer, 2007; Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007), and providing incubator space for new entrepreneurs (Mackey, 2007; Overmeyer, 2007; Gerend, 2007).

While most writing on the topic focuses on these and other benefits, there are some critics who note the potentially negative consequences to encouraging the widespread implementation of temporary uses. Among the pitfalls identified are the risk of a lack of investment in quality due to the short timeframe of projects and the concern that temporary uses undermine any comprehensive vision for the area (Speaks, 2005; Kelbaugh, 2002). From a technical and practical point of view, some property owners and municipalities fear never-ending legal complications that might arise from liability and safety issues or in terminating lease agreements with site users (Gerend, 2007). A criticism that hits the core of the concept of temporality is that it idealizes flux and change without consideration for their potentially and historically negative effects on certain citizens (Kohoutek & Kamleithner, 2006; Phillips, 2008). Even among those who promote temporary uses in principle there are concerns that using them as tools or institutionalising them jeopardizes some of their potential benefits (Pogoreutz, 2006; Spiegl & Teckert, 2006; Arlt, 2006; Mathur, 2004).

In 2002, a lack of funding had stalled revitalization efforts in the neighbourhood of Westwijk in Vlaardingen. Artist Jeanne Van Heeswijk was approached by the local housing corporation and

the owners of 15 vacant shops to develop a temporary function for the strip mall. Concerned about how residents would be involved in changes to the area, Van Heeswijk proposed three parallel programmes: an exhibition programme, the provision of artists' workspaces, and a community programme. Free studio spaces were offered to artists for periods of three months in exchange for linking their work to the local community and opening their studios to visitors two days per week. Every three months a new local issue was introduced simultaneously as a theme for all three programme areas "allowing a cross-reading of these issues through different presentation forms" (Van Heeswijk, n.d.). De Strip offered new spaces where residents could meet each other and provided an outlet for them to express their views on the changes around them. (Van Heeswijk, n.d.; Cumberlidge & Musgrave, n.d.)

Focus

Literature on the topic implies that temporary uses can provide certain social, economic, and cultural benefits. Proponents argue that temporary uses provide an opportunity for citizens to become actively involved in negotiations regarding the use of space in their area, stimulate economic development in an area, and also provide a venue for testing new ideas regarding appropriate uses of urban space (Kohoutek & Kamleithner, 2006; Haydn, 2006; Temel, 2006; Overmeyer, 2007). These claims seem plausible but do not appear to have been critically evaluated in practice at this point. This practicum will begin to investigate some of these claims by reflecting on the contribution that temporary uses make to reanimating underutilized spaces as well as the challenges they present. The focus of the practicum will be to answer the question "How can we allow and encourage that here?" with "that" being more flexible temporary uses of space and "here" being downtown Winnipeg, while using the earlier investigations to answer the questions "Why would we want to?" and "Why wouldn't we want to?"

The earlier provisional definition of the term *temporary use* gave an indication as to why a

more detailed study of these uses is necessary. It is clear that within this category of land use, there is room for several typologies, depending on such factors as the longevity and location of the use. These factors, along with several others, will be explored further in Part 2.

While temporary uses can be found in every type and location of human settlement, central urban areas are the focus of this research. Downtown Winnipeg was selected as a location to test ideas. A traditionally slow growth city (Leo & Anderson, 2006, p. 173), Winnipeg is often viewed as a challenging context for urban development, but at the same time, it has similarities to many of the locations where temporary use programs have been successful. Downtown was chosen as the focus area because of the number and density of properties potentially available.

Temporary use projects have already taken place in Winnipeg. Place Joseph-Royal was originally designed as a mixed-use development; until recently, however, the retail spaces on the ground level had not been leased. From February 13, 2009 to March 16, 2009, Chip & Pepper Jeans opened what they called a pop-up store in one of the vacant units. The outlet was intentionally planned to be there for a short period of time. The site owners hoped to attract attention to and to generate interest in their location, while the site user, in this case a large international retailer, was able to open for a short time in a market to which it does not usually have access. At the same time, the local community was able to experience what this type of site occupant might offer to the area. Each of these groups will have had to weigh these benefits against the potential risks of the project; for example, the property owners might have concerns that an abrupt conclusion to the project would have the appearance of a failed business, making the site seem less desirable to new users. A clear and high profile temporary use policy might help to alleviate some of these concerns or provide an understandable process for resolving issues that may arise with projects.

The Chip & Pepper pop-up store, an example of a temporary use of a privately owned space, highlights the ability of temporary uses to bring activity and attention to a location. How can we support more of these uses? And how can we support them in more "challenging" situations, where those involved may feel they have less in common than do a real estate developer, an

international retailer, and a fashion consumer? A preliminary reading of literature on the topic suggests that planners could do more to collaborate with and mediate between the actors in temporary use scenarios.

By focusing on the benefits of temporary uses in relation to how they might help reanimate underutilized urban spaces, an opportunity exists to explore a role for temporary uses that is less common in the city. Where they are often seen quite narrowly within planning policy, there is an opportunity to expand that understanding. In Winnipeg specifically, changes could be made to current policies and planning approaches that could encourage additional temporary use projects as positive additions to downtown.

1.2 Problem statement

The purpose of this research is to explore the effectiveness of temporary uses as tools for reanimating underutilized spaces and supporting strong urban design, especially in a slow growth city like Winnipeg. The thesis of this research is that a better understanding of temporary uses and how they can be encouraged will make planning and design in downtown Winnipeg more flexible and adaptable to changing urban conditions while making better use of available space. There are three specific objectives for this practicum.

The first objective is to provide an overview of contemporary theory and practices regarding the temporary use of urban spaces. Both the benefits and the drawbacks that might be expected from the promotion of these uses will be discussed. These issues will be explored through a literature review and precedent studies. The concepts unearthed in the literature review can inform and provide direction to further research while the precedent studies will highlight innovation and current practices in the field. This investigation will provide inspiration for the next stages of work and will help assess how lessons can be applied to the specific context of downtown Winnipeg.

The second objective is to develop recommendations for encouraging effective temporary use in Winnipeg. These recommendations to city officials build on an analysis of the information uncovered in the literature review and precedent studies, applying it to the Winnipeg context. A context analysis provides the necessary background information to ground earlier findings. Through a series of consultations with local stakeholders, recommendations are refined to acknowledge local experience. The intent is to facilitate the implementation of temporary uses while encouraging communication between planning, design, business, residential, and cultural communities and promoting public discussion surrounding design and planning issues.

The third objective is to highlight gaps in the literature and to suggest directions for further research.

The following research questions direct my investigation:

1. What are the claimed benefits of and drawbacks to temporary uses of space? Do they currently meet these claims?

As previously identified, planning literature describes the potential benefits of temporary uses of space. Less is written about whether these claimed benefits are actually fulfilled in practice and there is not much specifically written about the drawbacks to temporary uses. This seems to be because at this point, only proponents of the strategy are writing about this topic. It has not become widespread as a planning concern so there are few active critics of the idea.

2. What can local planners learn about temporary uses from experiences elsewhere?

I suspect that the experiences of other cities can help local planners to broaden their view as to what types of temporary uses are possible. They need general information about alternatives to the current local temporary use system and about the potential benefits of these alternatives. They also need to be able to communicate these policy systems to the public and to help coordinate and mediate between the actors involved in projects.

A presentation of what worked, what did not, and why might serve as a motivator, showing local planners how people in other cities have dealt with the challenges they are now facing.

3. How can Winnipeg's policies surrounding temporary uses be modified to support and encourage a wider range of interventions?

An analysis of the context and policy documents in Winnipeg provides a starting point for further discussion with local stakeholders. This policy critique explores the ways in which temporary uses are currently acknowledged and accommodated in Winnipeg. Strengths and weaknesses of the current local temporary use policy are identified in consultation with local planners, property owners, and community groups. The local applicability of strategies used in other cities is discussed and recommended improvements to the local process are suggested with input from stakeholders.

1.3 Importance of the study

This practicum aims to help readers see the possibilities of an expanded role for temporary uses in urban planning and understand the challenges of implementing a modified policy in Winnipeg. The outcome is of direct interest to those in the city who are interested in implementing temporary uses as it proposes recommendations for dealing with these uses. In addition to this direct application, the research also serves a number of other purposes.

The research begins to fill some gaps in the relatively limited literature on this topic. As mentioned earlier, there is a need to evaluate claims regarding the benefits of these uses. There is also a need to assess the applicability of temporary use projects and policies to different contexts. A large percentage of projects are carried out in Europe and little has been written about their applicability in North America.

The information developed in this research also improves planning practice and policy. By providing planners with a better understanding of the possibilities for these uses, they will be better able to assess and implement them in practice and will also be better informed in making policy decisions. The temporary use recommendations enable planners to work more effectively and efficiently with property owners and site users. The recommendations also assist property owners who are looking for an alternative to having their property sit vacant, while providing guidance to groups and individuals who are interested in making use of a space temporarily.

By taking a broad look at temporary uses in a variety of cities, I hope to expand ideas of what temporary uses can be and how they can help to moderate the process of urban change especially within the context downtown Winnipeg. A set of precedent studies form a database of current practices and a survey of strategies and plans that have been more and less successful in different cities. This aspect of the research may be of interest to a wide range of groups as a source of inspiration.

1.4 Research methods

Theoretical framework/perspective

I find it important to place myself within the branches of philosophy of science from the outset, as this does affect the way in which I approach the research questions. An explanation of my position can only help to clarify my approach to research and my product. Neuman outlines three approaches to social science research: positivist social science, interpretive social science, and critical social science (1997, p. 61-62). Other researchers may use other terms (Cresswell, 2009; Delanty & Strydom, 2003), but the positions described are essentially similar.

I tend to identify most strongly with what Cresswell would call an advocacy or participatory worldview, Neuman's critical social science. As Cresswell describes it, "An advocacy and participatory worldview holds that research inquiry needs to be intertwined with politics and a political agenda" (2009, p. 9). I agree with the advocacy and participatory worldview that:

> Research contains an action agenda for reform that may change the lives of the participants, the institutions in which individuals work or live, and the researcher's life. Moreover, specific issues need to be addressed that speak to important social issues of the day, issues such as empowerment, inequality, oppression, domination, suppression, and alienation. (Cresswell, 2009, p. 9)

In this research, I also begin to evaluate claims made by temporary use proponents. This suggests a more postpositivist approach to research. Cresswell outlines the postpositivist view as follows: "Postpositivists hold a deterministic philosophy in which causes probably determine effects or outcomes. Thus, the problems studied by postpositivists reflect the need to identify and assess the causes that influence outcomes, such as found in experiments" (2009, p. 7). In order to balance these interests and influences, I have adopted what Cresswell (2009) refers to as a mixed-methods approach, which integrates aspects of both quantitative and qualitative research. In wanting to evaluate claims, there is an aspect of post-positivist thinking that calls for some degree of quantification.

By forming a critique of current temporary use policies, I am suggesting that some solutions might be better than others, and that my recommendations will improve the existing situation. My

research questions, and the recommendations that follow from them, are therefore not value-neutral. While I do intend to contribute to the current body of knowledge on my subject, I agree in general with Wolfe who writes that "research in urban planning, unlike that in the social sciences, is geared to specific problem solving rather than to the general advancement of knowledge. The reason for doing planning research is to suggest a solution" (Wolfe, 1989, p. 64).

As an urban designer/planner, I have chosen to work from within "the system" (of urban design and planning as a field). I am thus working to alter thinking about temporary use from within the field and methodology of urban design as opposed to abandoning the system and starting fresh. This is evident in my choice of research methods and has repercussions in the normativity and potential conservatism of my recommendations.

In response to this issue, I am conscious of a point made by Hillier who states that as "planning theorists and practitioners we seem to have had a pervasive commitment to an ontology of *being* which privileges end-states and outcomes, rather than an ontology of *becoming* which emphasizes movement, process and emergence" (Hillier, 2005, p. 273, emphasis in original). I hope to break from this "ontology of being" through the development of an alternative concept for temporary uses centring on dynamic solutions rather than focusing on a specific static outcome.

Theoretical approaches

Specific research methods will be outlined in subsequent sections; however, I would first like to outline my methodological approach to the research. Given the exploratory nature of my research questions and my objective of generating ideas for Winnipeg, I do not feel restricted to an "absolutized methodology" (Delanty & Strydom, 2003, p. 94). I instead approach the project using a methodology of constructivist inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 174). Within this philosophy it is permissible to make modifications to process as one works rather than following the "pure" scientific research method of setting up an experiment, following it through to the end, and then analyzing the results.

In this project, I borrow an analytic approach described by Gadamer. In *Truth and Method* (1960), he suggests that a concept can only be fully understood by looking at a part in the context of the whole and the whole in relation to the parts (Gadamer 2003). This cyclical approach is also appropriate to a design process, in which work is always iterative and often involves jumping between a site-specific scale and a system-level scale to work through issues. While I am interested in working at the scale of a downtown policy and process, some issues are better approached at a smaller or larger scale. Through investigating the smaller scale of an individual space or use, it can be easier to understand how different elements work together and how people interact with each other, with the different physical elements, and with different programming. This knowledge can then be broadened to the level of an urban-area scale (downtown) and again to a more conceptual level of the larger whole-system scale (city, or even region or nation).

Using a wide range of approaches can be helpful as it enables the researcher to move continuously between the discussion of theories and concepts; the investigation of reference projects; the development of the recommendations; and the visualization of the spatial and social outcomes.

Project scope, assumptions & limitations

Much of the research for this practicum is based on two major assumptions. The first assumption is that temporary uses, applied with diligence, can enhance the use of urban space. This assumption is made given the body of literature that highlights the successes and benefits of temporary use projects. While following the spirit of this assumption, I am also critically evaluating this claim in order to provide a more balanced view of the situation. The second assumption is that the temporary use policies and guidelines implemented in other cities, and the experiences of those involved, are valuable and informative, if not directly applicable, to the development of a similar policy for Winnipeg. This assumption seems reasonable because the use of precedents is a recognised research methodology for understanding "how something has developed" or "how

something works" (Mason, 2002, p. 175). At the same time, generalizations from precedent cases to a specific case - Winnipeg - can only be made with careful consideration of the local context.

In addition to these assumptions, two limitations to the research can be foreseen. These limitations can be attributed to the relatively small scale of this study.

The first limitation is in access to a large number of informants with direct experience. One of the questions I am asking is, "Do temporary uses live up to the benefits their proponents claim for them?" but I do not have access to a variety of citizens with experience in temporary uses as city policy. So far, temporary uses have only been used on a limited basis in Winnipeg. It is unfeasible at this time to undertake a thorough survey of the citizens of another city; therefore, the views of a limited number of planners, along with published literature on the topic, are the primary source of information in answering this question. This may generate a biased view. To mitigate this risk, several planners, community groups, property owners, and citizens in downtown Winnipeg participated in the research for this project in order to hear a variety of views. Their perspectives are valuable in grounding the recommendations in the Winnipeg context, but may also be biased due to their lack of direct experience with a variety of policy options. Important future research to conduct would be an extensive analysis of the actual benefits of temporary uses as seen by people living in cities that have adopted more permissive policies towards them in contrast to those that have not adopted these policies.

It is important to note particular differences between the cities chosen as case studies and the city of Winnipeg. The context of space use and programming may be quite different between fast growth and slow growth cities, for example. This can make application of lessons learned through the case studies more challenging.

As discussed earlier, researcher bias presents an inevitable limitation to the project. The research questions asked, which are not in themselves value-neutral, have a strong influence on the information selected for further development, and the possibilities discussed are not the only options available.

As with all research, a limitation on available resources in the form of time and money presents a challenge. This reduces the amount of stakeholder consultation that is feasible for the practicum. Further consultation, with a wider range of community members, and additional iterations could and should be conducted prior to the implementation of this or any other recommendations.

Methodology

Research in support of this practicum involved several methods including a literature review, precedent studies, context analysis and policy document review, and stakeholder consultations. Each method was chosen to provide input for a particular stage of research, though the final process was cyclical. A literature review helped shape the preliminary stages, while the precedent studies, context analyses and policy document review begin to answer the more specific research questions. Stakeholder consultations provided an opportunity for uncovering key issues and for finalizing recommendations. These discussions also highlighted issues in need of further research. The product of these research methods includes policy and procedure recommendations for temporary and interim uses in downtown Winnipeg. These recommendations provide an illustration of how research can be applied to a specific context.

In the following sections, the methodology used is outlined in a roughly chronological order.

Literature review

The literature review informed the overarching concepts developed through the research. This section begins with a wide look at temporary uses, focusing on claimed benefits but also exploring various characteristics of temporary uses and their history. The discussion then turns to agonistic pluralism and creative governance as approaches that planners may find helpful in order to facilitate between actors.

Precedent studies

Yin defines a case study as "an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (1994, p. 13). Case studies are a regularly-used research tool in many fields, including design and planning. Francis describes a case study as "a well-documented and systematic examination of the process, decision-making and outcomes of a project that is undertaken for the purpose of informing future practice, policy, theory and/or education" (Francis, 2004, p. 16).

For this practicum, scaled down case studies, or precedent studies, were conducted with the intention of learning from the experiences of cities that have implemented progressive temporary use policies. Precedent studies were selected for two reasons: in order to investigate a range of experiences and to accommodate the limitations on direct observations.

The precedent studies in this practicum focus on innovative temporary use policies and projects already in place in other cities. Information for the precedent studies was gathered through secondary source documentation (written documents and web-based research). Information collected describes current practices as well as innovative processes and concepts in temporary use policy and projects. Precedents identified are Berlin, Zagreb, Portland, and Edmonton. The precedent research is explanatory and predictive in nature, aiming to answer the questions "why do things happen the way they do?" and "what will happen if we do or do not do X?"

Context analysis & policy document review

The context analysis is in many ways similar to a precedent study. A context analysis provides essential background information for applying concepts and ideas uncovered through the literature review and the precedent studies to a specific site, in this case downtown Winnipeg. This stage involved an exploration of the characteristics of the site as well as an investigation of the history of the site and relevant planning policies in order to enable comparisons between the precedents and

this city.

The same general information was gathered for Winnipeg as was gathered for the precedents. A key difference is the level of description in the narrative of the existing situation and the history of urban development patterns.

Relevant policies provide information regarding the current framework for decision-making. The City's long-term planning document, *OurWinnipeg*, was reviewed, along with the *Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law* and other planning documents.

Stakeholder consultations

The consultation process was designed to identify opportunities for and challenges faced in the implementation of temporary uses in Winnipeg. The consultation discussions aimed to engage local key informants in generating ideas for how to improve Winnipeg's temporary use policy and to solicit reactions to approaches used elsewhere. Through these discussions, additional opportunities and constraints were identified and the feedback received helped inform refinements to the recommendations.

The local key informants participating in this consultation included downtown property owners, downtown planners and designers from the City of Winnipeg staff, and potential site users.

Property owners and developers were interviewed individual in order to hear about their experiences with temporary uses and to hear their impressions of urban development in Winnipeg.

Planners and potential site users participated in two separate semi-structured group discussions in order to get agreement on what the key issues are from each group's perspective. Through these discussions, participants identified several solutions that could satisfy the needs of all involved. The information shared contributed to the development of policy recommendations.

This research method was used to help develop policy and program recommendations for temporary and interim use and to get feedback from local stakeholders. This process enabled me better understand the Winnipeg context and make recommendations at the end of the research

project.

Policy recommendations

Developing policy recommendations provides the opportunity to test ideas in the context of downtown Winnipeg. In *Urban Design: Method and Techniques*, Moughtin, Cuesta, Sarris, and Signoretta state that "Generating design ideas for solving problems of urban structure is fundamental to urban design. Design concepts are the basis of the creative process: without them the process of urban design degenerates into a sterile activity" (2003, p. 99). In the early stages of the design process, one of the objectives is to "generate a number of implementable futures" (Lang, 1994, p. 441).

The process involved in the development of design, and also policy, proposals and recommendations, is arguably somewhat mysterious to many (Zeisel, 2006, p. 22). Zeisel has attempted to outline the process. He proposes that the three elementary activities involved in designing are imaging, presenting, and testing (Zeisel, 2006, p. 22). In his explanation, Zeisel adapts a description of imaging provided by Bruner: imaging is "the ability to go beyond information given" (Zeisel, 2006, p. 22) in order to form "a general, sometimes only fuzzy, mental picture of a part of the world" (Zeisel, 2006, p. 23). The next phase of activity, presenting, is the act of making ideas visible to others (Zeisel, 2006, p. 24). These "visible" ideas can then be used and further developed by the designer as well as others. Finally, testing involves comparing the presentation against available information including constraints, objectives, performance criteria, and the images developed in the first, "imaging," phase (Zeisel, 2006, p. 24).

Ethics approval

Research at the University of Manitoba must follow formal ethics protocol. The Human Ethics Secretariat of the University of Manitoba outlines these protocols for research involving human subjects. Before any interviews or consultations with members of the public were held, official ethics approval was acquired from the University's Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board.

1.5 Organization of the document

Part 1 introduced the topic of research and the concepts being studied. Within Part 1, the purpose and objectives of the research as well as the theoretical and methodological approaches has been outlined.

Temporary uses as they are discussed in planning literature will be introduced and described generally in Part 2. This is followed by a discussion around their history, potential benefits, potential risks, and the role that planners play in their implementation.

Part 3 introduces precedent projects and policies from North American and European cities: Berlin, Zagreb, Portland, and Edmonton.

The fourth part of the practicum will apply these concepts to a Winnipeg context. An assessment of Winnipeg's development history and of current policies concerning temporary uses in Winnipeg will provide a starting point for stakeholder consultation. Issues raised in discussion with stakeholders will be considered, along with the background information gathered in Parts 2 and 3, in the development of a policy and program recommendations.

Finally, Part 5 will present an analysis, discussion, and synthesis, including implications for planning practice, and will outline directions for further study.

Part 2: Temporary uses in planning literature
2.1 What are temporary uses?
2.2 History of concept
2.3 Potential benefits
2.4 Potential challenges
2.5 Variables
2.6 Planner's role

Part 2: Temporary uses in planning literature

As temporary use is a topic not often discussed in planning literature and planning practice, it will be helpful to discuss and describe it in some detail here. I will begin by defining temporary uses generally and will also introduce the related concept of interim uses before proceeding to a discussion of their roots in planning history. With this background, I will move on to describe benefits that proponents associate with temporary uses. Examples of projects illustrating each potential benefit will precede a discussion of the benefit. As mentioned earlier, critiques of temporary use projects are less common; however, there are some potential challenges with temporary use projects to explore. Following the analysis of the benefits and challenges, I will investigate some of the differences between projects, identifying a series of variables. Finally, I will focus on the role planners have to play in temporary use projects, both in changing their own perceptions of these projects and in working with the actors involved in various scenarios. This starts with a look at models suggesting ways the idea of change might be reframed. Tactics and strategies are terms that surface regularly in this area of planning literature. I will suggest agonistic pluralism as a lens to help planners navigate the relationships between the various actors involved in temporary use projects. Following this, I propose Healey's concept of creative governance (2004) and Landry's idea of civic creativity (2006 & 2008) as ways of thinking about policy that might help planners to capture some of the potential benefits of temporary use projects.

2.1 What are temporary uses?

Defining and describing temporary uses

In order to "examine the potential for temporary uses in urban development... it seems necessary to formulate the object of study more precisely: what does an urban planner or resident mean by temporary uses?" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p.77). Indeed, some of the terms and concepts used in this area are challenging to define. As set out in the introduction, a provisional definition of the term *temporary use* as a use of space that is not intended to be permanent requires narrowing and specificity to be useful.

Given the low profile that temporary uses have relative to other city planning tools, an important starting point is to develop a thorough characterisation of these uses and of the concept of temporality. Sources cited regularly in the development of definitions and descriptions include Haydn and Temel (2006), Pogoreutz (2006), Arlt (2006), Blumner (2006), Gerend (2007), and Overmeyer (2007).

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines t*emporality* as a noun meaning, "The quality or condition of being temporal or temporary; temporariness; relation to time" (Oxford English Dictionary Online, 2008).

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines *temporary* as an adjective meaning, "Lasting for a limited time; existing or valid for a time (only); not permanent; transient; made to supply a passing need" (Oxford English Dictionary Online, 2008).

Haydn and Temel identify temporality as a catalyzing element in temporary uses. They point out that most temporary uses "seek to derive unique qualities from the idea of temporality. That is why they differ from lasting uses, not because they have fewer resources available or because they want to prepare their location for something other that will last longer" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 17). Instead, "this very temporality offers its own qualities, which can be interesting both for

planning and the economy as well as for groups of users who usually have little to do with planning or economy on the large scale" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 17).

An allied concept to temporary use is that of interim use. The difference between the terms interim use and temporary use may seem to some to be simple semantics. As Pogoreutz describes it, interim use could be considered a subset of temporary use: interim use implies a beginning and an end; an interim use comes between two other uses, whereas the term temporary use does not as explicitly imply that another use (either permanent or temporary) will follow the temporary one (Pogoreutz, 2006, p. 77). Interim uses take advantage of a "gap in the cycle of utilisation" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 11) and are "limited from outside, by planning that aims at other goals" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p. 77).

Pogoreutz argues that if we are interested in exploring the "extent to which they [temporary uses] can be instrumentalised for planning" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p. 77), then interim uses are a conceptually more manageable place to start. In his view, "interim uses can be planned; temporary uses, scarcely at all" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p. 77). This is because he sees interim uses as "limited from outside, by planning that aims at other goals" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p.77), prioritizing outside economic reinvestment in a neighbourhood over spontaneous artistic uses by the local community for example. It is his position that these "other goals," and the inherently time-limited nature of interim uses allow for more control over the projects. Blumner takes a broader view of interim uses, defining them as "the temporary activation of vacant land or buildings with no foreseeable development demand" (Blumner, 2006, p.4), though she does specify that the use of the site is time-limited (Blumner, 2006, p.4).

Several writers, including Pogoreutz, acknowledge that by instrumentalising and institutionalising temporary and interim uses, by focusing on economic or "other" goals, some positive aspects of temporary uses are lost. Pogoreutz (2006) argues that:

> By concentrating on interim uses… certain aspects of temporary uses remain unexplored, namely those that do not function as means to urban development ends. These include issues of informal, spontaneous, alternative self-organisation, whose primary characteristic is the use of available urban, programmatic, economic

> open spaces, but that 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. (p. 79)

Malloy picks up on this critique, noting that by situating temporary uses as an economic development infill tool, their potential to interject "a subversive element into the urban fabric and discourse on urban processes" (Malloy, 2009, p. 21) is undermined.

In some cases, the goals of the individual project may align with the exploratory philosophy of temporary use while the overall planning goals for an area under development, or the master plan, may align with the instrumental philosophy of interim use.

Though it is becoming an increasingly "fetishised" concept in architecture and urban planning (Phillips, 2008, p. 142), temporality has traditionally been a radical idea for these fields and "for the uses proposed for their spaces: usually, planning is for the long term and not for rapid changes in use" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 17). Some designers, used to working with master plans, may wonder what role they play in a strategy emphasizing temporary uses. Lydon, Bartman, Woudstra, and Khawarzad describe a possible relationship between temporary uses (which they refer to under the title of tactical urbanism) and master plans: "If done well, these small scale changes are conceived as the first step in realizing lasting change. Thus, tactical urbanism is most effective when used in conjunction with long term planning efforts" (n.d., p.2). Sennett (2007) also develops a view of incremental change that puts forward a role, though somewhat loosely defined, for design professionals in this process: "Incompleteness may seem the enemy of structure, but this is not the case. The designer needs to create physical forms of a particular sort, 'incomplete' in a special way" (Sennett, 2007, p. 294). What exactly this might look like has been an area of exploration for at least the past half century.

As a whole, temporary uses represent "a game that questions the current culture of urban planning, with whose help it becomes possible to depart from the well-worn paths of urban planning, and also a game in a position to reinterpret urbanity because it is critical of rituals"

(Pogoreutz, 2006, p.77). The potential benefits of this "game" can sometimes be at risk when planners and designers become heavily involved.

2.2 History of concept

From a planning perspective, the interest in temporary uses can be seen as stemming from two separate ideological origins: socio-cultural and economic. The social and cultural arguments in support of these projects tend to find their source in the post-modern movement of philosophical thought, while the economic arguments tend to be influenced by the dominant political and economic theories.

Everyday urbanism

In the 1960s, a radical community planning and experimental social architecture movement emerged. The emergence of this movement closely followed the development of the larger post-modern movement with its focus on multiplicity and difference. In planning and design, one of the manifestations of the post-modern movement is the everyday urbanism branch of planning theory (Fraker, 2007, p. 62). Everyday urbanism focuses on the "everyday space of public activity" and views the city as "above all a social product; the goal is to make a work of life" (Fraker, 2007, p. 62). Designers inspired by this philosophy find spaces that often go unnoticed to be intriguing: "To most design professionals, places such as this auto-body shop and meat-grilling operation remain invisible, illegal, or ugly. Yet this one daily ritual, multiplied a hundred thousand times over, is the everyday city" (Kaliski, 2008b, p. 89-90). Among the theorists who have influenced the everyday urbanism philosophy are Henri Lefebvre, Michel de Certeau, Fredric Jameson, and Guy Debord who was an important member of the Situationist group (Fraker, 2007, p. 62). Situationists are regularly cited as a group of artists whose work embodies this radical planning and architecture movement. The Situationist group was interested in developing new ways of experiencing the city, with a focus on spontaneity, flexibility and variability (Stevens, 2007, p. 16). Ronneberger observes that, "What the Situationists were in fact demanding were mobile urban spaces and a modifiable architecture that could be partially or totally transformed in tune with their inhabitants' desires" (Ronneberger, 2006, p. 47-48). Mackey has referred to the avant-garde philosophy of the 1960s and 1970s promoted by

the Situationists as a "celebration of indeterminacy" (Mackey, 2007, p. 2). The use of collage, the dérive, and constantly changing scenarios as exploration and production techniques has a continuing influence on artists and designers today. Everyday urbanists, coming out of this tradition, have become interested in temporary uses for the flexibility they provide to land use planning and programming and for the potential for active citizen involvement in the process of city building (Fraker, 2007, p. 62).

While to some, everyday urbanism presents a responsive and engaging opportunity for urban design, to others it falls short of a successful planning and design strategy. In *Repairing the American Metropolis* (2002), Douglas Kelbaugh contrasts everyday urbanism with two other paradigms, new urbanism and post urbanism. He argues that "Everyday Urbanism, which is the least driven by aesthetics, has trouble achieving beauty or coherence, day or night, micro or macro," though he concedes it is "egalitarian and lively on the street" (Kelbaugh, 2002, p.175). Michael Speaks is a vocal critic of everyday urbanism: "It does not even seek to understand the implications of the small-scale interventions that it launches, but is instead content to fetishize and tinker with the everyday things it finds ready made" (Speaks, 2005, p.36). A strong proponent of everyday urbanism, Margaret Crawford insists on the importance of these small details to the creation of human spaces: "This [the principles of everyday urbanism] goes against the grain of professional design discourse, which is based on abstract principles, whether quantitative, formal, spatial, or perceptual. Whatever the intention, professional abstractions inevitably produce spaces that have little to do with real human impulses" (Crawford, 2008, p.7-8).

Kelbaugh finds that in everyday urbanism, "The design professional is more of a co-equal participant in the public dialogue, which can be very open-ended and democratic. It is less normative and doctrinaire than New Urbanism, because it is more about reassembling and intensifying existing, everyday conditions than overturning them and starting over with a different model. It is the most modest and compassionate of the three paradigms" (Kelbaugh, 2002, p.174). In this critique, Kelbaugh implies that everyday urbanism reinforces the status quo prioritisation of existing

conditions. This is interesting because supporters of everyday urbanism, like Crawford, exert that it does the exact opposite: "Proposing alternatives to the limited scope and methods of contemporary urban design... everyday urbanism seeks to release the powers of creativity and imagination already present within daily life as the means of transforming urban experience and the city" (Crawford, 2008, p.11).

Kelbaugh's most critical assessment of everyday urbanism, as it relates to this practicum is that

> Everyday Urbanism may make sense in developing countries where global cities are mushrooming with informal squatter settlements that defy government control and planning, and where underserved populations simply want a stake in the economic system and the city. But it doesn't make sense in the cities of Europe, where a wealthy citizenry has the luxury of fine-tuning mature urban fabric and freely punctuating it with Post Urbanist buildings as vivid counterpoint. (Kelbaugh, 2002, p.177)

Perhaps a common understanding between everyday urbanists and new urbanists is not as far off as it seems however, as renowned new urbanist Andres Duany is reported to have told Kaliski, "Yours is but one of the tools, but an important one and increasingly so" (Duany as cited in Kaliski, 2008a, p. 217).

Temporary uses, when seen as a tool, fit with the concept of bricolage as a process of urban development and city building, expanding and making use of what exists already to create something new.

The entrepreneurial city

Another perspective, not exactly contrasting but certainly a separate philosophy focusing on the economic aspects of the city rather than the social, is that of the entrepreneurial city. From this viewpoint, the "city today is a place where unprecedented global flows of people, capital, and information see ongoing transformations no longer shaped by the managerialism of the past but instead embracing an intensified entrepreneurialism" (Hetherington & Cronin, 2008, p. 1). This puts the city's traditional "management," its government, in a new role:

> The entrepreneurial city seeks to identify market opportunities for private actors whose exploitation of these opportunities also serves the city's public objectives. City government becomes a risk-taker and a promoter of global competitiveness for business in the city. It also enables discovery of new markets and catalyses the formation of private-public partnerships in testing and developing new technology. (Lakshmanan & Chatterjee, 2006, p. 161)

Jessop also sees the connection between increased risk-taking by city governments, an entrepreneurial approach, and increased public-private partnerships:

> The city is being re-imagined – or re-imaged - as an economic, political, and cultural entity which must seek to undertake entrepreneurial activities to enhance its competitiveness; and that… this re-imag(in)ing is closely linked to the re-design of governance mechanisms involving the city – especially through new forms of public-private partnership and networks. (Jessop, 1997, p. 36)

Municipal governments see public-private partnerships as opportunities to save money while ideally increasing the quantity and quality of service through competitive pricing. There is an increased rhetoric of individual responsibility as citizens are given the opportunity to make the choices they feel are in their best interests.

Lakshmanan and Chatterjee see these partnerships as positive and as tied to the development of civil society organizations with the capacity to deliver services:

> This approach [entrepreneurial experimentation] was possible due to the emergence, in the urban institutional landscape, of a variety of civil society organisations devoted to advancing social, economic and empowerment objectives... Entrepreneurial cities recognised the value of these civil society organisations to advance public objectives, and empowered effective private, non-profit, and neighbourhood organisations for urban development and regeneration... Thus a model of partnership between the urban public and civil and private sectors originated in Phase 2 [transition to entrepreneurial approach]. (Lakshmanan & Chatterjee, 2006, p. 164-165)

This shift towards increasing partnerships can be seen as a sign of the changing role of government where, "The central issue for local state policy is no longer to provide social infrastructures, as was the case in the past, but to organise urban space in line with the needs of the market. The decisive features of the 'entrepreneurial city' are its abandonment of the statist solidarity principle and the mobilisation of space as a strategic resource" (Ronnenberger, 2006, p. 51). Lakshmanan and Chatterjee see the public sector "increasingly adopting a catalytic and enabling role in protecting public interest while reducing its own service delivery responsibilities" (Lakshmanan &

Chatterjee, 2006, p.166). They argue that "urban entrepreneurial actors (in the public, private and civil society sectors) partner and respond to challenges of intercity competition by inventing new identities and functions, policies and institutions" (Lakshmanan & Chatterjee, 2006, p.168).

Not all writers view this shift in the role of government positively. Aeschbacher and Rios are concerned that "This trend toward neoliberalism is characterized by an embrace of market forces and private enterprise; the dismantling of democratic structures and public investment; deregulation that externalizes environmental and social cost; and the privatization of state-owned enterprises and services" (Aeschbacher & Rios, 2008, p. 85). In their view it is not necessarily a sign of progress that "civil society organizations" outside government are stepping in to fill the new gaps created when government mechanisms are redesigned. Groth and Corijn highlight the need to be aware of potential tradeoffs: "Entrepreneurial approaches in city planning aiming at increasing mobility, international competition and image marketing, all too often tend to homogenise space on consumerist and aesthetic grounds" (Groth & Corijn, 2004, p. 505). Even Lakshmanan and Chatterjee warn that the incidence of the benefits generated by the changing role of government is "highly uneven among people and places" (Lakshmanan & Chatterjee, 2006, p.168).

Changes to governance philosophies have widespread effects. In many cases, a shift occurs in the dominant industry of a city. Lakshmanan and Chatterjee point to American cities as an example, "While American cities lost their older industrial base, the entrepreneurial cities became centres of production for higher-order goods and services, thereby increasing their competitive edge in international markets" (Lakshmanan & Chatterjee, 2006, p. 162). A physical repercussion of this shift is the redundant spaces and structures that are created; often industrial sites in inner cities are prime examples of this (Oswalt, Overmeyer & Misselwitz, 2009, p. 6). Using Ronnenberger's terms, these become key spaces for local governments to "organize" and to mobilize as "a strategic resource" (Ronnenberger, 2006, p. 51). At times this means the spaces will be quickly adapted and reused by new industries, those working on the "production of higher-order goods and services" as described by Lakshmanan and Chatterjee (2006, p. 162), while in other cases a more creative strategy

becomes necessary.

While an emphasis on ensuring the "productivity" of space may not sit well with some critics of this philosophical approach to temporary use, an entrepreneurial philosophy does share some traits with that of everyday urbanists. Lakshmanan and Chatterjee identify risk-taking, discovery and innovation as key traits associated with entrepreneurial activity (Lakshmanan & Chatterjee, 2006, p. 160). They cite Schumpeter in arguing that an organization, not just a single person can be entrepreneurial (Lakshmanan & Chatterjee, 2006, p. 160-161).

2.3 Potential benefits

A major component of the research is to assess the benefits of temporary uses, with a focus on the claimed social, cultural, and economic benefits. Important sources for this section will be *Urban Pioneers* by Overmeyer (2007) and *Temporary Urban Spaces: Concepts for the Use of City Spaces* edited by Haydn and Temel (2006). *Urban Pioneers* describes the process through which the city of Berlin has encouraged temporary uses to occupy vacant space. The authors feel this has been a positive approach for the city and approach the topic from that perspective. Haydn and Temel's book brings together a series of essays on the topic of temporary space and follows this with a series of two-page cut sheets describing a variety of temporary use projects. In *Design and Landscape for People: New Approaches to Renewal*, Cumberlidge and Musgrave (2007) combine case studies on themes including identity, citizenship, and "urban" with short essays on each theme. Blumner's 2006 paper, "Planning for the Unplanned: Tools and Techniques for Interim Use in Germany and the United States," introduces temporary uses as a useful planning tool for shrinking cities, focusing on cases in Germany and the United States.

When considering temporary uses as a tool to be used by planners, certain potential outcomes become more important. Because of their role in city building, planners are often particularly interested in exploring adaptable and flexible planning methods, in the adaptive reuse of existing spaces, in attracting attention to and initiating change in particular urban areas, in filling unmet needs, and in strengthening participation in planning.

Other benefits of temporary uses include highlighting creativity, encouraging entrepreneurship, providing incentives to property owners to maintain their properties, and supporting environmentally sustainable development. These benefits may be relevant to planners in that they relate to attracting attention to a specific site. These benefits also develop into a particular "culture" in the city. In this section, certain examples introduced earlier are revisited as we now have an opportunity to analyze them in more detail.

Benefit: Adaptable/flexible planning

NDSM Wharf, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

The wharfs on the banks of the IJ River in Amsterdam had officially been vacant for twenty years when the municipality recognised their potential to be redeveloped in the 1990s. In those twenty years, however, a community of squatters had developed a "thriving cultural and artistic network" (Mackey, 2007, p. 4). When the municipality decided to hold a competition in 1999 to develop a new plan for the area, Kinetisch Noord (Kinetic North) won. Kinetisch Noord is "a large collective of artists, craftsmen and cultural entrepreneurs originating from the squatting scene" (Topalovic, Neelen & Dzokic, 2003). They proposed guidelines for a framework, rather than a formal plan, for the area that builds on existing and future temporary uses of space:

- *there will be no classical zoning; instead criteria for attraction/repulsion between programs are established.*
- *the plan will be only partly 'fixed'– like a 'cheese with holes'. Pilot projects are strategically chosen for the 'fixed' areas, while the 'open-ended' areas would be free for initiatives to land.*
- *the basic limitations of the plan will be determined by the inventory of time-space gaps in use. This is a planning tool designed to moderate the 'puzzle' of already numerous initiatives and available spaces, over time. As a consequence, this tool would also allow for the physical mobility of program among several sites, which would increase the duration of temporary programs as well as their feasibility.*

(Topalovic, Neelen & Dzokic, 2003)

The planning process for the NDSM Wharf is an example of temporary users acting within a long-term strategy, where "the emphasis is on a constant process of making new connections rather than on a final product" (Quartiers en crise – European Regeneration Areas Network, n.d.). The process has brought unlikely groups - former squatters and municipal administration - together to plan the ongoing transformation of this area. (Topalovic, Neelen & Dzokic, 2003; Quartiers en crise – European Regeneration Areas Network, n.d.; Mackey, 2007)

Pop Up City, Cleveland, USA

Cleveland is a shrinking city with a surplus of buildings and land. People recognized that things needed to be done differently, "However, planning for decline is a depressing and counter-productive activity. Pop Up City, a temporary use initiative for Cleveland, was conceived as a way to circumvent the negativity and to shift the discourse about shrinking cities from scarcity and depletion to regeneration" (Schwarz,2009, p.49). Instead of developing grand plans for redevelopment, Pop Up City uses temporary use projects "to experiment with reinvention and to test new land use patterns and ways of living" (Schwarz, 2009, p.50). The initiative has three parts: capacity building, temporary events, and process. To build capacity and to generate support for the project, Pop Up City trains citizens through workshops and offers small grants to help with initiating temporary use projects. To attract attention and generate momentum around the idea of temporary use, Pop Up City hosts an ongoing series of events at high profile locations. Some of the events to date have included a temporary shop in a vacant storefront, a temporary public space on the site of a future development, a one-day dog park along the path of a future trail, and the temporary occupation of a pedestrian bridge (Schwarz, 2009, p. 53). To improve the process of implementing temporary uses, resources are shared with community partners and efforts are being made to "develop a clear and transparent mechanism for temporary use projects to make it easier for others to do this on their own" (Schwarz, 2009, p.52). While temporary uses are often spontaneous, Pop Up City acknowledges that they take a more structured approach, partly in an effort to reveal the challenges with implementing these uses more widely. The Pop Up City acknowledges the realities of a shrinking city while making room for and celebrating growth as it occurs locally. (Schwarz, 2009, pp.48-59)

RAW-Tempel, Berlin, Germany

A former industrial site, the 10 hectare RAW-Tempel ('Reichsbahnausbesserunswerk') railway yard, lies between two important districts in Berlin. The yard was used for 100 years until it

closed in 1993. Over the century, a dense maze of buildings developed, a "city within a city" employing 1200 workers at its peak (Groth & Corijn, 2005, p. 513). The site was quickly re-appropriated by artists and creative industries who by 1998 had organized themselves into a registered association, RAW-Tempel e.V., in order to "provide an organisational and legal framework" (Groth & Corijn, 2005, p. 513). The formation of this organization to represent the changing and evolving participants in the space meant that, under German law, the group's occupation of the site quickly changed from "illegal" into a temporary lease with the site's owner (at the time, various arms of the German government). The group's diverse projects received political support from district authorities until the site was transferred in 2000 to an investment company. Changing development trends in the area meant that the new owners were hoping to build new office and retail development, with little preservation of the existing structures. Feeling threatened, RAW-Tempel e.V. worked to "elaborate alternative plans by applying radical planning practices which would safeguard present activities and their function with the neighbourhood" (Groth & Corijn, 2005, p. 515). By mobilizing public support they were partially successful. The new plan identifies the four main buildings RAW-Tempel e.V. currently operates as a "cultural use," though it does not specify that the current uses will continue long term. (Groth & Corijn, 2005, p. 512-515; Blumner, 2006, p. 15-16)

Temporary uses can present an alternative approach to planning (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 162), an alternative to "the old urban planning based on a master plan and abandoning all control in favour of the so-called market" (Temel, 2006, p. 60). The RAW-Tempel example above is a clear example of how a temporary use can help guide the future direction of a site both by suggesting new uses for a site and by influencing property owners.

Currently relied-upon planning tools work best in environments of continual growth. As Overmeyer puts it, "If the period between planning and implementation becomes incalculable... planning threatens to cave in like a house of cards" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 103). Temporary uses can

help manage this unpredictability through a process of incremental change, testing various potential uses over time. As Lydon et al. point out, "long term change often starts with the process of trying something small. Upon implementation, results may be observed and measured in real-time. And when done inexpensively, and with flexibility, adjustments may be made before moving forward" (Lydon et al., n.d., p. 2). Cleveland's Pop Up City project, with its numerous small-scale project and three-pronged approach, is structured in such a way that events can build on one another and the success of each initiative can be evaluated.

The cost associated with projects is another factor in their flexibility. Some temporary uses have lower start-up costs associated with them than do permanent uses (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 37). In the eyes of some writers, this means they may be in a position to "risk failure; in effect enabling a process of evolution within the continuous flux of changing use" (Mackey, 2007, p. 5). If this is the case, "Weak programmes can easily be replaced, while the more successful uses can fossilise into permanent functions. This 'testing' of programmes allows for a sustainable emergence of diversity often in direct contrast to the imposition of mixed-uses in traditional masterplans" (Mackey, 2007, p. 5).

Cumberlidge and Musgrave, co-founders of the General Public Agency, identify "the need for utopian single visions to be replaced by multiple visions, frameworks where differing meanings and cultures can coexist" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 13), highlighting the growing importance of flexibility in planning. Temporary uses may provide opportunities to consider new options and multiple visions as "different pathways of urban development are envisaged by an often temporarily limited activity which eventually may even stand the chance of altering existing planning prerogatives" (Groth & Corijn, 2005, p. 506). Whether a project continues in the long-term or not, "temporary use projects are nonetheless part of a location's overall development. They put their stamp on a location not only for the course of their stay, but also on subsequent development" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 46).

Benefit: Adaptive reuse

Open Studio, Chicago, USA

The Page Brothers Building in Chicago is an architecturally significant building, dating from just after the Chicago fire of 1871. In 2003, the City of Chicago owned this building but was unable to find tenants for the ground floor retail space. As the City intended to sell the building within the next few years, the Department of Planning and Development requested that the City's Cultural Resources Department organize a temporary use for the space. An artist studio program, featuring a series of month-long residencies, was developed. Passersby watched art being created in the storefront windows and interacted with the artists at work. While the program concept was simple, this was a notable example of adaptive reuse on an interim basis. City staff and Chicago artists saw the potential for the space to extend beyond its designed use. Few modifications were made to the space both because the temporary use was compatible with the available space and because of the City's intention to sell the building to a private developer. The program was extended several times until a buyer was found in 2007. The ground floor of the building has since become home to a deli and a sandwich shop. (Blumner, 2006, p. 23; Shroedter, 2009)

Temporary uses are adaptive reuse *par excellence*. They take an existing underused space and adapt it, usually as simply as possible, to fulfill a new purpose.

At its core, a temporary use might be seen as an adaptive reuse of space. While adaptive reuse has become a "cliché of urban regeneration," as Landry points out, this does not make reuse any less worthwhile as an urban design strategy (Landry, 2008, p.123). The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) highlights "continuity of street frontages" as an objective of urban design (2000, p. 15). They also recognize the "quality of the public realm" as an additional key objective, aiming "to promote public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe, uncluttered and work effectively for all in society" (CABE, 2000, p. 15). With activity occurring in a

building it is more likely to be maintained and not torn down, maintaining the continuous street frontage. Further, temporary uses, even those on private property, can contribute to a high quality public realm by adding life to a street and thereby contributing to an attractive and safe environment.

Open Studio exemplifies Cumberlidge and Musgrave's view that, "Adaptive transformations, **which use, reuse and shift existing infrastructures,** become more appropriate forms of vision – visions building on and working with existing contexts and meanings and cultures" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 13, emphasis in original). In this case, an unused retail space offered an opportunity for people in Chicago to interact with artists and to promote Chicago's art scene. The program has inspired other property owners and organizations to coordinate similar programs in the city, like the Pop-Up Art Loop, a project that will be revisited later (Weinberg, n.d.).

This in turn creates opportunities for new directions and for challenging the status quo. Temporary uses offer "ways of shifting perceptions, testing and suggesting new directions in a more lighthearted or provocative way" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 175).

Benefit: Catalyst for change

Spacebuster, New York City, USA

Spacebuster was a partnership between the New York-based arts non-profit Storefront for Art and Architecture and Berlin-based architecture firm raumlabor. For nine days an ice-cream truck-like van drove through New York City. Its contents: an inflatable space for eighty people. The van stopped in overlooked spaces between buildings, under bridges, and in vacant lots; the membrane was unloaded and a bubble conforming to the available space would be inflated using a fan stored in the van. Workshops were held in these newly "created" spaces. By bringing people together in a unique experience, Spacebuster was able to generate discussion and attract attention to spaces that regularly go unnoticed. (raumlaborberlin, n.d.)

Build a Better Block, Dallas, USA

Better Block describes its process as a "living charrette" where "communities can actively engage in the "complete streets" buildout process and develop pop-up businesses to show the potential for revitalized economic activity in an area" (Build a Better Block, n.d., The Better Block Project section). The first Build a Better Block event took place in Dallas in 2010 when a group of local activists, property owners, and artists came together to "temporarily program vacant storefronts and to reclaim public space" (Lydon et al, n.d., p.03) for one weekend to illustrate the possibilities of a complete street. Groups got together to host temporary pop-up businesses like simple cafes, bookshops, and art studios. A temporary bike lane was added to the street using paint and cones, another parking lane became space for outdoor cafes, potted trees and street furniture were borrowed from a local props warehouse, and Christmas lights were strung across the street. Artists were invited to play music in the streets. The event was so successful that the City of Dallas quickly committed to making the changes to the streetscape permanent and many of the formerly vacant storefronts now have permanent uses. (Better Blocks, n.d.; Lydon et al., n.d.)

Temporary use projects can be catalysts for change by drawing attention and investment (financial and social) to an area and by allowing a space for experimentation. Overmeyer notes that the issue of temporary use can be "a catalyst of urban and location development" that can "trigger positive developments throughout the whole district" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 23). Interesting and innovative projects like Spacebuster and Build a Better Block can generate momentum by attracting attention, interest, and people to an area (Blumner, 2006; Overmeyer, 2007). Space that is undefined, that's "purpose is up for interpretation" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 104) appeals to a certain type of user. Temporary use projects can challenge the status quo through their experimentation and suggest different ways of doing things, potentially solving perceived problems. By showing an example of "what could be," the Build A Better Block project inspired community members to re-invest in an area and to consider the possibilities for similar streets throughout the city. This brief project

generated enough momentum to influence urban policy in Dallas.

Blumner found that, in Germany, "City officials perceive interim use as a means to attract residents and businesses to the city by enhancing its image" (Blumner, 2006, p.8). Blumner even suggests that residents may be drawn from city suburbs to new areas to live because of the opportunities offered by temporary uses (Blumner, 2006, p.9). This benefit is the one that can easily become the clichéd "double-edged sword": attracting quick investment to an area is a clear benefit for some, but it can also gentrify the area more quickly. Gentrification may limit the lifetime and number of temporary uses possible and may also place an area's amenities out of the financial reach of some citizens.

Benefit: Fill unmet needs

Keetwonen, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Amsterdam found itself with an urgent demand for student housing, but with no permanent sites available. The government did, however, have a large piece of land that was sitting vacant while being banked for future use. TempoHousing was commissioned in 2005 to modify shipping containers for use as temporary housing. This quick, affordable, and mobile solution allowed the city to build Keetwonen, a "village" of 1000 housing units. The project was planned and designed so that the units could be relocated after five years. Due to the success of the project, and the continuing need for student housing, relocation has been postponed until 2016. (TempoHousing, n.d.; Smith, 2010, p. 177)

Paris-Plages, Paris, France

Every summer since 2001 the Georges Pompidou Expressway in central Paris has been transformed into a beach for four weeks. The road closes to traffic and instead thousands of tons of sand, potted palm trees, beach chairs, and a swimming pool create a beach-like atmosphere along the banks of the Seine River. The Paris-Plages demonstrates the opportunity

for temporary projects to fill unmet needs. While many Parisians leave the city for holidays from mid-July to mid-August, some do not have this opportunity. Until the development of this project, opportunities for summer recreation and escape were limited in the middle of the city. Parisians can now enjoy a beach atmosphere without having to leave the city. (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p.199; Samuel, 2010)

Temporary uses can fill unmet needs that have yet to be recognized by the mainstream. Cumberlidge and Musgrave look at several precedents through which "temporary projects can benefit the city both economically and socially, raising land values while providing the city with much-needed resources – in this case, green space, healthy food and job opportunities" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 182). In Amsterdam, housing was identified as a need that had reached a crisis-state. Long-term solutions needed to be discussed, but some form of action was required immediately to fill the need for student housing.

In the Paris-Plages example, a lack of summer recreation and leisure space was identified in the city centre and a creative solution developed to fill that need. The success of the project has seen it continue every summer for the past decade; it has also inspired other cities like Berlin and Amsterdam to try similar projects (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p.199).

Benefit: Participation and communication tool

I Wish This Was, New Orleans, USA

This project gave community members an opportunity to dream and to voice their opinions about their neighbourhood. Candy Chang created small vinyl stickers, designed to look like the typical "My name is..." stickers. These were distributed to cafes and convenience stores throughout a New Orleans neighbourhood as well as posted in grids on vacant buildings. People were invited to write their ideas for what could happen in these unused spaces. The project is described as "a fun, low-barrier tool for citizens to provide civic input on-site, and the

responses reflect the hopes, dreams, and colorful imaginations of different neighbourhoods." The inspiration for this project came from Candy Chang's own concern over the lack of grocery stores in her neighbourhood. (Chang, n.d., I Wish This Was section)

Temporary uses can serve as innovative participation and communication tools. The I Wish This Was project asks citizens to consider and share their visions for unused spaces. Projects like this one can help build community by identifying similarities and connections while providing opportunities to share ideas. Cumberlidge and Musgrave point out that "Temporary projects can be important ways of shifting perceptions, testing and suggesting new directions in a more lighthearted or provocative way" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 175). The more light-hearted, provocative and whimsical approaches often taken to temporary projects can help to increase the diversity of people participating in the planning process by appealing to and reaching groups that do not always feel engaged by traditional communication and participation approaches.

The I Wish This Was project provides citizens with an anonymous and less intimidating method to participate in a discussion around community development. By building a sense of community, this more passive level of participation can develop into more active engagement. By engaging a wider diversity of people and by providing non-traditional opportunities for participation, "interim uses offer the possibility for average citizens to take a more active role in the development of their neighbourhood, which may be seen as an opportunity or a risk, depending on the city and its politics" (Blumner, 2006, p. 9). As an example of a case where community action turned from an opportunity to a risk, Blumner discusses People's Park in Berkeley, California where, in 1969, the National Guard evicted a group of citizens who were turning a parking lot into a park (Blumner, 2006, p. 9).

Benefit: Highlight creativity

De Strip, Vlaardingen, the Netherlands

In 2002, a lack of funding had stalled revitalization efforts in the neighbourhood of Westwijk in Vlaardingen. Artist Jeanne Van Heeswijk was approached by the local housing corporation and the owners of 15 vacant shops to develop a temporary function for the strip mall. Concerned about how residents would be involved in changes to the area, Van Heeswijk proposed three parallel programmes: an exhibition programme, the provision of artists' workspaces, and a community programme. Free studio spaces were offered to artists for periods of three months in exchange for linking their work to the local community and opening their studios to visitors two days per week. Every three months a new local issue was introduced simultaneously as a theme for all three programme areas "allowing a cross-reading of these issues through different presentation forms" (Van Heeswijk, n.d.). De Strip offered new spaces where residents could meet each other and provided an outlet for them to express their views on the changes around them. (Van Heeswijk, n.d.; Cumberlidge & Musgrave, n.d.)

Pop-Up Art Loop, Chicago, USA

Pop-Up Art Loop is one of the spin-off projects from Open Studio, also in Chicago. Another benefit of this project was its use of underutilized space to highlight creativity and creative work in Chicago. The project "transforms empty storefronts in the Loop into a moveable feast of public art galleries, exhibits and studios... creating temporary gallery space at no cost to the artist in prime Loop locations" (Chicago Loop Alliance, 2009). Pop-up galleries are a popular way to create connections between artists, property owners, and communities. (Chicago Loop Alliance, 2009; Weinberg, n.d.)

By providing affordable space, temporary uses give "artists and free spirits all the room they need to work, interact and develop" (Quartiers en crise – European Regeneration Areas Network , n.d.). Temporary use projects offer an opportunity to "showcase the creative talent of the city" (Blumner, 2006, p. 9). Vacant spaces can be the vehicle for these projects, having "the potential to serve as creative laboratories for a city" (Blumner, 2006, p. 3). This metaphor begins to link

temporary uses to creativity in a variety of senses, connecting not only with creativity in a cultural and artistic sense, but also with creativity in economics and marketing. Many cities like Berlin, which will be explored further as a key precedent, now see how "promoting its creative milieus is a great opportunity for the city" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 141). By emphasizing its image as a cultural capital, Berlin has seen "young artists flock to the city seeking outlets for their ideas" (Blumner, 2006, p. 9). Temporary uses, while being attainable outlets for artists, also enhance the sense of vibrancy and action that might make a city more appealing to artists and entrepreneurs alike. Blumner draws attention to the connection between temporary uses and economic development: "Interim use also complements the currently trendy theory of the 'Creative Class', which links the development of jobs in creative industries (arts, media, consulting) to future urban growth, by providing a spatial canvas for artistic types" (Blumner, 2006, p. 9). While artistic expression without connection to economic aims is valuable and important, cities are increasingly coming to understand the economic potential of creativity.

Benefit: Encourage entrepreneurship

LentSpace, New York City, USA

LentSpace is a project in New York City that makes good use of a vacant space to start a new business venture. On the surface it looks like a small city park, with benches, sculptures, and planters. The difference is that the trees in the planters will eventually be sold as street trees when they outgrow the space. (King, 2010)

Hotel Transvaal, The Hague, the Netherlands

The entire neighbourhood of Transvaal in The Hague is slated for "restructuring," or demolition and reconstruction. People and businesses began relocating as quickly as possible. But what effect will this transition have on the residents? And what can be done with the buildings until they are demolished? Since 2002, OpTrek, a temporary organization of artists,

has had a mobile office in the district. OpTrek initiates, commissions, and supports projects that engage the public in this process of change. One example is Hotel Transvaal. Hotel rooms with 1-5 star ratings are scattered throughout the neighbourhood in empty buildings. Rooms are relocated as buildings are demolished. The local community is involved in the project, with neighbourhood shops and restaurants providing all the services one would expect at a boutique hotel within walking distance of the hotel room. The entire district is the hotel. By bringing attention to the community, the project seeks to link the past to the future and to highlight local history and social structures. (Hotel Transvaal, n.d.; OpTrek, 2005; Haydn & Temel, 2006)

Temporary use projects offer an opportunity for space users to support themselves, contribute to the local economy, and make some form of statement about the use of space in the city. Oswalt et al. specifically identify entrepreneurs as one of the groups of typical temporary space users. These entrepreneurs "use an urban niche as a springboard for the realization of an idea" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 7). In both of the examples above, underused city spaces were identified as opportunities for unique businesses. Hotel Transvaal in particular shows how business can combine entrepreneurship with both artistic pursuits (in the design and decoration of the rooms) and with a strong social message (involving an entire community in the transition process), while being continuously in a state of flux. Some entrepreneurs are attracted by the flexibility and possibility for experimentation provided by temporary uses: "With little starting capital, a concept can be tested and then, if it is successful, firmly established and further expanded. In other words, temporary use offers a low entry threshold and possible avenue for the potential establishment of an economic, cultural, or social concept" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 7). Mackey, discussing the Amsterdam Noord project, reiterates the attraction of temporary use for some space users, in contrast to more formalized and less flexible arrangements: "The low start up costs associated with temporary users means they can risk failure; in effect enabling a process of evolution within the continuous flux of changing use. This 'testing' of programmes allows for a sustainable emergence of diversity often in direct contrast to the

imposition of mixed-uses in traditional masterplans" (Mackey, 2007, p. 5). Sometimes, this evolution leads to an "ideal" state, where a use becomes more long-term. In Germany, where temporary and interim use projects are more common, "experience to date... shows that many of them will become a professional business and hence part of the urban economy" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 23). In these cases, the business has in a sense been "incubated" as a temporary use (Gerend, 2007, p. 27). Other times, the temporary use project itself ends, but the skills and experience gained can be applied to another project. For example, Hotel Neustadt was a temporary hostel organized and run by youth in Halle, Germany. Their experiences "led many of the young people involved to engage in entrepreneurial activity of their own – setting up film or arts companies, running bars and other businesses – and contributing in a very direct way to the regeneration of the area" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 92).

Benefit: Benefits for property owners

Creative Space Agency, London, UK

In London, the Creative Space Agency works to match people with ideas with those who have available space. In 2005, the agency introduced Ballymore Properties, who were in the process of developing7,200 sq.ft. of future retail space, to Kinetica, a group looking for space for their project – an art museum that moves. Creative Space Agency helped develop an 8-month lease and funding agreements. The project launch was covered on television shows and in national papers, bringing positive media attention to both the new museum and to the property managers who would soon be in need of permanent tenants. (Creative Space Agency, n.d.)

Berlin real estate marketer Rainer Emelauer puts it simply, exclaiming, "Vacancy is expensive!" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 144). By filling a vacancy, temporary uses provide a direct benefit to property owners, almost always reducing their overall costs in one way or another. In some cases, the site user may be in a position to pay a full market rent, while in other situations a property owner may

be willing to accept less rental income in exchange for other perceived benefits. One of these benefits might be increasing a site's security. Keeping a site occupied helps to protect it from vandalism (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 144) and can reduce security costs (Blumner, 2006, p. 9). Temporary uses might appeal to owners not just in between tenants, but at the beginning and the end of their ownership. For example, even before a new building is completed, it may become apparent that the building will be difficult to lease (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 143). Accommodating a temporary use until long-term tenants are found can help the owner to carry some of the building costs. At the other end of the ownership timeline, a property owner might be interested in selling their property at a time when market conditions are unfavourable. In this case, holding on to the property for the short term and accommodating a temporary use may be a more profitable option (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 146). A further benefit of temporary uses is the attention they may bring to a property and an area. Emelauer, the Berlin real estate marketer, feels that encouragement of temporary use "is a potential means of communicating a positive image... or of changing its [a location's] image" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 144). The organizers of Build a Better Block in Dallas, USA found this to be the case when there was increased interest in vacant storefronts following their event.

Benefit: Environmental sustainability

Mobile City Farm, Chicago, USA

A community resource organization in Chicago has developed a unique "process for using vacant sites in the city during the inevitable urban cycle of demolition and redevelopment" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 182): they establish a farm. The Mobile City Farm project moves from site to site based on the availability of space, "ensuring that a site can be used productively even while 'derelict' or awaiting construction" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 182). When a new site is needed, the City of Chicago's Environment Office provides the Resource Center with a list of possible sites. Bringing the farm into the city not only creates

more green space, but also helps to educate city dwellers about environmental issues and sustainable farming practices. The City Farm program "*strives to provide education in sustainable farming, as well as job creation, building a community-sustained operation while also providing highly nutritious products to people in diverse neighbourhoods"* (*Resource Center Chicago, n.d.). Chicago's Mobile City Farm is an example of a temporary use that contributes to sustainability on several levels. (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 182; Resource Center Chicago, n.d.; Blumner, 2006)*

Blumner identifies two urban development trends that argue in favour of an urban policy that supports increased temporary use: "environmentally sustainable development, which encourages the recycling of land" and a "return to inner-city living, after decades of suburban growth" (Blumner, 2006, p. 8). Temporary uses allow cities to make more efficient use of already developed land, lessening the extent of greenfield development. Adaptive reuse, a strong point of temporary uses, can have a direct connection to environmental sustainability by helping to reuse and recycle properties and the resources captured within them when a long-term use ends. Some proponents, mainly referring to large pieces of property like an abandoned airport or industrial site, even feel that some temporary uses could "potentially aid the fight against global warming" (CABE, 2008, p. 6). This may seem like a stretch, but Chris Baines with the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) explains that "land in limbo can play many roles — from being where floodwater can go to more subtle ones like people not needing to get in their cars to take their dog for a run" (Baines as cited in CABE, 2008, p. 7). Here, the connection is made between temporary uses and urban design with a consideration for environmental sustainability. Projects like the Mobile City Farm encourage citizens to think about how vacant space could be used to support the city in a more sustainable manner.

2.4 Potential challenges

Critiques and risks of temporary uses

As noted earlier, most writing on the topic of temporary uses focuses on their benefits. Some critics, and even some proponents, do point out, however, that there are potentially negative consequences to encouraging the widespread implementation of temporary uses. Some of the challenges and risks identified include the drawbacks associated with institutionalizing temporary uses to the detriment of their benefits, a lack of stability, short-term investment, prioritizing economic development, gentrification, complications regarding the ownership of space, and the risk of idealizing the concept of temporary use.

Risk of institutionalization: Even among those who promote temporary uses in principle, there are concerns that using them as tools or institutionalising them jeopardizes some of their potential benefits (Pogoreutz, 2006; Spiegl & Teckert, 2006; Arlt, 2006; Gastil & Ryan, 2004b). Haydn & Temel write, "An important aspect of temporary use is that institutionalising it usually hurts more than it helps" (2006, p. 11). Mathur points out that "Designers are so good at studying these spontaneous situations, but when they are asked to formalize it, the very dynamism they sought falls apart" (Mathur as cited in Gastil & Ryan, 2004b, p. 17). This is especially true of those who value the creative benefits of temporary uses above their other potential benefits. According to Spiegl and Teckert:

> If temporary uses of seemingly unused spaces are considered primarily a field for experimentation, in order to select from the results only those projects that can be transformed into long-term undertakings, then temporality is conceived negatively from the outset: as a test run that needs to be completed as quickly as possible so that one can focus on stabilisation and codification again. Experience shows that many projects only become possible because they were temporary – and fell into crisis at the very moment they, as something temporary, were supposed to lead the way to the institutional. (Spiegl & Teckert, 2006, p. 102)

There is concern that project developers will focus on what the bureaucracy says it wants (through policies and grant opportunities) at the expense of creativity and spontaneity.

Sometimes it is the very success of these projects that create the tension: "These actors are able to cultivate and communicate a vision of development and become part of the planning process; they contribute... to the revalorisation of the spaces but at the same time are faced with a situation in which the mainstream planning system risks impacting negatively on the inherent qualities of these sites" (Groth & Corijn, 2005, p. 522).

Anarchy and lack of vision and stability: Much of the criticism directed at the everyday urbanism planning philosophy by designers like Speaks (2005) or Kelbaugh (2002) can also be applied to temporary uses. Critics are concerned that temporary uses may undermine any comprehensive vision for the area (Speaks, 2005; Kelbaugh, 2002). Indeed, temporary uses do appeal to the counterculture movement; Malloy writes that "This unbridled distant cousin of planning formulates temporary interventions as a way of interjecting a subversive element into the urban fabric and discourse on urban processes" (Malloy, 2009, p. 21).

Short-term investment: The short-term nature of the investment made or required by temporary use projects leaves them open to two lines of critique. First there is a fear that temporary use projects result in a lack of investment in quality due to the short timeframe of project. This concern can be heard through critiques of everyday urbanism. Because owners are receiving little income through rent from temporary uses, they have no incentive to invest in improvements that would benefit the temporary users (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 11). Temporary users lack the capital for major improvements but also lack the "long-term security that would make such investments worthwhile" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 11). In Berlin, one site user interviewed by Overmeyer found that "having only a temporary lease was a hindrance for us with regard to concrete planning and investments. We didn't dare at the start to put money into building anything" (Werner as cited in Overmeyer, 2007, p. 127).

A second critique related to short-term investment is that the process favours the elite; only the rich have time and money to spend on things that are not intended to last. The rise of "event

cities" might be a reflection of this: "The other side of temporary urbanism is the city of events: cities are increasingly wagering on cultural policies, rather than economic policies, to improve their chances in locational competition – in this case that means cultural events as part of the historic city, which are intended to make it more interesting for tourism and a well-heeled clientele – the so-called creative class" (Temel, 2006, p. 57).

These critiques are of particular interest to planners, who must consider a number of questions: Would good urban design be at risk? Might a strategy encouraging temporary use projects degrade the quality of urban design? Would some citizens be excluded from participation?

Viewing temporary use projects as commodities: Some critics see a risk that a strategy encouraging temporary uses to occupy unused spaces might prioritize economic benefits over all others. Smith points out, "Empty spaces represent the failure of capitalism. Not in our terms but in theirs… in a world run by ground rent, empty space is a crisis" (Smith as cited in Tan, 2008, p. 137). From an economic perspective temporary uses can be encouraged to ensure that space is "productive" in an economic capital sense, providing the opportunity to optimize the use of any space at any given point in time (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 23).

Depending on one's perspective, this can be either a benefit or a risk. To Pogoreutz, this turns temporary uses against those who have the most to gain from them: "Employing temporary uses as strategic tools also means turning them into economic instruments, even though they have been precisely a means of those who do not participate in urban planning decisions and could continue to do so – consider squatting, for example. It must therefore become a task of municipal politics to keep open spaces for such unplanned, spontaneous urban articulation" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p.79-80). Doron echoes this sentiment in the introduction to his essay, writing, "I will argue that these 'dead zones' have been conjured up and used by the hegemony for political, social and economic ends" (Doron, 2008, p. 204).

Further, in terms of the use of space itself, Jennifer Malloy at the University of Illinois finds

the commodification of temporary uses overlooks an important part of their value (Malloy, 2009, p. 20). Her critique of the writing of one proponent of temporary use is that "Instead of providing examples of temporary use that have social stimulation and interaction as core principles, Gerend, for the most part, characterizes it as an interim economic stimulus" (Malloy, 2009, p. 21). The examples of economic benefits put forward by Gerend are similar to those highlighted by many other writers and suggest that, to a certain extent, temporary uses are being appropriated by formal urban planning at the expense of grassroots community development (Malloy, 2009, p. 20).

Gentrification: Because they can draw attention to spaces that are underused or areas that are undervalued from the real estate market's perspective, temporary uses "frequently enough play a precarious role in gentrification processes" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p. 79). Attracting interest and attention to an area can on the one hand be seen as a benefit of temporary uses. On the other hand, when a location becomes attractive to investors, this attention "can also hasten their [a temporary use's] end" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 15). Elitist short-term investment, ownership issues, institutionalization, and commodification of temporary use projects are all factors that can contribute to the process of gentrification. Avoiding the trap of gentrification is difficult. An example of this is the writing of Mackey, who in his article, "Temporary use: A planning strategy for the uncertain," generally celebrates temporary uses as an opportunity for "an anti-establishment squatter collective" to collaborate with "the institution" (Mackey, 2007, p. 5). Nevertheless, he argues that "The low start up costs associated with temporary users means they can risk failure" (Mackey, 2007, p. 5). While the costs may be low relative to some longer-term uses, suggesting that users can risk having their investments fail implies that these users have excess capital available for this. Temporary spaces potentially present opportunities for a wider range of users to access space and to initiate a use.

Ownership of space and legal complications: This concern can open up a heated philosophical debate; who owns space and who decides if it is vacant? Doron writes, ""Those marvellous empty

zones at the edge of cities' (Foucault 1997: 355) have never been empty. Omitted from many of these empirical reports and theoretical texts is the fact that most of these *terrains vagues* have been populated by marginalized communities" (Doron, 2008, p. 204). Taking this further, he discusses a particular project: "I have been using the term 'dead zone'..., which was taken from planners' jargon... to indicate a gap, if not a total break, between the signifier and the signified... the words 'dead' and 'zone' should always be understood in inverted commas" (Doron, 2008, p. 204). While in the majority of cases, these issues do not come into play, it is worth keeping in mind how charged words can be, and that even a term like "vacant" or "empty" can be subjective assessments. When ownership and active use of a space by the owner is not clear a property may become attractive for squatters or others looking to make use of a seemingly empty space.

Kevin Lynch provides a good explanation of the impact that ownership has on a site. While he is discussing land development in relation to environmental problems, his arguments apply to this discussion as well:

> There are basic social issues underneath the technical ones: who owns the land? who develops it? what are their motives? The private ownership of land in the United States, the fragmentation of that ownership, and the motives of owners to exploit and maintain land values are patent and fundamental obstacles to rational management of our environment. Public control of the act of land development, public acquisition of any economic return arising from that act, and the use of criteria for development beyond mere dollar return are all necessities for us. Indeed, since land ownership is not the strategic center of economic power in a developed country, and since our environmental problems are so pressing, it may be that we will see much more public control of development rights in the critical growth areas of the United States. Not tomorrow, of course. (Lynch, 1990, p. 345)

While private ownership of most urban land is the accepted norm in North America, private ownership presents some of the same challenges to urban areas as it does to rural areas. It is difficult to ensure that public values and returns other than economic ones are generated. Because, in his view, land ownership is less closely tied to economic power than it once was, Lynch is hopeful that increased public control of development is coming.

Even once this has been settled, whoever controls the site may worry about never-ending legal complications (Gerend, 2007): "On the negative side of the debate, there is often a fear on the

part of the site owner that once a site has an interim use it will be difficult to get the user to relocate, or that the user may demand a replacement site, or other compensation" (Blumner, 2006, p.9). At the same time, the site users may fear that they will be expelled without notice, whenever it suits the landowners.

Idealization of temporary use: Temporary use of unusual spaces is often required in times of emergency or hardship. Kohoutek and Kamleithner wonder if it is appropriate to suggest and celebrate a strategy that is used in times of crisis as an everyday way of living. They remind us that "to an unbelievable extent, 'temporary uses' are most directly connected with wars, expulsions and natural catastrophes" (Kohoutek & Kamleithner, 2006, p. 35). The tent cities erected after natural disasters like earthquakes and the slums surrounding large cities worldwide are reminders of this. Temporary use becomes associated in some people's minds with a harmful shortage of space. This contrasts, in their view, with an abundance of space, which they associate with wealth:

> …the multiple use or repurposing of space, overlapping uses and the resulting 'density' are all the result of a shortage, whereas the isolation and dispersion of individual uses and their 'appropriate' rehousing in specific buildings, in keeping with the logic of functionalism, were initially an indication of increasing wealth. (Kohoutek & Kamleithner, 2006, p. 36)

Others idealize temporary use; Phillips observes that "many contemporary artists and architects fetishise the unfinished, the processual, the gestural and the ephemeral" (Phillips, 2008, p. 142). Some architects and designers, today as much as in the 1960s when the Situationists were active, appear taken by these concepts without consideration for function and practicality.

2.5 Variables

Several examples have been put forward to illustrate the idea of temporary use. While these examples have similarities, they also have differences, of course, and by comparing their characteristics, we begin to get a sense of the range of projects that could be categorized as temporary uses of space.

To begin to describe various temporary use projects, a series of variables will illustrate some of the key pragmatic differences to be considered. These variables have been divided into two categories: site characteristics and use characteristics. Characteristics of the site's context include socio-economic context, previous use, ownership, and project objectives. Use characteristics include the type of use proposed, the legality of use, project lifespan, and site utilization cycle.

Following this description, a table has been included that compares project variables between what might be described as "ephemeral" and "interim" temporary uses. While there are exceptions, projects can generally be seen as having characteristics that place them on a continuum between ephemeral and interim uses.

Context characteristics

Socio-economic context: The potential for temporary uses is influenced by factors outside the site alone. The "relationship between the physical structure of cities and the social and economic lives of their residents" (Urban Age Project, 2007, p. 246) is important to explore and to consider when assessing the benefits and challenges of temporary uses. In this practicum, some of the parameters analyzed when considering a site's context include the area's population, population density, population growth, and vacancy rates.

Previous use/Existing infrastructure/Size: Different sites lend themselves to different opportunities based on what has occurred in that location in the past. While this may seem obvious, it helps to account for the range of activities undertaken as temporary uses. For example, if the site is

currently a vacant lot slated for redevelopment in a couple of years, a community garden might be a possibility. Alternatively, if the site is a vacant storefront, an art gallery or community centre could fit into the available space without much modification or renovation. For many temporary use project initiators, the site itself is an essential source of inspiration. For everyday urbanists, good urban design is about working with what currently exists. From a pragmatic standpoint, temporary uses that can take advantage of a site's existing infrastructure often involve fewer upfront investment costs.

Physical location: The location of a site within a city and its accessibility to users are important factors in determining what temporary use, if any, can take place. Oswalt et al. note that "in terms of centrality of location and accessibility, the spatial preferences of temporary users are often no different from those of the conventional real estate market" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 8). For most temporary use projects, this means that "the more intact the infrastructure of the site, the more accessible its location and the more vital the network of potential users, the more likely a temporary use is to succeed" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 42). Oswalt et al. find that "As a rule, temporary uses do not arise in isolation but in clusters" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 10). Because temporary uses tend to "benefit from the presence of similar activities nearby... Many temporary users choose a site less for its location than because of the temporary user milieu that already exists there" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 9). These clusters "enhance users' visibility and networking opportunities" (Blumner, 2006, p. 9) while also generating "specific identities" (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 10). These identities emerge over time, in contrast with shopping centres, where cluster identities are seen to be artificially generated (Oswalt et al., 2009, p. 10).

For some uses, part of this location identity is the fact that they physically relocate relatively often. One site user in Berlin commented that "hopping from place to place was part and parcel of the Federal Press Beach in the beginning" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 127). Blijburg, a beach club in Amsterdam, was planned as a temporary project, but is now in its third home as the popular beach relocates to stay ahead of housing development on the artificial island of IJburg. Stanja van Mierlo,

one of the creators of Blijburg, says, "I believe in temporary use, as long as you can hop" (van Mierlo as cited in Rijpers, 2006). Catherine Thompson might describe these projects that move from location to location while introducing new ideas about the use of city space as "loose-fit spaces": "Some loose-fit spaces may move around over time within our urban fabric, reflecting the dynamic, mixed, sometimes ambiguous landscapes which are likely to develop as expansive networks of infrastructure slice through and re-knit the existing fabric. Some residual spaces can become the test bed for new ideas. . ." (Thompson, 2002, p. 70).

Ownership of site: The ownership of a site may impose certain requirements on users. Generalizations about whether private or public ownership of a site is "better" for temporary use projects are difficult to make. Traditionally, private land owners are interested primarily in the economic return of any risk they take. This would seem to suggest that support for an untested temporary use might be low. Conversely, private land owners are perhaps more likely to support the entrepreneurial spirit of temporary users. The keepers of publicly-owned space may be more likely than private owners to support projects that produce non-economic benefits, but as they have the whole "public" watching them may be less likely to make perceived risky decisions.

Project objectives: Each project has a unique set of objectives. Haydn and Temel describe the philosophy guiding a temporary use project: "It starts out from the context and the current conditions, not from a distant goal; it seeks to use what already exists rather than inventing everything anew; it is concerned with small places and brief spans of time as well as the conditions at various points in time" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 12). Alternatively, the glossary in *Temporary Urban Spaces* describes interim uses as "places where there is a gap in the cycle of utilisation, which can be used in the short-term for other purposes, usually not with purely economic motives" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 11). In *Temporary Urban Spaces*, Christa Kamleithner describes two approaches to developing goals for a project:

> the first is motivated by a clearly directed economic calculation with the goal of improving a property or section of a city; the other is motivated by the knowledge of the lack of knowledge about the "correct" objectives – an effort to employ temporary uses in a process of trial and error to find new urban programmes. (Kamleithner as cited in Haydn & Temel, 2006, p.11)

Use characteristics

Type of use/activity: One of the surprising things about temporary uses might be the wide range of activities that can be accommodated, from markets to art shows, from sporting events to festivals, from community gardens to retail stores. Blumner lists the following as examples of the range in scope and scale of temporary uses: parks and garden, art/culture, sport/recreation, entrepreneurial, parking lots and storage sites, and alternative living situations (Blumner, 2006, p.6).

Legality of use: Some projects could be described as completely legal, following all laws and by-laws and applying for all the required permits. Some are not necessarily legal but are tolerated. Many projects like RAW-Tempel in Berlin began by re-appropriation of space by "pioneers" who "discover abandoned sites and reinvent them" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 36). The owners of the site had not approved this use, but in this case, the site users were able to transition to an official lease with the owners. In the case of many squatter communities, no formal approvals are received. Ararat is a squatted building on the site of Campo Boario, a former slaughterhouse in Rome, Italy. The building has served since 1999 as illegal accommodations for immigrants, a Kurdish cultural centre, and workspace for the radical architecture and urban research collective, Stalker (Endres, 2003). Though the use is officially illegal, the local authority that owns the land tolerates it. Whether or not the local authority is the owner of the site, they will play a role in assessing a project's legality through planning permissions, licenses, and codes. As Overmeyer points out, sometimes projects are "tolerated even in situations for which no planning permission has been granted" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 160). Groth and Corijn note that, while local authorities and proprietors are the main actors who determine the legality of a temporary use, if they take a long time in making their decision, the

neighbourhood and project sympathisers may begin to mobilise and become part of this decision-making process as well (Groth & Corijn, 2005, p. 521).

Lifespan: The lifespan of a project is the amount of time it is anticipated to exist. The lifespan may be agreed on from the outset by all parties, may be flexible, or in situations involving squatters may be a point of disagreement. The continuum of use lifespan might be imagined as starting at "ephemeral" and stretching to "permanent." Somewhere in between would be "temporary" and "interim." For Haydn and Temel, brevity is important, though they do not specify a particular lifespan: "Temporary uses are those that seek to derive unique qualities from the idea of temporality. That is why they differ from lasting uses, not because they have fewer resources available or because they want to prepare their location for something other that will last longer" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 17).

Utilization cycle: Closely connected to a project's lifespan, and also sometimes to a project's physical location, is its cycle of utilization. Some projects are planned to be set up one time and in one location only. An example would include the Hotel Transvaal, which is tied to a specific time and place. Alternatively, some projects are designed to take place several times over the course of their lifespan. Paris-Plages, taking place in the same location each summer, but over several years would be one example of this. Mobile City Farm is an example of a project that is designed to move to new locations around the city from time to time. Another aspect of a site's utilization cycle is its cycle of daily use. Innovative multi-use facilities, which see different uses over the course of a day, often "seek to anchor other forms of use alongside the 'dominant' prescribed ones" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 11).

Table comparing project variables between "ephemeral" and "interim" temporary uses

	Description	Types of use	Cycle of use	Project proponent	Legality of use	Intent	Tools
Ephemeral	• Use of very short duration • Usually a more informal project than an interim use	• Event	• One time only • Can be recurring	• Artist • Community organization • Promoter	• Legal • Illegal	• Attract attention • Generate interest • Change perspectives • Informal, spontaneously planned • Encourage self-organization	• Supportive culture (both in government and in society more generally)
Interim	• Use that takes place between two other longer-term uses • Generally takes place over a longer period of time and is more formal than an ephemeral use	• Retail • Business • Art/cultural exhibit • Housing	• Can be recurring, but must change sites • Often one time only	• Entrepreneur • Government • Property owner	• Tolerated • Most often legal	• Economic benefits for property owners • Incubate new businesses • Incremental step towards long-term goal	• Bylaws • Policies • Strategies

2.6 Planner's role

A focus on temporary uses accentuates the reality of change in urban areas. This may be a factor in why temporary uses are not commonly encouraged by planners. While planners of course acknowledge the fact that cities, and land uses within them, change, planners are more accustomed to seeking stability and permanence in their work as opposed to impermanence and flux.

In this section the part that planners play in temporary use projects will be explored. Because temporary uses are not a traditional focus for planners, it may not at first be clear how they can contribute, leading to questions like, "What is the role of the architect or planner if they are no longer imposing forms or defining functions?" (Mackey, 2007, p. 4). If, as Sennett writes, "The designer needs to create physical forms of a particular sort, 'incomplete' in a special way" (Sennett, 2007, p. 294), what does this mean for planners? Thinking about plans as "incomplete" is unusual for many planners, but Hillier, Sennett, and Overmeyer suggest models for reframing the concepts of change and temporary use. Within planning literature there is debate about whether tactics or strategies present better tools for managing change. There is recognition that, whatever tools used, planners are often in the position of facilitating relationships between actors. Agonistic pluralism is presented as a lens that may be helpful in this process. Finally, creative governance is proposed as a model that can help cities and their planners facilitate and implement innovative projects.

Cumberlidge and Musgrave (2007), Hillier (2005), and Sennett (2007) all argue for a degree of incompleteness in the plans of urban designers. Cumberlidge and Musgrave want planners to leave "the space (physical and conceptual) for uncertainty and spontaneity, the unplanned" (2007, p. 181). Hillier is interested in shifting urban planning towards "a practice of finding and encountering rather than of regulating and judging" (Hillier, 2005, p. 284). Sennett's contrasting models of the Open City and the Brittle City provide a model for conceptualizing the difference between a city structure that accepts and tolerates change and one that is change-resistant.

These ideas might be seen as arguments against the development of long-term master plans,

and indeed, Groth and Corijn observe that current development practices appear to undermine the master plan, with the focus of long term planning shifting from "hard" building projects to "soft" social transformations (2005, p. 504).

Reflecting on this perceived shift, Arlt argues that master plans are no longer relevant and no longer possible in today's planning context (Arlt, 2006, p. 16). Blau, however, defends the importance of "a much larger highly strategic and carefully staged plan of action with, often precise, formal objectives" (Blau, 2007, p. 19). Arlt agrees that "goals must be formulated and partners sought for their implementation who have similar, or at least compatible, goals" (Arlt, 2006, p. 16). Both writers are interested in developing a city that is "dynamic and open-ended" (Blau, 2007, p. 23), it is simply the degree of pre-determination that is debated.

But how incomplete should a plan be? Speaks (2005) and Kelbaugh (2002) argue that overly incomplete plans lack the vision necessary to inspire and to potentially revitalize an urban area. Hillier and Sennett address this issue by exploring feelings planners may have about change and reframing incompleteness as a potentially inspiring model for urban development.

Reframing change and temporary uses

While spontaneity and uncertainty may be celebrated in theoretical writings and in small-scale projects, within planning practice itself there are challenges to embracing flux and change as productive and workable concepts. The reluctance of many planners to embrace temporary uses, uses that are intended to change, may be evidence of this challenge. A shift in the way planners think about change is required.

In "Straddling the Post-Structuralist Abyss: Between Transcendence and Immanence?" Hillier discusses the inevitability of uncontrolled changes in space and develops a theory as to why she believes planners are less comfortable with instability. She describes the paradox in planning practice between change and stability:

> In order for planners to represent an entity in a plan or to act purposefully... They require some point of stability. This is the heart of planning. Moreover, such

> 'stability' is inevitably ephemeral. It can only be temporary... Planning practice, therefore, while theoretically concerned with change, is actually change-resisting because it requires representation to stabilize elements sufficiently to be able to act purposefully. Planning's attempts to abstract patterns and coherences out of fragmented nets and gels serve to arrest, stabilize and simplify what would be otherwise irreducibly complex and dynamic. (Hillier, 2005, p. 284)

If planning tends to be change-resisting, what models or analogies might help planners conceptualize change in a workable form?

Sennett (2007) describes two contrasting representations of the city that he feels mirror this inconsistency in planning thought: the Brittle City and the Open City. In Sennett's view, the Brittle City is the result of "over-determination, both of the city's visual forms and its social functions" (Sennett, 2007, p.290). The Brittle City is ruled by the concepts of equilibrium and integration, concepts that restrict creativity (Sennett, 2007, p.292). Sennett's Open City, by contrast, is illustrated in Jane Jacobs' description: "In an open city, as in the natural world, social and visual forms mutate through chance variation; people can best absorb, participate and adapt to change if it happens step-by-lived-step" (Sennett, 2007, p.293). Over-determination has resulted in environments that "decay much more quickly than urban fabric inherited from the past. As uses change, buildings are now destroyed rather than adapted; indeed, over-speculation of form and function makes the modern urban environment peculiarly susceptible to decay" (Sennett, 2007, p. 292). A model that is designed from the outset to welcome change may enable more creative uses of space and may allow buildings to be considered functional for longer periods of time.

Overmeyer suggests looking to other fields for alternative models. He points out that self-regulating development models are becoming common, most notably in the area of software development. He describes open-source methods wherein "The programmer defines a concept that is to be developed with the aid of a programme that has yet to be written... Anyone interested can access all information pertaining to previous attempted solutions, and also has the right to use, test and further develop the original version of the programme distributed" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 105). Through this method, a variety of solutions are put forward through the "free exchange of information, collective creativity and mutual cooperation" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 105). Overmeyer

suggests this model could serve as inspiration for an "open-source urbanism" that takes "into account a wider range of development scenarios" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 105) and invites citizens "not just to look at plans but to design and shape urban space themselves" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 107).

Tactics & strategies

What tools can planners use to build the "Open City" or to encourage "open-source urbanism"? In a broad sense, planners might use tactics or strategies to achieve their objectives. For some planning writers, however, these terms are charged, with theorists like Hayden and Temel (2006), Blau (2007), and Arlt (2006) arguing the benefits of one approach over the other.

For Haydn and Temel, temporary uses are the urban planning equivalent to tactics while master plans are equivalent to strategies (2006, p. 16). Haydn and Temel describe tactics as "an approach from the weaker place, which is not in a position to dictate conditions to an opponent but is compelled to try to exploit relationships to its advantage, by waiting for an opportunity and exploiting it flexibly and quickly" (2006, p. 16). They also argue that "Temporary use is the opposite of the master plan: it starts out from the context and the current conditions, not from a distant goal; it seeks to use what already exists rather than inventing everything anew; it is concerned with small places and brief spans of time as well as the conditions at various points in time" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 12). In contrast, they consider strategy to be "an approach that... works from a position of power that is in a position to force its opponents to accept its conditions and to ignore limitations imposed by circumstances" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 16). As strong proponents of temporary use, Haydn and Temel value tactics over strategy. The language used to describe tactics is more positive, from their perspective, than the words chosen to characterize strategies.

Blau's description seems to be rather dismissive of tactics: "Tactics are opportunistic; they exploit opportunities. Strategy is generative; it creates opportunities" (Blau, 2007, p. 17). She argues, "Whether or not it is successful in achieving a desired outcome, strategy – by imagining, planning, and rationally projecting actions and their consequences onto existing conditions – transforms those

conditions into possibilities" (Blau, 2007, p. 17).

Arlt describes the differences between how tacticians and strategists act and the power relationships that occur between them: "Whereas the strategist has the power and money to achieve his goals without having to show too much concern for external conditions, the tactician must pay great attention to both circumstances and his adversaries" (Arlt, 2006, p. 42). In Arlt's view, this system as applied in current urban planning is broken:

> in theory, an authority entrusted with urban planning still has the political power to operate like a strategist, but it no longer has the resources. The authority depends on private support, and the type of co-operation required here is based on the public-private partnership (PPP) established between private and public actors to implement, for example, urban-planning projects. Meanwhile, urban authorities seem to be responding in an increasingly defensive manner, leaving decisions increasingly to the private sector (i.e. to investors), and forgetting that a tactician also has his own goals, which he wishes to achieve – albeit in a tactical manner – on the basis of co-operation. (Arlt, 2006, p. 44)

Arlt makes a final analogy between interim users and guerrillas: "The guerrilla is never a strategist, he is the classic tactician" (Arlt, 2006, p. 43).

However even within the military context from which the terms tactic and strategy are drawn, it could be argued that both are necessary in a successful campaign. Lydon et al argue for the use of temporary use projects as tools in an approach that acknowledges the importance of both tactics and strategies. "Tactical urbanism" features the following characteristics:

- A deliberate, phased approach to instigating change;
- The offering of local solutions for local planning challenges;
- Short-term commitment and realistic expectations;
- Low-risks, with a possibly a high reward [sic]; and
- The development of social capital between citizens and the building of organizational capacity between public-private institutions, non-profits, and their constituents.
  (Lydon et al., n.d., pp. 1-2)

Of key importance in this discussion is the phased approach that demonstrates an appreciation for the value of both larger, long-term changes and smaller, shorter-term projects: "While larger scale efforts do have their place, incremental, small-scale improvements are increasingly seen as a way to stage more substantial investments. This approach allows a host of local actors to

test new concepts before making substantial political and financial commitments" (Lydon et al., n.d., p. 1).

Blau reiterates the benefits of incremental changes and connects the practice back to the concept of openness within urban planning: "Consistently staging the conditions for future moves, each individual intervention prepared the ground for further interventions. This is a practice based on a concept of the city as an ongoing, open-ended project – an open work..." (Blau, 2007, p. 19). She also points out the potential to involve a variety of people, or local actors, and the dialectical nature of an approach that blends long-term plans with small projects:

> In terms of the city, the open work is a multi-authored project in which each individual intervention is part of a much larger highly strategic and carefully staged plan of action with, often precise, formal objectives. The larger conception of the plan informs each of the smaller authored moves, and the smaller moves impact and modify the larger direction of the plan. (Blau, 2007, p. 19)

This approach can be seen as opening up a dialogue between large plans and small projects, ultimately benefiting them both: "If done well, these small scale changes are conceived as the first step in realizing lasting change. Thus, tactical urbanism is most effective when used in conjunction with long term planning efforts" (Lydon et al., n.d., p. 2).

Healey is concerned with how planners can open the dialogue through which strategies are developed. She finds that the militaristic concepts of tactic and strategy come from a management approach to urban planning that was especially prevalent in the 1960s. In this conception, a strategy "could be expressed in organizational goals, which expressed core values. These could then be developed into trajectories and principles to guide specific actions through careful analysis" (Healey, 2007, p. 181). She sees this approach becoming less common due to socio-political changes and that, more commonly, "Strategies are as much 'found' as explicitly created (Mintzberg 1994)" (Healey, 2007, p. 183). Developing strategies, and selecting the tactics to accomplish strategies, is an exploratory, collaborative, and creative process.

A significant role for planners is to facilitate the process of "finding" while ensuring that multiple voices are heard: "In a condition where the setting of the urban agenda can no longer be the

expression of a harmonious consensus, the definition of a politics and a form of city planning that can bridge the gap between these multiple heterogeneities without repressing their inherent differences and tensions is one of the biggest challenges" (Groth & Corijn, 2004, p. 523). There is an increasing recognition that "Strategy formation is not just about the articulation of strategic ideas, but about persuading and inspiring may different actors, in different positions in a governance landscape, that particular ideas carry power, to generate and to regulate ideas for projects" (Healey, 2007, p. 182). Planners must navigate the relationships between those involved in temporary use projects carefully.

Navigating relationships between actors

Several actors participate in the success of temporary use projects. Haydn and Temel use the metaphor of a network to describe the relationships: "In terms of both location and function, interim users are situated in various networks whose productive overlapping can lead to surprising possibilities" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 13). They identify "interim users, 'official' users, owners, users/visitors, administration, politics, media" as the most important roles in a temporary use project (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p.14). Any of these actors might initiate a project, but every actor generally plays a role in bringing the project to life. Because of the different roles, there is potential for conflict as each actor may have a different set of values and priorities for the project. The focus here will be on how planners can navigate these relationships and on the role that planners play in temporary use projects.

Agonistic pluralism is a model of democracy put forward by Mouffe that may help to clarify the relationships between various actors in temporary use scenarios, especially where there is conflict. Mouffe's model developed as a critique of deliberative democracy which assumes that for decisions as well as "for the norms and institutional arrangements to be valid they should have been agreed by all affected by their consequences according to a process of deliberation" (Mouffe, 1999, p. 747). Mouffe feels that deliberative democracy denies the role of conflict in decision-making and that we

must "acknowledge the dimension of power and antagonism and their ineradicable character" (Mouffe, 1999, p. 752). She makes a key distinction between *antagonism* and *agonism*. Mouffe views antagonism as an element of the relationship between enemies and she contrasts this with agonism between adversaries (Mouffe, 1999, p.755). While Mouffe sees what she refers to as the "political" dimensions of antagonism as an inherent element in human society, by approaching it differently, as agonism, she believes we can "defuse" it (Mouffe, 1999, p. 754). She describes agonism as:

> a we/them relation where the conflicting parties, although acknowledging that there is no rational solution to their conflict, nevertheless recognize the legitimacy of their opponents. They are 'adversaries' not enemies. This means that, while in conflict, they see themselves as belonging to the same political association, as sharing a common symbolic space within which the conflict takes place. (Mouffe, 2008, p. 151)

This model provides an instructive lens through which to analyze challenges that may arise within relationships, like those between property owners and site users or between property owners and planners. By reframing relationships as agonistic rather than antagonistic, possibilities may arise where there were none. While in the case of property owners and site users it is not only symbolic but also physical space that is to be shared, each actor is working towards the same general goal of seeing a space used.

For Hillier, the model of agonistic pluralism fits well with our lived experience of cities and society, "The key is to be open to future potentialities. There will inevitably be agonistic tendencies as society is ever in transition and nothing is perfect. In particular, there will always be tensions between the state, with its requirement for self-preservation, and entities seeking to destabilize codings along new lines" (Hillier, 2005, p. 282). Moreover, she argues that planners have a role to play in how agonistic relationships shape urban spaces: "Planning is the art (or science) of spatial manipulation. It is a mediator in the continuous process of space-becoming or spacing" (Hillier, 2005, p. 282). Cities are continuously changing physically as well as socially and planners can help to mediate that change. As mediators in the process of "spacing" described by Hillier (2005, p.282), it is worth reflecting further on the particular roles planners can play in temporary use scenarios. Planners are in a position to collaborate with and mediate between the actors involved in temporary use scenarios.

As an alternative to the model of deliberative democracy, agonistic pluralism proposes that "the existence of multiple publics and centers requires a conception of democracy that embraces difference and is realized through dialogue between adversarial parties" (Aeschbacher & Rios, 2008, p. 90). As planners are often the civil servants entrusted with executing and maintaining "comprehensive proposals" (Speaks, 2005, p. 36) for the physical and social design of an area, it is essential that they find a way to balance the interests and needs of temporary users with the direction of the longer term vision. At the very least, local government and planners are generally involved in temporary use projects through the "traditional role of providing building and use permits... Sometimes the public sector takes on more innovative roles, such as acting as an agent to bring owner and potential user together for a first meeting" (Blumner, 2006, p. 7). Either of these roles places planners in a position of mediation and negotiation that can be challenging to balance. In addition to acting as mediators, planners are often called on to facilitate bureaucratic process for property owners and site users. The precedents illustrated in Part 3 will demonstrate how planners have taken on these roles, sometimes several of them at a time, as they work through temporary use projects.

In response to current urban development trends in German and American cities, Blumner describes how a shift is occurring in the role of some city governments from a "regulating role to an activating one" (Blumner, 2006, pp. 3-4). In "Reclaiming Urbanity: Indeterminate Spaces, Informal Actors, and Urban Agenda Settings," Groth and Corijn describe this as "a shift from 'government' to 'governance'" (2005, p. 504). The term *governance* refers to "collective action arrangements designed to achieve some general benefit" (Healey, 2004, p. 11), and *government* refers to "the formal organisations of the 'public sector'" (Healey, 2004, p. 11). Healey and Landry make proposals for the form of governance culture they feel best enables planners to manage relationships and propose innovative solutions.

Creative governance

In order to implement policies that capture the potential benefits of temporary uses, it is clear that planners need to take a creative, and also innovative, approach.

Landry defines creativity as "thinking at the edge of one's competence, rather than the centre of it" (2006, p. 407). Healey ascribes a double meaning to creativity as it relates to governance processes: "In one sense, new governance capacities can be developed, whether through struggle, learning or evolution. In a second sense, some ways of doing governance have better potential than others to foster the innovatory, creative modes sought by the advocates of economic and cultural creativity" (Healey, 2004, p. 11).

Building on this need for creativity, Davila et al. (2006) define innovative initiatives as the successful implementation of creative ideas within planning practice. But how can governments ensure that creative and innovative approaches are pursued? Can creativity be legislated?

Arlt warns against institutionalising temporary uses as this may diminish or eliminate some of their key benefits (Arlt as cited in Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 11). This may be a valid concern when it comes to the development of the specific uses themselves, however there may be a place for some degree of institutionalization when it comes to how city officials view and approach temporary uses. In "Creativity and Governance," Healey takes issue with the stereotype of contemporary governance practices stifling innovation and disputes the position held by many in the private sector: "Business people and creative artists often imagine that creativity and governance are somehow in dualistic opposition, implying that more 'government' means less 'creativity', whether measured as wealth generation or in terms of culturally enriching projects" (Healey, 2004, p. 11). Instead Healey argues that governance and creativity do not need to be mutually exclusive (2004, p. 11). She promotes "creative" governance, or a "mode of governance, which allows experimentation and understands that experiments fail as well as succeed" (Healey, 2004, p. 14). In Healey's view, a variety of governance processes are available for a government to promote; therefore, the "amount" of government has little to do with governance culture. At the same time, Healey, like Blau, does not

advocate an "acceptance of chaos" (Blau, 2007, p. 23). Rather, Healey promotes the idea that business people, creative artists, and governments work together to achieve the best and most creative results. She argues that some degree of structure and agreed-upon framework is necessary and can perhaps even stimulate creativity:

> too much risk and uncertainty may inhibit creative responses just as market practices need a degree of stability to sustain them. 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. (Healey, 2004, p. 13)

The key to this "trick" is balance and accountability: For Landry, this key is what he calls civic creativity: "Civic creativity is imaginative problem-solving applied to public good objectives. It involves the public sector being more entrepreneurial, though within the bounds of accountability, and the private sector being more aware of its responsibilities to the collective whole" (Landry, 2006, p. 2). Similarly to Healey, he feels that "The 'civic' and the 'public' have come in for a battering over the closing decades of the 20th century. A string of negative connotations are associated with them: bureaucratic, red tape, hierarchical, inefficient, social welfarist, lacking in vision, machine-like..." (Landry, 2006, p. 190). Taking issue with this association, Landry believes that "Being creative in a civic sense needs to be legitimized as a valid, praiseworthy activity" (Landry, 2008, p. 191).

Using terms that echo Mouffe's agonistic pluralism, Landry writes that civic creativity's "scope is the confluence point between individual self-interest and collective desires, where being 'me' and being 'us' at the same time is possible. It is a creativity that negotiates and balances between a diversity of conflicting interests and thus is always involved in some form of politics" (Landry, 2008, p. 190). This might be a description of agonistic pluralism in action. Landry writes that planners and others drawing on civic creativity are "able to negotiate commitment, ownership and credence for their ideas and actions so that the tendency to take risks, often at the boundaries of existing procedures and rules, is seen as accountable and full of probity" (Landry, 2008, p. 190). In other words, they are able to take risks while being accountable.

Participatory budgeting as used in Porto Alegre, Brazil is described by Landry as an example

of civic creativity because it challenges the "traditional relationship between state and public" (Landry, 2008, p. 194). In this model, the public becomes more actively involved in decision-making about municipal finances. The city is divided into sixteen districts each represented by a Popular Council elected by area residents. Two representatives from each Council are also elected to a city-wide Council of Representatives who set the agenda for public works spending. Final decisions on spending are made at joint meetings with City offices, the Council of Representatives, and the Chamber of Councilmen (elected in city-wide elections) (Landry, 2008, pp. 194-5). Initiating the system likely seemed to be a risky decision in the 1980s, but it allowed for greater transparency and participation by the public while changing the municipal government's processes, philosophy and relationship with society.

Sometimes the risks appear to be too high for government to endorse creative governance. Coaffee and Deas evaluate two case studies of partnership in local governance, one seen as successful and the other less so, encouraged through the New Deal for Communities initiative in England. They found that, in both cases, "the enormity of the pressure typically placed on area-based regeneration bodies to produce demonstrable outcomes at a relatively early stage" often comes "at the expense of the experimentation and creativity ABIs [area-based initiatives] are also supposed to stimulate" (Coaffee & Deas, 2008, p. 180). Coaffee and Deas observe that while the expectation of outcomes "can, of course, be justified on the grounds that identifiable results from policy intervention help spread confidence and interest amongst the different actors whose involvement is necessary over the long term" (Coaffee & Deas, 2008, p. 180), the experiences in the case studies, "nonetheless, suggest a need for greater fortitude on the part of government, allowing a settling-in period in which the fundamentals – putting together a staff team, agreeing administrative procedures, develop appropriate skill sets, and building inclusive strategy – can be put in place" (Coaffee & Deas, 2008, p. 180). They find that "developing creative and effective joint-working within and across neighbourhoods is undoubtedly a difficult and time consuming process that sits uneasily alongside bureaucratic and electoral cycles which demand more immediate evidence of results" (Coaffee &

Deas, 2008, p. 182). They argue that as decades of "urban policy have demonstrated that longtermism and patience are essential when dealing with... knotty issues, so too attempts to extend local government joint working require a forbearance that has not often been evident" (Coaffee & Deas, 2008, p. 182). The demand for quick results can be a reason some governments show a reluctance to shift towards creative governance processes.

Albrechts writes of the case of Hasselt, a city in Belgium, where creative governance is slowly becoming institutionalized with positive results. Faced with traffic congestion and needed road work, the mayor turned the traffic problem into an asset – free public transportation. Until then, the leading plan had been the traditional solution of adding yet another ring road to the road network. Albrechts sees this as evidence that "Government systems of development, control and regulation have often been fixed for a long time, yet are seldom reviewed and adapted to changing circumstances" (Albrechts, 2005, p. 261). Albrechts sees this new way of approaching planning challenges beginning to take hold in Hasselt, led by the creative risk the mayor was willing to take. In his view, the sequence of events that took place in Hasselt illustrates the process through which creative practices can become institutionalized, with the discussion and engagement it encouraged in broad sectors of the population being one of its most important features:

> In some places the process of 'discourse structuration' and its subsequent 'institutionalization' becomes perhaps more important than the plan as such... In this way new discourses may become institutionalized, that is, embedded in the norms, attitudes and practices, thus providing a basis for structural change. From this point, a shared stock of values, knowledge, information, sensitivities and mutual understanding may spread and travel through an array of regional, provincial and local governmental arenas, sector departments and consultants. New approaches and new concepts can be sustainably embedded via institutionalization... However, this takes time and dedication. (Albrechts, 2005, p. 261)

Groth and Corijn put forward the occupation of Léopold Station in Brussels as a failed, but influential, attempt by citizens to become involved in the process of development. Léopold Station, Brussels' oldest train station was slated to be demolished to make way for expansion of the European Parliament complex. This area of the city had experienced rapid change over the past decades as the European Parliament established itself. Many members of the local community felt

excluded from the decisions taking place around them, and for three months, a group calling itself BruXXel.org occupied the station, hosting a variety of activities, performances, and debates. Groth and Corijn discuss how "By means of a substantial, but rather unusual, intervention in urban politics, the 'external' collective subsequently engaged in a game of playful diplomacy and 'statements against statements' forcing all the actors involved in or affected by the planning of D4 and D5 to debate openly the various issues at stake" (Groth & Corijn, 2004, p. 519). This occupation caused "daily turmoil" (Groth & Corijn, 2004, p. 519) and forced a meeting between the various actors. Ultimately, no substantial changes were made to the original plans, and "the occupants abandoned the matter and left the premises in a festive parade" (Groth & Corijn, 2004, p. 519). Whereas some might feel that this ending supports the argument that the occupation was a "mere symbolic effort of the temporary, fun versus zero concrete results" (Pétitions Patrimoine as cited in Groth & Corijn, 2004, p. 519), Groth and Corijn argue that, in fact, "a formerly deadlocked situation marked by a rigid opposition of two antagonistic positions has been reactivated/transformed into a forum of dialogue and a new focus on possible sustainable development scenarios for the area gained exposure at a city-wide level" (Groth & Corijn, 2004, p. 520). There now seems to be potential for the relationship to transition from antagonistic to agonistic. While no change occurred in plans for this specific site, Groth and Corijn believe that the occupation has opened opportunities in Brussels for the sort of dialogue between long-term plans and temporary events or projects and between actors in the city to which Blau and Lydon et al. refer.

The examples above illustrate that creative governance can be found (or not) in many city processes. The way creative governance is expressed will vary from city to city. Healey warns that while "Some modes of governance may restrict creativity... [and] Others may help to release creative energy... there is no simple equation between the characteristics of a 'creative city' and a 'creative' mode of urban governance, no 'one size fits all' recipe" (Healey, 2004, p. 18). She suggests instead that cities interested in developing creative modes of governance must:

> discover a complex balance between self-regulation and re-distribution, between being supportive in multiple ways and constraining where essential, between openness and transparency and accepting the likelihood of critique and protest, between producing and circulating knowledge and information and accepting that valuable knowledge resources are also to be found in the many nooks and crannies of urban life. (Healey, 2004, p. 18)

Ultimately this means that cities must be willing to "learn to experiment and therefore to learn from failure as well as success" (Healey, 2004, p. 18). Failure can be frightening for a city, and but Landry suggests the effects of not encouraging creativity can be negative. He finds the positive characteristics and intentions of creative governance "are often thwarted by the risk-averse, inward-looking culture of the civic. Civic creativity seeks to overcome this problem even though civic authority may fear it. Creativity is dangerous or unsettling, but not using it is even more dangerous" (Landry, 2008, p. 192).

Hillier, borrowing from Marcus (1994), has a vision of planning that would allow for the experimentation called for by Healey and Landry:

> Planning as an experimental form would be an interpretive framework which demands analysis of itself as a cultural product and a method for rendering the social. Plans would be 'messy texts' which are centrally interested in the creativity of social action through imagination, narrativity and performance. (Hillier, 2005, p. 278)

Hillier is supportive of planning as an experiment, and the idea of plans as "messy texts" suggests that new directions and revisions are always possible. Plans as "framework" allow for new and different readings by different groups and interests to co-exist, an idea connecting with agonistic pluralism. In this view of planning, Hillier, citing the writing of Deleuze and Parnet (2002), also expands the view of what planners can do:

> Perhaps planning should become a practice of finding and encountering rather than of regulating and judging (Deleuze and Parnet, 2002)? Regulating and judging demand conformity to invented rules, to a transcendence of 'correct' ideas which effectively prevent people from thinking... Such overly stringent regulation impedes creativity. It 'effectively trains thought to operate according to the norms of an established order or power, and moreover, it installs in it an apparatus of power, sets it up as an apparatus of power itself'. Regulation as power-full control means that one must 'have correct ideas' (both quotations, Deleuze and Parnet, 2002: 23). To shake off such a model, planning could perhaps become open to encounters with the outside, to openly experiment, to relax its demands for hierarchical structures of control... and free up the potential for creative, nonconformist ways of thinking and

> working, proceeding by intersections, crossings of lines, encounters. 'No correct ideas, just ideas' ('pas d'idées justes, juste des idées') (Deleuze and Parnet, 2002: 9). (Hillier, 2005, p. 284)

By de-emphasising the planner's role in regulation, Hillier echoes the calls for a creative mode of governance that encourages and supports creative thinking and the generation of multiple solutions. Rather than "correct ideas," Landry suggests that the aim of creative governance and civic creativity is "to generate a continual flow of innovative solutions to problems which have an impact on the public realm" (Landry, 2006, p. 190).

Part 3: Precedents

Part 3: Precedents

In this section, examples from other cities are examined in order to address the second part of a question posed in the introduction: Do temporary uses currently demonstrate the benefits and drawbacks claimed for them? Four precedent studies, looking at temporary use strategies in Berlin, Zagreb, Portland, and Edmonton, provide a description of the context and particular approach used in each city as well as an investigation of the benefits and challenges experienced in each city. The role that planners play in the process is also described.

As Michael Mellauner points out, "Realised projects contain an explosive power. They provoke the question 'Why not here too?' The knowledge something can be implemented mobilises sleeping giants" (Mellauner as cited in Haydn & Temel, 2007, p. 15). Local planners can learn from these examples, comparing the different roles planners take on depending on the context and exploring under what circumstances temporary uses work best.

3.1 Berlin, Germany

Population: 3,443,000 in 2010 (Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg, 2011, p. 02.1)

Population density: 3,810 people per km² and 7,124 people per sq. km. density in the inner city (Urban Age Project, 2007, p. 253)

Population growth: From 1991 to 2010, the population decreased by -0.7%. This is an average annual change of -0.03%. In 1991, the population was 3,465,748 (Eurostat, n.d.); this decreased to 3,387,828 in 2004 before rebounding slightly.

Vacancy rates: Office vacancy (2011): 8.1% (Colliers Berlin GMBH, 2011, p. 8)

Context: Berlin

Berlin's unique history has made it a leader in the promotion of temporary uses. After the city's reunification in 1990, Berlin found itself with thousands of vacant properties. The formerly divided city now had two sets of most civic buildings and amenities. At the same time, new capitalist investment in the former East Berlin added to the city's stock of surplus buildings as there was often interest in building new rather than reusing old factories, office buildings, hospitals, and administrative buildings. This real-estate reinvestment was highly subsidized, but "was not accompanied by lasting economic power" (Eichstadt-Bohlig, 2007, p. 228) so even these new buildings were often vacated after several years. Buildings were sometimes abandoned as some people chose to leave East Berlin after being restricted from doing so for decades; spaces along the former Berlin Wall were also vacated. Overmeyer estimated in 2007 that there were 1,000 vacant sites within inner-city districts or on the city periphery totalling 170 hectares (Overmeyer, 2007, p.30). When larger industrial sites like the Tempelhof Airport (300 hectares) are included, the area can be up to 700 hectares (Blumner, 2006, p.12). Questions were raised about what to do with these usable, yet redundant, buildings and properties.

Initially after reunification, creative communities were attracted to Berlin by affordable accommodations and this has lead to the city's international reputation as a creative centre (Sudjic,

2007, p. 227). The history of these creative communities was closely tied to the concept of squatting. People wanted space for studios, for galleries, and for expressing their ideas. Sometimes it was impossible to find the legal owners of a property, other times perhaps little effort was made to do so.

Over the past two decades, temporary uses have become thoroughly integrated into Berlin's city planning culture. Gerend (2007), Overmeyer (2007), and Blumner (2007) all describe political and administrative systems that work together to encourage and support these uses.

Given the large number of properties to be managed, the city needed an organization to ensure redevelopment could take place effectively. Liegenschaftsfonds Berlin is the entity that "manages and markets all properties owned by the State of City of Berlin" (Overmeyer, 2007, p.181). As the owner of extensive property, the City of Berlin had the opportunity to set a precedent for how development proposals for vacant land were handled. The Berlin parliament, under tremendous pressure to address concerns over high vacancies, implemented a creative solution by ordering Liegenschaftsfond Berlin to accept more temporary use proposals for their properties available for sale or lease (Gerend, 2007, p.25). While not an approach that had been tested elsewhere, it seemed to build on small, localized successes already being experienced. This exemplifies Healey's view of creative governance in which the leadership "allows experimentation and understands that experiments fail as well as succeed" (Healey, 2004, p. 14).

Taking the innovative approach further, Overmeyer highlights how the Liegenschaftsfond "recently created a sub-section on its website specifically for temporary users" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 181). This is an example of the public sector becoming "more entrepreneurial, though within the bounds of accountability" (Landry, 2006, p. 2).

Benefits

Through this integrated approach to temporary uses, many of the benefits identified earlier become possible outcomes. In this case, one of the most explicit benefits was the increased attention planners were able to focus on a particular area of the city or a particular property, with the potential

of one project or a combination of projects becoming true catalysts for change.

Another benefit illustrated by Berlin's municipal strategy was the opportunity for more flexible and adaptable planning. In Marzahn-Hellersdorf, planners anticipated attracting a wide range of cultural uses to the area. The local interim use coordinator found, however, that community gardens, parks, and recreation sites were more successful in Marzahn-Hellersdorf than were cultural uses (Blumner, 2007, p. 14). Through discussions with residents and interim users, the coordinator found that "a plan for the naturalization of some of the area's larger sites might be most appropriate for the long-term use of these spaces" (Blumner, 2007, p. 14).

Challenges

Of the challenges identified in the literature, one that is seen as difficult to address is managing the risks associated with institutionalizing temporary uses through a municipal strategy. The perceived threat of institutionalization generally concerns the prioritization of economic or political interests over social or cultural ones. The City of Berlin's approach of focusing on interim uses as short-term projects appears to reduce this imbalance by removing some of the pressure of generating a sustainable profit. At the same time though, more controversial, complicated, or spontaneous projects may find it increasingly difficult to locate available space as the City administration becomes more involved in regulating, and also supporting, temporary and interim uses. In keeping with this increased municipal involvement, there may be disagreement between project initiators as to the benefit of this City "help"; some will appreciate the added support and the availability of templates and other documents while others will be turned off by the bureaucratic nature of the relationships.

Planner's role

Through this initiative, planners also began taking a more active role in promoting and communicating the benefits of temporary use projects for all urban actors, including site users,

property owners, and the local community. Blumner documents a pilot project that integrated temporary use even more completely into the planning administration. From 2003-2005, one district in Berlin partnered with the Berlin Senate to host a pilot program that included the appointment of a municipal staff person to coordinate temporary and interim uses (Blumner, 2006, p. 13). This coordinator marketed open space in Marzahn-Hellersdorf under the slogan of "Land in Exchange for Ideas" (Blumner, 2006, p. 14). Due to the district's location on the edge of Berlin, rather than in the core, this pilot did not attract as many cultural uses to the area as had been anticipated; however, the coordinator was able to build relationships between community groups and individuals (Blumner, 2006, p. 14).

Overall Berlin's strategy has allowed planners to support, implement, and test a wide range of projects in a relatively short period of time. This has enabled them to apply temporary use projects as tactical tools to support and influence longer-term strategies for City districts.

3.2 Zagreb, Croatia

Population: 686,586 in 2011 ("Zagreb," 2011)

Population density: 4,232 people per km² in 2011 ("Zagreb," 2011)

Population growth: From 1991 to 2011, the population decreased by -2.9%. This is an average annual change of -0.1%. In 1991, the population was 706,770 in 1991 (Bašić, 2004, p. 56).

Vacancy rates: Office vacancy (2011): 9% (Colliers International Croatia, 2011, p. 6)

Shopping centre vacancy (2011): 25% (Colliers International Croatia, 2011, p. 8)

Context: Zagreb

Zagreb shares some similarities with Berlin in that the city underwent (and is arguably still undergoing) a major shift beginning in the 1990s. Sić, in the article "Spatial and functional changes in recent urban development of Zagreb," refers to the period from the 1990s onward as the "transition period" (2007, p. 6), during which the region is shifting to a new political and economic system.

In this context of urban change, some sites and buildings have become vacant and fallen out of the public's awareness. In response to this challenge, the Croatian architecture and media collective Platforma 9,81 developed the Nevidlijivi Zagreb (Invisible Zagreb) project, a database and map of sites that have been overlooked for redevelopment.

The database and mapping project was initiated in 2003, and by mid-2005, there were 40 sites on the map. The idea is to provide as much information as possible about each site in an interactive database where users can find architectural layouts, photographs, and some historical background on each site, enabling "potential users to get more detailed description of the sites, to get a better view of their condition, capacity and possibilities of organizing different types of events on each location" (Mesaric, 2005). While this project officially ended in 2005, other initiatives have sprung from it, building on its objectives, including Operajica:grad (Operation: City) beginning in

2005 (Lab for culture.org, n.d.) and Zagreb – Cultural Kapital of Europe 3000 (relations e.V., n.d.) which ran in conjunction with Invisible Zagreb.

Benefits

Different authors emphasize different aspects of the project. To Haydn and Temel, the aim was "to investigate the city on an extensive scale, to categorise the spaces and, at the end of the project, make them usable for future architectural projects" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 203). The uses encouraged through the database are described generally by Haydn and Temel as "temporary cultural uses to support urban development" (Haydn & Temel, 2006, p. 202). Cumberlidge and Musgrave focus on the "alternative methodology for planning" that this project invited: "In the post-transitional context of rapid privatization and deregulation, it has created a simple strategy to influence the actual, real use of urban space and buildings, the political agenda and the engagement of the wider public with issues of urban space and buildings, without an overtly 'educational' or 'activist' framework" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 162).

On a large scale, the project highlights the opportunities of an adaptable and flexible approach to urban planning as it "continues to influence the formation of policy and practice in the city... The project investigates the possibilities of informal urban and cultural strategies that can inhabit these spaces with temporary public activity and serve as a strategic delay before the ultimate changes take place" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 162).

Nevidlijivi Zagreb and the individual projects it has supported have had several benefits. It has served as a participation and communication tool; it has been a catalyst for a change in the way residents view their city; it has promoted and allowed for the creative adaptive reuse of some potentially hard to reuse sites; and it has offered opportunities to both property owners and site users.

Nevidlijivi Zagreb was conceived as a "bottom-up strategy" to engage citizens in the discussion about public space and the "right to the city" that was playing itself out in the physical

development of Zagreb. The project used "different ways of influencing the public" to encourage discussion about "the involvement of citizens in public life" (Platforma 9,81, n.d.). Ultimately, the media coverage of the project enabled a "city-wide debate about the future of these spaces" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 164). This "new type of urban practice in which the process of urban transformation is navigated instead of planned using the methods of reprogramming, temporary taking over, initiating events shows that it is possible to re-think and use the city in the creative way" (Platforma 9,81, n.d.). The events themselves "involved public directly" in the process of investigating the feasibility of potential new functions for different spaces (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 164).

Encouraged by this support for citizen involvement a change has developed in the way residents view their city. In their book, Cumberlidge and Musgrave discuss Nevidlijivi Zagreb under the heading of "Identity" (2007, p. 162). This is a testament to the way in which the project has inspired residents to re-imagine the identity of their city as a creative and cultural capital. To them, "Identity can and should be the basis for long-term, successful place-making, a process that nurtures local distinctiveness, pride in place, a culture open to change while respecting continuity with the past" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 144). Until this point, Zagreb had experienced a lack of "leadership in planning, and massive growth of private development without an infrastructural or public programme to support this" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 162). What Nevidlijivi Zagreb recognized and worked to prevent was the risk of losing or taking for granted what already existed in the city. As Cumberlidge and Musgrave explain:

> Mapping is the starting point of characterization – a process of understanding, charting what is there, and developing tools to record and visualize that information. Conventional characterization makes implicit value judgments about the quality of the landscape or built environments, omitting the ordinary or the 'unimportant.' (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 144)

Platforma 9,81 saw this type of judgement being made in Zagreb; formerly vibrant and well-used spaces were being overlooked in the new development paradigm, leading to a potential disconnection of identity. Cumberlidge and Musgrave warn against this, writing: "In considering

identity within planning there is a need to recognize and understand existing identities and also to consider how to support developing identities" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 145).

As highlighted by Haydn and Temel, the database prepared as an essential component of the project enabled categorization of challenging spaces in support of long-term urban development. The potential for structures to be reused was "revealed and the placing of this information in the public domain encouraged other groups to make use of the spaces, with technical assistance from the Invisible Zagreb team" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 164).

Challenges

One of the challenges of this project is that, as it has not been absorbed into the municipal administration, it risks being discontinued should Platforma 9,81 cease to exist or move on to other projects. The project was initiated under the banner of the "Cultural Capital" program. This can be an effective way to make change happen quickly, but unless major benefits materialise immediately, the project does not get picked up as a "serious" urban planning and development tool. Bureaucracy has its own challenges but can provide stability and continuity. This is an opportunity for the municipal planning department to build on, as Landry would describe it, some "imaginative problem-solving applied to public good objectives" (Landry, 2006, p. 2). The department's inaction could indicate a lack of creative governance; by not becoming more actively engaged in this project it has left all the risk, and long-term responsibility, with Platforma 9,81. Unless this can be developed into a viable business it is unlikely that Platforma 9,81 will sustain the project indefinitely.

Planner's role

The group's intentions were political from the start: Damir Blazevic, co-founder of the group, stresses that "Members of Platforma 9,81 were not brought together by their designer preferences or similar architectural discourse. The collective was founded for clearly political reasons in a specific context" (Blazevic as cited in Hötzl, 2004). The group saw their roles as architects and

designers changing: "As public institutions weaken and state control is increasingly transferred to private interests, architects are called on to influence urban policy as advocates of the public domain. We believe that architecture practiced as pure discipline cannot respond to these new social dynamics" (Blazevic as cited in Hötzl, 2004).

The project development process enabled relationships to be formed "between the professions, the political, public and private sectors, and the general public, and the collaboration of these partners became the opportunity to develop new urban strategies" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 164). Serving as a type of "matchmaker" between people with unused space and people looking for space to use, the project has had benefits for both property owners and site users.

Nevidlijivi Zagreb has used "action research to explore the possibility of harnessing 'marginal' or ambiguous activities as a way of generating more long-term plans for public and social spaces that can become accepted parts of an official urban plan" (Cumberlidge & Musgrave, 2007, p. 164). Perhaps the success of this project has been more subtle. Has it changed the city enough that it has become part of its identity, a new way of doing things? Or was it viewed as an "art piece" that was only a temporary diversion?

3.3 Portland, USA

Population: 583,776 in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011)

Population density: 1,655 people per km² in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011)

Population growth: From 1990 to 2010, the population increased by 33.5%. This is an average annual change of 1.7%. In 1990, the population was 437,319 in 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1991). This has been a fairly steady increase, though the largest jump took place through the 1990's as the population increased by 21.0% to reach 529,121 in 20001 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

Vacancy rates: Office vacancy (2011): 11.9% (Colliers International Portland, 2011, p. 3)

Context

Portland is widely recognized as a North American city that adopts innovative solutions to urban design and development challenges; a case in point is its renowned urban growth boundary. The City's dedication to maintaining its growth boundary has led to strategic planning around land use and housing in all areas of the city. Tax increment financing and a large steering committee were some of the approaches used to ensure the success of a high density urban neighbourhood in the city's Pearl District (Portland Development Commission, 2001, p. 9). The District is now "the model for urban neighborhoods throughout North America" (Winslow, n.d.), recognized for its strong urban design and vibrant atmosphere achieved through a mix of warehouse conversions and new construction infill. One might assume that its success could be emulated in other districts throughout the city. The question might be do those districts wish to emulate the Pearl District? One nearby district in Portland is clear that it does not.

While the Central Eastside Industrial District (CEID) shares some physical characteristics with the Pearl District, such as turn-of-the-century warehouses and a mix of uses, and was designated as an urban renewal district by the Portland Development Commission in 1986 (Stout 2003), the Central Eastside Industrial Council, a volunteer-run organization representing local business and

property owners, is committed to ensuring the CEID does not "turn into another Pearl District" (Stout 2003). In fact, the District has been identified as an "industrial sanctuary" in Portland's comprehensive plan, a designation that limits most uses aside from industrial ones. But where to go from here? The CEID is a district that "needs to figure out what it wants to be" (Dann, Meier, Rice, & Somerfield, 2009, p. 20). Enter a focus on temporary uses as an approach to uncovering that vision.

This is the approach recently tested by the Central Eastside Industrial Council in partnership with a team of graduate students from Portland State University. The students played "matchmaker" between property owners in the Central Eastside Industrial District and potential users looking for space. While the District is described as "steadily growing" and continuing to attract and retain business (Dann et al., 2009, p. 41), there are still some vacancies which tend to take the following forms: "large parcels of empty land awaiting a positive climate for redevelopment...; small pockets of underutilized indoor space...; and temporarily vacant storefronts" (Dann et al., 2009, p. 41). From among these vacancies, twelve potential sites in the District and thirteen proposed projects were identified as test cases to be facilitated through the process of implementing temporary uses. Some of the proposed projects included office space for a non-profit organization, a bike skills park, and a circus camp (Dann et al., 2009, p. 15).

From this experience, opportunities and barriers were identified. Among the opportunities, support for the limited number of temporary use projects already taking place and the potential for increased networking opportunities when working on temporary use projects were identified. Lack of clarity regarding the long-term vision for the District was identified as both an opportunity and a threat; this could be an opportunity for temporary use projects to lead the way in testing and solidifying a vision, or an increase in the number of projects could lead to further confusion and lack of cohesion. The relationship between the CEIC and the City was also identified as an area of tension. Working together on small projects could lead to increased understanding and better relationships; however, some businesses were uncertain about the City's future intentions for the

District. Some barriers identified included a lack of connections between property owners and potential users, communication challenges between these two groups once initial connections have been made, the additional public scrutiny to which publicly-owned land is subject, bureaucratic red tape (real and imagined), and the capacity for property owners, potential users, local government and organizations to carry out projects (Dann et al., 2009, p. iv).

Ultimately, the following seven recommendations are documented in the report by Dann et al. entitled "No vacancy: Exploring temporary use of empty spaces in the Central Eastside Industrial District":

1. Improve Sources of Information and Education
2. Improve Connections between Potential Users and Property Owners
3. Encourage Interim Use of Publicly Owned Land that is Vacant, Anticipating
4. Redevelopment, and/or Disused
5. Demonstrate the Benefit of Temporary Use of Vacant Spaces in the CEID
6. Increase Access to Liability Insurance for Temporary Projects
7. Remove Costly Regulatory Barriers to Interim Use of Vacant Space
8. Reduce Financial Barriers to Temporary Use by Non-Profits
   (Dann et al., 2009, p. v)

Benefits

This project aimed to take advantage of all the benefits identified for temporary uses, but ultimately its primary benefit was likely as a communication tool and a method for promoting participation in discussion surrounding the future of the Central Eastside Industrial District. The process focused on bringing stakeholders together and on discussions surrounding opportunities for temporary use. This encouraged discussion around various stakeholders' vision for the future of the District and developing a response to the initial challenge raised by a local real estate professional of determining what the District "wants to be" (Dann et al., 2009, p. 20).

Challenges

In working on bringing various actors together for this project, "tensions, conflicts, and

points of disagreement about what the CEID's identity should be" were uncovered (Dann et al., 2009, p. 20). Additionally, the CEIC's relationship with the City was another source of tension as some participants were uncertain about the City's intentions for the area. A third relationship that was a source of tension was that between property owners and space users. Dann et al. found that "Successful brokering between temporary spaces and space users is about more than just providing information; it's about building relationships and bridging different social worlds by being a liaison, a translator, and negotiator between parties" (2009, p. 23). While they approached each of these relationships and conflicts from an optimistic perspective, highlighting the importance and benefits of clear communication, it is likely that some tension will remain. Determining a vision for the area will go a long way to clarifying how actors can best work together in an agonistic relationship.

Planner's role

An interesting aspect of this project is the focus on a small area of the city and the targeted partnership with the local business representatives rather than with municipal officials. While municipal officials can mandate legislation, business and property owners are those who must take advantage of these opportunities and overcome barriers. Also, while the municipal government is often ultimately responsible for outlining a vision and strategies to achieve it, local business organizations often carry considerable influence in setting the direction for a smaller district. The model of Business Improvement Zones and other business-led organizations is an American invention (Tait & Jensen, 2007, p. 120). Perhaps this could be considered "part of the wider transformation of liberalization and 'third way' politics expressing a synthesis between social democratic interventionism and neo-liberal market ideas" (Jensen, 2004, p. 16).

It may also be easier for private property owners to take the perceived risks associated with temporary use because, as Dann et al. point out, there can be "different expectations for public properties than for private properties. People expect to have input into the uses of public properties, so agencies must conduct public review of proposed projects" (2009, p. 23). They found that "For

publicly owned properties, the need to conduct significant amounts of education and outreach about activities happening on the sites poses a public relations challenge and a burden on staff work loads" (Dann et al., 2009, p. 23). Ideally, all property owners would want to do "the right thing" for the surrounding area by contributing to neighbourhood vitality, but this is not always the case and sometimes is not feasible. This is where there is a clear role for local government to become involved with a combination of rewards and negative reinforcement for participation.

This project is important because it demonstrates both need and demand in a local area and how these two sides can be brought together to mutual benefit while also benefitting the District as a whole by increasing vitality and contributing to a negotiated vision for the future.

3.4 Edmonton, Canada

Population: 730,372 in 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2007)

Population density: 1,067 people per km² in 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2007)

Population growth: From 1991 to 2006, the population increased by 18.4%. This is an average annual change of 1.2%. In 1991, the population was 616,741 (Statistics Canada, 1997). The population increased continuously over this period, reaching 666,104 in 2001 (Statistics Canada, 2007).

Vacancy rates: Office vacancy (overall): 10.74% (Colliers International, 2010a, p. 1)

Office vacancy (downtown): 6.5% (Avison Young, 2010, p. 12)

Context: Edmonton

Some types of property can be harder to redevelop than others. One of the more challenging property types is former gas stations. These sites are often contaminated and there are therefore large costs associated with their remediation and redevelopment.

In Edmonton, the City's Contaminated Gas Stations Task Force, a committee of council supported by an administrative team, has been working for the past two years to develop an approach for redeveloping properties that were previously gas stations. This work is in line with "Council's Strategic Goal of preserving and sustaining Edmonton's environment" as outlined in *Contaminated Gas Stations Task Force Work Program - Discussion Paper Draft 3: Barriers and Resolutions* (City of Edmonton, 2010a, p. 1), but also helps the City reach additional goals. A discussion paper entitled *Contaminated Gas Stations Task Force Revised Strategy* presented to the Task Force in July 2010 identifies three specific benefits to the City of Edmonton from the successful redevelopment of previously contaminated sites:

- Social Benefits: returns underutilized land to productive use and assists in revitalizing communities.
- Economic Benefits: denser communities and more compact land use is more economically efficient. Redevelopment or repurposing underutilized sites could increase land values and municipal property tax revenue.

- Environmental Benefits: human health must be protected from the dangers posed by contaminated sites through vapor penetration into basements, ingestion of contaminated soils or through direct contact with contaminants. Adverse impacts on groundwater, aquatic environments and degradation of utility lines must be eliminated. (City of Edmonton, 2010b, p. 4)

Experience has shown that there are many barriers to the redevelopment of former gas stations and it has been unclear what the City's role should be in these situations. The City conducted research to identify some of the reasons that property owners may be unwilling to redevelop, remediate, or sell their properties. Among the reasons identified were several cost-related issues, including the value of the land relative to the cost of remediation, financing challenges, and limitations on government support options (City of Edmonton, 2011a, p. 1).

Benefits

In the opinion of the writers of the discussion paper, interim uses rank highly among the possible solutions: "Prevalent among the potential resolutions is the need for Interim Land Uses. Where long term remediation is unavoidable, interim uses have been employed with great variety more often within Edmonton and in countless other jurisdictions. The result is the recycling of land at a staged rate using exposure control and risk management strategies" (City of Edmonton, 2010a, p. 4). Interim uses are seen as a tool to accelerate the reuse of land while having the "the potential to improve neighbourhoods visually, economically and creatively through the use of exposure control and risk management in partnering with owners, the arts community and entrepreneurs" (City of Edmonton, 2010a, p. 4).

Challenges

The discussion paper also identifies a list of barriers and challenges to an interim use strategy, including:

> zoning restrictions, development permit considerations, limiting liability, resource constraints, community engagement and desire, vandalism, administrative requirements of utility companies, stigma associated with existing interim landuses

> (e.g. parking lots) and lack of successful examples in the Alberta context. In addition, there are several players that need to 'buy-in' and actively participate in the process for desirable interim land-uses to be successful on brownfield sites. (City of Edmonton, 2010a, pp. 47-48)

In a report published one year later, the Task Force reports that, after working with several property owners over the course of the year, the initial barriers have remained the same. Overall, however, the four main obstacles property owners struggle to overcome have proven to be providing environmental information, leasing agreements, zoning and development permit issues, and funding (City of Edmonton, 2011b, p. 1).

In response to these obstacles, the Task Force identifies potential solutions. To assist property owners with some of the legal aspects of interim uses, a "streamlined interim leasing agreement that addresses liability, duration, use and the roles of stakeholders" is suggested (City of Edmonton, 2011b, p. 2). They recognize that "This may require customizing of a base template for each scenario. Education of stakeholders of the boundaries of the agreement is critical to manage expectations and ensure adequate resources to meet potential expenses. As in part 1 [providing environmental information on current site status and activity], an appropriate level of information would be required in order for the City to mitigate risk" (City of Edmonton, 2011b, p. 2).

The Task Force identifies current zoning and permitting processes as an obstacle and recommends "Modifying the Zoning bylaw to include a range desirable interim uses" and "Creating permit exemptions for interim uses to simplify the process" (City of Edmonton, 2011b, p. 2). Currently options for allowable interim uses on these properties are quite limited. Owners are not willing to re-zone their properties solely to accommodate an interim use.

Improved financial incentives to encourage implementation of these uses may be required (City of Edmonton, 2010a, p. 33). The City's updated Brownfield Redevelopment Grant Program specifically states that the funds (up to $200,000) "can also be applied to the construction of infrastructure to support an innovative interim land-use that might be outlined in a detailed exposure control program or long-term remediation plan" (City of Edmonton, 2011c, p. 8). Other options presented for consideration in the Discussion Paper included tax cancellation, tax deferral, and

purchase of properties by the city (City of Edmonton, 2010a, pp. 18-22).

Planner's role

Based on these findings, the Task Force developed a number of potential resolutions and strategies. Among the solutions being considered by the City to help with the redevelopment of these challenging sites are facilitation of the process ("caseworker" approach), the strategic purchasing of properties by the City, density bonuses, shifts in land taxation, adjustments to the current brownfield grant program, and increased frequency of interim uses (City of Edmonton, 2010a, pp. 35-41).

The Task Force recognizes the opportunity for the city to participate in the development process at a variety of levels:

> A municipality could be everything from silent supporter to managing partner, depending on the way the strategy is developed and funded. If the City of Edmonton takes a more passive approach to interim use, it would still need to be an advocate as well as involved in the process through its issuance of development permits, business licenses and inspections just like they would be for many other types of commercial land-use. However, if the City becomes an active partner in the process, its involvement might expand to include site planning, partner engagement, administrative management, and funding through grants or tax abatements. (City of Edmonton, 2010a, p. 47)

Finally, a 2011 revision to the discussion paper concludes that "A municipality has the power to take a pro-active role in advancing interim land uses. By providing support to shepherd a land owner through the process of creating an interim project, the City of Edmonton can blend its own priorities with allocation of resources and partnership with property owners, community groups, artisans, entrepreneurs and other non-traditional business players" (City of Edmonton, 2011a, p. 6). This statement illustrates recognition of the role interim and temporary use projects can play in a long term strategy.

This is perhaps the clearest example of a city attempting to navigate an agonistic relationship. The City and the property owners have differing objectives, and likely disagree strongly with the other's position on certain points, but they can nonetheless work together towards a common goal of remediating and redeveloping former gas station sites.

If this program is successful, it will be a strong example of creative governance involving "the public sector being more entrepreneurial, though within the bounds of accountability, and the private sector being more aware of its responsibilities to the collective whole" (Landry, 2006, p. 2).

3.5 Summary

In the four precedents explored in this section, we see several different goals and approaches to implementing a strategy that encourages temporary and interim uses. Berlin and Zagreb are cities responding to change on a massive scale: physically, culturally, socially, economically, and politically. In Portland, temporary uses are being explored as a strategy to target a particular area of the city, and in Edmonton, interim uses are being considered to target specific property types.

Benefits

In Section 2.3, individual projects were described that illustrated potential benefits from temporary or interim uses. But are any of the following benefits still realized when a city implements a larger strategy encouraging temporary uses?

- Adaptable/flexible planning
- Adaptive reuse
- Catalyst for change
- Fill unmet needs
- Participation & communication tool
- Highlight creativity
- Encourage entrepreneurship
- Benefits for property owners
- Environmental sustainability

In all the examples above, there is evidence of an adaptive reuse of a space. Landry reminds us that "recycling older industrial buildings is now a cliché of urban regeneration, but does not make it less worthwhile" (Landry, 2008, p. 123). While it may be obvious, a basic requirement of a strategy of temporary uses is available vacant space. Therefore, cities undergoing, or having undergone, a major transition in economy may be more likely to have a use for these policies.

In the cases of Berlin, Zagreb, and Portland, it is clear that the reuse of the space on a temporary basis has benefits for the property owner. This is a critical part of making these interim use projects work, and it is the aspect of their approach that Edmonton is struggling to resolve. Finding a balance between the outcomes a municipal government and a community want to see and the outcomes that matter to a property owner is essential to moving forward with a project.

Other benefits from the list above are realized more clearly through some strategies than

others. In Zagreb and Portland there is evidence of how a temporary use strategy can be part of a flexible planning process, one that seeks to develop a vision for a city or a district. In keeping with this, these strategies also illustrate the benefits of temporary use programs as a participation and communication tool.

None of these examples specifically target entrepreneurship; while there is evidence of incentives to property owners, these cities don't have specific programs associated with promoting entrepreneurs to use the spaces. Along with this, the policies don't appear to target filling unmet needs. Filling an unmet need is more likely to be the outcome of business plan research; however, governments could provide incentives to encourage temporary uses that fill identified needs.

None of the examples clearly illustrates a temporary use strategy as a catalyst for change. Perhaps this is more of a broad, vision-related proposition. It would be difficult to prove that these strategies are or are not catalysts in their areas. Certainly drawing attention to an area and to interesting projects taking place is only likely to attract more attention and therefore one could argue that these strategies will be catalysts for change.

Challenges

Whether these precedents contribute to or fall victim to any of the challenges described in Section 2.4, and listed below, is more difficult to assess.

- Risk of institutionalization
- Anarchy & lack of vision and stability
- Short-term investment:
- Prioritization of economic development
- Gentrification
- Ownership of space & legal complications
- Idealization of or bias against temporary use

In Berlin some critics have suggested that "exploiting the possibilities [of empty spaces] through temporary appropriations, either through cultural or economic strategies, is a tool of neoliberal urban transformation. In that sense, the appropriation of urban voids seems a function of the market" (Tan, 2008, p. 136). Taking this one step further, Tan, inspired by the work of Neil

Smith, writes, "As with the neoliberal urban strategies based on spatial investments (in collaboration with state policy), the outcome is generally a state-led urban transformation and gentrification; the government intervenes as a consumer subjected to the rules of the market" (Tan, 2008, p. 136). But to present this as a critique of temporary use strategies, as opposed to any other strategy, might be misleading. If a strategy is successful, reinvestment takes place and, unless some other strategy is in place to counter it, gentrification is a likely outcome.

Because the Central Eastside Industrial District project in Portland and the Nevidlijivi Zagreb project are interested in the process of developing a longer-term vision for their areas, it could be argued that at present there is a lack of vision and stability. A focus on temporary use projects could be perceived as leading to a sense of anarchy in the short term at least.

All the precedents researched seem to be keenly aware of the need to clarify ownership of space and to assist in minimizing legal complications when endorsing or supporting a project.

Planner's role

All precedents researched show recognition for how challenging it can be for users to implement one-off projects, especially on a short-term basis. They all demonstrate an effort to facilitate and/or streamline the process for both property owners and site users. In Portland and Zagreb, this is being done through a "match-making" process and through sharing information. In Berlin, a dedicated civil servant is assigned to assist with temporary use projects. In Edmonton, a "case-worker" approach is being considered; this would be similar to the approach in Berlin, but would likely target particular properties to assist with. In all cases, a variety of templates are being developed to help property owners and site users navigate the steps involved in realizing a project.

Local planners can learn from these experiences. In each example, planners play a slightly different role. In Berlin, planners are facilitators, mediators, and promoters. In Zagreb and Portland, municipal planners do not currently play an active role in these projects, but might be considered part of a communication network. If the projects in their current format were incorporated into the

municipal government, local planners would find themselves playing the role of facilitator, promoter, and networker. In Edmonton, it appears planners will be taking on the role of negotiator, negotiating interim uses with property owners as part of longer term site remediation plans. They will also be facilitators of the process, if a "case-worker" approach is adopted. In each case it is inevitable that planners will also be required to be enforcers. Though none of these precedents present strategies that demand temporary or interim uses of sites, the planning department is ultimately responsible for ensuring that projects meet zoning regulations and have the required permits.

Part 4: Winnipeg
4.1 Context: Winnipeg
4.2 Existing policies and their implications for temporary uses
4.3 Organizations Supporting Downtown Development
4.4 Critique of current approach
4.5 Recommendations

Part 4: Winnipeg

As noted in the introduction to this work, urban development trends in Winnipeg are a source of frustration, hope, and curiosity for me. While it seems that I see more and more properties boarded up or going unused in the downtown, I regularly see and hear about people and groups making flexible use of underappreciated spaces. These creative solutions, interventions, and partnerships developed around making ideas work provide hope for a sustainable downtown future. Finally, when I see these projects, in Winnipeg and elsewhere, I wonder what the barriers are to making them happen here and how we can encourage even more such projects.

In this part, some responses to the third research question identified in Part 1, "How can Winnipeg's policies surrounding temporary uses be modified to support and encourage a wider range of interventions?" will be put forward. This will begin with a general description of urban development trends in Winnipeg and the identification of existing policies and by-laws relating to temporary use. The City's current approach will be critiqued, incorporating findings from the literature review, precedent studies, and discussions with local stakeholders. Based on this critique, improvements will be suggested in the form of eight recommendations to City officials.

4.1 Context: Winnipeg

Population: 633,451 (Statistics Canada, 2007)

Population density: 1,365 people per km² (Statistics Canada, 2007)

4,283 people per km² downtown density (City of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada, 2006b, p. 2)

Population growth: From 1991 to 2006, the population increased by 2.9%. This is an average annual change of 0.5%. In 1991, the population was 615,215 (City of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada, 2006a, p. 2).

Vacancy rates: office vacancy – overall (2010): 6.45% (Colliers International, 2010b, p. 1)

office vacancy – downtown (2010): 6.2% (Avison Young, 2011, p. 8)

Winnipeg is the most populous urban region in Manitoba with a population of 633,451 (Statistics Canada, 2007). Over the past thirty years, Winnipeg's population has been increasing slowly. The population increased from 535,100 in 1971 to 633,451 in 2006 (City of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada, 2006a, p. 2) - an annual average change of 0.74% - making Winnipeg a slow-growth city, described by Leo and Anderson as a city with a growth rate of less than .96 of 1% per year (Leo & Anderson, 2006, p. 170). In the few years, however, the city's population has been increasing more rapidly. In the year 2009, the population increased by 9,200 people, or a change of 1.38% over the previous year (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 7). According to the Conference Board of Canada, the city's population is expected to increase to 849,000 by the year 2031 (Conference Board of Canada as cited in City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 7). This would represent an annual average change of 1.36%.

Should this estimate be correct, Winnipeg's annual average population change would be similar to the 1.2% annual average change experienced in Edmonton over the past twenty years. Portland's population has been increasing the most quickly of the precedents researched, at an average of 1.7% each year. In contrast, Berlin's population has decreased over the past twenty years, an average change of 0.7% each year. Zagreb's population has also decreased, even more

significantly, with an average change of 2.9% each year.

The population increase projected by the Conference Board of Canada would be a similar increase in population to the period from 1950 to 1976, when 180,000 more people made the city their home (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 16)[1]. Over that period, development patterns were such that the city's population is widely-dispersed, with civic infrastructure stretched to support it. Some writers have criticized Winnipeg's development pattern:

> The word 'decline' springs to mind when Winnipeg is mentioned, not because of anything to do with either economic or population growth but because of a proliferation of empty storefronts and decaying houses in a number of downtown districts, a profusion of potholes, and a sewer system so badly deteriorated that sinkholes open up in the streets and swallow automobiles and construction equipment. A good share of this deterioration stems from the willingness, indeed the determination, to spread the city so thinly as to deplete the resources available for the maintenance of existing infrastructure and services. (Leo & Anderson, 2006, p. 183)

This development pattern has led to a city with a population density of 1,365 people per km^2 (Statistics Canada, 2007). Two of the precedent study cities have similar densities: Portland has a city density of 1,655 people per km^2 and Edmonton's density is 1,067 people per km^2. Berlin is more densely populated at 3,810 people per km^2 (Urban Age Project, 2007, p. 253) and Zagreb is denser still at 4,232 people per km^2.

The City of Winnipeg considers its downtown to be the area "defined by specific boundaries including the Red River to the east, the Assiniboine River to the south, the Legislative Building, Central Park, Exchange District, and Chinatown to the west, and the CPR main-line at Higgins to the north"[2] (City of Winnipeg, 2000, p. 66). This represents a large area, covering approximately 3.2 km^2 (Centre Venture, 1999, p. 6). Within this downtown area, there is a residential population of 13,470 (City of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada, 2006b, p. 2), giving it a density of 4,283 people per km^2 (City

[1] Given the smaller initial population, however, the average annual population change was larger, at 1.89% (City of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada, 2006a, p. 2). From 1950 to 1976 Winnipeg's population size increased by 47.3%, whereas from 2009 to 2031 the overall population is expected to increase in size by 25.8% (City of Winnipeg, 2001, p. 7).

[2] This description comes from *Plan Winnipeg 2020*. This by-law has recently been replaced by *OurWinnipeg* as the Plan Winnipeg by-law required by the *City of Winnipeg Charter*. Because *OurWinnipeg* does not provide a geographical definition of downtown and because many of the City's other by-laws still refer to *Plan Winnipeg 2020*'s description of downtown, this will be the area used for this project as well.

of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada, 2006b, p. 2). Obtaining comparable data for small areas of different cities can be challenging, however, some general comparison can be made. Berlin has a peak density of 7,124 people per km² (Urban Age Project, 2007, p. 253), while downtown Edmonton is home to approximately 11,000 people in 160 hectares, or around 6,875 people per km² (City of Edmonton, 2010c, p. 13 & p. 6). Portland has one small census tract, an area of 0.3 km² that had a density of 10,135 people per km² (Population Research Center, 2011a, p. 83).

An interesting distinction between Winnipeg and the cities explored in the precedent studies is Winnipeg's physical isolation – the nearest city with a population over 100,000 is Regina, approximately 600km to the west, and the nearest city with a population over 1,000,000 is Minneapolis, roughly 700km to the southeast. Berlin, Zagreb, Portland, and Edmonton are all significantly closer to other large cities like Frankfurt, Munich, Vancouver, and Calgary. At the same time, Winnipeg does not have as populous a metro area as the other cities. While Winnipeg's metro population is just over 750,000 people (Statistics Canada, 2011), both Edmonton and Zagreb have metro populations of just over one million people each (Statistics Canada, 2011; "Zagreb," 2011), while Portland's metro is just over 2.25 million (Population Research Center, 2011b, p. 8) and Berlin's is just over four million (Urban Age Project, 2007, p. 224). Some see Winnipeg's relative physical isolation as a factor contributing to the city's vibrant arts scene - an exaggeration according to local artist Ed Janzen, but still a commonly held view (Janzen, 2010).

Winnipeg has a lower proportion of vacant office space than the other cities studied. While Winnipeg's office vacancy rate is 6.45%, Portland's rate is 11.9%. Berlin, Zagreb, and Edmonton's rates fall between these two extremes. Because of a lack of new building projects, Winnipeg is second only to Regina in having the lowest overall office vacancy rate among a dozen major Canadian cities (Avison Young, 2011, p. 8). Winnipeg and Edmonton experience similar office vacancy rates within their downtown cores, at 6.2% and 6.5% respectively. Overall retail vacancy rate in Winnipeg is 1.9% (Avison Young, 2011, p. 7), though cityplace, a two-level, 114,000 sq.ft. shopping centre in downtown Winnipeg, is "suffering from an 18% vacancy rate" (MJB Consulting, 2009, p.

104). This is similar to the experience of shopping centres in Zagreb, where vacancy rates stand at 25%.

The positive picture painted by Winnipeg's low vacancy rates is contrasted with an emptiness of another sort – an abundance of surface parking lots. A local newspaper, the Winnipeg Free Press undertook an analysis of surface parking lots in downtown Winnipeg and found they cover an area of 0.22 km^2 (Welch, 2010), or approximately 8.8% of downtown Winnipeg's surface area. If the area taken up by streets and sidewalks was excluded from the calculation, this percentage would likely be significantly higher.

4.2 Existing policies and their implications for temporary uses

Several by-laws and policies shape development in Winnipeg. In addition to the *OurWinnipeg* by-law, Winnipeg's 25-year plan guiding development in the city, the City has several other by-laws to which all development must conform. By-laws that affect temporary use projects include zoning by-laws, secondary plans, the building code, policies relating to vacant and derelict buildings, and special events permits. Some of these by-laws are supportive of temporary uses while others are, either intentionally or unintentionally, obstacles to temporary use projects. In the following section, relevant sections of each policy will be described and the policy's relationship to temporary uses discussed.

OurWinnipeg

Development in Winnipeg is guided by a long-term plan, required by the Province of Manitoba as a condition of the *City of Winnipeg Charter Ac*t in which it devolves some of its powers to the City. This plan becomes a by-law of the City of Winnipeg and must be reviewed 5 years after each replacement or re-adoption. The plan must set out "(a) the city's long-term plans and policies respecting (i) its purposes, (ii) its physical, social, environmental and economic objectives, and (iii) sustainable land uses and development..." (Province of Manitoba, 2002, section 224).

The City adopted the *OurWinnipeg* document as by-law in July 2011 and this becomes the City's new 25-year plan. It replaces *Plan Winnipeg 2020*, a document still referred to in some City by-laws.

The focus on long-range planning in a document like *OurWinnipeg* might at first glance appear to have little in common with temporary uses. However, if temporary uses are viewed as tactical tools to be used in working towards longer-term strategies, the potentially beneficial relationship between temporary uses and long-term strategies becomes clearer.

The vision statement put forward for the next 25 years is: "OurWinnipeg: living and caring because we plan on staying" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 20). The document lays out directions and enabling strategies in several focus areas to provide guidance for future development in Winnipeg.

A key priority of the *OurWinnipeg* plan is to sustainably accommodate growth in downtown Winnipeg while creating a "complete community"[3]: "As it accommodates future growth, Downtown offers one of the best opportunities to create complete, mixed-use, higher-density communities in a way that promotes sustainable practices. Downtown intensification and redevelopment makes efficient use of land and makes the best use of existing infrastructure" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 34). Temporary uses fit with this vision of downtown by promoting the use of existing, under-utilized infrastructure thus leading to densification. In the Exchange District area of downtown especially, temporary uses of heritage buildings could contribute to the conservation of heritage assets and to overall sustainability objectives, like waste minimization, through the reuse of buildings that might otherwise be left to demolition by neglect. Two buildings on the northwest corner of Rorie Street and McDermot Avenue have had street-level vacancies for several years. Temporary projects like pop-up shops or cafes may return these buildings to people's mental maps of the area after having been forgotten about for years.

OurWinnipeg identifies the need to "capitalize upon Downtown's strategic advantages" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 35). A strategy that encourages temporary uses offers the rare opportunity to turn vacant space, usually viewed negatively into a valuable asset. Currently, "Vacancy is equated with blight and this undermines the vitality of the city. Short-term uses for vacant properties... can reposition vacancy as a community asset" (Schwarz, 2009, p. 51). As was found in Cleveland with the Pop Up City project, temporary use projects can promote the idea of vacant land as "a great luxury, one that expands the practice of urban design beyond form-making to include the ever-changing dimensions of space, time, and lived experience" (Schwarz, 2009, p. 50).

The strategic advantage offered by temporary uses applies to the economy and the city's image as well as to urban design. Temporary and interim uses sometimes develop to complement existing permanent uses, and if these temporary projects are successful, they are often developed into

[3] Complete communities are defined as "places that both offer and support a variety of lifestyle choices, providing opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to live, work, shop, learn and play in close proximity to one another" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 33).

permanent uses either in their existing locations or elsewhere. By supporting this type of experimentation, temporary uses encourage entrepreneurship along with the economic development and employment growth *OurWinnipeg* wishes to advance (City of Winnipeg, 2011, pp. 48-53). *OurWinnipeg* advocates "focused district, destination and cluster approach to Downtown development" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 34). As temporary uses tend to develop in clusters, a strategy that encourages these uses may enhance the development of local identity for particular areas of downtown (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 35). For example, the West Exchange District is well-known as a hub for visual artists in Winnipeg, but the Winnipeg Folk Exchange, Manitoba Music's offices, and several concert venues are also located here. Perhaps these could develop into a hub for musical artists as well, supported by temporary uses like additional concert and practice space.

Temporary uses can contribute to both the image and reality of a "thriving and vibrant Downtown" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 50). Temporary and interim use projects tend to be "people-oriented" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 34) uses that attract attention, interest, and investment to an area (Blumner, 2006, p. 8) and activate underused spaces. This local image and identity can grow to represent Winnipeg's downtown at a national or global level. Because a strategy supporting interim and temporary use projects would be fairly uncommon world-wide, it presents a valuable promotion and marketing opportunity. Such promotion would present the type of welcoming image to the creative industries and to entrepreneurs that *OurWinnipeg* wants to foster (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 50).

Another element that contributes to a sense of vibrancy in a city is creativity. *OurWinnipeg* puts forward that "Winnipeg is a city of the arts. We are a city that expresses itself through arts, culture and creativity" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 83). The directions and strategies proposed to support and sustain these statements focus primarily on artistic and cultural creativity. Temporary uses were identified in the literature review and supporting examples as venues to highlight creativity. Temporary projects can passively promote creative work, for example through window displays, or

they can actively engage citizens, as in the De Strip project in the Netherlands where artists opened their studios to the public.

While *OurWinnipeg* does not explicitly make a commitment to the creative governance or civic creativity models described by Healey and Landry, there are hints that currently popular philosophies like Landry's "creative cities" may be having an influence. The words *creative* and *creativity*, used numerous times referring to arts and culture and "creative industries," are also used twice in relation to approaches to civic challenges: once in arguing for "creative and complete solutions" to address crime (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 15) and once describing "land supply challenges that need to be resolved creatively" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 16). The word *innovative* is used four times in the document; once in relation to a strategy used in the past (the introduction of constructed wetlands to manage runoff), twice in relation to efficiency in civic administration, and once in relation to communication approaches.

In addition to thinking about creativity as it relates to artistic, cultural, and entrepreneurial pursuits, creativity can be considered in the context of urban design as well as governance and planning. A strategy supporting temporary and interim uses can be an approach to optimizing city resources that expands the concept of "creativity" in the city.

Relating to governance and planning, *OurWinnipeg* focuses on ensuring inclusive communities where opportunities are available to all community members (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 73). Proponents argue that temporary uses are effective strategic tools for "those who do not participate in urban planning decisions" (Pogoreutz, 2006, p. 80). By actively engaging with temporary users and those who take part in them, Winnipeg may have an opportunity to connect with and support a wider diversity of its community members than it has in the past. The document identifies collaboration as a direction relating to economic planning as well: "Collaborate with all public, private and community economic development agencies to advance economic advantages" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 50). A specific strategy proposed in *OurWinnipeg* is "Ensure that the important and distinct roles of partnering agencies are united with a clear mission (City of Winnipeg,

2011, p. 50). Temporary and interim use projects can allow each partner agency to take incremental steps towards achieving a larger shared mission, either on their own or working with another agency. As an example, an arts organization might develop a temporary use project that highlights their members' work while activating a vacant street-level space. This would achieve the organization's goal of promoting their members' work while also working towards a community goal of increasing street-level activity. Alternatively, this same organization might partner with the local Business Improvement Zone to develop a project that meets the objectives of both organizations while also working towards a shared community vision.

Zoning by-laws

The *Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law,* last updated in 2004, governs zoning issues in downtown Winnipeg.

The *Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law* is intended to "advance *Plan Winnipeg* downtown policies and the vision articulated in *CentrePlan*; in particular to support and enhance the unique and distinctive neighbourhoods, functional districts, character areas, and focal points that combine to form a diverse, vibrant downtown" (City of Winnipeg, 2004a, section 100(2)). Presumably this reference to *Plan Winnipeg* will soon refer to *OurWinnipeg*.

In terms of its zoning, downtown Winnipeg is well-suited to a strategy promoting temporary uses. In the *Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law* most uses that one would imagine for a temporary or interim use are permitted, or at least conditional, uses. One challenge for some temporary use projects is the City's urban design review process. This requires that any "development, redevelopment, expansion, demolition, or exterior alteration visible from public rights-of-way or rivers" (City of Winnipeg, 2004a, section 250(1)) be reviewed and approved by the City's Urban Design Advisory Committee. This step could add up to forty-five days to the approval timeline for temporary projects that call for visible alterations to a structure.

Secondary plans

The *City of Winnipeg Zoning By-law* defines a secondary plan as "a plan providing such objectives and actions as Council considers necessary or advisable to address, in a neighbourhood, district, or area of the city, any matter within a sphere of authority of the City of Winnipeg, including, without limitation, any matter dealt with in Plan Winnipeg or pertaining to economic development or the enhancement or special protection of heritage resources or sensitive lands" (City of Winnipeg, 2006, p. 33). These plans provide an additional level of detail that can take into account local issues. Downtown Winnipeg as a whole does not have a secondary plan, but parts of downtown fall under existing secondary plans or are at various stages in the secondary planning process. Development within these areas must be compatible both with *OurWinnipeg* and the local secondary plan.

The only adopted secondary plan affecting downtown is the *West Alexander & Centennial Neighbourhood Plan*, adopted by the City of Winnipeg in 2008. The very western edge of downtown, a rectangular section bordered by Hargrave Street and Lizzie Street to the west and Princess Street to the east stretching from Notre Dame Avenue to Logan Avenue, is considered to be part of the West Alexander and Centennial neighbourhoods as well as a part of downtown. A secondary plan was developed for this area because of its unique situation as both an established residential neighbourhood and a centre of major medical institutions (City of Winnipeg, 2008, p. 3). An existing concern in the area that temporary uses would have to overcome is the perception that "Land uses are expanding in an ad hoc manner" (City of Winnipeg, 2008, p. 4). At the same time, temporary uses could provide support for the "lack of services" also identified as a challenge (City of Winnipeg, 2008, p. 4). Vacant buildings along Hargrave Street, designated a character commercial zone in the plan, could host pop-up shops. With some creative thinking, perhaps even a mobile bank could be developed as residents identified a bank as a missing service. Given its proximity to Red River College, temporary uses along this stretch of Hargrave Street could serve college students as well as local residents and those who work in the Exchange District.

The secondary planning process for the *Warehouse District Neighbourhood Plan* began in 2009. This plan would cover the northern area of downtown and will "consist of several 'precinct' areas, which include the Exchange District National Historic Site, Chinatown, the Waterfront Drive area, the Arts & Culture district area, the area immediately to the west of the Exchange District, and the Red River College – Civic Hall area" (City of Winnipeg, 2010a, p. 6). The intent of this plan is to "guide redevelopment and adaptive re-use within the Warehouse area, and to ensure new development is in keeping with the area's unique history, built form, and architectural character" (City of Winnipeg, 2010a, p. 6). To date a *Planning Assessment* has been undertaken, with specific attention to the Exchange District where an *Exchange District National Historic Site Streetscape Inventory* was conducted, and an *Exchange District National Historic Site of Canada Commemorative Integrity Statement* was developed for review by the Federal government (City of Winnipeg, 2010a, p. 6). As identified earlier, temporary uses could provide an approach to ensuring that buildings are kept in use and protected from demolition by neglect. Council has not yet approved any plan for this area.

An example of a location in the Warehouse District that could benefit from a temporary use project is the public parkade on Albert Street between Notre Dame Avenue and McDermot Avenue. This structure was designed to feature street-level retail activity with parking above. The scale and detailing of the building echo the character of the surrounding architecture. From the perspective of many planners this would appear to be an example of a "best practice." The challenge is that retail uses have struggled to survive in this location. Within a two-block radius of this site there are several art galleries at street-level, including Fleet Galleries and Warehouse Artworks in the same block, and a number of artists' studios in the buildings above. Providing studio spaces where artists could be seen producing their work, as was done in Chicago with the Open Studio, would highlight a key feature of the area while animating the street.

Design guidelines

Though not adopted as formal by-laws, the City has approved design guidelines both for

downtown and for specific districts within it.

The *Downtown Winnipeg Urban Design Guidelines* provide guidance for development proposals that will be subject to review by the Urban Design Advisory Committee as set out in the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law (City of Winnipeg, 2005, p. 1). The guidelines are suggested as a minimum standard and the aim is "to ensure the thoughtful integration of development proposals into their local context and consistency with the standards articulated in *Plan Winnipeg* and *CentrePlan*" (City of Winnipeg, 2005, p. 1). The guidelines and the review process focus on both architectural design and the relationship between urban design and the public realm. The guidelines identify several principles that projects should "recognize and celebrate" (City of Winnipeg, 2005, p. 3). Well thought out temporary use projects should have no trouble contributing to these principles, particularly recommendations like "Celebrate and build on the best features of the surrounding context" and "Animate the interface between interior and exterior space" (City of Winnipeg, 2005, p. 8). As identified earlier however, temporary use projects may find the design review process time-consuming.

The City has also prepared guidelines for development along Waterfront Drive in downtown Winnipeg. *Waterfront Drive: Expectations for New Development* is a statement of expectations that "describes the type and shape of development that the City of Winnipeg anticipates for the west side of Waterfront Drive, from Lombard Avenue to Higgins Avenue" (City of Winnipeg, 2004b, p. 2). The document sets out development criteria touching on aspects of the setting, the site, and the building. In this case, temporary uses are more likely to occupy newly developed buildings as interim uses as soon as buildings can be occupied and until permanent uses can be found. A developer who actively pursues temporary uses as part of the development plan may be able to "demonstrate a vertically integrated mix of uses contributing to day/evening, year-round activity (e.g. combinations of retail/restaurant/entertainment on main floor, with dwellings/office/retail above)" (City of Winnipeg, 2004b, p. 5) from the outset of the development's life.

Several of the condominium developments along Waterfront Drive were designed and built

to accommodate retail on the main floor. Many of these spaces have been for lease for several years. While there is perhaps not yet a large enough local population to support full-scale retail, people living along Waterfront Drive, and in the east Exchange District more generally, require local services like grocery stores that are not established in a neighbourhood that was until recently primarily commercial. Pop-up markets that use a space on a once per week basis could provide needed services while demonstrating how street-level activity can benefit a neighbourhood.

Temporary use projects could play another role in the development of this area: temporary users may arrange to occupy future building sites until development is ready to go ahead as was the case in the RAW-Tempel and NDSM Wharf examples presented in Part 2.

The aim of the *Pioneer & Waterfront Development Principles and Guidelines* document is "to establish a policy and design framework that will be utilized by the City and the FRC [Forks Renewal Corporation] as an important planning tool when evaluating and guiding future development proposals in this area" (City of Winnipeg & The Forks Renewal Corporation, 2004, p. 1). Both The Forks Renewal Corporation Board and by the City of Winnipeg's Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development endorsed this document. The area covered by these guidelines is "bound by the CNR High Line, which extends along the west and north boundary of the site, the banks of the Red River to the east and a line to the south, which stretches from the Esplanade Riel west to Union Station" (City of Winnipeg & The Forks Renewal Corporation, 2004, p. 3). The document establishes planning principles and public realm design guidelines to guide development for the area as a whole. Temporary uses can contribute to several of the planning principles including "Encourage intense street level activity," "Encourage a vibrant cultural atmosphere," and "Encourage public art" (City of Winnipeg & The Forks Renewal Corporation, 2004, p. 7). One of the principles might be seen as a challenging fit for temporary uses without further information to the public about their benefits within a larger strategy: "Reinforce the unique character already established within The Forks" (City of Winnipeg & The Forks Renewal Corporation, 2004, p. 6). Without a plan for the integration of temporary uses within the long-term vision for the site and without a public education

component, some temporary use projects might be viewed as the type of "architectural 'fads'" (City of Winnipeg & The Forks Renewal Corporation, 2004, p. 6) the guidelines are intended to restrict.

The *Pioneer & Waterfront Development Principles and Guidelines* also identifies five development opportunity sites. Opportunity Site 4, situated along the Red River on the northeast corner of Waterfront Drive and Pioneer Avenue, acts as a gateway to downtown from St. Boniface. When across the river in St. Boniface, the view is impressive: the Esplannade Riel, the Forks National Historic Site, and the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, with the Winnipeg skyline in the background. When one crosses the river, they first reach the intersection of Waterfront Drive and Pioneer Avenue. This is a key entrance point to downtown, and it is a missed opportunity that the corner does not feature strong urban design principles. Again, as along Waterfront Drive, temporary uses have the potential to animate these proposed development opportunity sites until such a time as development goes ahead. As an example, at Opportunity Site 4 the preferred long-term use for the site is a mix of residential and commercial development that maintains public access and a park-like atmosphere and integrates public art (City of Winnipeg & The Forks Renewal Corporation, 2004, p. 18). Temporary or interim uses could be initiated that support the long-term land use preferences and the planning principles for the area. A mini-golf course that integrates dramatic and eye-catching public art is an active use of the space that could draw people to the site, especially in the summer months. Guerrilla gardening, chair bombing (where chairs and public seating are added to public spaces), mobile food carts, and organized special events could supplement these activities.

Winnipeg Building By-Law & Manitoba Building Code

These documents set out requirements regarding the minimum standards to which buildings must be maintained for safe occupancy. "Code issues" are an often cited challenge in making use of vacant spaces on a temporary basis. When a building has not been maintained at a sufficient standard, the costs of bringing it back to code can be significant and even prohibitive for many property owners and site users. The City of Winnipeg is taking steps, through the *Vacant Building By-*

Law discussed below, to ensure buildings are usable and meet minimum safety requirements.

Vacant Buildings By-Law

The *OurWinnipeg* plan identifies the elimination of derelict buildings as a key direction for the City and strong disincentives against vacant and boarded buildings have been introduced. A strategy encouraging the temporary use of vacant buildings could provide a counterbalance of incentives.

Winnipeg's Vacant Building By-Law and its 9-Point Vacant & Derelict Buildings Strategy were introduced in July 2010 to increase community safety, to decrease instances of demolition by neglect, and to discourage the boarding of vacant buildings (City of Winnipeg, 2010b). The by-law, which replaces a previous less strict version, requires that buildings be maintained to a certain standard, that boarded building permits be applied for annually, and that owners who wish to board up their buildings be required to pay fees. This is where the encouragement of temporary uses as an incentive to reduce vacancy may be particularly attractive in some cases.

Schedule A of the by-law details the maintenance standards for vacant buildings. These standards are designed to increase the safety of vacant buildings and to reduce the possibility of demolition by neglect. The by-law recognizes the need for buildings to be structurally sound should someone, like fire services or police for example, be required to enter unexpectedly. Roofs, walls, floors, and stairs are all required to be safely maintained. In addition to increasing safety, these standards mean that owners are responsible for the expense of maintaining their properties. Another benefit is a reduction in the number of cases where the cost of repairing a building to minimum standards for occupancy is unmanageable. The by-law also mandates annual inspections, at the owners' expense, to ensure compliance. The cost of this inspection varies depending on the work required on the building; if a repair order is issued following the inspection, a fee of $1,000 is charged while if no repair order is issued, the fee is $500.

If an owner does not wish to secure access to their vacant property through regular

maintenance of doors and windows, they may apply for a Boarded Building permit. This permit allows them to put plywood over door and window openings, but still requires that they meet the maintenance requirements of Schedule A. A Boarded Building permit costs $2,000 for the first annual permit, with an increase of $1,500 for each additional year the building remains boarded.

The *Vacant Buildings By-Law* provides strong financial disincentives to building vacancy. At a minimum, owners can expect to pay $2,500 per year for a vacant building, in addition to property taxes and maintenance costs. As this is a relatively new by-law, there may still be some cases where a property owner has allowed their building to deteriorate too far to allow for safe occupancy. However, in the future, this by-law could partner effectively with a strategy that encourages and supports temporary use in order to provide a balance of disincentives and incentives to maintaining building occupancy.

Strategies explored in the precedent studies could complement this by-law to provide a complete package. For example, a database like that developed in the Nevidlijivi Zagreb project could help to the city maintain an inventory of vacant and derelict buildings while making this list more helpful to potential site users. A small focused area like the Exchange District might be a practical centre around which to develop a Winnipeg database. Additionally, an approach like that used in Edmonton, where the city administration worked closely with property owners to identify barriers to both the long-term redevelopment of former gas stations and the interim use of these sites, could help Winnipeg to develop appropriate programs that reduce the number of buildings that become derelict.

Special events permits

The City of Winnipeg categorizes events or uses lasting up to fourteen days as special events. Many precedents described earlier, like the Build a Better Block project, would be considered special events in Winnipeg. Support and planning assistance for special events in the city is quite well-organized, with a Film & Special Events Office advising and offering coordination assistance on

larger projects. There is also a Special Events Committee – a cross-departmental working group that includes representatives from the Film & Special Events Office, Public Works, Winnipeg Transit, and the Winnipeg Police Service – that meets regularly with people organizing events in the city (City of Winnipeg, 2009).

4.3 Organizations supporting downtown development

In addition to the City of Winnipeg itself, several organizations, some of them arm's-length agencies of the City, are involved in supporting downtown development. These established organizations are resources that property owners and site users often turn to for support, whether this is part of their mandate or not.

CentreVenture Development Corporation

CentreVenture Development Corporation is an arm's-length agency of the City of Winnipeg, created in 1999 and mandated to stimulate downtown revitalization by providing "leadership, vision and a connection for business and government to intersect and work together on development opportunities for the betterment of downtown Winnipeg and the City as a whole" (CentreVenture, 2010a, p. 2). CentreVenture's 2009 Annual Report states the organization's mission: "To serve as an advocate for downtown and a leader in promoting development by identifying opportunities, creating partnerships, forming innovative improvement strategies, providing information and by serving as an accessible conduit to support initiatives" (CentreVenture, 2010a, p. 2).

CentreVenture's work is guided by the *CentrePlan Development Framework*, last updated in 2008. The City adopted the first version of *CentrePlan* in 1994 and consisted of two documents: *Vision and Strategies*, outlining a long-term vision for downtown, and an *Action Plan*, intended to be updated annually. When CentreVenture was created in 1999, the first iteration of the *CentrePlan Development Framework* was developed "to provide physical direction and illustrate in a graphic format the vision articulated in *CentrePlan*" (CentreVenture, 2008, p. 1). In fact *CentrePlan* identified five key visions for downtown (CentreVenture, 2008, p. 5), at least three of which could be strengthened by a strategy encouraging temporary use of underutilized space. Temporary use projects can contribute to a sense of "community and belonging," to "prosperity and innovation," and to "soul and personality."

As the *CentrePlan Development Framework* simply provides an additional level of detail to some

of the by-laws and guidelines already discussed, it is not surprising to see that the nine focus areas highlighted to support these visions echo those identified in other documents. As an example, encouraging public art is a priority emphasised in the *Pioneer & Waterfront Development Principles and Guidelines* and is also mentioned as a focus area in the *CentrePlan Development Framework*. A strategy encouraging temporary uses has a unique potential to contribute to the focus of "Urban Structure: Define Neighbourhoods, Districts and Character Areas"; temporary use projects might be incorporated into specific districts in order to "reinforce a district's particular character and encourage creative development" (CentreVenture, 2008, p. 12).

In 2010, the City endorsed CentreVenture's *Portage Avenue Development Strategy* (CentreVenture, 2010b, p. 6), a plan that:

> refines the definition of downtown, provides focus for development, encourages increased density of development and supports a concentrated retail, commercial, residential and entertainment mix. The Portage Avenue plan acknowledges the social and economic context of Portage Avenue and introduces specific actions intended to support development within the context of a public/private investment strategy. (CentreVenture, 2010b, p. 2)

One of the objectives of this plan is to "Focus development inward towards Portage Avenue thereby increasing development density and pedestrian traffic that in turn support existing attractions such as the retail district on Portage and Graham, the MTS Centre, Portage Place, The Bay, the University of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Convention Centre" (CentreVenture, 2010b, p. 3). A focal point of the *Portage Avenue Development Strategy* is the creation of a Sports, Hospitality, and Entertainment District (SHED) as a destination that builds on the recent success of MTS Centre (CentreVenture, 2010b, p. 7). The SHED is proposed as one of four districts along Portage Avenue (the others being the University District, the Retail District, and the Commercial District). If a strategy encouraging temporary uses were to be promoted, the SHED and Retail Districts would likely be most successful as initial target areas.

Within the SHED District, for example, the cityplace mall was noted as having a high vacancy rate at 18% (MJB Consulting, 2009, p. 104). There is an opportunity for pop-up cafes and shops to set up before and after events at MTS Centre to enhance the image of the district as a

sports, hospitality, and entertainment hub. Permanent establishments in cityplace could work with temporary users to create a street festival atmosphere that may draw people to the mall on non-event days as well.

This strategy could be effective in promoting street-level activity in the Retail District along Graham Avenue and its side streets. A challenge faced in this area is that many of the vacant spaces are across from surface parking lots and parkades; pedestrians may feel this creates a "dead-end" because once they reach the end of one side of the street, there is nothing to draw them back up the other side.

CentreVenture's organization mission and guiding documents are generally compatible with the aims of a strategy supporting temporary and interim uses. Currently the structure of the organization and the resources available to CentreVenture appear, however, to be optimized for working on large-scale projects with long-term tenants rather than with numerous very small site users.

Business Improvement Zones (BIZs)

There are two Business Improvement Zones in the downtown area, the Downtown BIZ and the Exchange District BIZ. The City of Winnipeg identifies the purpose of a BIZ board as "to beautify, improve and maintain real property of the City" and "to promote improvements and economic development" (City of Winnipeg, 2003, section 5(2)). The support of temporary and interim uses falls primarily under the second purpose, but can benefit the first as well. The role of the BIZs in temporary use projects is twofold. First, the BIZ needs to ensure that existing business owners have sufficient information about temporary use projects and the benefits they may bring to an area and surrounding businesses. Secondly, the BIZ necessarily plays a role in advocating for the needs of permanent business owners and in mediating between current and future business owners.

Neighbourhood Renewal Corporations (NRCs)

The Central Park, Centennial, and Alexander neighbourhoods in downtown Winnipeg are also supported by a Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation (NRC), the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation. NRCs are established through the Province of Manitoba's Neighbourhoods Alive! program to provide "community organizations in neighbourhoods with high concentrations of poverty with the support they need to improve quality of life and make their neighbourhoods safer, more inclusive, and equitable" (Kliewer, McCracken, Couture & Reimer, 2010, p. 2). These organizations are governed by community economic development principles, giving them a slightly different focus from the BIZs. While economic development is still a priority, citizen-led initiatives that integrate social and economic goals take precedence (Kliewer et al., 2010, p. 3). These organizations are often oriented towards smaller-scale projects, but frequently lack the financial resources to support programs. Because NRCs have such a wide-ranging focus, they sometimes lack the information and expertise necessary to help site users and property owners navigate complicated municipal processes effectively.

There is an additional development corporation in downtown Winnipeg. The Forks North Portage (TFNP) is an amalgamation of two development corporations established in the 1980s to guide redevelopment at The Forks and of the north side of Portage Avenue from Vaughan Street to Carlton Street (Province of Manitoba, 2011, p. 1). The mission of this organization is "to act as a catalyst, encouraging activities for people in the downtown area through public and private partnerships and revitalization strategies, and to work to ensure financial self-sufficiency" (Province of Manitoba, 2011, p. 1). TFNP is more actively involved in the management and development of large projects and events than other development corporations in the province, partnering with the City of Winnipeg, for example, to develop the *Pioneer & Waterfront Development Principles and Guidelines* discussed above.

4.4 Critique of current approach

Drawing on discussion from Part 1 and from discussions with local stakeholders, Winnipeg's current policies are critiqued. Two focus groups, one with a group of City of Winnipeg planning staff and one with a group of potential site users, and three interviews, with downtown developers, took place. These conversations began with a general discussion around current projects and participants' daily activities followed by an introduction to several precedents researched for this project. These topics led to wide-ranging conversations that touched on a number of the questions from the interview guides (see Appendix) and follow-up questions were then asked in order to cover all topics.

Potential benefits and risks as seen by stakeholders

Participants were asked about any interim or temporary use projects they were aware of both in order to learn what sort of profile these types of projects currently have in the city and to learn more about current projects. After an introduction to precedents from elsewhere, participants were asked what they viewed to be the advantages and disadvantages of temporary use projects. Participants were also asked how they felt temporary uses could fit into the overall revitalization of an area.

Stakeholders in Winnipeg identified many of the same benefits stemming from temporary uses highlighted in the literature as well as a few others. In some cases, their experiences reinforced the literature review findings, while in others, they felt the literature exaggerated the potential benefits. One stakeholder shared, "I think there's a value in temporary uses or temporary places because it can bring some variety and it can also achieve multiple aims" (Planners Focus Group).

The potential benefit that seemed to resonate most strongly for Winnipeg stakeholders was the idea of temporary uses as a catalyst for change. The potential for temporary use projects to attract attention, generate increased activity in the downtown, and make use of space that has sat

vacant for a long time was seen as a likely positive outcome of these projects. In discussing one project that is currently being planned, one site user argued:

> And again, it animates a space that may not have had any activity in it for years in some cases. So it draws attention from potential leasees. Trying to animate the sidewalks with types of activities we want (and lessen activities we don't want on the street at the same time). We could generate so much more liveliness in our downtown streets. (Users Focus Group)

Another site user felt that temporary use projects present an opportunity for experimentation that could lead to change: "That's the bonus of temporary things is that they're pilot projects; they're demonstration projects in a way. Take one block and say, "this is what it could be" (Users Focus Group). Planners were less adamant that temporary uses would necessarily attract increased attention, but felt that "If these projects help to create more activity, more street life, I think that would help to revitalize an area and could also create a sense of destination" (Planners Focus Group). Assuming temporary uses could attract attention, planners felt the potential benefits would be "urban vibrancy, vitality of an area, excitement, whimsical. It makes an area interesting to be in. And it also helps create more interactions with other people that might just happen by accident" (Planners Focus Group).

The way in which temporary uses can, intentionally or not, contribute to flexibility in long-term planning was fresh in the minds of planners working on the plan for a new subdivision:

> Because the golf course it [the new subdivision] will run through has been closed for many years, it's become this informal dog park. At an open house, people were saying, "What? You're going to get rid of our dog park?" So now we're looking around to see where we could establish a dog park because just saying, "This has never been a dog park" is not going to be a viable option. (Planners Focus Group)

While a dog park was not initially part of the plan for the new subdivision, an existing informal temporary use of the space reflected how people actually use the area and what they would like to see happen there in the future.

At the same time, the sort of interaction described above shows the potential for temporary and interim uses to encourage public participation in planning decisions. This, in turn, contributes to a sense of community ownership of a space, according to one site user:

> It's also a sense of community; most of these projects were in downtown areas and it's about building a sense of community where the public has ownership of their space. Right now the public doesn't really have ownership of their space and all of these kinds of projects are about more spaces for people to live and enjoy. (Users Focus Group)

Temporary uses provide an opportunity for the public to show planners what they want by initiating and engaging with uses of space that they support.

Economic benefits were also anticipated. While the literature review identified advantages for property owners and the encouragement of entrepreneurship as potential benefits, Winnipeg stakeholders saw these advantages slightly differently. One developer felt that temporary uses could present an indirect benefit to property owners by helping to improve the image of an entire area: "The Downtown BIZ is funded by ratepayers so I think it's in everybody's interest not to have derelict properties next to a viable business" (Interview 1). In this case, rather than simply seeing the economic benefit that might be gained by one property owner, the developer perceives the potential for all property owners in the area to benefit from a temporary use project occurring in a vacant space. Others saw an opportunity to maximize available resources while still achieving the desired impact. An organization commissioning art pieces for a public space recognized that "We could never have afforded as many permanent pieces with the resources we had available at that time" (Users Focus Group). Some people seem to agree that a smaller investment is acceptable and understandable in a temporary or interim use, which can make their implementation more financially accessible to a wider segment of the population.

Interestingly, this smaller investment is seen as a risk by others. The main concern identified was related to the risks associated with encouraging short-term investment in an area. Surface parking lots, which will be discussed further below, were raised as an example. The attitude towards these properties seems to be that "because they're considered temporary there's not a big investment required" (Interview 1).

Another point raised was related to the lack of a clear vision that might result if an area were to have many temporary uses taking place. When asked if he felt temporary uses could be part of the

revitalization of an area, one developer responded, "Absolutely, but they have to fit in. They can't be incompatible with the long-term goals of the neighbourhood. The reason I say that is a lot of my experience has been that we've had temporary uses that have been undesirable uses and they become permanent uses" (Interview 1). Supporting temporary uses without consideration for how they fit with the long-term vision for an area presents future challenges and may move an area further from, rather than closer to, achieving that vision.

Overall, site users saw only potential benefits from increased temporary use, while planners were more likely to identify potential risks as well as benefits.

Factors making Winnipeg more or less conducive to a temporary use strategy

Participants discussed whether there were any factors that they felt made Winnipeg more or less conducive to a successful strategy encouraging temporary use. Winnipeg's "slow and steady economy," in the words of one interviewee, came up often and was seen by some as a disadvantage and by others as an advantage.

Some planners felt that "It's when property values start to trend upwards that people start to get a little bit more creative with their use of space" (Planners Focus Group). Because Winnipeg's "rents per sq.ft. are still fairly low compared to other jurisdictions" (Planners Focus Group), there may be less incentive to put vacant space into use. This assessment of market rates is reflected in numbers prepared by CB Richard Ellis in 2011. Rental rates for Class A office space in downtown Winnipeg were found to be $15.69 p.s.f. in 2010, (CB Richard Ellis, 2011, p. 10) while in Edmonton rates were in the $21.48 p.s.f. for the same category of space (CB Richard Ellis, 2011, p. 8). Rates are also higher in Vancouver and Halifax where they stood at $30.64 (CB Richard Ellis, 2011, p. 5) and $18.43 (CB Richard Ellis, 2011, p. 22.) respectively.

Another factor identified as making Winnipeg less conducive to a successful strategy encouraging temporary uses is Winnipeg's relatively low population density. In the experience of local planners, "as you get more people packed into a given area, you tend to utilize space in a more

efficient manner" (Planners Focus Group). At the same time, the vacancy rate for certain types of space is quite low, implying that while people may be physically spread out around the city, access to different types of space may be differentiated. It seems as though some of the more "difficult to use" spaces may have been vacant for longer periods of time.

One participant pointed out that in the downtown there has been "lots of space empty for a long time so it's more likely that there will be a willingness to experiment" (Interview 3). Another site user viewed long-term vacancies as opportunities when planning a project that would make use of vacant storefront windows:

> We know the building owners that have buildings that have been up for lease for a while. I don't foresee a huge issue. Part of the deal is you clean the windows so it cleans up their space a little bit. And again, it animates a space that may not have had any activity in it for years in some cases. So it draws attention from potential leases. (Users Focus Group)

One downside to a slow steady economy is that sometimes temporary uses become longer-term uses, not because the project is an appropriate long-term use, but because the economic climate makes it more economically viable to maintain the "temporary" use (Interview 1). The classic example here is surface parking lots. As one planner put it, "there are certain 'temporary' uses that set off immediate alarm bells for us" and in some cases, "there's nothing more permanent than a temporary use" (Planners Focus Group). Many surface parking lots in Winnipeg illustrate a specific concern identified in the literature review. These lots "are never landscaped or developed properly because nobody wants them there, but because they're considered temporary there's not a big investment required" (Interview 1). This connects with the concern about the lack of quality or investment that can sometimes be associated with temporary uses.

Climate was mentioned several times and with different implications. The added challenge of maintaining a building in a usable state given Winnipeg's cycle of extreme temperatures was cited by many. Some felt that temporary uses might provide a solution:

> One of the biggest problems we face is derelict buildings and once they become vacant that's when they really start to decline. That's when the heat gets turned off, that's when the roof starts to leak and the windows get broken and as soon as that happens it becomes exponentially more expensive to fix the building. The best

> solution is to keep them occupied even if they're not making any money, if you're covering the operating costs, that's helpful. (Interview 1)

Others felt that cold temperatures made it difficult to sustain momentum gathered from temporary outdoor summer events into the winter months (Interview 3).

Finally, while climate was often cited as a factor making Winnipeg less conducive to a strategy of temporary use, one property developer highlighted Winnipeg's existing "culture of innovation and festival" as a unique feature that may place the city in a position to take advantage of such a strategy (Interview 3). Even without a dedicated arts and culture advocate on City staff, Winnipeg is widely recognized as a cultural hotbed and a place where creative people make interesting things happen.

An advantage in the Exchange District over the rest of downtown Winnipeg was felt by some to be the number of local property owners, as opposed to properties managed by larger, sometimes multi-national, leasing companies. One site user shared this experience of trying to set up projects: "That's what we found: If you can talk to the owner, that's one thing, but by in large, leasing companies don't have the ability to do it or it's not worth their time" (Users Focus Group). Talking to the owner, however, wasn't seen as a guarantee: "It really depends on the individual [for private owners]. It's a personality thing with a lot of these building owners" (Users Focus Group). On the whole, however, site users in Winnipeg have found that having the opportunity to speak with the owner allowed them to explain the benefits of their projects and to discuss and overcome any foreseen challenges.

Strengths & weaknesses of the current approach

Winnipeg's approach to development seems to be to outline a broad vision for overall development in the downtown area. Temporary uses are not explicitly excluded, but are not discussed as a tool to help achieve, fine-tune, or adjust the overall vision. Stakeholders were asked to critique the City's current approach to handling interim and temporary use projects. They were asked to identify strengths and weaknesses of the current process.

Weakness: Lack of flexibility and phasing

One of the potential weaknesses of this approach is its inflexibility and its orientation bias towards high growth environments, as highlighted by Blumner: "Tools such as zoning, master plans, and land use plans are relatively inflexible instruments designed to regulate future development. These tools were created to protect private interests as well as public welfare, and they work well in an environment of consistent growth" (2006, p. 3). Overmeyer echo this view stating, "Current planning systems were created to deal with phases of growth and prove inadequate in the face of shrinking processes or stagnation" (2007, p. 103). While Winnipeg is not a shrinking city given its rate of growth, its sprawling infrastructure and low-density population mean that it shares some features with shrinking cities. Blumner describes German cities where "empty space dominates, property owners are disengaged, and investors are scarce" (Blumner, 2006, p. 3). The prevalence in Winnipeg of surface parking lots and vacant storefronts, arguably forms of empty space, along downtown streets is often remarked upon (Leo & Anderson, 2006, p. 183). Rather than considering these similarities, the OurWinnipeg document is based on projections that show significant population growth in the coming years. Given development patterns in the past, Winnipeg's downtown might be described as a site "for which demand remains unpredictable" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 105). If this is the case, planners would do well to ensure the development and planning process takes "into account a wider range of development scenarios" (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 105), otherwise planners risk becoming "pre-occupied with making large-scale transformative change" (Lydon et al., n.d., p. 1) at the expense of opportunities to promote liveability through incremental change.

Weakness: Missed opportunity to encourage temporary uses to support vision

Another weakness of the current approach is its failure to recognize the potential of temporary uses to inform, direct, and support long-term vision. Temporary uses could help to bridge the gap between vision and reality in a slower growth environment. This was found to be the case in

Berlin, an experience that prompted Overmeyer to write,

> That urban development... cannot always be conducted as a linear implementation of urban planners' masterplans is illustrated by numerous planning proposals that were never, or only partially implemented. If the period between planning and implementation becomes incalculable... planning threatens to cave in like a house of cards. (Overmeyer, 2007, p. 103)

Instead, as has been the case in Amsterdam Noord, temporary and interim uses act "within a long-term strategic development plan, as a 'trial and error' planning tool that could respond and adapt to changing site and economic conditions" (Mackey, 2007, p. 5).

Weakness: Confusion around terms

There is currently a lack of clarity regarding the difference between temporary and interim uses. This is true in planning literature as well as in planning practice. When does a use transition between categories commonly used in planning practice, from a special event to a temporary use and then to an interim use and finally to a permanent use? There are no definitive answers to be found in planning literature. In practice in Winnipeg, these distinctions would be at the discretion of city planners to a certain extent, however there are some policies in place that provide some direction.

The City of Winnipeg Special Events permit and the *Winnipeg Zoning By-Law* outline the oversight required for events and uses of different lengths. If a tent, stage, or bleachers is to be located in the downtown area, and will be in place for more than fourteen days, the City's Urban Design Review committee is to be contacted (City of Winnipeg, 2010c). For events taking place over fewer than fourteen days, the installations can be approved simply by the Special Events Committee. The next dividing line would be the thirty days allowed by the *Winnipeg Zoning By-Law* after which temporary uses must cease to operate. Interim uses, which might provide direction for uses intended to be somewhere between a thirty day temporary use and a permanent use, are not described in any City by-law. Interestingly, the term *permanent use* is not described in the by-law either.

Given this uncertainty, it is initially up to site users to determine whether their proposed use is more similar to a special event or a long term use. Aside from the relatively minor challenge of

directing a project to the correct "stream," the limited range of uses allowed as temporary uses reflect a lack of consideration for the wealth of creativity that could be inspired by shorter term uses. While uses other than those listed specifically as temporary uses in the by-law would likely be permitted on a temporary basis, they would be subject to all requirements in the by-law. As one property developer put it, "there is an existing regulatory bias towards permanent use" (Interview 3).

Weakness: Challenges relating to timelines & transparency of process

Many property owners and site users feel the current process for managing temporary uses is time-consuming and that the process is not always clear from the outset. Participants in the focus groups and interviews felt that the current process has many steps and people don't know what they're getting themselves into. Participants also felt that timelines can be too long, an issue that can discourage potential site users. As one site user noted, "Even organizing a one day festival is 6 months of paperwork. There are lots of layers to navigate – it takes gumption" (Users Focus Group). Planners echoed this view, observing that, for some projects, "there are so many different licenses that you have to get from the City" (Planners Focus Group). A property developer noted that sometimes "people get started on a project but stop at step 2 because they suddenly find out there are 6 more steps they weren't aware of" (Interview 3).

While some of this discouragement can be attributed to a lack of research or by misunderstandings regarding the process, several site users, property developers, and planners had all been frustrated at one point or another by challenges in realizing time-sensitive project:. "One of the challenges with interim use, particularly when it comes to buildings, is that people don't realise some of the implications or costs of what they're doing until they're actually in it" (Planners Focus Group).

Bureaucracies are often called on to reduce the timelines involved in project approvals, but the level of frustration seems to be exacerbated when the amount of time required to approve a project is longer than the time the temporary use will be in existence. Discussing the interest of artists in producing site-specific work, one site user observed, "You have to be very keen as an artist

to go above and beyond for your project and there are artists out there who are willing to do so. But time is money. And it depends what your priorities are for this particular project" (Users Focus Group).

Strength: Efforts to streamline processes

In response to some of these critiques, some City of Winnipeg processes relating to temporary uses have already been streamlined. A precedent discussed in one interview as well as one focus group was the City of Winnipeg's process of approving temporary tents for special events. While in the past, all tents would need permits, the City decided in 2003 that tents smaller than 900 sq. ft. would no longer require permits. Planners and one developer cited this as a good example of "taking away the hurdles and hoops that people have to jump through" (Planners Focus Group). Planners explained that "the City has identified that below a certain size, these really have no impact. Identifying these types of uses that really aren't going to have a lot of impact and make the process a lot easier for them to occur" (Planners Focus Group).

Another example highlighted by planners was the way the City handles seasonal garden centres. Some business used to come to the City every year with the same plan to be approved. Inevitably, every year, there would be last-minute applications and unexpected delays for an approval process that took two to three weeks. Instead, the City has started to do blanket approvals: "If your garden centre is the same as it was last year, you've got blanket approval to do the same thing, you don't have to come back and see us" (Planners Focus Group).

Both examples illustrate that often existing processes work, but streamlining them and making them easier to use benefits planners, site users, and property owners.

These successful examples have likely been facilitated through an increased effort by city planners to work more closely with other departments and with people initiating projects. Planners feel that the "department's philosophy is increasingly changing towards more collaboration and dialogue early" (Planners Focus Group). As an example of both streamlining City process and

increasing collaboration, planners point to the City's Special Events Committee, a cross-departmental committee that is able to handle all issues relating to special events. Working with the committee is a "process that the folks who were accessing the committee seemed to get a lot out of" (Planners Focus Group). Through dialogue between project initiators and several city departments, "Solutions are often even better than what the applicant was initially proposing... We encourage people to come to us when they're at the very first step" (Planners Focus Group). By having everyone meet together there is a more collaborative process where the discussion is "less 'you have to go through steps A-Z' and more 'oh, you want to do X, well, if you do Y then you can do X *and* Z" (Planners Focus Group). These are promising steps though there are clearly opportunities to improve even further.

Opportunities

In discussing the strengths and weaknesses of Winnipeg's current approach to working with interim and temporary use projects, stakeholders identified opportunities that could be built upon in the development of a strategy.

Site users in particular recognized that there are organizations that are currently providing support for these types of projects. Businesses and other groups regularly approach the staff of Business Improvement Zones or Neighbourhood Renewal Corporations for help in navigating City processes and in preparing various applications. They feel supported by these organizations, with which they often have a previous relationship, and feel that these organizations will advocate for them. While the process can seem overwhelming at first, one site user acknowledged that "as soon as someone can get a bit of help, it takes the pressure off and makes it easier" (Users Focus Group). Because these organizations have supported others with similar projects in the past, they are more knowledgeable about how to proceed and "have tried to be an intermediary" (Users Focus Group). Groups initiating projects for the first time appreciate the advice, support, and assistance of someone who has previous experience working with the City's system.

Beyond taking advantage of the individual capacity of employees at organizations like Business Improvement Zones, the presence of a group of businesses working together presents an opportunity. Participating in a larger organization encourages business owners to consider the whole rather than simply the part, or the area rather than simply their individual business. As explained by one developer, this group may be quite interested developing a strategy that encourages temporary use if they are convinced of its potential benefits for the area:

> When a building exists within an environment of other buildings, if your interest is in the whole as opposed to a single part, then I think you're very motivated to be thinking about how is this whole performing? If you have a vacancy and that vacancy reflects poorly on other occupied units, you're very inclined to find a temporary use or do something to kind of camouflage the vacancies. So typically in a shopping centre environment as well as in a downtown urban environment that are usually managed by people who are trying to look after the interests of the city, they want to see activity. The last thing they want to see is a dead zone in an area that is otherwise well-trafficked. (Interview 2)

Another opportunity is to build on the existing support, both of the public and the municipal bureaucracy, for special events. The existence of a Film & Special Events Office at the City of Winnipeg creates a single-desk access point for those planning special events. The Office coordinates the City's involvement and ensures that relevant City departments become involved as soon as the need is recognized. This system contributes to a collaborative approach in working on events and takes some of the guesswork out of the process for those initiating a project. Because many temporary uses begin as special events, and because special events are relatively well-supported by the local government, an effective strategy for prospective temporary users might be to initiate a project as a special event and transition it over time and through iterations to a slightly longer-term temporary use.

Winnipeg is recognized, and sees itself, as a "city of the arts" (City of Winnipeg, 2011, p. 83). There is an opportunity to build support for and excitement about temporary uses by drawing on this existing image of the city and by focusing on the potential of temporary uses to highlight creativity. Vacant space can be an important piece of infrastructure, providing a venue to showcase creative work or a space to incubate creative industries. While arts and culture are a focus of the

City's long-term plan and are clearly appreciated as a resource, some stakeholders see the opportunity to develop this resource even further. One developer asked, "Why aren't cultural amenities being maximized? These can contribute to a multiple bottom-line" (Interview 3). He suggested several ways, encouraging temporary and interim uses among them, which the City could build on this existing asset.

Barriers to implementing more temporary projects

Property owners and temporary space users face a number of barriers to implementing temporary projects. These include the complexity of the issues and, closely related, red tape and regulatory challenges. Significant resources are required to overcome these barriers. The current lack of financial incentives for property owners and the lack of capacity among both property owners and site users combined with a lack of willingness to experiment on the part of the City mean that many projects do not get off the ground. Finally, communication challenges between all actors test even the most committed temporary users.

Barrier: Complex issues

Perhaps due to the excitement, creativity, and do-it-yourself attitude that often generate temporary use projects, site users generally want the project development and approval process to move forward quickly. Because of this, there may be a tendency to underestimate the complexity that comes even with short-term projects. In both focus groups, the challenges of implementing a seemingly simple project like a seasonal sidewalk patio were discussed. Satisfying the requirements of various interests and issues like traffic flow, public works, accessibility, the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, and the planning department requires collaboration and compromise that can be time-consuming to achieve. As planners put it, "It really goes to show how these issues become intertwined" (Planners Focus Group).

While a proposal may seem straight-forward, "Sometimes certain things do or do not occur

for a myriad of reasons. It's one of those things, where issues are often complex. They're a lot more complex than initially thought and sometimes people go with the path of least resistance" (Planners Focus Group). This is not to say that solutions cannot be developed. The comment simply highlights the need for improved communication about the current process and between departments to continue to develop improved solutions.

Barrier: Red tape and regulatory challenges

Issues around permits, insurance, and other legal requirements are often raised as barriers to implementing temporary projects. It is difficult to know whether the complexity of the issues around these uses leads to the large number of regulations relating to them or whether, the regulations create added layers of complexity. Some stakeholders felt this reflected challenges in North American culture in general: "There's a culture in North America that if there's something wrong or there's something that might be questionable, there's almost a demand for government to have some sort of regulation or some sort of program for it. And sometimes it can be overkill" (Planners Focus Group). They felt this mentality had extended into its own industry, observing, "This culture of by-laws and legality... It's risk-management. It's the insurance industry" (Users Focus Group).

Requirements like zoning, building and occupancy permits, liability insurance and contracts can seem overwhelming to property owners and site users who are less familiar with them and especially with how these requirements relate to temporary use. Lack of information can lead some property owners to be overly-reluctant to explore potential projects while others may run into legal challenges or unexpected expenses and "last-minute" requests due to misunderstanding about requirements. The perception of some site users is that:

> One of the stumbling blocks on anything we do is usually the regulations that are in place whether it be from the City or the Province. There are a lot of rules in place. You get a neat idea that works someplace else for some reason and you say why can't it be done here and it's usually regulations and restrictions say it can't be done here. (Users Focus Group)

While government regulations may be the cause restricting some projects, there are other

factors like financing and insurance that sometimes stand in the way. For example, if a building owner does not own the property outright, they may run into trouble with their bank if they stray too far from the intentions of the long-term proposal for which the bank approved financing:

> It might not fit with the financing mechanisms they have available. Sometimes companies that will finance your buildings, they're used to doing a certain type. They're used to doing residential, or they're used to doing commercial. They're not used to trying to do both. (Planners Focus Group)

In other cases, "Sometimes people are reluctant to do certain things with their buildings because they're worried about liability but also worried about potentially invalidating their insurance" (Planners Focus Group). Ensuring public safety is a concern that is not debatable: "The challenge with changing use is always the building code because those are safety issues and those are rules people don't want to bend. If it's something like an incompatible land use that might be open for debate but nobody wants to err on the wrong side when it comes to safety issues" (Interview 1).

Barrier: Lack of financial incentives for property owners

Many participants felt that some form of incentive could help motivate property owners to be more creative with their vacant spaces. The City's Vacant Building By-Law provides several disincentives to discourage owners from letting them become vacant or derelict, but "you can only use your hammer so much. You have to use a carrot a bit too and offer incentives to do the right thing" (Interview 1). Most felt financial incentives would be most effective:

> You're not going to do it unless there's a return of some sort. Now there are financial returns and there are other types of returns, but typically in the development community, it's more about the financial return than other things. (Interview 2)

Some property owners may not feel they have any financial incentive to maintain a building through temporary use, hoping instead to have an opportunity to build a new building for a specific long-term tenant: "In terms of energy efficiency sometimes it's cheaper to build new than it is to keep an old building" (Planners Focus Group). This attitude towards the cost of new builds seems to be culturally relative, in North America compared to Europe, one developer pointed out, "We think

of buildings that are 50-75 years old as, in our language, fully amortized, fully depreciated, let's start over" (Interview 2).

A challenge that property owners currently face when trying to put vacant buildings into use between long-term tenants is that often temporary users can't afford to cover costs. Planners had recently been in discussions with one building owner who found that "the people who were approaching him who were interested in leasing were only willing to pay about $400-500/month while the actual cost to him, in terms of overhead costs, were more than $500/month so he would actually be losing money to bring those tenants in" (Planners Focus Group).

Current property taxation practices are a barrier to temporary or interim use. One developer felt, "I think there would be an inclination to think a little bit more creatively if there were some advantage and the advantage could be something as simple as we will abate or waive your taxes during this period of temporary use if it fits into some criteria" (Interview 2). Planners see the negative repercussions of the current approach to taxing vacant lots. Property owners propose a "temporary" surface parking lot, and, "Well those 5 years turns out to be 15-20 because it's just more economically viable to retain it as a surface parking lot as opposed to building. That's probably more of a function of taxation scheme than anything" (Planners Focus Group). Compared to the expenses and risk involved in transforming a surface parking lot into a new development, the property taxes assessed by the City of Winnipeg on these sites are relatively low.

Why do buildings become vacant?

One interviewee provided a concise and insightful explanation of why buildings become vacant: "There's a bunch of reasons why buildings become vacant or underutilized. Some of them are manifestations of the building itself; it has become dysfunctional in terms of the use of space, it's too small to fit what it used to, merchandising changes, big box formats. No one wants to operate out of 1500 sq.ft.; now they want to operate out of 80,000. So you can get functional obsolescence. And then there would be another one, physical obsolescence, where the building is just deteriorating

so quickly that people don't want to keep reinvesting in it and it's easier to say let's just build something new, new systems, new modern features. And then there would be another one that would be more economic. That's usually an influence of an area changing or the characteristics of an area have changed. So in classic terms, when we think of buildings that are underutilized or vacant there's usually some form of physical, functional or economic obsolescence at play" (Interview 2).

Barrier: Lack of capacity

All stakeholders felt that they often lacked the capacity, both in terms of financial resources and administrative power, to bring temporary use projects to fruition.

Even property owners who are interested in having their space used on a temporary basis may find it challenging to manage the additional administrative work this creates. One developer explained, "It's as much work to do a $100,000 project as it is to do a $10,000,000 project. So to get a whole block redeveloped, it's a lot easier to deal with one tenant rather than 100 small ones. So the same with an interim use, if you're looking at different tenants on a monthly basis, it's overwhelming and administratively it's a really big issue" (Interview 1).

Additionally the time and effort that needs to go into developing connections and relationships between property owners and site users can be overwhelming, especially when considering short-term projects. Site users have found that:

> The owners could live anywhere around the world and it's a management company in charge and they really don't have either the interest or the time to really care because it's such a small pain in the butt project that it's not worth their time or energy. And that's what we found: If you can talk to the owner that's one thing, but by in large, leasing companies don't have the ability to do it or it's not worth their time. (Users Focus Group)

Both property owners and site users have found that "so many businesses, they don't even know where to begin. It's too complicated and the cost is a big factor too" (Users Focus Group).

From the property owners' perspective, there is sometimes limited capacity to negotiate the potential risks and expenses associated with a short-term tenant. One participant observed,

I would desperately like to put people in that space, but there are costs. If it's after 8

> at night or on weekends, we've got security costs where we're willing to break even, but we can't take on the extra costs. I'd love for a group to be in there for that 6 week period [for a community art program, for example], but then I run into questions... we're talking kids, we're talking art materials, we're talking consequences to carpet... (Users Focus Group)

Finally, even if both parties are interested in moving forward with a project, there can be limited resources available for managing the space: "We used to want our own space but to manage your own space for a temporary program is near impossible because you have to manage all the logistics of managing a building" (Users Focus Group). This organization now "piggy-backs" on spaces used by long-term programs.

Barrier: Lack of willingness to experiment on the part of the City

All stakeholders, even city planners, commented on what they saw as a lack of willingness to experiment on the part of the City. Site users questioned the organizational thinking behind this: "Is it because it's always been done that way? And they're not willing to try something?" (Users Focus Group). Planners felt innovative solutions were being explored in some areas, but that with "a lot of our regulations and the building industry in general, there's a certain inertia... We're used to doing certain things in certain ways and sometimes it takes a while to change" (Planners Focus Group). Site users find the response to some of their proposals frustrating: "It almost seems like the message is not one of 'let's make this happen, we're here to help', it's almost like 'this is going to be a problem, you have to prove yourself'" (Users Focus Group).

Changing this perception of the city and allowing planners to take some degree of risk with the projects they support "will require some increased flexibility by different agencies or municipal government because sometimes there can be a lot of bureaucratic inertia. By default we're always trying to plan for the worst case scenario" (Planners Focus Group). City departments are sometimes reluctant to try new things because they are worried about setting precedents that they will be held to regardless of the success of the project or of changing circumstances (Planners Focus Group). For example, proposals that could potentially increase long-term maintenance liabilities are met with

reluctance, even if the project is intended to last only a limited time.

Despite efforts in this area, increased communication and collaboration between the various City departments can still be a challenge: "There's a silo mentality," especially when it comes to issues affecting budgets (Planners Focus Group). Planners feel that in order to implement innovative proposals, departments need to begin "questioning certain preconceived notions about what the impacts of an action will be" (Planners Focus Group) and possibly moving away from focusing on the worst case scenario outcome. Site users feel that if temporary and interim uses are to become a successful part of a long-term vision for the city, "Really, it's going to come down to a cultural shift within government" (Users Focus Group). One developer saw change slowly taking place, with some people working on and supporting these sorts of projects, but finds that supporters still face cultural challenges. He said, "The change hasn't been cultural yet, it's been individual" (Interview 3).

Barrier: Communication challenges

Effective communication between the actors involved in temporary uses can be challenging in at least three different but interconnected ways.

The first barrier to effective communication is the challenge of ensuring clarity regarding the process and procedures of implementing a project. Frustration regarding what some site users and property owners feel is an overly-complicated process was illustrated in their critique of the current process. However, some of this frustration may stem from a perceived lack of clarity and from misunderstandings. The developer who referred to project initiators who "stop at step 2 because they suddenly find out there are 6 more steps they weren't aware of" (Interview 3) observed frustration with the number of steps involved, but also frustration with the surprise of discovering unexpected steps.

A second area in which communication could be improved is in the use of language and the elimination of jargon. The way in which regulations are presented can make them even more overwhelming for someone implementing a project for the first time. There is currently no plain-

word, jargon-free explanation of how to go about implementing projects. While precise legal descriptions are essential in order to avoid misunderstandings, people starting projects for the first time need to know where to begin. For example, many standard legal clauses can seem intimidating or heavy-handed and the term *site plan* can be intimidating to first-time project initiators: "The idea of a site plan is overwhelming, feel they're supposed to hire an architect" (Users Focus Group). Currently these people are turning to organizations like local Business Improvement Zones for assistance in working with the City because "they don't even know where to begin" (Users Focus Group). There is an opportunity to present this info in a more accessible way.

Finally, an important aspect of clear communication is managing expectations. As one developer put it, "What you have to be a little bit careful about is the expectations that you create" (Interview 2). This is true whether referring to discussions between property owners and site users or referring to communication with the public. If it is not clear to the site user or to the public that a particular use is intended to be temporary, it can lead to challenges for future development efforts. An example of this in Winnipeg can be seen with community gardens that have been established on vacant lots. The City argues the sites were only meant to be temporary and that in some cases, "now the market's changed, and private developers are interested in developing a property and the City wants to sell it, yet the community is really attached to this lot now" (Planners Focus Group). This illustrates one developer's observation that "In theory you should be able to say, 'This is temporary until we do something else,' but in reality, once people have something, to take it away is impossible" (Interview 1).

To effectively manage these situations, "It's important to have community buy-in from the outset. It's important for people to be aware of the temporary use and of what the permanent use is intended to be" (Interview 1). Tied to this is the importance of including the public in the process of determining a vision for an area. While no single use is likely to satisfy everyone's desires, a clear long-term plan can help to provide context for discussions and allow people to see where specific uses, both temporary and permanent, fit.

Role of the City and its planners

Stakeholders in Winnipeg identified a number of roles for planners in temporary use projects; some which they saw planners fulfilling already and some where they felt a more active role could be taken.

The role that planners play as regulators was identified as an area not to lose sight of. The City's function of reviewing projects, especially with a focus on safety, was recognized as a necessary one, even as stakeholders argued for more flexibility in implementing certain projects. One planner saw both regulation and evaluation as important components of this responsibility: "One role is the public safety thing... Reviewing projects while thinking about health and safety is the role of the City. So there's got to be that sort of scrutiny or oversight piece" (Planners Focus Group). One developer pointed out that, in a broad sense, "The City has a public service role" (Interview 1).

This "public service" can be defined in many ways. The planner quoted above also noted that the City has an enabling role to play in project implementation: "But on the flipside, if something makes sense, we should be enabling and we should assist however we can to make that happen" (Planners Focus Group). This might be seen as a process of facilitating, and facilitator was a role identified for planners to play in two senses. One developer felt that the City should "facilitate rather than push" (Interview 3). This was echoed by planners who suggested:

> That's a role the City has to play too... We need to make what we want easier, because right now it's the same process for everything. It's about how we set the enabling framework for what we want. Make what we want as easy as possible and maybe make the stuff you don't want... Well, you don't want that to be the path of least resistance (Planners Focus Group)

Facilitation was also mentioned by planners with specific reference to communication: "It's sometimes also about managing expectations" (Planners Focus Group). Planners felt they played an important role in ensuring all actors have a clear understanding of the project implementation process.

Finally, one stakeholder felt that the City should be leading the way in encouraging creative solutions to civic challenges: "Change hasn't been cultural yet, it's been individual. There are some people working on these sorts of projects, supporting them, but they still face cultural challenges" (Interview 3).

4.5 Recommendations

"Downtown revitalization in Winnipeg – it's in need of fuel, but the tank's not empty yet" (Interview 3).

While temporary uses of vacant space are taking place in Winnipeg and while stakeholders recognise several benefits these uses can bring about, project initiators still face numerous barriers discussed above. The following recommendations build on literature, precedent cases, and information from local stakeholders to describe aspects of a temporary use policy for downtown Winnipeg that would help to optimize the use of space and to achieve a long-term vision. These recommendations reflect the successes and challenges that face temporary uses in other contexts while also considering the context of urban development and the vibrant artistic community in Winnipeg. Each recommendation can stand on its own, however, the order in which they are listed provides a sequence that builds towards a final over-arching recommendation. If the City of Winnipeg implements Recommendation 1 as a first step, it might find that others follow more easily.

Recommendation 1: Establish a single point of contact.

Problem Statement: Currently a variety of organizations and city departments are assisting those who want to initiate temporary use projects with different aspects of their projects. Often these organizations are missing pieces of information or do not have the staffing capacity to provide the attention necessary. Site users and property owners need to know where to go for advice.

Strategy: The City of Winnipeg should work with other organizations to establish a single point of contact for temporary use projects. Designating a single staff person as the point of contact for temporary use projects in downtown Winnipeg achieves several purposes. First, this makes it easier to ensure that the information disseminated to site users and property owners is accurate and consistent. At the same time, while consistency is maintained, this staff person will be in a position to take a "caseworker" approach to projects, identifying each project's specific needs and

working with others to resolve issues. A staff person who could help navigate the process was among the "soft infrastructure needs" one developer identified as a requirement in order for increased temporary use to be an effective development strategy (Interview 3). This approach was found to be helpful in Berlin and is being recommended by Edmonton's Contaminated Gas Stations Task Force. By assigning one staff person to assist with and coordinate temporary use projects, specific expertise will be developed that can be applied to other projects and contribute to broader knowledge about the challenges and benefits of temporary use. This will ease the pressure on other organizations that are currently approached for assistance with projects as they will be able to redirect people to someone with the resources and knowledge to get the project done.

Currently in Winnipeg, Business Improvement Zone staff regularly finds itself helping businesses and site users navigate permitting and approval processes. In one recent case, "the BIZ became involved negotiating back and forth with performer and City. We've tried to be an intermediary...; they [some site users and property owners] don't even know where to begin... As soon as someone can get a bit of help, it takes the pressure off and makes it easier" (Users Focus Group). Finally, this staff person will serve as a much-needed champion and advocate for temporary use projects. Site users felt a champion working inside municipal government would be able to build support for projects and help build momentum for a cultural shift within government (Users Focus Group). One developer agreed that "you need a champion," but also added that there need to be "tools for this champion to use" (Interview 3).

Opportunity: By providing a simple, straightforward answer to the question of "Who do I need to talk to?" a single desk approach could reduce the perceived complexity of the current process. The designation of a staff person to work on these projects also helps with issues of capacity.

Challenge: With several organizations currently involved in these projects, determining the best home for a staff person will require negotiation. Organizations like the local business improvement zones have already built relationships with property owners and site users who might be involved in projects; however, providing personalised assistance on these projects may not be a fit with their

overall mandates. A position within the municipal government has the advantage of being well-placed to develop policy; however, this staff person would need to have a position in the organizational hierarchy that allowed them to easily work cross-departmentally. An arm's-length organization like CentreVenture might be a good choice, but they would require financial support from the City to expand in this way.

Recommendation 2: Demonstrate the benefits of temporary uses of space in downtown Winnipeg.

Problem statement: The City of Winnipeg, property owners, site users, and various agencies share a common interest in downtown development. Many of these actors are intrigued by the idea of temporary uses as a tool to achieve their development goals but are unsure whether potential benefits will be realised and whether potential risks will be manageable.

Strategy: A series of pilot projects should be implemented to demonstrate the potential of temporary use projects to benefit downtown Winnipeg. An organization could sponsor a series of temporary use sites to illustrate the potential benefits and to help market the concept. Regulatory and approval preparation work could be done ahead of time by the sponsor so that a certain number of city spaces could be "pre-approved" for temporary uses (Interview 3). The sponsoring organization would promote the spaces and work with interested site users to execute their proposals. One site user imagined a large-scale, well-organized event to make the case for temporary use:

> I think you need some of those wow events and activities every once in a while to really be the beacon for everybody to follow. Right now you've got the guerrilla art market out there, smaller events, boutique events, doing a lot of events but for no real money – it's kind of sweat equity. We have a fairly good-sized budget but we don't have a lot of extra money to do anything big ourselves outside of what we do here, but if the Winnipeg Art Gallery or Plug-In brought in a visual artist and said 'we're going to take over this block for a month and do something,' that would be phenomenal. And that would sort of lead the way in terms of dealing with some of those issues at City hall regarding permits, access, liability insurance. You have to argue the net benefit to the community and that in theory wins out over time. That's what will change bureaucracy or bylaws. Really it's going to come down to a cultural shift within government. Internal champions inside government. (Users Focus Group)

Opportunity: By developing a series of projects rather than just a single example, the pilot emphasizes that temporary uses can be a solution for a variety of different sites rather than a curiosity that works in one carefully-examined case. This approach presents temporary uses as a "paradigm for development rather than a site-specific solution" (Interview 3). Another advantage to implementing a series of projects is that it allows a variety of issues, challenges, and successes to be identified quickly. By making temporary use projects a more common occurrence, a level of comfort can be developed. This has "parallels to the regulation of buskers" that is seen at the Forks in Winnipeg (Interview 3). Because buskers have auditioned in order to participate, officials feel comfortable that they know more or less what the outcome will be and that they maintain a certain level of control over their site.

Challenge: It may be challenging to coordinate the timelines of several projects to ensure that they overlap. While it is not essential that the projects be at the same stage, it would be important from a promotional perspective that several projects be active at the same time.

Recommendation 3: Improve sources of information available to temporary users and property owners.

Problem statement: Very little information dealing specifically with temporary and interim uses is available to assist site users and property owners with project planning and implementation. Lack of knowledge and information about the positive aspects of temporary uses discourages property owners from seeking out these possibilities and may cause others, including funders and neighbours, to oppose these projects. Lack of information can also discourage site users from proposing unusual or creative uses for vacant space. Misunderstandings occur when property owners, site users, and planners are not clear on the process to be followed and on their relationships with one another.

Strategy A: Develop a database of available properties and project proposals. This strategy has been successful in both Zagreb and Portland, enabling property owners with vacant space and site users with project proposals to find each other. An online database should be developed that collects

as much information as possible regarding the physical characteristics, the financial conditions, and the timing requirements of available space. Additionally, site users should be able to upload details and requirements of project proposals.

Strategy B: Develop clear sources of information to guide those interested in initiating temporary use projects. A variety of tools for sharing information could be developed including general information brochures as well as checklists and templates for those actively involved in or considering projects. Checklists and templates can help guide site users and property owners through the steps of implementing a temporary use project and provide direction for overcoming potential challenges. Checklists clarify the steps of a process while helping project initiators to collect and organize required information. Templates can be developed for a number of documents that site users and property owners are likely to need including budget and lease agreements. These checklists and templates can help project initiators get a sense of the requirements and scope from the outset of the process. In all cases, care should be taken to reduce jargon and to ensure that unrealistic expectations are not created through use of language.

Opportunity: Making resources easily available to the public allows for increased transparency regarding the process of implementing projects. Additionally, the strategies described above increase the perception that temporary use projects are realisable. When accessible sources of information are developed, project initiators see that they are not alone in working on these types of projects; other projects are being developed around the city and they are supported by a structure that wants their projects to be successful.

Challenge: Maintaining these detailed resources may be a challenge. A database in particular would require regularly updating in order to stay current and relevant as different properties become available or unavailable.

Recommendation 4: Introduce financial incentives for property owners.

Problem statement: The Vacant Building By-law includes strong financial disincentives to

discourage property owners from boarding up their vacant buildings, but "You can only use your hammer so much. You have to use a carrot a bit too and offer incentives to do the right thing" (Interview 1). Property owners may be interested in supporting temporary use projects but still need to make a return on their investment, or at least cover their costs. One developer felt that he would be more willing to take on the risks and added work associated with temporary uses if more formal incentives existed: "I think there would be an inclination to think a little bit more creatively if there were some advantage" (Interview 2).

Strategy A: Build on existing disincentive programs to add incentives for property owners to seek out temporary uses for their vacant buildings. The City could work with vacant property owners to promote temporary uses as an alternative to boarding up buildings before they require major repairs. Possible incentives could include alleviation of property taxes for the period of the temporary use or a tax receipt if the temporary user is not in a position to pay market rent or if money needs to be spent in order for the building to be reused. Other incentives could include a special grant program like that used in Edmonton, providing funds for interim uses and property improvements that are part of a long-term use strategy, or low-interest loans towards redevelopment.

Strategy B: Rework taxation on downtown property so that vacant/underutilized space is not rewarded. Some land uses, like surface parking lots, that are less desirable from an urban design and planning perspective are relatively safe and economically rewarding investments for property owners. Planners find that parking lots approved as a "temporary use" of a site tend to become long-term uses; they believe this is due to the method of taxation. In contrast, there are many risks and costs associated with developing a piece of property, and the owner may not be willing or interested in taking these on. By reworking taxation rates, the municipal government may be able to shift the economic balance so that the outcome desired from a design and planning perspective is also the more attractive option for developers.

Opportunity: Developing incentives for property owners helps to acknowledge the role they play in achieving urban design goals. Ultimately, "everyone who owns real estate aspires to have their

property performing at its highest and best use" (Interview 2) and vacancies are not compatible with this goal. While disincentives and repercussions are often a necessary part of planning strategy, by working with developers to acknowledge and alleviate barriers where possible planners are able to build more functional relationships and may be better positioned to work out mutually beneficial, or at the very least mutually acceptable, agreements.

Challenge: A program of incentives and disincentives must be balanced with market realities. Developers must be able to use the model to develop workable business plans; if there is no demand for development, properties may simply be abandoned. The City must ensure that incentives are justified based on the expected returns, both financial and social. In determining expected social returns, the City faces the challenge of contingent valuation or "efforts to price or place economic values on public goods... and then apply standard tools such as benefit-cost analysis to determine whether the projects are in the public interest and should be undertaken" (Lindsay & Knaap, 1999, p. 298). This debate is familiar territory for municipal governments, but it may be difficult to combine the challenges of contingent valuation with the introduction of increased temporary uses, a less traditional approach to planning and development.

Recommendation 5: Continue to streamline process where possible.

Problem statement: Stakeholders identified approval and application processes that seem complex and confusing to property owners and site users as a key frustration to initiating more projects. By having various departments work together collaboratively, the City has managed to streamline some approval processes, like those for garden centres and small tents for special events. These approvals were simplified because "the City identified that below a certain size, these [special events tents] really have no impact" (Planners Focus Group). Many stakeholders feel there is room for additional improvements.

Strategy A: The Province and the City should work together to develop guidelines for sidewalk patio development. Site users and planners specifically identified the approval of sidewalk

patios as a complicated and time-consuming process. Collaboration by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission and relevant City departments could lead to a set of guidelines that would help site users to better understand the constraints and concerns being considered in the approval process. This could help to improve the quality of the submissions.

Strategy B: Identify areas for improvement based on pilot projects. A pilot project that initiates a series of demonstration projects will inevitably provide the opportunity to identify additional processes to be streamlined. Municipal planners can help in this area by "identifying the types of uses that really aren't going to have a lot of impact and making the process a lot easier for them to occur" (Planners Focus Group). Planners recognize that they "need to take away the hurdles and hoops that people have to jump through" (Planners Focus Group) in order to support creative initiatives.

Opportunity: These strategies build on previous successes that the City has had in streamlining processes. The experience gained from that work can be drawn on and applied to new initiatives.

Challenge: Changes to systems and policies can be slow to progress. Many stakeholders expect adjustments to procedures to take effect quickly and can become frustrated with the process when change is slow. Another source of frustration may be the negotiations that are sometimes required in order to work towards a goal. Some stakeholders may find the compromises discouraging or unsatisfying.

Recommendation 6: Develop a clear shared vision for temporary and interim use.

Problem statement: Thinking about temporary uses as a tool that can support a long-term strategy is a newer and less common concept in urban planning. Several stakeholders felt that temporary uses had been misused in the past, leading to a negative view of this category of use. Stakeholders were reluctant to endorse a strategy that encouraged increased temporary use without a clear shared understanding of what they are and where they fit in a long-term plan. For example, one interviewee liked the idea of temporary uses but added, "They can't be incompatible with the long-term goals of the neighbourhood" (Interview 1).

Strategy A: Temporary and interim uses should be introduced as a tool when downtown stakeholders are discussing development strategy. Stakeholders felt that temporary uses could be most helpful in Winnipeg as tactical tools to be used in working towards the realization of a shared vision. For example, a vision that seemed to resonate for stakeholders was something like, "No vacant street-level spaces and increased activity on the street." One site user foresaw challenges to project approvals if the vision was not shared by most community members and businesses. In order to be allowed street closures for their event, they "have to develop the support of all the different businesses and merchants that are in the area to go along with our street closures... Right now the businesses are more of the boutique, independently-owned which are into street-level activity and things like that, but if you had more of a big-box store, or name brand – Starbucks and things like that – you might get less support because they might have different goals" (Users Focus Group). One developer summarized the challenge of developing a shared vision:

> I think that there is a mindset about all that so the challenge... is in showing people the way to find temporary uses that have value added, that either incubate something or change somebody's impression of something or simply allow you to carry that facility or carry that asset until it can get there, because there are changes happening in a neighbourhood or something. So if you can show that direction and more particularly if you can enable that direction through policy incentives, economic incentives, legislative incentives, whatever toolkit you can bring, then those would all be very good things. (Interview 2)

Strategy B: Build temporary use considerations into current and future policies, plans, and by-laws. Landry writes that "The shape, style and form of the future city is in essence embedded in the laws, regulation, codes and guidelines of the present" (Landry, 2006, p. 210). Once a shared vision is established, embedding it in civic policy is an important step in moving towards realization of the vision. Ways in which temporary uses could contribute to or support a variety of City of Winnipeg policies, plans, and by-laws were discussed earlier in this practicum. A presence in policies can lend a sense of legitimacy and relevancy to temporary use projects within the minds of some planners, politicians, and citizens.

Opportunity: A shared vision that is carried through into policy provides opportunities for neighbours to influence each other. For example, adjacent property owners might approach the

owner of a vacant property to encourage them to host a temporary use (Interview 3). This encourages a community to build on the area's strengths and to involve their neighbours in projects they want to support (Interview 3).

Challenge: There is a risk that if all stakeholders agree on a vision for temporary uses that the projects will lose a degree of their spontaneity. This approach inevitably institutionalizes temporary use projects and limits their countercultural potential. Malloy argues a formal recognition of temporary use as a development tool "sidesteps its connection to radical grassroots community development efforts" (Malloy, 2009, p. 20).

Recommendation 7: Plan for both current and future uses.

Problem statement: Buildings and communities designed with long-term goals in mind, without considering the current context or unanticipated changes in future direction may be unsuccessful. For example, current planning wisdom calls for an increase in mixed-use buildings, with retail at street-level and residential space above. This type of building design is being encouraged in Winnipeg, but planners shy away from mandating it because "if the market isn't there you're going to have this empty space" (Planners Focus Group). This is an example where incremental steps may need to be taken towards the long-term goal.

Strategy: Develop guidelines to encourage the design of flexible spaces. When building new, designers should be encouraged to design flexible spaces that can adapt to changing needs and can also be changed incrementally to achieve long-term goals. In the case of mixed-use development this might mean that designing spaces that are suited to multiple uses:

> So increasingly what cities are trying to do, and what we're trying to encourage, is that on the ground floor maybe you build it so that it could house commercial retail in the future, but you build it in a manner that it's flexible space. Maybe it starts as office or residential rental. As the market conditions permit or change then you look at transitioning that space but if you build it from the get-go with 12 ft. high ceilings and plumbing and things of that nature, it becomes a lot less complex and a lot less challenging to transition a use on that floor. (Planners Focus Group)

This strategy may allow a development to be successful in the short-term while enabling it to

incrementally transition towards achieving the long-term goal of increased mixed-use in a neighbourhood.

Opportunity: Again, this strategy builds on current practice as planners are already encouraging the flexible design of space on an informal basis. Developing guidelines around how these spaces can be designed would help them increase the number of developments that use this approach and potentially increase mixed-use in an area. Guidelines would also help designers and developers apply best practices to their projects.

Challenge: There could be some resistance to design-related guidelines if these are perceived to raise the initial cost of development. Another challenge could arise if a market for the space does not develop as anticipated; this could cause disappointment and frustration among developers who may be less interested in developing such spaces in the future.

Recommendation 8: Foster a culture of creative governance in municipal government.

Problem statement: Stakeholders are frustrated with what they see as reluctance on the part of the City and some property owners to take risks. Most are not looking for the City to take excessive risk; they are simply asking for an acceptance of low risk where the likelihood of reward is high. At the same time, planners may be interested in experimenting with more innovative approaches to urban design challenges but find themselves working within a government culture of risk management. In arguing for increased creativity in planning, Albrechts has pointed out that "if we keep emphasizing the planning enterprise as a purely regulatory and problem-solving practice, it may lose its creative possibilities for structural change" (Albrechts, 2005, p. 248).

Strategy: The City should do more to empower planners to develop pilot projects that test theories and "best practices" identified elsewhere. If the municipal government is to be an environment that fosters creativity and develops innovative solutions to local problems, planners need to be encouraged to take a degree of risk. Stakeholders find that this change "hasn't been cultural yet, it's been individual. There are some people working on these sorts of projects,

supporting them, but they still face cultural challenges" (Interview 3). Pilot projects provide opportunities to build relationships while experimenting with the application of solutions developed elsewhere to local challenges. The boundaries of a pilot project provide a degree of accountability. Healey argues that to develop and maintain a culture of creative governance, city planners:

> need to discover a complex balance between self-regulation and re-distribution, between being supportive in multiple ways and constraining where essential, between openness and transparency and accepting the likelihood of critique and protest, between producing and circulating knowledge and information and accepting that valuable knowledge resources are also to be found in the many nooks and crannies of urban life. Above all, a mode of urban governance, which encourages creativity has to learn to experiment and therefore to learn from failure as well as success, and to recognise that redundancy in resource use is as much a positive quality, spreading access to opportunity and support, rather than merely a negative inefficiency.
> (Healey, 2004, p. 19)

Opportunity: A benefit of developing a culture of creative governance at the municipal is that it establishes the city government as a model and demonstrates leadership on the part of the City. When a city government shows a willingness to take on a certain level of risk, and supports its planners in doing so as well, this encourages others outside government to experiment and to be creative too.

Challenge: Changing a government culture and building trusting relationships is a "difficult and time-consuming process that sits uneasily alongside bureaucratic and electoral cycles which demand more immediate evidence of results" (Coaffee & Deas, 2008, p. 182).

Part 5: Conclusions
5.1 Revisiting the research questions
5.2 Implications for planning practice
5.3 Directions for further study

Part 5: Conclusions

In this part, I return to the initial research questions, reviewing conclusions developed through the course of the practicum research. After this review, the implications of this research for broader planning practiced are discussed before I expand on directions for further study in the final section.

5.1 Revisiting the research questions

1. What are the claimed benefits of and drawbacks to temporary uses of space? Do they currently meet these claims?

Through a literature review and through the study of several existing projects, I introduced nine benefits and seven challenges that are associated with temporary use projects. I was able to identify individual projects to illustrate each benefit, and thus it can be argued that these projects can achieve the claimed benefits. While specific projects were not put forward as examples to highlight potential drawbacks to temporary use projects, it appears there is increasing discussion around these issues.

When reviewing larger strategies encouraging temporary use projects through the precedent studies of Berlin, Zagreb, Portland, and Edmonton, advantages for property owners and the adaptive reuse of vacant spaces were the most clearly demonstrated benefits. In all four precedents, steps are being taken to clarify ownership of space and to assist in minimizing legal complications. As will be discussed further in Section 5.2, some of the negative impacts of institutionalization appear to be difficult to avoid completely.

2. What can local planners learn about temporary uses from experiences elsewhere?

Local planners can learn from the experiences of planners in Berlin, Zagreb, Portland, and Edmonton about different approaches to managing temporary use projects and to encouraging these projects as part of a larger strategy. As highlighted in Section 3.5, planners play slightly different roles in each city. In Berlin, planners are facilitators, mediators, and promoters. In Zagreb and Portland, municipal planners do not currently play an active role in these projects, but might be considered part of a communication network. In Edmonton, it appears planners will be taking on the role of negotiator, negotiating interim uses with property owners as part of longer term site remediation plans.

3. How can Winnipeg's policies surrounding temporary uses be modified to support and encourage a wider range of interventions?

Enacting the recommendations put forward in Section 4.5 would help to improve Winnipeg's policies surrounding temporary use projects and would allow the city to realise some of the benefits these projects can present.

5.2 Implications for planning practice

Planners have an important role to play in supporting temporary use projects. They are well-placed to encourage developers to consider incorporating temporary, or interim, uses from the outset of their projects. They have connections with other City departments and with local organizations through which they can share information about the benefits and risks of temporary use projects as well as information about the steps to follow in implementing projects. They are often called on to work with area stakeholders to develop a vision for a community. Through these functions, planners can be leaders in changing the way temporary uses are viewed and how they are applied as tools in urban development.

Landry (2006) stresses the importance of planners being proactive rather than reactive when it comes to urban issues. He argues that "Where issues are addressed only reactively they are already problems if not crises, and responses are defined by the problems themselves, so we are forced to deal with yesterday's problem not tomorrow's opportunity" (Landry, 2006, p.46). In this vein, while the implementation of temporary use projects and downtown vacancies may not seem like pressing issues at this point, it is worth exploring these topics and monitoring trends in order to "detect little changes that may become significant in the future" (Landry, 2006, p.46).

As they learn more about temporary uses and begin to apply them, planners must learn to recognise the "limitations of overly prescriptive or formulaic policy responses" (Pietarse, 2008, p. 137). Pietarse predicts that without an increased awareness of these limitations and without addressing current systems of urban development, the status quo, which represses many, will continue (2008, p. 137).

While some of these issues may appear to some to be beyond planners' functions, Bell argues that considering where planning and urban design connect with a wider range of issues is the way to ensure the design professions retain their relevancy in the minds of the public: "To make design more relevant is to reconsider what 'design' issues are. Rejecting the limits we have defined for ourselves, we should instead assume that design can play a positive role in seeking answers to many

different kinds of challenges. We have limited our potential by seeing most major human concerns as unrelated to our work" (Bell, 2008, p. 15). At the same time, whether planners or the public accept it or not, planners' work affects more human concerns than many people recognise; planning and policy decisions, big and small, affect the physical design of our cities.

5.3 Directions for further study

"Designers are so good at studying these spontaneous situations, but when they are asked to formalize it, the very dynamism they sought falls apart" (Mathur as cited in Gastil & Ryan, 2004b, p. 17).

The opinion above, expressed by Anuradha Mathur in a published roundtable discussion about open systems, bears repeating. While I have endeavoured to keep this warning in mind while researching and writing this practicum, I feel it is a trap that I have not managed to stay out of completely. Some of my early explorations were in the areas of play, but in developing an argument for the legitimacy of these ideas within planning practice, some of this initial playfulness was lost. Is this as inevitable as writers like Arlt seem to believe? This is an important question for future investigation.

Malloy begins to identify some of the specific questions and issues that might guide such research. She writes that "Gerend's introduction (2007) of temporary use to American planners situates this practice as an economic development infill tool and sidesteps its connection to radical grassroots community development efforts" (Malloy, 2009, p. 20). She sees aspects of temporary use being "overshadowed by the emerging dominant conversation on temporary use practices" (Malloy, 2009, p. 22). Instead she argues that "Temporary use is not only associated with the fleeting use of an urban site, it also incorporates the very concept of temporality as a way of approaching and generating projects that have to do with how we choose to live, work and interact within urban spaces" (Malloy, 2009, p. 22). Does the current conversation about temporary use actually take voice away from those who first made use of it in a more intentional way?

The concept of agonistic pluralism was introduced as an interesting lens for looking at the relationships between actors involved in temporary use projects. A discussion on agonism leads to questions about planning and democracy, about participation in planning, and about how planners engage in planning activities.

Sennett makes the connection between democracy and the design of urban space:

> When the city operates as an open system – incorporating porosity of territory, narrative indeterminacy and incomplete form – it becomes democratic not in a legal sense, but as physical experience. In the past, thinking about democracy focused on issues of formal governance; today it focuses on citizenship and issues of participation which have everything to do with the physical city and its design. (Sennett, 2007, p. 296)

Aeschbacher and Rios echo this view of the connection between citizenship and physical space: "Active citizenship begins with the recognition that the public realm is a political and physical terrain of struggle that is produced contextually, relationally, and through dialogue; that is incrementally negotiated over time through democratic participation; and that is manifested in material form" (2008, p. 85). From a political and philosophical perspective, temporary use projects, which often spark dialogue between a variety of actors, might be seen as a symbol of active citizenship, where projects represent incremental "negotiations" about space.

How, then, to design and implement these agonistic spaces? "How," Aeschbacher and Rios ask, "can we, as the planners and designers of the public realm, manifest agonistic and dialogical spaces that reflect a multicentric, dynamic vision of citizenship?" (Aeschbacher & Rios, 2008, p. 90).

Involving others in the physical process is essential. As Aeschbeacher and Rios contend, the role of planners and designers "must extend beyond disciplinary boundaries to directly engage the material production of space through active citizenship" (2008, p. 85).

Questions about participation inevitably lead to questions about who is involved in planning processes. Wigley highlights the importance of being aware of whose needs are being identified and considered: "We know that the physical form of the city is radically changing all the time… We also know that people's relationships to the city change and, therefore, they change. That brings up the issue who is the 'we' that defines the city" (Wigley as cited in Miles, 1997, p. 38). As one Winnipeg stakeholder pointed out, "You also run into: Is it appropriate? You're talking public space, or space that's open to the public, then what you put in there is also up for debate. Is it appropriate material and who decides?" (Users Focus Group).

Temporary use projects demonstrate the need for planners to "trust the creativity of

residents. They must acknowledge that there are multiple publics and that planning and governance in a new multicultural era requires a new kind of multicultural literacy and a new kind of democratic politics, which is more participative, more deliberative, more agonistic" (Albrechts, 2005, 263). By engaging with groups that are not often involved in planning processes, temporary use projects might expand participation. Haydn and Temel observe that "In the current debate over the use of public space in cities, temporary uses are seen as tools of empowerment: revealing the possibilities of space" (2006, p. 14) and, arguably, empowering those who help to reveal these possibilities. The potential for temporary use projects to act as tools for participation, empowerment, and capacity building are areas that deserve further study.

Finally, the connection between temporary uses and planning in a wider range of contexts should be explored. Temporary uses, the "unplanned," and the "informal" are becoming essential aspects of urban planning in many cities around the world:

> The growth of future cities depends upon how well we are able to plan for the 'unplanned'. The generic theme evolving from Asia, Latin America, and Africa is that as cities expand, the 'informal' grows faster than the 'formal'. Thus plans will need paradigmatic change to deal with the heterogeneous housing and mobility needs of growing populations. We will have to plan for activities that cannot be well-defined and predicted, which is better than turning a blind eye to the future. (Tiware as cited in Burdett & Sudjic, 2007, 490)

The precedent studies and examples put forward in this practicum have all been found in northern hemisphere cities. The context of urban development is quite different in other parts of the world. In 2000 there were 47.5 times more people living in Mexico City than there were in 1900 (Urban Age Project, 2007, p. 168). In Shanghai in 1981 there were 121 buildings over eight storeys. In 2000 there were 3,529 and in 2005 there were 10,045 (Urban Age Project, 2007, p. 110). This requires a different kind of planning than is used for cities that are experiencing no growth, like Berlin and Zagreb. As noted above by Tiware, there is a role for the "unplanned," and possibly for temporary uses, to play here as well, but that role will be different.

Temporary uses can be powerful tools for urban development, but planners need to be proactive in engaging with them and in learning more about their possibilities.

References cited

Aeschbacher, P., & Rios, M. (2008). Claiming public space: The case for proactive democratic design. In B. Bell & K. Wakeford (eds.), *Expanding architecture: Design as activism* (pp. 84-91). New York, NY: Metropolis Books.

Albrechts, L. (2005). Creativity as a drive for change. *Planning Theory, 4*(3), 247 -269.

Arlt, P. (2006). Urban planning and interim use. In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 39-46). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg (2011). *Die kleine Berlin-Statistik 2010: English edition*. Berlin, Germany: H & P-Druck.

Avison Young (2010). *Avison Young real estate forecast 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.avisonyoung.com/Research/Market_Reports_Archive/#national

Avison Young (2011). *Winnipeg 2010 annual review/2011 forecast (spring 2011)*. Retrieved from http://www.avisonyoung.com/Research/Market_Reports_Archive/#winnipeg

Bašić, K. (2004). Zagreb: Population change 1991-2001. *Croatian Geographical Bulletin*, *65*(2), 55-66. Retrieved from http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=57810&lang=en

Bell, B. (2008). Preface: Expanding design toward greater relevance. In B. Bell & K. Wakeford (eds.) *Expanding architecture: Design as activism* (pp. 14-17). New York, NY: Metropolis Books.

Blau, E. (2007). City as open work. In E. Blau, I. Rupnik, & I. Rogi Nehajev (eds.), *Project Zagreb: Transition as condition, strategy, practice* (pp. 8-25). Barcelona, Spain: Actar D.

Blumner, N. (2006). Planning for the unplanned: Tools and techniques for interim use in Germany and the United States. Retrieved from http://www.difu.de/english/occasional/06-blumner_planning.pdf.

Build a Better Block (n.d.). The better block: A living charrette. Retrieved from http://betterblock.org/how-to-build-a-better-block/

CB Richard Ellis (2011). Canada: 2011 market outlook. Retrieved from http://www.cbre.ca/EN/Our+Offices/Manitoba/Winnipeg/Winnipeg+Market+Outlook.htm

CentreVenture (2008). CentrePlan development framework. Retrieved from http://www.centreventure.com/PDF/CentrePlan%20Final%2009-22-08.pdf

CentreVenture (2010a). Turning the corner: 2009 Annual report. Retrieved from http://www.centreventure.com/reports.php

CentreVenture (2010b). Portage Avenue development strategy. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/CLKDMIS/ViewDoc.asp?DocId=11453&SectionId=293210&InitUrl=/CLKDMIS/Documents/c/2011/m11453/epc%2011%2009%20no.%2001%20-%20business%20plan.pdf

Chang, C. (n.d.). I wish this was. Retrieved from http://candychang.com/i-wish-this-was/

Chia, R. (1999). A 'rhizomic' model of organizational change and transformation: Perspective from a metaphysics of change. *British Journal of Management*, *10*(3), 209-227. Doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.00128.

Chicago Loop Alliance (2009). About Pop-Up Art Loop. Retrieved from http://www.popupartloop.com/about.php

City of Edmonton (2010a). *Contaminated gas stations task force work program - discussion paper draft 3: Barriers and resolutions.* Report: 2010DCM042 Attachment 1. Retrieved from http://sirepub.edmonton.ca/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=367&doctype=MINUTES

City of Edmonton (2010b). *Contaminated gas stations task force revised strategy.* Report: 2010DCM056 Attachment 1. Retrieved from http://sirepub.edmonton.ca/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=369&doctype=MINUTES

City of Edmonton (2010c). *Capital city downtown plan*. Retrieved from http://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/Capital_City_Downtown_Plan_May_27_2010.pdf

City of Edmonton (2011a). *Unwilling Owners: Reasons for Inaction on Remediation and Sale. Report: 2011SPE021, Attachment 1*. Retrieved from http://sirepub.edmonton.ca/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=581&doctype=MINUTES

City of Edmonton (2011b, June 27). *Challenges to establishing alternative uses for brownfield sites. Report: 2011SPE021, Attachment 1*. Retrieved from http://sirepub.edmonton.ca/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=581&doctype=MINUTES

City of Edmonton (2011c). *Brownfield redevelopment grant program*. Retrieved from http://www.edmonton.ca/environmental/programs/brownfield-redevelopment-grant-program.aspx

City of Winnipeg (2000). *Plan Winnipeg... 2020 Vision*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: City of Winnipeg.

City of Winnipeg (2003). *Business improvement zone procedures by-law*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/biz_overview.stm

City of Winnipeg (2004a). *Downtown Winnipeg zoning by-law*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/zoning_bylaws.stm

City of Winnipeg (2004b). *Waterfront Drive: Expectations for new development*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning_downtown.stm

City of Winnipeg (2005). *Downtown Winnipeg urban design guidelines*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning_downtown.stm

City of Winnipeg (2006). *Winnipeg zoning by-law*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/zoning_bylaw200.stm

City of Winnipeg (2008). *West Alexander & Centennial neighbourhood plan*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/CLKDMIS/DocExt/ViewDoc.asp?DocumentTypeId=1&DocId=4386&DocType=C

City of Winnipeg (2009). Mayor supports first Canadian "Ciclovia" event: Event encourages citizens to engage in active and green alternative transportation. News releases September 11, 2009. Retrieved from http://winnipeg.ca/cao/media/news/nr_2009/nr_20090911.stm

City of Winnipeg (2010a). *Current secondary planning initiatives for 2010, eFile EP-1.2*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning_secondary.stm

City of Winnipeg (2010b). *Vacant buildings program*. Property and neighbourhood standards. Retrieved from http://winnipeg.ca/cms/bylawenforcement/vacantbuildings.stm

City of Winnipeg (2010c). *Special events permits*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/Services/permits/#specialevents

City of Winnipeg (2011). *OurWinnipeg*. Retrieved from http://speakupwinnipeg.com/ourwinnipeg/

City of Winnipeg & The Forks Renewal Corporation (2004). *Pioneer & Waterfront development principles and guidelines*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning_downtown.stm

City of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada (2006a). *Winnipeg neighbourhood profiles: 2006 census data - City of Winnipeg*. Retrieved from http://winnipeg.ca/census/2006/City%20of%20Winnipeg/

City of Winnipeg & Statistics Canada (2006b). *Winnipeg neighbourhood profiles: 2006 census data - Downtown Winnipeg*. Retrieved from http://winnipeg.ca/census/2006/City%20of%20Winnipeg/

Colliers Berlin GMBH (2011). Office Leasing and Investment market Report: Berlin - Q1-Q2 2011. Retrieved from http://www.colliers-berlin.de/en/research/market-reports.html

Colliers International (2010a). Edmonton Office Real Estate Report 2010 Q3. Retrieved from http://www.collierscanada.com/en/Commercial-Property-Research?office=Winnipeg&proptype=Office&year=2010

Colliers International (2010b). Winnipeg Office Real Estate Report 2010 Q4. Retrieved from http://www.collierscanada.com/en/Commercial-Property-Research?office=Winnipeg&proptype=Office&year=2010

Colliers International Croatia (2011). Croatia: Research & Forecast Report – Mid-year 2011. Retrieved from http://www.colliers.com/country/croatia/researchreports?lang=en

Colliers International Portland (2011). Portland: The Knowledge Report – Q3 2011 Office. Retrieved from http://www.colliers.com/Markets/Portland/Research

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). (2000). By design: Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice. Retrieved from http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/CABE/CABE-publications/By-Design/

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). (2008). Land in limbo: Making the best use of vacant urban spaces. Retrieved from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/land-in-limbo

Coaffee, J. & Deas, I. (2008). The search for policy innovation in urban governance: Lessons from community-led regeneration partnerships. *Public Policy and Administration, 23*, 167-187.

Crawford, M. (2008). Preface: The current state of everyday urbanism. In M. Crawford, J. Kaliski, & J. Chase (eds.), *Everyday urbanism* (2nd ed.), pp. 6-15. New York, NY: Monacelli Press.

Creative Space Agency (n.d.). Kinetica Museum at Old Spitalfields Market. Retrieved from http://www.creativespaceagency.co.uk/case_studies/view/kinetica_museum

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cumberlidge, C., & Musgrave, L. (n.d). Thurrock: A visionary brief in the Thames Gateway. Retrieved from http://www.visionarythurrock.org.uk/docs/examples/destrip/index.html.

Cumberlidge, C., & Musgrave, L. (2007). *Design and landscape for people: New approaches to renewal.* London, England: Thames & Hudson.

Dann, B., Meier, B., Rice, E., & Somerfield, B. (2009). *No vacancy!* Portland State University, Portland. Retrieved from http://novacancyproject.wordpress.com/about/

Davila, T., Shelton, R., & Epstein, M. (2006). *Making innovation work: How to manage it, measure it, and profit from it*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing.

Delanty, G., & Strydom, P. (2003). The interpretive tradition. In G. Delanty & P. Strydom (eds.), *Philosophies of social science: The classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 85-99). Maidenhead, England: Open University.

Destination Winnipeg (2008). Quarterly economic highlights: 3rd quarter 2008. Retrieved from http://www.economicdevelopmentwinnipeg.com/winnipeg-economy/winnipeg-economy/economic-performance

Doron, G. (2008). '. . . those marvellous empty zones at the edge of cities': Heterotopia and the 'dead zone'. In M. Dehaene & L. De Cauter (eds.), *Heterotopia and the city* (pp. 202-213). New York, NY: Routledge.

Eichstadt-Bohlig, F. (2007). The stunted metropolis. In R. Burdett & D. Sudjic (eds.), *The endless city: The urban age project by the London School of Economics and Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen Society* (pp. 228-231). London, England: Phaidon.

Endres, T. (2003). Stalker Â– Ararat, Campo Boario, Roma, Italia. Retrieved from http://www.templace.com/project-pool/one37ba.html?prj_id=3654

Eurostat Press Office (2010, February 18). Regional GDP per inhabitant in 2007. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=STAT/10/25&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

Eurostat (n.d.). Urban audit: Berlin. *Regional Policy – Inforegio*. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from http://www.urbanaudit.org/DataAccessed.aspx

Fraker, H. (2007). Where is the design discourse? *Places*, *19*(3), 61-63. Retrieved from http://places.designobserver.com/feature/where-is-the-urban-design-discourse-to-rally-discussion/476/

Francis, M. (2001). A case study method for landscape architects. *Landscape Journal*, *20*(1), 15.

Gadamer, H. (2003). Hermeneutical understanding. In G. Delanty & P. Strydom (eds.), *Philosophies of social science: The classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 158-164). Maidenhead, England: Open University.

Gastil, R., & Ryan, Z. (eds.). (2004a). Roundtable discussion: Leisure and politics. In *Open: New designs for public space* (pp. 22-24). New York, NY: Van Alen Institute.

Gastil, R., & Ryan, Z. (eds.). (2004b). Roundtable discussion: Open systems. In *Open: New designs for public space* (pp. 15-17). New York, NY: Van Alen Institute.

Gerend, J. (2007). Temps welcome. *Planning*, *73*(11), 24-27.

Groth, J. & Corijn, E. (2005). Reclaiming urbanity: Indeterminate spaces, informal actors and urban agenda setting. *Urban Studies, 42*(3), 503-526. DOI: 10.1080/00420980500035436

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hajer, M., & Reijndorp, A. (2002). *In search of the new public domain*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Nai Publishers.

Haydn, F. (2006). A material that never comes to rest. In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 67-74). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Haydn, F., & Temel, R. (2006). Glossary. In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 8-17). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Haydn, F., & Temel, R. (eds.). (2006). *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces*. Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser. .

Healey, P. (2004). Creativity and urban governance. *Policy Studies*, *25*(2), 87-102. Doi: 10.1080/0144287042000262189.

Healey, P. (2007). *Urban complexity and spatial strategies: towards a relational planning for our times.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hetherington, K. & Cronin, A.M. (2008). Introduction.In K. Hetherington & A.M. Cronin (eds.), *Consuming the entrepreneurial city: image, memory, spectacle,* pp. 1-17. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hillier, J. (2005). Straddling the post-structuralist abyss: Between transcendence and immanence? *Planning Theory*, *4*(3), 271-299.

Hotel Transvaal. (n.d). Welcome to Hotel Transvaal. Retrieved from http://www.hoteltransvaal.com/.

Hötzl, M. (2004). Agents of change: A new role for the profession. *Erste Bank*. Retrieved from http://www.sponsoring.erstebank.at/report/stories/platforma_981/en

Janzen, E. (2010). The power of myth. *Canadian Dimensions, 44*(1). Retrieved from http://canadiandimension.com/articles/2675/

Jensen, O. B. (2004) The BIDs of New York—power, place and the role of business improvement districts. Paper for the XVIII AESOP Congress, 1–3 July 2004, Grenoble, France.

Jessop, B. (1997). The entrepreneurial city: Re-imagining localities, redesigning economic governance, or restructuring capital? In N. Jewson and S. MacGregor (eds.), *Transforming cities: contested governance and new spatial divisions,* pp. 25-38. London, England: Routledge.

Kaliski, J. (2008a). Everyday urban design: toward default urbanism and/or urbanism by design. In M. Crawford, J. Kaliski, & J. Chase (eds.), *Everyday urbanism* (2nd ed.), pp. 216-221. New York, NY: Monacelli Press.

Kaliski, J. (2008b). The present city and the practice of city design. In M. Crawford, J. Kaliski, & J. Chase (eds.), *Everyday urbanism* (2nd ed.), pp. 88-109. New York, NY: Monacelli Press.

Kelbaugh, D. (2002). *Repairing the American metropolis: Common place revisited*. Seattle, OR: University of Washington Press.

King, J. (2010). Myriad ideas to fill void of empty lots. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/01/26/MNDV1BKUM4.DTL

Kliewer, K. et al. (2010). *Community-based planning: Engagement, collaboration, and meaningful participation in the creation of neighbourhood plans*. Winnipeg, Canada: Institute of Urban Studies.

Kohoutek, R., & Kamleithner, C. (2006). Temporary uses, deregulation, and urbanity. In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 25-37). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Lab for culture (n.d.). Case studies – analytical approach: Operation:grad. Retrieved from http://www.labforculture.org/en/case-studies/contents/projects/case-studies-analytical-approach/operacija-grad

Landry, C. (2006). *The art of city-making*. London, England: Earthscan.

Landry, C. (2008). *The creative city: a toolkit for urban innovators* (2nd ed.). Sterling, VA: Earthscan.

Lang, J. T. (1994). *Urban design: The American experience*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Laskshmanan, T.R. & Chatterjee, L. (2006). The entrepreneurial city in the global marketplace, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, 6*(3), pp 155-172.

Leo, C. & Anderson, K. (2006). Being realistic about urban growth. In *Journal of Urban Affairs*, *28*(2), 169-189.

Lindsay, G. & Knaap, G. (1999). Willingness to pay for urban greenway projects. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 65*(3), 297-313.

Lydon, M., Bartman, D., Woudstra, R. & Khawarzad, A. (n.d.). *Tactical urbanism* (Vol. 1). Retrieved from http://streetplans.org/research_and_writing.php

Mackey, J. (2007). Temporary use: A planning strategy for the uncertain. Retrieved from www.shef.ac.uk/architecture/main/gallery/gal/diploma/theoryforum07/essays/joseph_mackey.pdf.

Malloy, J. (2009). What is left of planning?! Residual planning! In T. Schwarz & S. Rugare, *Pop up city: Urban infill vol. 2* (pp. 19-38). Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). London, England: SAGE.

Mehrotra, R. (ed.) (2005). *Everyday urbanism: Margaret Crawford vs. Michael Speaks*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, A. Alfred Taubman College of Architecture.

Mesaric, V. (2005). A tour of Invisible Zagreb. Retrieved from http://www.heritageradio.net/cms2/heritage-memory-single-view/article/a-tour-of-invisible-zagreb/

Miles, M. (1997). *Art, space and the city public art and urban futures*. London, England: Routledge.

MJB Consulting (2009). Downtown Winnipeg retail market analysis & general positioning strategy. Retrieved from http://www.downtownwinnipegbiz.com/home/business/retail_strategy/

Mouffe, C. (1999). Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism? *Social Research*, *66*(3), 745-758.

Mouffe (2008). Public spaces and democratic politics. In J. Boomgaard (ed.), *Highrise, common ground: Art and the Amsterdam Zuidas area*, pp. 135-158. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Valiz.

Moughtin, C., Cuesta, R., Sarris, C., & Signoretta, P. (2003). *Urban design: Method and techniques* (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Architectural Press.

Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Optrek. (2005). The Mobile Project Office. Retrieved from http://www.optrektransvaal.nl/.

Oswalt, P., Overmeyer, K., & Misselwitz, P. (2009). Patterns of the unplanned. In T. Schwarz & S. Rugare, *Pop up city: Urban infill vol. 2* (pp. 3-18). Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative.

Overmeyer, K. (2007). *Urban pioneers*. Berlin, Germany: Jovis.

Oxford University Press, & Chadwyck-Healey, Inc. (2000). *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford, Eng.: Oxford University Press.

Portland Development Commission (2001). *Pearl District development plan*. Retrieved from http://www.pdc.us/pubs/inv_detail.asp?id=234&ty=14

Petrescu, D. (2005). Losing control, keeping desire. In P. Blundell-Jones, D. Petrescu, & J. Till (eds.), *Architecture and participation* (pp. 43-61). New York, NY: Spon Press.

Phillips, A. (2008). Politics of informal production. In A. F. Kiendl (ed.), *Informal architectures: Space and contemporary culture* (pp. 142-47). London, England: Black Dog Publishing.

Pietarse, E. (2008). *City futures: Confronting the crisis of urban development*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Platforma 9,81 (n.d.). Invisible Zagreb. In Art-e-fact, 4. Majaca, A & Eric, Z. (eds). http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_platform981_en.htm on October 2, 2009.

Pogoreutz, R. (2006). Urban intelligence. In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 75-80). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Population Research Center (2011a). *2000 and 2010 Comparison profiles, Census 2000 geography: Multnomah County census tracts*. Retrieved from http://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu.prc/files/Multnomah_CT2000.pdf

Population Research Center (2011b). *2010 Census profiles: Oregon and its metropolitan areas*. Retrieved from http://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu.prc/files/2010_PL94_MSA.pdf

Province of Manitoba (2002). *City of Winnipeg Charter Act*. Retrieved from http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/2002/c03902e.php

Province of Manitoba (2011). Forks North Portage Partnership. Retrieved from www.gov.mb.ca/asset_library/en/abc/lg/forks_north_portage_partnership.pdf

Quartiers en crise – European Regeneration Areas Network (n.d.). *The Casco theory applied to a creative hub - Kinetish Noord, Amsterdam (Holland)*. Retrieved from http://www.qec-eran.org/urbact/ndsm_ws7.htm

Rajchman, J. (2000). *The Deleuze connections*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

raumlaborberlin (n.d.). Spacebuster. Retrieved from http://www.raumlabor.net/?p=1799

relations e.V. (n.d.). Zagreb – cultural kapital of Europe 3000. Retrieved from http://www.projekt-relations.de/en/explore/zagreb/index.php

Rijpers, Y. (2006). Temporary use as urban catalyst. Retrieved from http://www.inspiringcities.org/index.php?id=1&page_type=Article&id_article=18059

Resource Center Chicago (n.d.). Resource Center's City Farm. Retrieved from http://www.resourcecenterchicago.org/aboutcityfarm.html

Ronneberger, K. (2006). From regulation to moderation. In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 47-54). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Samuel, H. (2010, April 14). Expressway roads along Seine to be closed after 40 years. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/7590210/Expressway-roads-along-Seine-to-be-closed-after-40-years.html

Schroedter, A. (2009). Iconic ice cream seller to open on State. ChicagoRealEstateDaily.com. Retrieved from http://www.chicagorealestatedaily.com/article/20090624/CRED03/200034525/iconic-ice-cream-seller-to-open-on-state#ixzz1dPYH36Kl

Schwarz, T. (2009). Ad hoc urbanism. In T. Schwarz & S. Rugare, *Pop up city: Urban infill vol. 2* (pp. 49-60). Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative.

Sennett, R. (2007). The open city. In R. Burdett & D. Sudjic (eds.), *The endless city: The urban age project by the London School of Economics and Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen Society* (pp. 290-297). London, England: Phaidon.

Sić, M. (2007). Spatial and functional changes in recent urban development of Zagreb. *Dela, 27*, 5-15.

Smith, R.E. (2010). *Prefab architecture: A guide to modular design and construction.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Speaks, M. (2005). Everyday is not enough. In R. Mehrotra (ed.), *Everyday urbanism: Margaret Crawford vs. Michael Speaks* (pp. 34-42). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, A. Alfred Taubman College of Architecture.

Spiegl, A., & Teckert, C. (2006). Tom waits 4'33". In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 97-104). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser. .

Statistics Canada (1997). *Highlights for Edmonton (city) Alberta*. Retrieved from http://www12.statcan.ca/english/profil/Details/details1.cfm?SEARCH=BEGINS&ID=11979&PSGC=48&SGC=4811061&DataType=1&LANG=E&Province=48&PlaceName=edmonton&CMA=835&CSDNAME=Edmonton&A=&TypeNameE=City

Statistics Canada (2007). Population and dwelling counts, for Canada and census subdivisions (municipalities), 2006 and 2001 censuses - 100% data (table). Retrieved from http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/data/popdwell/Table.cfm?T=301&S=3&O=D

Statistics Canada (2011). *Population of census metropolitan areas.* Retrieved from http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/l01/cst01/demo05a-eng.htm

Stevens, Q. (2007). *Ludic city: Exploring the potential of public spaces*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Stout, H. (2003). Eying the industrial sanctuary. *Portland Business Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.bizjournals.com/portland/stories/2003/09/08/focus1.html?page=all

Sudjic, D. (2007). Looking for a new future. In R. Burdett & D. Sudjic (eds.), *The endless city: The urban age project by the London School of Economics and Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen Society*, (pp. 226-227). London, England: Phaidon.

Tait, M. & Jensen, O.B. (2007). Travelling ideas, power and place: The cases of urban villages and business improvement districts. *International Planning Studies, 12*(2), 107–127.

Tan, P. (2008). Can 'spaces' be fully capitalized? Art and the gentrification of non-places. In A. Szymczyk & E. Filipovic (eds.), *When things cast no shadow: 5th Berlin Biennial for Contemporary Art* (pp. 136-139). Zürich, Germany: JRP-Ringier.

Tempohousing (n.d.). Keetwonen (Amsterdam student housing). Retrieved from http://www.tempohousing.com/projects/keetwonen.html

Temel, R. (2006). The temporary in the city. In F. Haydn & R. Temel (eds.), *Temporary urban spaces: Concepts for the use of city spaces* (pp. 55-62). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser. .

Thompson, C.W. (2002). Urban open space in the 21st century. In *Landscape and Urban Planning 60*, 59-72.

Urban Age Project (2007). Data. In R. Burdett & D. Sudjic (eds.), *The endless city: The urban age project by the London School of Economics and Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen Society*, (pp. 244-273). London, England: Phaidon.

U.S. Census Bureau (1991). *Oregon – Place: GCT-Pa. age, sex, and group quarters: 1990. Data set: 1990 Summary tape file 1 (STF 1) - 100-percent data*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?_bm=y&-context=gct&-ds_name=DEC_1990_STF1_&-CONTEXT=gct&-mt_name=DEC_1990_STF1_GCTPA_ST3&-tree_id=100&-redoLog=true&-geo_id=04000US41&-format=ST-3&-_lang=en

U.S. Census Bureau (2011). *State and county quick facts: Portland (city), Oregon*. Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/41/4159000.html

Van Heeswijk, J. (n.d.). De Strip. Retrieved from http://www.jeanneworks.net/.

Weinberg, L. (n.d.). Space Invaders. *Time Out Chicago*. Retrieved from http://timeoutchicago.com/arts-culture/art-design/71742/space-invaders

Welch, M. A. (2010, December 4). Lots and lots and lots: Surface parking sprawl is a civic scourge. *The Winnipeg Free Press*. Retrieved from http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/local/lots-and-lots-of-lots-111312094.html

Winslow, J. (n.d.). Pearl District. Project for Public Spaces. Retrieved from http://www.pps.org/great_public_spaces/one?public_place_id=663

Wolfe, J. M. (1989). Theory, hypothesis, explanation and action: the example of urban planning. In A. Kobayashi & S. Mackenzie (eds.), *Remaking Human Geography* (pp. 62-77). Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Applied social research methods series (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeisel, J. (2006). *Inquiry by design: Environment/behavior/neuroscience in architecture, interiors, landscape, and planning* (rev. ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Appendices

Appendix A – Semi-structured interview guides

Topics for discussion with property owners/developers:

a) What do you think are the benefits to you? Could this help you in doing your work?

b) In your view, how could temporary use projects fit in the overall revitalization of an area?

c) Do you have concerns about temporary uses?

d) Is there anything about Winnipeg that makes it more or less conducive to temporary uses?

e) In your opinion, what is the nature and speed of urban change in Winnipeg?

f) Have you had experience with these sorts of projects?

Yes: What information do you wish you had known before embarking on a project? What needs to be done to enable more projects?

No: If you see value in this, how should these uses be accommodated? What might a policy look like? What needs to be done to enable projects?

g) If temporary uses were to be more widely implemented, what would you see as your role and responsibilities as a developer? What do you see as the role and responsibility of the City? Of site users/tenants? What do you see as the role of the public?

Topics for discussion with site users:

a) Have you had experience with temporary uses, either in your professional life or outside of it?

b) What are the benefits of temporary use to you… of having access to space on a temporary basis?

c) What are the disadvantages?

d) Is Winnipeg's current process for temporary use projects effective? Why? Why not?

e) Can you identify three major issues related to temporary use, in Winnipeg particularly?

f) What information do you wish you had known before embarking on a project? Or what

information do you think you will need before you are able to implement a project?

g) What do you see as your role in temporary use projects? What about the role of the City?

h) Role of the public?

Topics for discussion with planners:

a) What do you see as the benefits of temporary uses of space?

b) Do you have any concerns about these uses?

c) What do you see as your role (as the City of Winnipeg) in temporary use projects?

d) How are temporary uses accommodated today (what rules apply)?

e) How can these uses be accommodated more effectively? Ideally, what would the system be? If you could change the rules, what would this look like – rule-wise, outcome-wise?

f) What do you see as the role of the public?

g) Is there anything about Winnipeg that makes it more or less conducive to temporary uses?

h) In your view, how could temporary use projects fit in the overall revitalization of an area?

Appendix B – Informed consent forms

Statement of Informed Consent – provided on University of Manitoba Letterhead

Research Project Title: **Temporary uses as moderators of urban change: A policy and guidelines for Winnipeg**

Researcher: **Shelagh Graham**

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

---

1. The Purpose of the Research

This project focuses on developing an innovative policy and guidelines proposal for temporary uses in urban Winnipeg. I will be conducting a series of stakeholder discussion workshops as a component of my Major Degree Project, a requirement for a Masters' Degree in City Planning from the University of Manitoba. In particular, I am interested in how temporary uses are currently supported and accommodated in Winnipeg; how the strengths and weaknesses of this approach are viewed by those involved in projects; and how the process could be improved.

I will be using the information from these discussions toward a publishable manuscript that will be accessible to the general public. In addition, the academic urban planning community will be able to access the information given in this report, as part of my practicum or within another academic publication.

2. Procedures

Three groups of participants (planners from the City of Winnipeg, downtown property owners, and community group members) are invited to be involved in separate participatory research processes of the project – key informant interviews and stakeholder discussion workshops. You are invited to participate in a stakeholder discussion. As a participant of this study, you will be asked to describe your experiences and thoughts regarding temporary uses in Winnipeg. A total time commitment of approximately one hour will be requested.

This research method is used to develop a draft temporary use policy and guidelines and to get feedback from local stakeholders. This process will help me better understand the Winnipeg context and make recommendations at the end of the research project.

3. Risk

Your participation in this project will not pose a risk to your safety or well-being.

4. Recording Devices

With your permission, discussions will be recorded using a digital voice recorder and notes may also be taken so that analyzing the material at a later date may be completed with greater ease and efficiency. A digital audio file of the discussion and both digital and hard copies of the notes taken during the session will be kept on file.

5. Confidentiality

Information collected from participants will be incorporated into a final report. All information will be treated as confidential and stored in a private and secure place (a locked cabinet), and subsequently destroyed once the project has been completed. I will be responsible for destroying the data.

No reference will be made to specific individuals in the reporting of the data, however, given the small number of potential respondents, you may be identifiable to your colleagues. If you feel that a question asks you to reveal confidential or undisclosed information, you may decline to answer the question.

6. Feedback
The final project will be made available at the request of the participant. Please contact me for a copy of the project, expected to be available in October 2011. Contact information is provided at the end of this consent form.

7. Credit or Remuneration
There is no credit, remuneration, or compensation for participant involvement in this study. Participants are asked to volunteer their time.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the course project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and/or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Principal Researcher:
Shelagh Graham, graduate student, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba, home address
Telephone: phone number; Email: email address
Advisor:
Prof. Gerry Couture, Adjunct Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba, 201 Russell Bldg., Winnipeg, MB, R3T 2N2
Telephone: phone number; Fax: fax number; Email: email address

This research has been approved by the Joint Faculty Research Ethics Board (JFRED) of the University of Manitoba. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Secretariat at 474-7122, or e-mail margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Thank you for participating in this project. Your cooperation and insights are very valuable and are greatly appreciated.

_____
Participant's Signature Date

_____
Researcher and/or Delegate's Signature Date