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1. Introduction

The discourse of the ‘creative city’ has emerged and grown in the last decades as one of the consequences of the transition to a post-industrial era. The increased attention to the creative sector as an important element to foster economic growth – in some cases economic renaissance – has been and still is at the center of numerous academic and political debates. This discourse has emerged also at the urban context and the creative industries are now considered extremely valuable for their ability to give a new image to cities, attract mobile capital and thus enhance their economic competitiveness. This is especially true in areas of urban decay as municipalities seek to regenerate them through the promotion of creative clusters and centers for cultural innovation.

Cultural and urban planning have become two highly interconnected concepts as many cities promote the strategic use of cultural resources for urban and economic regeneration purposes. This has originated several consequences in terms of urban and cultural policies and the now broadly accepted concept of ‘creative city’ is far from being undisputed. Indeed, much criticism is moved to the current approaches to urban and cultural planning, aiming at opening up to new and more inclusive models. The concept of the creative city and especially its practical translation into local projects of urban regeneration are particularly delicate because they involve the complex participation of several stakeholders, each with own interests and goals.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze cases of creative urban regeneration under a stakeholder perspective. The contribution of this work lies in bridging the gap between stakeholder analysis, urban governance framework and organizational issues. It will do so focusing on the city of Copenhagen, Denmark, and in particular looking at four representative cases: PB43, Bolsjefabrikken, DARE2mansion and Skabelonloftet.

This thesis aims at answering to the following research questions: (RQ1) Taking in consideration the configurations of stakeholders’ interests and characteristics (in terms of power, influence, alliances) is there a correspondence in terms of organizational structures and models of governance? (RQ2) Looking at these cases, what can be inferred about the current state of the arts of creative urban regeneration in the city of Copenhagen?
The thesis thus analyzes the interplay between three elements: stakeholders’ objectives, policies (with related political goals), and organizational structures of the cases taken into consideration. In order to answer to these research questions Stakeholder Analysis has been adopted as main analytical approach. Details of the methodology used are contained in the apposite chapter and sections.

The structure will be as follows: Chapter 2 is dedicated to a review of the existing theory. This part serves as overall framework for the subsequent case-based analysis, and it is necessary in order to understand the current discourse of the ‘creative city’ as well as the stakeholders’ perspectives on it. In Chapter 3 there is a detailed description of the scope of the thesis, the methodology applied and the cases selected, while Chapter 4 will present and discuss the main findings. The conclusion at Chapter 5 includes also some limitations of this research.

2. A review of the existing theory

2.1 The rise and evolution of the creative city agenda in urban regeneration

The transition to a post-industrial era characterized by the dominant concept of ‘knowledge society’ and ‘knowledge-based economy’ is something that has been widely discussed in the last decades (Bell, 1974; Drucker, 1993; Scott, 2000; Harris, 2001; Burton-Jones, 2001; Rooney, Hearn & Ninan, 2005). Interestingly the concepts of knowledge city and creative city have merged as a result of the assumed synergy between cultural and knowledge-based activities (Musterd and Deurloo, 2006). This had many consequences in terms of urban planning and regional policymaking. Creativity became central for economic competitiveness not only for what concerns marketable products and services but also at the spatial level for place making.

Policy-making framework and political agendas are inevitably connected to academic discourses. In this sense the two most influential contributions are the ones of Landry and Bianchini (1995; 2000), the first to introduce the concept of ‘creative city’, and Florida (2002) on the ‘creative class’. Both perspectives acknowledge the shift from an industrial to a post-industrial society based on the production of ideas, with the challenges that this transition poses. In particular Landry and
Bianchini (ibid.) claim the importance for cities to find creative solutions to urban problems as decay and economic depression. In this sense creativity is seen as a crucial factor in the context of urban development and revitalization, with the attempt to go beyond the traditional attention on hard factors and investments in the physical attributes of a place. Creative industries are considered valuable for their ability to give a new image to cities and enhance their economic competitiveness.

Much emphasis has been put on these concepts, and it is nowadays broadly accepted that cities have to invest in amenities and culture to be attractive for (and retain) a mobile creative class, in order to achieve economic prosperity. It is especially this concept that has been largely discussed and criticized. However, the purpose of this work is not to analyze Florida’s work, neither to go into depth with amenity-based theories1. These are rather taken as starting point and the most relevant criticism to these perspectives will be discussed. The theoretical background of this work will be mainly focused on the creative city concept, how this perspective evolved over time, and the role of creativity and culture in urban regeneration processes. The attempt of this theoretical review is also to introduce the most critical points of these theories and the arguments that other scholars have formulated against them.

In order to understand the current tendencies and the ‘creative city’ concept, it is interesting to see how the meaning of cultural planning has developed, and how over the decades this concept has increasingly become connected to urban planning and city policy-making. The notion of cultural planning in fact is not separated from the spatial dimension and the idea of economic growth. Cultural planning is indeed defined as “the strategic use of cultural resources for the integrated development of cities, regions and countries” (Evans, 2001 p. 7, quoting DMU, 1995).

In his work Cultural planning: an urban renaissance?, Evans (2001) traces the historical dynamics of cultural planning. He outlines the main evolution of culture in the post-industrial economy, underlining the change of focus from social facilities and amenities to the economic dimension: cultural economy, once intended as an “unquantified aspect of private and public cultural activity, became not only recognized, quantified and celebrated, but also began to feature as significant

---

1 For amenity-based theories see: Clark, 2004; Florida, 2002; Glaeser et al., 2000.
elements of national and regional economic plans and of production and employment growth.” (p. 138). As many other scholars, he identifies as major force behind this trend the decline of traditional manufacturing and the emergence of the experience economy. City seeking economic revitalization and growth started including arts and culture in their economic strategies, and “planning for culture therefore no longer just entailed social facilities and amenities, higher-scale arts centres and civic ‘flagships’ and palaces of culture, but a form of economic planning for both cultural production, consumption and associated infrastructure such as transport, skills/training, workplace and other amenities.” (ibid.). Also Edensor et al. (2010, p. 2), referring to Lily Kong², underline the “transition from an era where culture and the arts were supported according to social and cultural rationales – under a banner of community development or ‘art for art’s sake’ – to an age in which urban policy makers have foregrounded the role of creative industries in economic development and urban renewal.”

Similarly, Freestone and Gibson (2006) outline the historical evolution of the cultural dimension of urban planning strategies, noting how cultural activities changed their meaning over time in relation to economic development, urban regeneration and place-making [Table 1 in the Appendix summarizes these concepts]. These authors look at several big cities of the twentieth century and trace an historical narrative of the role of arts and culture in urban planning. They individuate different paradigms, starting from the 1900s ‘city beautiful movement’ when the city was viewed as a work of art, to arrive to the latest ‘creative city’ paradigm. Throughout the century, culture moved from being something segregated in citadels or distinctive zones, valued essentially for its educational and monumental significance or as means to display wealth, to become in the latest decades key instrument for economic growth and foundation for city planning. Cultural institutions themselves became “active promoters of revitalization and place marketing” (Strom, 2002, p. 9), and art, culture and entertainment have become explicitly part of a city’s renovation program and spatial planning. Nowadays, urban policy is inseparable from cultural policy, and planning programs include more broadly economic growth, infrastructure development and upgrading of cultural amenities (Freestone and Gibson, 2006).

Scholars see the 1980s as the decade that witnessed a major shift in the cultural policy rationale from social and political concerns to economic development and urban regeneration objectives (Bianchini, 1993, 1999; Landry et al., 1996). By the mid 1980s “the emphasis of cultural policy as a mechanism to enhance community development and encourage social participation was progressively substituted by an emphasis on the potential of cultural policy as a tool for urban economic and physical regeneration.” (García, 2004, p. 315). It was in this decade of strategic shift from social to economic goals that “the language of ‘subsidy’ was gradually replaced by the language of ‘investment’” (Bianchini, 1993, p. 12-13), and “arguments about the wider, social value of the arts were quietly abandoned in favour of new ones which sought to demonstrate their economic power. (…) Suddenly everyone was interested in the unsubsidised sectors of what was being redefined as the ‘cultural industries’” (Landry et al., 1996, p. 26).

In this ‘age of city marketing’ (Bianchini, 1999) European cities focused their strategies on “political consensus, the importance of partnerships between business and public sector agencies, the value of ‘flagship’ cultural projects in promoting a city’s image and the contribution of culture to economic development.” (Bianchini, 1993, p. 2). This is the period of the “first-generation attempt to manipulate symbolic assets in pursuit of local economic growth” (Scott, 2004, p. 464): local governments increasingly started promoting flagship projects, art festivals, major sport events and similar mass spectacles in order to construct a positive city image, foster tourism and attract international investments in order to stay competitive in the global market (Bianchini, 1993; Scott, 2000, 2004). Kong (2000, p. 387) identifies four characteristics of this period: increasing investments in infrastructures as “studios, marketing and support associations and the planning of cultural districts”; flagship projects and high profile events aimed at encouraging cultural tourism; the revival of urban public spaces; and an increase in public-private partnerships.

Examples of this approach are numerous and include, among others: the museum quarter in Frankfurt, the Burrell Collection of Glasgow, the arts and jazz festivals in Rotterdam, the Guggenheim in Bilbao, Temple Bar in Dublin. All flagship projects that need to be contextualized in light of broader efforts of these cities to promote culture and market themselves as creative.
What emerges from the analysis of these scholars’ contribution is that cultural planning, in relation to urban regeneration processes, significantly evolved over time. Projects like the Guggenheim in Bilbao or the Walt Disney Concert Hall in LA need to be understood in light of first approaches to cultural integration of urban redevelopment projects. These are crucial because they first underlined the economic value of artistic and cultural activities in the context of urban development. However, the notion of creative city has considerably changed, including now a more complex set of elements. We assist now to a scenario where consumption and production intertwine and there is a coexistence of amenities, specialized skills and workforce, technology and specialized infrastructure. This is accompanied by an increasing focus on creative industries and creative clusters, innovation, small and medium business activities, networks of suppliers and purchasers. There is much more emphasis on what Montgomery calls the “production–distribution–consumption value chain” (Montgomery, 2003, p. 298).

Scott (2004, p. 465), referring to the ‘80s and ‘90s strategies as “first-generation lines of attack”, identifies a second-generation of policy that has emerged and it is “directed less to the selling of places in the narrow sense than to the physical export of local cultural products to markets all over the world.” Providing a taxonomy of cultural-products industrial clusters, Scott distinguishes between the ones whose outputs are immobile and thus consumed at the place of production, and those whose outputs are mobile and can be sold on a global scale (see also Evans, 2009). This distinction reflects the difference between first- and second-generation policy approaches: the first type of clusters host theme parks, museum and entertainment areas, festivals and sport events; the second category includes creative industries districts of media, design and crafts. In particular the latter are characterized by networks of specialized companies that organize themselves as small flexible specialized firms and system houses3. This distinction between quarters and clusters will be further discussed in the next section (see p. 13). A clarification can be made in advance saying that quarters essentially correspond to a physical urban area, while clusters reflect the features of industrial district as studied by authors such as Porter (1998), Stantagata (2002, 2005), Sacco and

3 This term is used to signify “an establishment whose products are relatively small in number over any given period of time but where each individual unit of output represents huge inputs of capital and/or labor.” (Scott, 2004).
Pedrini (2003). In any case, what is worth to underline is that in these agglomerated contexts production, consumption and urban environment are tightly interwoven.

Mommaas (2004), in his study on Dutch cultural clusters, remarks the fact that urban planners promote creative clusters in order to revitalize local urban areas and their creative local economy. He sees these cultural clustering strategies as the “next stage in the on-going use of culture and the arts as urban regeneration resources” (p. 508). If in the earlier days there was a predominance of big flagship projects, “today, with all major cities having developed their own spectacular festival agendas and (re-)opened their flashy museums and theatre complexes, the regeneration-through-culture agenda has moved to a higher level. Here, we see a shift from a policy aimed at organising occasions for spectacular consumption, to a more fine-tuned policy, also aimed at creating spaces, quarters and milieus for cultural production and creativity.” (Ibid.).

The concept of cultural entrepreneurship underlies these strategies. As mentioned above, one implication is the increase in public-private partnership, with the involvement of new actors such as urban planners, development agencies and private investors. Governance models become thus more complex, as well as the motives behind these projects, that include (Mommaas, 2004):

a) (Still) fostering the attraction power and brand value and identity of a place.

b) Stimulating a more entrepreneurial approach to culture: alternative sources of income than the subsidies, cultural activities aimed at including new forms of arts as well as new types of audiences.

c) Finding new economic uses of old and empty buildings and historical infrastructures (warehouses, factories, monasteries, military sites, shipyards).

d) Stimulating sources of innovation and creativity: clusters provide a support structure and a climate favorable to creative workers, because they offer a context of socialization, trust,

---

4 It is not the scope of this work to analyze the forces behind and the benefits of spatial agglomeration and clustering of creative firms, studied by authors such as Scott (1996, 2000, 2006), Cooke & Lazzeretti (2008), Lorenzen & Frederiksen (2008), Santagata (2002, 2005) – drawing from Marshall’s work on industrial districts and Porter’s study on clusters and competitive advantage (Porter, 1998). Moreover, there is a substantial lack of clarity over the definitions of creative cluster, due to the variety and heterogeneity of its spatial forms, its flexibility and lack of clear geographical boundaries (Bagwell, 2008; Martin & Sunley, 2001; Bailey, 2003; Markusen, 1999; Evans, 2009; Cinti, 2008).
inspiration and exchange. The cultural economy in particular is characterized by transaction-intensive nature, and clusters represents more or less informal networks of interactions where spontaneous information spillovers can emerge (Scott, 2010).

In particular the latter point shows the nature of the more recent approaches to culture in urban regeneration processes. Rather than being only characterized by the development of cultural facilities that make a city attractive, new models are emerging with more emphasis on the productive and economic dimension of culture, as a new set of policies grows drawing upon the logic of cultural production (Pratt, 2009).

Today, policy interventions and public-private investments concentrate more and more on the development of new industrial clusters in local cultural and creative quarters, as pointed by Evans in his study on the geography of creative clusters and the types of interventions and rationales behind these policies (Evans, 2009). In the author’s words, cities are “utilizing the creative quarter/knowledge hub as a panacea to implement broader city expansion and regeneration plans” (ibid. p. 1003). Creative hubs/clusters became a main feature of the creative city, with much emphasis on start-up and SME-driven growth, and initiatives aimed at supporting skills, training and entrepreneurship (see also Bagwell, 2008). As also noted by Scott (2004), there has been a shift in focus to the more global creative industries, open to trade and exchange. This is further reinforced by the fact that there is less attention in current policy rationales to consumption than to production and infrastructure (Evans, 2009). In this scenario creative industries clusters have achieved great importance because it is assumed that “dense local networks create a dynamic atmosphere that spurs innovation, lures talent, attracts investment and generates growth through a self-reinforcing, endogenous process.” (Turok, 2003, p.2) Local and global scale thus intertwine, since “the cultural industries based on local know-how and skills show how cities can negotiate a new accommodation with the global market, in which cultural producers sell into much larger markets but rely upon a distinctive and defensible local base (...) Cultural industries and entrepreneurs will play a critical role in reviving large cities that have suffered economic decline and dislocation over the past two decades” (Leadbeater and Oakley, 1999, pp. 14-16).
2.2 Main features of contemporary creative cities

In light of these recent developments in cultural urban regeneration strategies we can better frame and contextualize the main features and conditions of today’s creative city model. The coexistence of rationales aimed at both cultural production and consumption in fact informs the way contemporary cities characterize themselves. New arguments did not simply substitute the old ones, rather they implemented them. This widening of the developmental perspective – and of the number and typology of actors involved – has raised new ambiguities and issues. In many cases opposing rationales and goals co-exist in the same programs and policy plans (Bianchini, 1993).

On one hand contemporary creative cities still try to incorporate leisure, entertainment and tourism into the local economy (as it occurred in the 1980s and ‘90s): these are interpreted as ‘proto-creative city’ features. In other words, some characteristics of today’s creative city still appear related to the conviction that attracting key workers through an appropriate package of amenities, openness and tolerance will spur local economic growth.

On the other hand, the progressive acknowledgment of the importance of a specific “apparatus of the urban production complex” (Scott, 2008, p. 16) has resulted in more emphasis on conditions that spur cultural production. In particular, Scott (2010) studies the urban agglomeration phenomenon and analyzes the features of contemporary creative cities in the context of a wider creative urban milieu. He traces a set of ideal conditions of the creative city, considering the complexity of socio-spatial relationships constituting the local creative field. This perspective goes beyond the amenity-based approach that seek to make cities attractive on the consumption side for creative individuals, who in turn will contribute to make the city more creative. According to Scott, this is far from being a sufficient condition for the creative city. He identifies a more complex system of relationships between the core sector of the cultural economy – with its specific driving structure of income and employment – a set of complementary activities (including craft, fashion and design), the local labor market structures and eventually a wider urban milieu that includes also leisure and amenities. (See Figure 1 in the Appendix for a schematic representation of this framework).
Having made these considerations, it is interesting to see which are today’s creative city’s main characteristics and distinctive conditions. Romein and Trip include both elements of business- and people-oriented policy perspectives (Trip and Romein, 2010), thus trying to overcome the debated argument around whether jobs follow people or labor follows capital (Scott, 2000; Florida 2002; Glaeser et al., 2001). These features are:

- Social climate, characterized by diversity and social tolerance (Florida, 2002).
- Buzz and atmosphere: buzz is fundamental to acquire tacit knowledge (Storper and Venables, 2002), a vibrant and diverse environment, and street life (Jacobs, 1961), which make possible the emergence of a specific atmosphere of the place.
- Labor market and employment opportunities that attract creative workforce.
- Built, living and residential environment: building on Jane Jacob’s notions, scholars support the idea that a creative neighborhood “needs a mix of buildings, differing in age and state of upkeep” (Hospers & Van Dalm, 2005, p.10)
- Amenities: public transport, education, leisure, security, etc. (Clark, 2004; Florida, 2002).
- Policy, government and governance: Landry (2000) suggests the intervention of different actors and stakeholders that should act in close cooperation.
- Clusters and incubator spaces: former industrial buildings renovated into creative incubators, often characterized by affordable leases (Landry, 2000; Florida, 2002; Mommaas, 2004).

In particular, referring to this latter point Cremers (2011) underlines the importance of the spatial element in order to attract creative workers, with special attention to: third places for meeting and networking; historic ‘raw’ buildings; distinctive architecture; mix of old and new buildings; diverse mix in functions; tolerant climate; flexible environment; a mix in cheap and more representative office space; accessibility; easy but limited entrances; contrasting elements in the built environment; and, finally, waterfront development.
Looking instead at the urban creative milieu\textsuperscript{5} that fosters innovation, entrepreneurship and creative production (and, in this sense, the creative city is compatible with the concept of innovative city\textsuperscript{6}), then cities tend to possess these features (Cooke and Lazzeretti, 2008):

- Infrastructures such as universities, research institutes and cultural facilities.
- The capacity to translate its history into appropriate ‘image’, urban cultures and lifestyles.
- Openness, receptivity and learning among its citizens and cultural institutions.
- Experimental places dedicated to the exploration and promotion of cultural innovation.

In this sense, creative quarters and clusters can be seen as an important and distinctive feature of contemporary creative cities, as they are part of a larger strategy to integrate cultural and economic development and foster creativity and innovation. Previous researches differentiated clusters – agglomerations of producers in one specific place – and quarters – focused on the development of consumption-based and entertainment activities. This separation however does no longer reflect the recent changes and complexity in the meaning of culture and place making (Stern and Seifert, 2010). Indeed, both cultural quarters and clusters present features of cultural production and consumption.

Among the variety of its spatial forms, creative clusters can also take the form of creative centers located in individual buildings or building complexes. It is worth notice that creative clusters, independently on the form they will take, differ from more conventional business clusters because “additional factors are critical to their development and form, notably local area regeneration, conservation/heritage, cultural tourism and related visitor economies” (Evans, 2009, p. 1013). Their aims are also different: “some have social as well as enterprise goals, cultural as well as growth objectives” (Bagwell, 2008, p. 34). Because of the coexistence of different aims and rationales behind the development of creative clusters, these are characterized by an openness and flexibility, what Mommaas (ibid.) defines ‘ad-hocracies’ (referring to Mintzberg, 1983) due to the lack of a

\textsuperscript{5} The first to introduce the concept of creative milieu was the Swedish author Gunnar Törnqvist, who identified four key features: information transmitted among people; knowledge (the storage of this information); competence in certain relevant activities; creativity, the creation of something new out of all these three activities, which could be regarded as a sort of synergy. Source: Hall, P. (2000) Creative cities and economic development, Urban Studies, 37(4).

\textsuperscript{6} Perceived in terms of its incubator function in relation to technology-intensive firms.
standardized planning formula and the variety of interests at stake. These clusters models can vary according to context-specific circumstances, personal enthusiasms, alliances and delicate balance between the actors’ cultural and economic objectives.

2.3 The conversion of redundant buildings into creative centers

The urban-cultural planning model has put much emphasis on local cultural resources and the spatial element of a place. This can be largely witnessed in the emergence of plans and strategies that support and promote creative production and workspaces at the local and regional level, like cultural and creative industry clusters, networks and hubs. Even though creative clusters are extremely connected to the notion of creative city, as already mentioned, theories connected to the benefits of clustering are intentionally excluded from the scope of this work. However, it is very important for the understanding of the subsequent case-based analysis of this work, to underline the role, in urban site-based regeneration processes, of the conversion/renovation of redundant buildings into spaces of cultural production and consumption. A particular form of creative cluster, the mixed-used space hosting art studios, retail stores, office and living spaces, became an essential feature of the creative city. It is in these spaces that “the traditional land-use distinction and separation between workplace, home and leisure has also begun to blur and overlap. In post-industrial city centres and former industrial zones this has again combined altogether to produce living and work space in proximity to cultural and entertainment facilities” (Evans, 2001, p. 145). All across the world, post-industrial cities pursue urban regeneration through cultural activity and the establishment of ‘creative buildings’ as such. Policy documents and evidences show how cities tend to replicate this approach applying a sort of ‘magic’ formula, implicitly referring to the statement of Jane Jacobs: “Old ideas can sometimes use old buildings. New ideas must use old buildings” (1961, p. 188). As noted by Zukin (1995, p.22) “sometimes it seems that every derelict factory district or waterfront has been converted into one of those sites of visual delectation”. Examples of reuse and refurbishment of redundant industrial buildings are numerous, and they include the Custard Factory in Birmingham, the Cable Factory in Helsinki, Wester Gasfabriek and NDSM in Amsterdam, Frappant and Gängeviertel in Hamburg. This typology of buildings is
particular attractive since “creative workers value old industrial buildings, and feel connected to the look and feel of the physical environment. They appreciate the rawness of the area and the historical presence of the industrial heritage. The symbolic values of the local look and feel of the area.” (Cremers, 2011, p. 3). This also partially explains the vast number of squatting movements and appropriation of former industrial buildings by artists, alternative and marginalized groups, who are “not incorporated as part of the contemporary ‘imageable city’” and for whom “the urban spaces popularly represented as dystopias may actually be practised as essential heavens, transgressive lived spaces of escape, refuge, employment and entertainment.” (MacLeod & Ward, 2002, p. 164).

The list of building-based initiatives as such has become endless, and they are now a distinctive feature of post-industrial cities all around the world. Most often these initiatives have the primary objective of economic development and urban regeneration, with buildings organized as spaces for cultural production, contributing to the growth of the local creative industries (Montgomery, 2007). Also Scott (2008) notices the importance of the upgrading of old industrial areas for new spaces able to accommodate high-level production and consumption activities, referring to them as “dramatic new architectural symbologies” (p. 8) that emerged in the growth of a cognitive-cultural economy. Urban spaces and derelict facilities are recycled and converted into places that serve a diversity of economic and cultural purposes. In his study of UK-based as creative business centers (2007) Montgomery identifies their main characteristics and success factors. Creative workspaces are most often occupied by small start-ups that network with each other and create synergies. They sell product or services to the market but get their revenues also from events and ancillary services such as restaurant or cafés. They are characterized by below-the-market rents, with important attention to a balanced mix of tenants. The public sector usually finances refurbishment costs through massive grants, seeing in these initiatives a potential in terms of “enterprise development, the growth of the creative industries, wealth creation and the general benefits of image where cities come to be associated with creativity, innovation and style.” (p. 615). Even though most of the benefits are not immediately tangible, creative centers generate a number of positive outputs such as direct and indirect employment opportunities, visitor attractions, community building, buzz and positive atmosphere in the surroundings. Montgomery goes on saying: “Creative industry managed
workspaces and incubators are closely linked to local re-generation strategies, often playing a pivotal role in attracting in other types of activity and changing perceptions of the area. Initially viewed with some degree of scepticism by many policy makers, they are now seen as key to the development of creative industry clusters.“ (p. 616).

The temporary occupation of empty industrial buildings has also become a widespread phenomenon. Originally born as grass-root initiatives, temporary uses are now more and more integrated into city-marketing campaigns, like in the case of Berlin where they have been captured and “harnessed in recent economic and urban development policies and in the official city marketing discourse, in the context of the discursive and policy shift toward the promotion of Berlin as a ‘creative city’” while these sites were previously neglected and left out of the official promotional discourse (Colomb, 2012, p. 131).

Colomb, referring to Peck (2005) states that this process of “enlistment of new forms of cultural and social expression by local policy-makers and real-estate investors in the name of the “creative city” agenda (…) is contradictory and conflictual, because it changes the way such spaces work and often threatens their very existence by raising investors’ interest in previously neglected areas.” (p. 133). According to the author, this inherent contradiction eventually leads to conflicts between public policy makers and local investors and the initiators, who most of the times come from “outside the official, institutionalized domain of urban planning and urban politics” (Groth & Corjin, 2005, p. 506). In any case, projects that involve the creation of creative centers through the conversion of former industrial buildings are characterized by a high degree of complexity, since many different actors are involved in the process.

In their study on the conversion of Dutch industrial and military complexes, Baarveld and Smit (2011) underline the contextual and organizational complexity of such processes, invoking the need for a collaborative interaction between several public and private parties, including interest groups and citizens. In particular, they acknowledge the existence of several challenges due to the fact that costs and benefits of such renovation processes often are not transparent for all the actors involved. Focusing on a balance between costs and benefits, Baarveld and Smit’s perspective gives light to
the complexity of stakeholder dynamics. In particular, they focus on the voluntary negotiation between public bodies, property developers and landowners. Their work mostly concentrates on the financial investments of private investors and government bodies, with these actors’ respective focus on profit-making and non-profit functions. The authors investigate the organizational setting of the renovation processes, identifying the roles of stakeholders and the dynamics between them. Their attention is on actors’ contribution to the costs of renovation, as well as the benefits they get out of it. The study of Baarveld and Smit introduces the element of negotiation between stakeholders in urban regeneration processes: stakeholders constantly negotiate by both creating and claiming value.

Also Scheltens, Van der Voordt and Koppels (2009) look at the role of stakeholders in the transformation of industrial heritage, analyzing how the different actors involved cope with challenges and dilemmas typical of renovation projects. These authors highlight the role of stakeholders’ interests in the planning process of industrial heritage transformations. In particular, they claim the importance of including the interests of many actors in order to access different sources of funding. However, they also affirm “some interests will also have to be excluded, because answering to too many different interests leads to unacceptably large investments. Moreover, too many different interests can result in the works getting gummed up, with little prospect of realising individual interests and goals, and an accompanying loss of quality. The prospect of achieving their interests and goals will make the actors more likely to commit to the process for the long term.” (Ibid. p. 2). Similarities and differences between stakeholders and their respective interests are taken into account for what concerns a successful initiation and development of regeneration processes. Good processes are the result of a careful assessment of actors’ interests, and eventually their alignment: “Intertwining the interests of all stakeholders and formulating common goals and preconditions for the planning process have proven to be essential for reducing the risk of parties pulling out prematurely.” (p. 7). As interests often conflict with each other, some important critical issues emerge. These are discussed in the following section.
2.4 Major limitations of the creative city theory and some critical issues

As stated above, notions of cultural planning and creativity in urban contexts, especially when connected to economic regeneration plans, have given rise to many controversial issues. Bianchini (1993, pp. 201-204) underlines some specific challenges related to cultural policy in the context of urban regeneration. These can be categorized into: 1) ‘spatial dilemmas’, which are “conflicts in the spatial distribution of cultural provision” (p. 201) (such as the tension between city center and periphery and the risk of gentrification); 2) ‘economic development dilemmas’, related to the conflict consumption vs. production (with strategies oriented towards consumption that are mainly profitable in the short-term, guaranteeing visibility and political returns); and 3) cultural funding dilemmas’, the trade-off between strategies that support ‘ephemeral’ or more ‘permanent’ activities.

Referring in particular to the dichotomy consumption-production, Pratt (2008) argues that researchers and policy makers have overlooked the importance of cultural production. The relationship between production and consumption is further complicated by the fact that “cultural industries are such an emblematic site of debate and practice; they are a practical example of the hybrid and complex relationships between production and consumption, the symbolic and the material.” (ibid, p. 3). Mommaas is asking himself whether the increased emphasis on creative clusters and local entrepreneurship represents the development of a “new, more complex interaction between culture and the economy” or it is going towards another functionalization of culture (2004, p. 509). Indeed, many local and regional policies are still focused on strategies aimed at increasing tourism attraction and promoting the city as a place for cultural consumption. This has lot to do with city-branding and place-marketing\(^7\) since the way a place is seen through its marketable elements and its ‘brand value’ can be highly profitable: “A city that does not curate its image and manage its story is out of date. It cannot compete with other cities for investors, tourists and affluent consumers.” (Zukin, 2008, p. xii). Tibbot (2002) goes further arguing in favor of city branding as an essential feature to maximize the impact of cultural regeneration projects, which should be “part
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\(^7\) Place marketing can be defined as “the intentional and organized process of construction and dissemination of a discourse on, and images of, a city, in order to attract tourists and investors or generate the support of local residents for a particular urban vision” (Colomb, 2012, p. 141).
of a holistic destination brand” (p. 73). Public authorities are not the only actors engaged in this kind of practices. Molotch (1976) critically examines the role of ‘place entrepreneurs’ who invest in place making in order to satisfy private-sector interests and get profit in the real estate market. Efforts towards the construction of a positive city image are functional to the interests of capital and consumption. Interesting in this sense to note how private and public interests became much more blurred, since the public has become very attentive to profit and initiates many partnership with the private. As suggested by Hetherington and Cronin (2008, p. 5), “the public and the private can no longer be neatly separated. Through practices such as regeneration and city branding we see the involvement of both sectors”. As explained in the next chapters, this is also evident in the case of Copenhagen.

Among the different scholars who identified limits in the creative city agenda, it is particularly interesting the position of Tim Edensor (Edensor et al. 2010, p. 4) who also discusses the instrumental conception of creativity as something “related to fostering labour market participation, civic boosterism and competitiveness.” He identifies three main categories of limitations. The first one is associated to the view of artists as creative entrepreneurs, with the consequence of promoting “only those cultural activities whose products are easily commodifiable” (ibid. p. 4), thus excluding other forms of creativity. A second limitation is the geographical specificity and in particular the consensus in cultural policy making that large metropolitan areas are the main sites of cultural production and consumption. In this sense more peripheral spaces are not taken into account. Edensor goes further adding that “cultural regeneration strategies not only privilege metropolitan areas, but within these areas tend to fetishise particular aestheticised spaces of production and consumption, such as the gentrified urban centre or bohemian cultural enclave” (ibid. p. 5). Similarly, Collis, Felton and Graham (2010, pp. 3-9) argue against the current discourses that “privilege inner-urban sites” and are rooted in the old assumptions about creative inner cities and uncreative suburbs (see Florida, 2004) with the risk of “homogenized, prescriptive geographies”. Referring to Soja’s understanding of a place through its objective, imagine and experienced space (1996), the authors explain this trend as “a tendency for policy to separate material and experiential geographies from imagine ones, thus giving only a partial and very limited
view of creative place” (Collis et al., 2010, p. 8). The third limitation that Edensor identifies is the emphasis on middle-class values and priorities, reflected by a specific and in a way exclusive notion of creativity, drawing his critique from the notion of class distinction through cultural consumption and practices (Bourdieu, 1984). Similarly, Pratt (2011, p. 125) refers to an “implicit hegemonic project of favouring a particular type of culture (that appeals to a modern, or cosmopolitan, sensibility) over local or indigenous styles.”

Edensor proposes a re-conceptualization of creativity as something more inclusive and grounded in the everyday and popular culture. He stresses the importance of vernacular forms of creativity that can be found in places like suburbs and rural areas or alternative community spaces, trying to abandon dichotomies like cool/uncool or global/local. The importance of his contribution is that he adds a reflection to the complex relationship between creativity and its spatial dimension, and that recognizing the relevance of creativity in the economic sphere he tries to go beyond its instrumental aspect: “In rethinking the notion of creativity, we also wish to disentangle it from economic instrumentality by arguing that there is much to be said for non-productive creativity” (p. 10).

The instrumental role of creativity and culture is also denounced by Garcia (2004), who claims that “urban cultural policies remain second to the rationale of more ambitious and easy-to-monitor economic development strategies” (p. 324). She identifies the need to “keep arguing in favour of a cultural agenda that is not necessarily subsumed to economic imperatives” (ibid). The real challenge is thus “to place culture closer to the centre of the equation and to use it, not as a temporary – commodified – instrument towards external ends, but as an end in itself that can develop its full potential in the long term as a mark of truly distinct urban centres” (p. 325-326).

Another critical aspect is the complex relationship between cultural policies and vernacularism. Vernacular is “an essential backdrop and condition for the new creative quarter, at least to begin with” (Evans, 2010, p. 20). This refers to the broader discussion about whether creativity can be planned, and consequently what should be the role of policy makers in the creative economy. Many (see also Scott, 2004) agree with Richards who argues that “creativity should be encouraged to emerge from the bottom up, through ‘natural’ rather than externally created clusters” (2011, p.
As previously mentioned, grass-root phenomena such as the temporary occupation of empty buildings by artists and creative entrepreneurs have become more and more integrated in city marketing campaigns (Colomb, 2012). The efforts to create an authentic atmosphere of a place and/or integrate alternative and underground creative activities and spaces into more defined programs and strategies, show the importance of imagery creation and place marketing in the current global competition for creative industries because, as noted also by Harvey (2001, pp. 396-397), “some way has to be found to keep some commodities or places unique and particular enough … to maintain a monopolistic edge in an otherwise commodified and often fiercely competitive economy”. In this way “the ‘creative city’ discourse consequently takes the processes of cultural commodification and artistically inflected place promotion which have existed since the 1970s one step further” (Colomb, 2012, p. 142, referring to Peck, 2005).

However, the integration of previously non-represented spaces into the official imagery implies a fundamental contradiction, since “a branding strategy using a city’s subculture may enhance the city’s symbolic value, but simultaneously undermine the everyday conditions necessary to sustain the creative process itself” (Bader & Scharenberg, 2010, p. 80). This last aspect feeds one of the main criticisms to the creative city agenda, which is the risk of homogenization and loss of authenticity. In a context of global competition cities use culture to differentiate themselves and in order to achieve this they “have promoted what it is not possible to replicate: culture and /or heritage”. Paradoxically, this is translated in the adoption of similar strategies and initiatives of urban regeneration. “As cities attempt to distinguish themselves and become competitive, they may fall into what Richards and Wilson (2006, p. 1210) term as ‘serial reproduction’ … as cities use similar strategies and proven formulas in order to position themselves as unique, they also undermine their distinctiveness and thus their ability to compete.” (Alvarez, 2010, p. 172). In this way, “although culturally led projects are essentially about enhancing local distinctiveness, in practice they can be disappointingly imitative” (Landry et al. 1996, p. 32) and most creative city strategies become “enemies of diversity and promote sameness” (Pratt, 2011, p. 123). This inevitably leads to a loss of authenticity.
In order to avoid this risk, it is necessary to keep in mind that: “Place and culture are persistently intertwined with one another, for any given place… is always a locus of dense human interrelationships (out of which culture in part grows), and culture is a phenomenon that tends to have intensely local characteristics thereby helping to differentiate places from one another” (Scott, 2000, p. 30). The specific characteristics that are embedded in any given locality can also be defined as ‘habitus of location’: “We can describe a city as having a certain cultural character… which clearly transcends the popular representations of the populations of certain cities, or that manifestly expressed by a city’s public and private institutions” (Lee, 1997, p. 132). As noted by Evans (2001, p. 137), the presence of this ‘cultural character’ is very relevant when it comes to cultural planning, since “attempts by municipal and other political agencies to create or manipulate a city’s cultural character are likely to fail, produce pastiche or superficial culture, and even drive out any inherent creative spirit that might exist in the first place.” Standardization of a place and its cultural activities, decreasing uniqueness, will eventually erode the same monopoly advantage mentioned before. Furthermore, in order to build competitive advantage on this uniqueness, there is the need to “support a form of differentiation and allow of divergent and to some degree uncontrollable local cultural developments that can be antagonistic to its own smooth functioning” (Harvey, 2002).

Rantisi and Leslie (2010) contribute to this discussion with a study on the design industry in Montreal, Canada, aimed at analyzing how formal governance structures and top-down practices can be complemented by informal ‘sites of regulation’. Taking into account the specific attributes of the creative industries identified by scholars like Caves (2000), Thorsby (2001), and Scott (2000), Rantisi and Leslie underline the inappropriateness of hierarchical governance mechanisms to regulate the process of creative production. Rather than direct intervention, governments and policy makers should pay attention to those resources that support risks and experimentation, such as affordable live- and work-spaces, diverse land uses, and ‘thirds places’ that are “neither work nor home, which serve as generative milieu for the creation of community” (Lloyd, 2004, p. 354). In these non-formalized spaces, creatives can exchange ideas and inspirations. Similarly, Ponzini and
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8 Source: http://www.16beavergroup.org/mtarchive/archives/001966.php
Rossi (2010, p. 1037) argue that what city administrators and policy makers can do is to “provide the physical and social space needed for creative and economic opportunities to take root” so that there is the need for the city to maintain “a certain amount of ‘garage’ space” identified as garages, warehouses, historical buildings and affordable housing.

In the same way Rantisi and Leslie do not advocate for the absence of public intervention, but they see their role in the regulation of land uses and spaces, or other forms of ‘crowding-in measures’ (Frey, 1999). According to the two authors informal and vernacular spaces are fundamental to shape and sustain creative production. They argue that “accessible, diverse, open and affordable spaces are critical to the nurturing of creative talent and the production of symbolic knowledge associated with cultural industries.” (p. 39). In particular, these spaces of support are: cultural and economic diversity, ‘third places’ like cafés, restaurant, and cultural centers that incentive informal meeting and social interactions, and affordable working/living spaces. As noted by Romein and Trip (2003), incubator spaces and buildings transformed into creative working spaces can also represent third spaces that provide opportunities to stimulate interaction and merge work, leisure and social activities. Low rent is particularly seen as crucial because it guarantees security by lowering the cost of failure, thus this measure contributes to giving space to the creatives for experimentation rather than focus on commercial gains.

However, often artists and creatives are not involved in the development strategy but “brought in late to ‘decorate’ rather than being integral to the process” (LAB 1992, p. 1). As mentioned in The Artist in the Changing City (BAAA 1993, p. 47) “Planning at all levels of government can greatly assist the development of flexible working and living spaces for artists. The crucial thing is that artists should be visible, that they should be consulted directly, and that the solutions to their needs should be designed to be long term and integral to all urban cultural planning.” In the case of such creative centers, it is important to underline that “security ultimately depends on ownership” since “it is clear that unless such workspaces are held in public or independent ownership, and protected from the pressure of the property and land use market wherever they may be located, their initial revaluation and rent rises will swiftly be followed by change of use to more lucrative occupation or redevelopment.” (Evans 2001, pp. 174-176).
Inevitably this emphasis on creative re-use of empty buildings as driving force for a creative environment (as well as flagship to market the city) is connected to debated issues such as the phenomena of **gentrification and displacement**, since the “promotion of the creative class is a *de facto* support for a particular type of gentrification, and an implicit, or often explicit, (re-) ordering of social and cultural priorities at a ward and city scale” (Pratt, 2011, p. 127). The dynamics of gentrification have been widely documented (Lees et al., 2008; Zukin, 1991; Lloyd, 2005). In the specific case of building requalification, “these conversions of property – both in usage and building form – often lead to a revalorization of real estate which may in turn translate into the displacement of lower income residents”. Interestingly, “this wave of displacement differs from previous rounds of urban renewal and gentrification in that it is triggered by creative entrepreneurs and firms, rather then by residents” (Catungal et al., 2009, p. 1099).

This specific pattern of gentrification sees the displacement of a wider range of actors that include, together with working-class residents, traditional manufacturers and the creative class itself, such as artists, craft-makers and non-profit organizations (ibid.). This explains why Pratt (2008, p. 10) argues that gentrification “provides us with a strong empirical message as to how consumption-based re-generation is corrosive to production based versions. Some policy makers consider that it may be a price worth paying for growth; however, it is certainly not a good way to promote the cultural industries or the creativity so often valued in them”. Another interesting aspect is that “whereas gentrification was originally a bottom-up, organically structured process, it is now deliberately used as political device in urban regeneration. In current gentrification processes, ‘creativity’ is often used in a top-down manner” where “municipalities offer cheap facilities for artists in order to give new life to run down urban areas” (Lehtovuori and Havik, 2009, p. 210).

### 2.5 The creative city: *for whom?*

All these issues turn around the question of who is really benefiting from the creative city agenda. The coexistence of different and somehow divergent objectives within creative city strategies can partially explain why it is so difficult to reach a process that will eventually benefit all.
Many authors see the dominance of specific interest groups in the creative city discourse, referring to ‘growth coalition actors’ (Catungal et al., 2009) and business élites who overlook local social and cultural needs (Zukin, 1995; Landry, 1996; Garcia 2004; Pratt, 2011) and value creativity and culture only when they contribute to economic growth (Gibson and Kong, 2005). Pratt (2009, p. 1043) argues that “cities are wasting what are currently one of the most dynamic industries as ‘starter fuel’ for property development and residential expansion when the cultural industries could be used to develop more substantial economic and cultural agendas.” Abandoned warehouses, old commercial and industrial buildings are “the hottest real estate now” (Baycan-Levent, 2009, p. 121). Once derelict sites, these places are now at the center of regeneration plans and this of course does not elude the interests of a certain “land-based elite” who profits “through the increasing intensification of the land use of the area in which its members hold a common interest”, as underlined by Molotch (1976, p. 309). Often, the promise of progressive change, livability and creativity for all that is contained in the ideal of creative city (Landry, 2000) is translated in practice into growth-driven and property-led urban developments, that rather than breaking social boundaries reinforce social exclusion. “The reality is that city leaders … are embracing creativity strategies not as alternatives to extant market-, consumption- and property-led development strategies, but as low-cost, feel-good complements to them. Creativity plans do not disrupt these established approaches to urban entrepreneurialism and consumption-oriented place promotion, they extend them” (Peck, 2005, p. 761).

Therefore the need for a “revisions of the creative city model in which equality and civic participation and not growth and centrality stand at its center, including the enactment of creativity not as an urban development strategy but as a human right” (Jakob, 2010 p. 194). Scholars invoke for democratic decision-making and participatory programs (Landry, 1996; Garcia 2004), as well as the integration of creative and experimental practices in policymaking and urban planning, in order to overcome the ‘creative policy gap’ between official and creative actors (Borén and Young, 2012). The ultimate objective is “to retain ‘local control’ … and thus to avoid the feeling of alienation, misrepresentation and lack of ownership that surrounds most current approaches to city regeneration” (Garcia, 2004, p. 324). Unarguably, “one of the challenges of the new century is to
democratize this process and create transparency in the production of urban spaces.” (Miles et al., 2000, p. 4). This is complicated by the diversity of stakeholders involved: municipal bodies and city authorities, local community, creatives, real estate investors, and academic theorists. Each of them has own agenda and goals. This complexity of actors and interests asks for new urban governance models.

2.6 Creative city policies and governance models

As discussed above, top-down approaches and rigid planning, especially when directed to the creative industries, can generate critical issues and heated debates. The conflicts that surround these projects can, among other things, help to “illuminate many aspects of local systems of governance, such as local power structures, political agendas and forms of decision-making.” (Bassett et al., 2002, p. 1758).

Here I refer to the concept of governance as the set of relationships between institutions, organizations and individuals, a "collective model of functioning" (Neto and Serrano, 2011, p. 4) and a "co-ordination of different institutional orders" (Pratt, 2005, p. 15). In this sense urban governance can be seen as the mode of governing different forces, related to issues such as social equity and local diversity, competitiveness and sustainability. Thus, "it is expected of institutions of governance that they perform the balancing act between these sometimes competing societal goals" (Keignaert, 2007, p. 2). This is particularly true in the case of urban regeneration processes, where the variety of actors and interests involved is extremely high. In particular different interest groups are now asking for more open and democratic decision-making processes over investment priorities (Pratt, 2005) as they seek to being represented in the urban cultural agenda (see also Taylor, 2009). These actors include community and dissention groups, activists and creatives protesting for more inclusive projects, as well as private investors who “demand a role in the process of ‘shaping and moving the city’” (Ache, 2000, p. 447).

The model applied can strongly influence the result and sustainability of new projects, especially in the case of conversions of former industrial areas into creative centers. In fact, “urban governance
seems to be closely tied to the fostering of creativity in a city” (Costa et al., 2009, p. 23; see also Smith and Warfield, 2008). Therefore, as noted by Baycan-Levent (2009, p. 121) “the challenge is to build up a ‘creative urban governance’ which requires shifting mindsets, visioning, building consensus and creating the conditions for people to become agents of change rather than ‘victims of change’”.

Still, “the overwhelming majority of state and planning structures are simply too static and self-complacent”, even though “this is a panorama … that slowly changes when in global contexts of governance and planning, more creative actors and professionals participate (and have the capacity to influence)” (Costa et al., 2009, p. 23). The panorama is indeed changing, as city councils have learned how to “incorporate a wider range of ‘stakeholder interests’ and public opinions at an earlier stage in the development process”, also because “it would prove difficult to exclude such groups and avoid such procedures in the future without arousing suspicion and almost guaranteeing opposition” (Bassett, 2002, p. 1774). New models are required not only to incorporate a broad range of interests, but also to preserve authenticity and prevent projects from “falling into the traps of the bureaucratic system” (Lehtovuori and Havik, 2009, pp. 214-215).

It is thus clear the need to move “from a conventional welfare-state model towards ‘post-modern’ models of cultural/urban governance” (Mommaas, 2004, p. 528). But what is a ‘post-modern model’ of urban and cultural governance? We assist now to an increased integration of different stakeholders and the emergence of more bottom-up and less centralized approaches that engage local citizens (Neto and Serrano, 2011). In the last years there has been a gradual shift towards “a greater emphasis on process-related and ‘soft’ issues of stakeholder engagement, partnership formation, leadership development, ‘institutional capacity’ development, knowledge and learning” (Magalhães, 2004, p. 33). In an increasingly heterogeneous and volatile environment, approaches that are “more flexible, less static and traditional, more communicative and creative, less standardised, open to learning processes and open to participation by many different stakeholders” are crucial for cities in order to stay competitive in the global environment (Ache, 2000, p. 446). This last point is stressed particularly by Landry (2000), who argues that creativity should be
incorporated and used as method in urban renewal and planning. In this sense also Landry invokes for ‘creative urban governance’.

However, alternative processes and models can be very fragile because there is the risk that creativity becomes incorporated into fixed economic and political goals or, on the opposite, that excessive openness results into lack of leadership and structured action. There is also the risk that “the reality of local, empowering institutions and programmes fails to match the rhetoric” (Kearns and Paddison, p. 849). Moreover, this is not an easy task because “imagining such a new agenda will entail some significant challenges to the form of policy making” involving: an effort to work across traditional departments and “across boundaries of government, civil society and commerce”; a deeper understanding by policy-makers of the nature of cultural production; and, finally, infrastructures of public participation rooted at the local level in order to acquire legitimacy (ibid, p. 18-19). These new forms of governance may require the “translation of the function of local authorities from that of primarily service provider to that of enabler of service provision” (Taylor, 2009, p. 161). It is this shift in the role of public bodies that requires the integration of new actors in a multi-governance model.

Smith and Warfield identify different characteristics of creative governance, such as: “creative decision-making processes, the inclusion of diverse and non-mainstream knowledge, the networking and connection among different vertical levels of government (local, provincial and federal) and horizontal ministries (planning, culture, engineering, and so on), as well as public-private partnerships to support creative industries.” (2008, p. 295; see also Neto and Serrano, 2011).

These trends in local governance are reflected also at the smaller scale of creative buildings. Lehtovuori and Havik (2009) write on alternative approaches to the governance of creative spaces in Amsterdam and Helsinki, where local authorities incorporate sub-cultural groups into decision-making processes (for example with the institution of “breeding places committees” where politicians, artists and local entrepreneurs discuss possibilities for adaptive re-use of empty buildings). Moreover, “mainstream politicians and real-estate developers have also discovered the potential of ‘hidden’ or marginal places and invested in their development into centres of urban
creativity. Case by case, this calls for new kinds of connection and cooperation of cultural actors, businesses and planning authorities. Each stakeholder has to be ready to question old presuppositions and experiment” (ibid. p. 213).

In this context is thus interesting to see, on a case-based level, how the interplay of different stakeholders’ interests may affect the models of governance applied.

3. From theory to practice

3.1 Scope of the analysis

With a review of the existing theory, the last chapter aimed at clarifying the main concepts of the ‘creative city’ concept, its application in policy-making and the relative implications and critical issues that arise when these are implemented at the local level. In particular what emerged is that the creative city notion is far from being undisputed and the complexity of interests and actors involved demands for new governance models in order to meet different and sometimes divergent goals.

This thesis aims at investigating a particular aspect of the creative city: the conversion of abandoned and former industrial buildings into creative centers. Being rooted at the local level, and requiring the participation of several actors such as municipal authorities, community groups, artists and creative entrepreneurs and real estate investors, this kind of creative cluster is very suitable for the understanding of stakeholders’ dynamics and institutional forces. There have been many studies on the role of urban governance in urban regeneration and as support to the creative industries (Neto and Serrano, 2011). However, these studies did not take into account specific interests and characteristics of the stakeholders involved in creative urban regeneration processes, neither the organizational structures underlying these projects. The contribution of this work lies in bridging the gap between stakeholder analysis, urban governance framework and organizational issues.

This thesis analyzes the city of Copenhagen, Denmark, and its effort to position and promote itself as a creative city, in particular by investing in creative urban regeneration processes. The aim is to understand how Copenhagen is positioned in the discourse of the creative city by analyzing the
forces between and the interests of the main actors involved in creative urban regeneration processes.

In order to understand the configuration of stakeholders involved in such processes, four relevant case studies have been selected. The choice of using the case study as methodological approach is explained by the desire of grounding the thesis in real life examples, with real actors involved - and relative forces and pressures. The goal in fact was to go beyond the abstract level of policy definition and see how these principles are implemented in practice. The cases selected, bringing together a variety of actors characterized by different goals, provide a fertile ground to discuss governance models and organizational structures. Moreover, they offer an accurate picture of the current state of the art in the Copenhagen ‘creative city’ discourse and the way city authorities implement policies in terms of governance structures. The cases analyzed and compared are: PB43, Bolsjefabriken, DARE2mansion and Skabelonloftet. The explorative research conducted has shown that these cases represent exhaustively the current discourse on conversion of abandoned buildings into creative centers in the city of Copenhagen.

The objective of this thesis is to answer to the following research questions:

**RQ1:** Taking in consideration the configurations of stakeholders’ interests and characteristics (in terms of power, influence, alliances) is there a correspondence in terms of organizational structures and models of governance?

**RQ2:** Looking at these cases, what can be inferred about the current state of the art of creative urban regeneration in the city of Copenhagen?

The discussion will be developed through two directions or analytical levels:

1. Investigation of the internal organizational structures, and therefore the dynamics between internal stakeholders (hence more the choice of the case study).
2. Investigation of the governance models underlying these cases, and therefore the dynamics between internal and external stakeholders. This second level of interpretation is tied to the urban policy framework.
This thesis draws on the hypothesis that the typology of interests behind such projects and the relative power and relevance of some of the actors involved influence the type of governance and organizational structures. More specifically the hypothesis is that when the primary goal is related to business opportunities and profit making, governance structures will be characterized by private-private partnerships and the organizational structure will be more rigid and hierarchical. On the contrary, when the primary goal is the enhancement of creativity and experimental practices or neighborhood regeneration, there will be a stronger role of the municipality with public-private partnerships, and organizational structures will be more inclusive and participatory. In particular, a specific assumption justifies the hypothesis of a correspondence between stakeholders’ interests and urban governance: it is in fact assumed that when interests are diverse, governance models will take into account this complexity and consequently be more inclusive. Eventually, this should also have impacts in terms of policy making. It is likely that political decisions affect the governance and the organizational structure of these projects, but also that these projects in turn play a role in shaping future policies.

After the illustration of the methodology of research (section 3.2) and a description of the cases selected (3.3), the discussion will be structured as following:

a) Description of stakeholders’ composition and interests.
b) Is there a correspondence between stakeholder’s interests and organizational structures? (RQ1)
c) Is there a correspondence between stakeholders’ interests and governance models? (RQ1)
d) What can be said about Copenhagen’s overall context? (RQ2)

3.2 Methodology of research

3.2.1 Case study

Having a restricted focus, case study method enables to capture the complexity of the phenomenon studied (Yin, 1994; Stake, 1995, Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2001). Moreover, allowing the combination of different perspectives and other research strategies, it can be considered a 'meta-method' (Johansson, 2003). Indeed, for the purpose of this thesis the case study approach was
combined with a qualitative research method and a Stakeholder Analysis perspective.

The case study approach was chosen because of the complexity of stakeholders’ relationships and institutional forces that characterize creative urban regeneration. This method in fact allows for an in-depth and holistic understanding of a subject. Moreover, since it investigates a phenomenon within its real-life context, the research can be grounded in real-life examples and this is very important in order to see eventual implications in terms of policy making.

The criterion adopted for the selection of the cases was that they must have been former industrial buildings converted into creative centers, possibly in area of interesting development perspective plans. The objective was in fact to identify agglomerate context where production, consumption, and urban environment are interconnected. According to this criterion, four cases were selected: PB43, DARE2mansion, Bolsjefabrikken and Skabelonloftet. These are key cases as they concentrate all the issues previously discussed in the theory and they involve a broad range of actors and interests. In addition, even though they were purposefully selected cases, they eventually revealed themselves to be representative for the city of Copenhagen.

3.2.2 Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Analysis is the process that enables to identify “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives” (Freeman, 1984, p. 46) and analyze their attitude in relation to a specific issue. The aim of Stakeholder Analysis is to “develop a strategic view of the human and institutional landscape, and the relationships between the different stakeholders and the issues they care about most” ⁹.

Stakeholder Analysis allows to identify and analyze attributes such as: level of power, influence and interest of stakeholders, the group they belong to, the degree of involvement in the project and legitimacy in the eye of the other actors (Freeman, 1984; Schmeer 1999; Bryson, 2004). It is thus a perfect analytical approach in order to identify and define the main features of actors involved in a decision-making process or in the management of an organization.

3.2.3 Data collection

Data and information were collected through a qualitative research that included on-site visits, observations and 16 individual in-depth and semi-structured interviews with key informants for each case (see Appendix for the list of people interviewed), integrated by secondary data such as press releases, reports and newspaper articles. In addition, a first explorative phase was crucial to gather information about the cases selected but also to identify the key stakeholders later used as sample of the in-depth interviews. Actors included in the analysis were selected in two different steps. Inputs coming from theory, on-site observations and other material collected were used to develop a checklist of all potential stakeholders. This was later compared with what emerged in the interviews.

In-depth interviews were structured with questions aimed at getting information about: the underlying forces of the stakeholders involved, actors’ attitude towards the project, their perceived level of influence and power, their level of involvement and prevalent interests in the project. This qualitative approach was chosen due to the complexity of institutional forces and human relationships (such as informal hierarchies, personal charisma and power) involved in all four cases. Moreover, there was not the possibility to reach a significant sample of respondents for a more quantitative survey method, due to the lack of transparency around the cases’ organizational composition and, in a few occasions, the reluctance of some actors to this kind of research approach. In any case, more meaningful data could be collected through interviews and on-site observations (that included also the participation to two monthly meetings at Bolsjefabrikken).

3.3 Why the city of Copenhagen?

As noted by Lund Hansen (2001, p. 852) "the creative city as strategy in the context of urban competitiveness has recently taken root in Copenhagen". In the last years in fact Danish authorities have prioritized the creative city discourse in their agenda both at the national and municipal level. Many attempts have been made to “emphasise Copenhagen as a creative city” (Københavns
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10 This was especially true in the case of Bolsjefabrikken and PB43, probably because of their grass-root nature.
Kommune, 2004a, p. 21) and shape a “unique narrative of Copenhagen’s profile as a creative metropolis” (Københavns Kommune, 2004b), by underlining its transformation into a post-industrial and knowledge-based economy (Københavns Kommune, 2005). "Both culture and creativity have become central to attempts to stimulate the cultural and creative industries and to promote the city at an international level, attracting investment and the “Creative Class”" (Bayliss, 2007, p. 890). In the last decades indeed Copenhagen has put more and more emphasis on the economic potential of culture and creativity (ibid). This included an increased attention to the creative industries as both important booster for the Danish economy (Kulturministeriet & Økonomi- & Erhvervsministeriet, 2003) and as a mean to attract investment and human capital. The rhetoric of the creative city and the belief in Florida’s creative class concept are clearly expressed in municipal strategic plans, that see “technology, creativity and tolerance as the driving force behind the city’s economic growth and development” (Københavns Kommune, 2004a, p. 8).

Copenhagen has also proved to be a good reference context for the analysis of the issues previously discussed in the theoretical review. This is because by promoting the creative city discourse, Copenhagen is not immune to its criticisms. It is explicitly referring to the Danish capital that Lund Hansen et al. (2001, p. 866) claim: "What at first glance appears to be an unambiguously positive characteristic and goal—the creative city—becomes on closer inspection a dubious ideological smokescreen to cover up the social costs associated with compulsive adaptation to the “requirements” of the “new” flexible globalized economy, including reduced transparency in urban governance, social and geographic polarization and large scale transformation of the urban landscape involving considerable displacement."

All these reasons make Copenhagen an appropriate case to discuss the implementation of the creative city discourse and its implication in terms of urban governance. In addition to that, the selection of one single city was made as a deliberate choice: if all the cases share the same common contextual framework (and therefore the political, legal and administrative conditions are a fixed variable), it is easier to see the correspondence between the interests at play and the organizational structure. However, this can also present a limit since it is more likely that the governance model does not vary.
3.4 Case description

3.4.1 PB43

PB43 stands for Prags Boulevard 43, a street in South-East Copenhagen where an old paint factory building is located. The facility, erected by Sadolin & Homblad A/S at the beginning of the 20th century, has become property of Akzo Nobel after the Swedish company Nobel Industries bought Sadolin & Holmblad in 1987, and later merged with the Dutch Akzo in 1997. After the facilities closed down in 2006, the space was converted in 2010 into a center that now hosts artists and creative entrepreneurs. The area covers 6,400 sq meters and consists of four buildings. There are 25 user groups and a total of about 100 users renting the space for a nominal fee of DDK 15-35 per sq meter. In these venues artists and creative entrepreneurs run bicycle and wood workshops, art galleries, architecture and urban laboratory, ceramic and photography studios. It is both a leisure and business community where users have a strong ownership of the space. Tenants organized themselves as the Association Working Community PB43, which in the future will be transformed into a cooperative. For everyday operations PB43 is administered by a board elected by the users. Initiator of the project is the non-profit organization Givrum.nu, whose mission is to mediate between users and real estate owners in order to find temporary solutions before buildings will be renovated or demolished. Givrum.nu approached Akzo Nobel in order to find a rental agreement for the space. This resulted in a two-year lease contract where users have to pay only fixed taxes. Givrum.nu was the first signing tenant and the mediator of the process in its initial phases. The contract was then extended for other 4 years, and PB43 is now directly responsible for the lease until 2016.

3.4.2 DARE2mansion

DARE2mansion is a creative hub located in the Northern-East part of Copenhagen. The space extends for 1,300 sq meters and used to be a mechanic workshop and garage from the ‘30s. Laila Pawlak and Kris Østergaard, CEOs and co-founders of DARE2, bought it in April 2012 together with other three partners: Lucy Vittrup, Daisy Lovendahl and Steen Beck-Hansen. Laila and Kris are the initiators of the project and main investors of the property. DARE2mansion hosts their
company DARE2, a consulting firm doing research, training and networking in the field of the experience economy. Working on three different business areas (DARE2develop, DARE2academy and DARE2network) the firm has developed over time many projects and a network of collaborators and partners that however had not shared a physical headquarter. With the aspiration of having a place that could unite all their activities, where to run meetings, workshops, and host the network’s members, DARE2mansion finally opened to the public in October 2012, after 3.000 hours of voluntary work spent to renovate the facilities.

DARE2mansion hosts a variety of entrepreneurs and free agents who work primarily in the creative industries. People allowed to use and work in the space have to be members, or as called in DARE2mansion, “Mansioners”. There are three kinds of memberships. The first category is the one of ‘fixed’ members who pay DDK 3.500 + tax each month. They have their own office, free 24h access to all facilities, meeting rooms, and cheap access to additional services (such as bookkeeping, lawyer, IT programming). Then there are ‘flex’ members, who share a working space located at the first floor of the building. They pay DDK 1.500 + tax and in addition to working desk space they also have access to meeting rooms and general facilities. The third kind of membership includes the ‘friends’: these are mainly partners that do not live in Copenhagen and are part of DARE2network. They pay DDK 300 + tax for having working-hour (9 to 5) access to the space - often used when they come to Copenhagen and need a meeting room or just a place to relax.

Inside the two-floor building the atmosphere is highly informal and rooms are personalized with different themes. Rather than looking like a standard office space, DARE2mansion is characterized by vivid colors, recycled furniture and informal lounge areas. As Laila Pawlak explained, the place “is created organically: it is constantly changing, it’s alive. And it feels like home.” In addition to office spaces, meeting and conference rooms, DARE2mansion has: kitchen, living area, carpentry and wood workshop, photo studio, and performance space. Some sponsors contributed to the renovation of the space. The company Dyrup for example offered DDK 250.000 in paint material and the telephone company Call Me sponsored phone booths located in the common office space.
Interesting the surrounding area where DARE2mansion is located. Very close to Bolsjefabrikken, this area is literally at the border between a rich neighborhood and a poorer area with diverse ethnical background. It is this diversity that shapes the “unique” character of the place. Most importantly, this is an area where the municipality is planning to invest by 2016 10 billion DKK\(^{11}\) for the creation of North Campus, the Copenhagen’s new Science City.

### 3.4.3 Bolsjefabrikken

Bolsjefabrikken, the Danish word for Candy Factory, is a non-profit organization that operates with two user-controlled cultural centers in Copenhagen. It was established in 2008 in a candy factory in Glentevej 8, North-West of the city. Having being told to leave the place in 2009, Bolsjefabrikken started a campaign in order to spread the word about the association and its projects. After some months they approached a private owner of an empty plumbing factory in Lærkevej 11, North Copenhagen. After some negotiation, they finally reached an agreement where the association could borrow the space for free. In exchange, they would have to take care of building maintenance and renovation of the facilities. Moreover, the agreement established a one-month notice to move out of the property. On September 17th 2009 Bolsjefabrikken moved from Glentevej to Lærkevej. Bolsjefabrikken on Lærkevej is now a 1,000 sq meters cultural house and working community that hosts various workshops (sewing, bicycle, wood, metal, screen-printing), a concert venue, music and video editing studio, recording room, art gallery, as well as a common room, kitchen, a library and a café. The place is used for different purposes such as concerts, performances, workshops, and exhibitions.

In early 2010, Bolsjefabrikken expanded with a second center located in an old forge on Ragnhildgade 1, on the edge of the Østerbro neighborhood, East Copenhagen. The space is owned by the municipality and managed by Copenhagen Ejendomme, a property manager organization (part of Culture and Leisure city department) that controls over 800 public buildings. The municipality ceded the building to Bolsjefabrikken for free. The location in Ragnhildgade extends

---

\(^{11}\) See [http://cas.ku.dk/english](http://cas.ku.dk/english) and [http://noerrecampus.ku.dk/english/](http://noerrecampus.ku.dk/english/) Last consulted October 2012
for 1.200 sq meters and it is dedicated to larger scale events. It hosts a concert hall, media workshops, rehearsal rooms for theater groups and yoga.

Since the agreements with both property owners are temporary, Bolsjefabrikken has the risk to dissolve and therefore to start the entire process from scratch (finding a new place, seeking support, renewing the space, etc.). In order to make sense of the further investments needed to renovate and maintain the facilities, Bolsjefabrikken is looking to secure its location. The organization’s goal is to purchase the property in Lærkevej. In order to do so it has started a fundraising campaign called ‘Possibilize’ with the objective of gathering DKK 500.000.

### 3.4.4 Skabelonloftet

Skabelonloftet (in English The Shipyard Loft) is a 1.400 sq meters loft located in Refshaleøen, an old shipyard near Copenhagen Harbor. Refshaleøen Island covers a surface of 500.000 sq meters and once was one of Denmark's major industrial icons. Owned now by four pension funds, Refshaleøen has radically transformed in the last 15 years becoming the biggest area of urban development in Copenhagen's Harbor. This area once housed Burmeister & Wain shipyard, from 1872 to 1996, when it went bankrupt. The loft was originally used as storage for material employed in ship construction. After the bankruptcy in 1996, creative people and artists slowly started to move in. Painters, writers and people looking for a quite and inspiring place started renting some spaces in the loft. Among them there was Anette Holmberg, who rented a room as her art studio. In March 2009, when the company owning the property had decided to clear the building, Anette Holmberg found an agreement with them and she eventually started the project Skabelonloftet. The owner of the property invested for the first two years to make the space possible to be rented out. This meant a re-structuring of electricity, heating and water systems, as well as some additional expenses that the owners' foundation covered. Anette Holmberg founded the company Holmberg.dk Aps through which she manages the loft, renting it from the landowner and sub-renting it to creative professionals and companies. The loft now has 17 studios and a total of 55 tenants: a real creative community with designers, architects, artists and photographers. Anette Holmberg created an art community where "business is also very welcomed", since she provides private companies and
organizations with the space for conferences and seminars, as well as commercials and photo shootings. One of her goals in fact is to stimulate a "symbiosis between companies and the art world, giving the possibility to companies to achieve an artistic experience by interacting with this space."

Skabelonloftet is definitely a business, but Anette Holmberg, who is an artist herself and has a background in Arts Education, sees it also as an "art project". Interested in how "room can change the attitude and the behavior of people" she believes in the creative energy of the loft and in the connection between the verbal and the non-verbal worlds: the ones of business and arts. For this reasons she has established a partnership with the Educational Foundation of America's Arts and other arts organizations with which she will organize an art residency program in the loft.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Main stakeholders involved and their characteristics

Information about the stakeholders was collected through qualitative research: in-depth interviews, on-site observations and analysis of reports and press articles. There is a broad spectrum of people directly or indirectly affected by the activities of these organizations. However, for the purpose of this analysis only a few categories of actors appeared to be relevant. These actors are the ones most involved in the organization in terms of resources invested, power and influence exercised, and commitment in the project. This explains why local residents are not directly considered in the analysis: in fact none of the four analyzed cases has shown significant community engagement, despite their intentions. This section presents the characteristics of the key actors involved for each of the four cases. Actors are analyzed looking at their type of involvement in the project, their attitude towards it, their leverage and the kind of interests they have in being involved.

This section addresses this question: Which are the main stakeholders involved and how are they characterized? It is important to underline that this section is a necessary descriptive step in order to further explore and discuss the two main analytical levels: it is only by indentifying the interests
of the key internal and external stakeholders that organizational and governance models can be understood, as well as the general trends and approaches that characterize the city of Copenhagen.

**PB43**

**AkzoNobel**, Dutch multinational producing chemicals and decorative paints, is unquestionably one of the most influential players for what concerns the life of PB43. This company is in fact the legal owner of the buildings in Prags Boulevard 43. There are *three primary interests* behind the support of AkzoNobel to this project. First of all, it is seen as a real estate investment: East Amager was historically a working class neighborhood, and the value that the presence of PB43 can generate is extremely beneficial for AkzoNobel that has also other properties in the area. Second, PB43 is used for internal communications. Images and stories about the project and the transformation of Prags Boulevard were used in internal self-promotion documents and reports. Third, PB43 is a good opportunity for AkzoNobel in terms of corporate image. The company aims at improving its reputation among local residents, after the decrease in local employment opportunities as a consequence of the closing down. Far from being part of a hidden agenda, this was clearly expressed by Thomas Mezger, project leader at AkzoNobel:

“The closing has probably had a negative impact on our reputation in the local area ... Therefore, we hope that the agreement with Givrum.nu and the temporary lease of the site will allow people to see that AkzoNobel acknowledges the publics’ concerns. Practically there will also be someone that will take care of the site and prevent its rapid decay. The only alternative would have been to demolish all the buildings and build a parking lot.” (Source: Andersen & Toft-Jensen, 2012 p. 44)

These interests explain why AkzoNobel has been very supportive to PB43. But even though there is a good relationship between the landowner and its tenants, AkzoNobel representatives come only once a year to PB43 and the company is not involved in the daily life of the organization. This does

---

12 Source: interview with Steen Andersen and “Understanding PB43” MACA – June 2012, I. Korolev
not mean that it has no power and influence in the decision-making. Users do acknowledge this and are perfectly aware of the fact that AkzoNobel will eventually sell the place.

Another important actor is Givrum.nu, initiator of the project. Started by Christian Fumz and Jesper Koefoed-Melson in 2010, this organization’s goal is facilitating the conversion process of abandoned buildings into creative spaces. In order to do so, Givrum.nu proposes itself as mediating figure between users and owners. Christian Fumz was also one of the persons involved in the first-generation phase of Bolsjefabrikken in Glentevej. From this very grass-root experience they now move towards a more liberal one, offering consultancy services to RE owners.

“We want to have a more and more professionalized approach, because we want now to live also on this” (Jesper Koefoed-Melson)

And this is also stated in their website: “Our support can cover everything from an introductory workshop to a complete organisation of use of the building, where we handle every aspect of the process: creation of network, fundraising and organisation.” Givrum.nu therefore is not extraneous to the logic of RE development and gentrification. Rather, they consciously contribute to this discourse. In their report “Fra lakfabrik til kulturfabrik - en evaluering af værdiskabelsen på Prags Boulevard 43” (From paint factory to culture factory - an assessment of value creation in Prags Boulevard 43) they seek to communicate the social and cultural value but also the economic one that PB43 creates, contributing to area regeneration. The main goal of Givrum.nu is to sustain participatory and democratic processes of urban regeneration but also to become a recognized player in this field. This is well expressed in their report where they claim: “Givrum.nu is the only company that specializes in the use of empty buildings, been the driving force in this development” (p. 16).

The third category of stakeholders who actively participate to PB43 is represented by its internal users. Looking at the internal life of PB43, creative entrepreneurs and artists that populate this space can be definitely considered as the ones ‘making the rules’. There is indeed great ownership of the space and freedom. However, when it comes the issue of PB43’s future users do not play a

---

very influential role in the decision-making process, as they can occupy the space only temporarily. The composition of user groups is very diverse and people use the space in different ways: some have in PB43 their office, studio or workshop, a business registered there. Others have their job somewhere else in the city and come to PB43 for part-time activities. Users are generally more educated than the average Copenhagen citizen, their average age is of 30 years and the majority of them are men. People share more or less the same interests in being part of PB43. Affordability of the spaces is clearly one of the reasons why people want to be there, not only to reduce expenses but also because this gives them more creative freedom. Users see in PB43 all the conditions to foster their creativity through knowledge sharing and social interaction with neighbors. In addition to the business opportunities that being part of PB43’s network can offer, people like to:

“Be part of a good cause” (Ivan Korolev)

“Start something new from the ground” (Steen Andersen)

“Be in a neighborhood with a great potential” (Kasper Find)

Amager Øst Lokaludvalg is the local council committee of East Amager, the neighborhood where PB43 is located. The objective of this council is to ensure a dialogue between neighborhood residents and politicians. It has a yearly budget of approximately DDK 3.3 million allocated to activities that promote democracy and culture. Amager Øst Lokaludvalg has a very positive attitude towards PB43 as its president Ole Pedersen has in various occasions expressed.

“We have seen something innovative that we have not seen before, both in terms of content and organization. Accessibility is important, and it is fascinating to see how much can be created in a short time, when you engage people. People are very excited about what PB43 is doing and they are happy that there are finally activities in their area that they can join in.” (O. Pedersen. Source: Melson and Rask, 2012).

The council is clearly interested in local development: “They are very dialogue-seeking and interested in the local area, and it is appealing to us because they put time into something that can contribute to local area development.” (Ibid.).

14 Source: “Fra lakfabrik til kulturfabrik - en evaluering af værdiskabelsen på Prags Boulevard 43”
This is echoed by Søren Kærsgaard Snarberg, employed in the council:

“The council is happy to give money to PB43 because they are involved in the neighborhood community. They do not have abstract aspirations that cannot later implement. Once they get the money they actually get things done.” (SKS)

**Copenhagen Municipality**, similarly to the local council, is willing to sustain financially cultural projects that ‘give something back’, for example by improving the surrounding area. The City is however involved only indirectly in PB43, mostly for the release of authorizations for safety and technical issues. However, the area is on their agenda, even though this is not expressively stated in policy plans.

“In municipal offices they talk very often off the records about PB43, because it is a very unique reality, especially in this neighborhood. Clearly the city is interested in the future of this space”.

(K. Find)

Moreover, the city limited, development opportunities for the area until 2017, because there are other priority areas where huge investments have been done.

**DARE2mansion**

The number of the stakeholders directly involved in DARE2mansion, as well as the extent of their involvement, is much smaller compared to PB43. This is due to the fact that DARE2mansion is a very recent project and it is 100% privately run. Both the idea of the project and the investments in fact come from private initiative. For these reasons relatively few categories of actors emerged to be relevant for this research.

The first category is represented by the five **partners** of DARE2mansion: Kris Østergaard, Laila Pawlak, Lucy Vittrup, Daisy Løvendahl and Steen Beck-Hansen. Main investors are Kris and Laila, husband and wife other than partners, who together own 90% of the property. The partners have diverse levels of involvement in the daily life of DARE2mansion but they essentially share vision,
strategy and goals. Their interests are aligned and eventually drive to the creation of business opportunities. In addition to that, DARE2mansion supports social projects and non-profit initiatives.

A second category of stakeholders is the one of Mansioners, the actual tenants of the house. They are not only interested in sharing office space but they see in DARE2mansion an opportunity to get inspired, share ideas and do business together. The system to access the mansion is based on recommendations by other members and this explains why people share the same values.

The Copenhagen Municipality is also interested in DARE2mansion. This space is located in Haraldsgade quarter, one of the seven ‘areas of innovation’ where the city has planned to invest resources for local development and urban renewal\(^\text{15}\). It is in this perspective that the city has established several local departments, one for each neighborhood, which monitor project proposals and activities with the goal of making these areas more attractive. Moreover, Haraldsgade is part of a larger area that in the next ten years will be developed into a Science City based around the University's North Campus (Pharmacy, Health and Natural Sciences). This huge development plan includes an allocation of 200.000 sq meters for established companies, incubators, start-ups, a variety of commercial activities, new housing opportunities (40.000 sqm), conference facilities, libraries, exhibition centers, etc. This will be accompanied by an investment in new urban spaces and green areas, as well as an expansion of the metro city ring and the overall infrastructure system. The objective is to spur the interaction between science, city and business and to “boost the Science City’s appeal as an international urban and residential neighbourhood” (Science City North Copenhagen Development Plan, p. 2). Funding come from Realdania, the City of Copenhagen, the University of Copenhagen and the Danish University & Property Agency. In light of these future development plans, it is clear why DARE2mansion fits the City’s strategy. DARE2mansion is an opportunity to ground area regeneration and innovation plans in an already existing reality.

\(^{15}\) Other areas of development are: Sundholm neighborhood in Amager, Old Valby, Husum, St. Kjeld Quarter in Østerbro, Central Vesterbro, Birds District Bispebjerg.
Områdeløft Haraldsgade, the local council responsible for the development of this neighborhood, has already initiated a dialogue with DARE2mansion. Considering the future plans for this area, the presence of a place like DARE2mansion is definitely an asset.

“We see their place as a very valuable access to the quarter and our work. Dare2mansion are in fact the best self-made/bottom-up effort that we can be working together with, also because of their professionalism and understanding of the challenges and limitations within public service.”

(Birgitte Kortegaard, project director of Områdeløft Haraldsgadekvarteret)\textsuperscript{16}

Bolsjefabrikken

It is hard to say who are the actual users of Bolsjefabrikken in Lærkevej and Ragnhildgade, since these cultural centers are open to everyone. However, besides party haunters, there is a core of about 40 people that are related to the Bolsjefabrikken in a more permanent way. This core of activists sees in Bolsjefabrikken an opportunity for experimentation and artistic freedom. Besides the cheap rent for studios and atelier, concerts and parties that animate the Factory's life, people seek to put in practice a model alternative to the capitalistic one.

“We have some ideas about how the society should be like.” (B. Henningsen)

Indeed people feel part of a ‘bigger project’ and see Bolsjefabrikken as a testing ground for a more inclusive conception of culture.

The owner of the space in Lærkevej is a businessman owning a plumbing company. He accepted to temporarily give the property for free because he hasn't been able to sell it. He was convinced to set this agreement because this meant having someone maintaining the house, preserving it from vandalism, and clearing the sidewalk from the snow in wintertime. These would be all extra expenses that now the users of Bolsjefabrikken are responsible for. The owner is very supportive to their cause.

\textsuperscript{16} Source: Kortegaard, B., birkor@tmf.kk.dk, 2012, Creative urban regeneration. Some questions about DARE2mansion [email] Message to M. Mussapi (marina_mssp@hotmail.com). Sent Wednesday 17 October 2012.
“He would be very happy if we could buy this place, and he’s actually pushing in this direction” (B. Henningsen)

Nonetheless, the fact remains that the property is on sale now and someone can buy it from one day to the next.

**Copenhagen Ejendomme** owns and manages the property in Ragnhildgade. Their goal is to sell the building in 4-5 years to some private developer for the construction of new private housing. They already sold part of the surrounding area but they are now waiting for better conditions of the RE market. The main reason why Ejendomme decided to give Bolsjefabrikken the space is that they could take care of the building.

“We wanted to try house-sitting. It was good sense if someone was using the area, because it is costly to keep people outside [drug addicts, homeless]. The alternative was either spending money to take care of the building or to demolish it.” (John Dahl-Pedersen, Copenhagen Ejendomme)

For both Lærkevej and Ragnhildgade the objective of property owners is not area regeneration but rather the reduction of maintenance costs. This is because both areas are not under a spot of gentrification cycles.

“It’s a social area, there’s no need to make it vibrant. The fact that Bolsjefabrikken is here won’t increase the value of the area. We don’t see it as an investment. The only advantage we have is that we don’t have expenses.” (JDP)

Nonetheless, politicians do appreciate the value of the initiative for the sake of city image: a picture of Bolsjefabrikken was on the cover of their latest cultural strategy plan.

“Bolsjefabrikken is an insanely good example of a place that lives its own life, but also helps to attract a lot of people and put a lot of creative things going. If we hadn’t a place like Bolsjefabrikken, Copenhagen would be a boring place to live”.

(Pia Allerslev, Culture and Leisure Mayor of the city)\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{17}\) Source: Johannesen, 21 August 2011: Brugerstyring mellem kommune og kapital, Information
There are essentially four categories of actors involved in Skabelonloftet. However only the **property owner** has power to decide over the future of the space. The owners of the loft, and of the entire area of Refshaleøen Island, are four private pension funds: Sampension, PKA, PFA and LD (Lønmodtagernes Dyrtidsfond). REDA (Refshaleøen Real Estate Company) is responsible for the rental of the buildings in the area and also for renovation projects. The Refshaleøen Island was designated perspective area in 2009. Until 2021 it will be used for temporary projects “to generate cultural and creative entrepreneurship that can prepare the area’s long term development.” (From REDA website, own translation). The goal is to “create a vibrant and diverse urban development of the area at the international level. This is done by prioritizing space for workshop communities, galleries and creative industries in all scales and at the same time respect the area’s industrial history.” (Ibid.) It is in this sense that Skabelonloftet is a real “showcase for the island” as Anette Holmberg suggested. The reasons why REDA is focusing on creative industries and culture are thus – not surprisingly – far from being philanthropic.

“The private owners don’t care about the creative industries. They care about money. However, they may realize that having culture and heritage can also create value.” (A. Holmberg)

The interview with Claus Hovmøller – who works in the Refshaleøen Real Estate Company – showed that they did realize this value.

“We are attracting tenants and events with the right profile in order to gain attention to the area, so that one day people want to live or work here. When we realized that it was not possible to develop in the short-term, and started facing the fact that it was a long-term process, there was a shift in focus: we started thinking about what to do in order to make the best of what we’ve got. So this time frame we’re working on generating more value and making this place more open and vibrant.”

They also have a clear idea about the future of the creative industries that now reside in the area.
“We are now building a social and cultural infrastructure... it would be odd if some of these creative activities won’t stay here in the future. The things that have attracted people to come will be integrated, otherwise it won’t be as they expected.” (C. Hovmøller)

**Anette Holmberg** is lobbying for that politicians will protect the area, also if necessary declaring it historical site for its industrial history and building heritage.

“I will do my best to convince owners and politicians to preserve this site. They should realize how important it is to work with the built heritage and work around it, before building new houses.”

But it has to be underlined that Skabelonloftet, on the contrary to Bolsjefabrikken, is not political at all. There is much space for creativity, but the emphasis is on the commercial aspect. Anette Holmberg wants to foster creative synergies but she demands also a professional spirit and therefore she selects business-minded people. At the end it is about business. But how do tenants participate to this strategic vision of Skabelonloftet and its future?

“*It’s Anette vision. It’s her project.*” (K. Holm)

Tenants have their own business to take care of. At the moment there are 55 people renting an office or a desk space in the loft. They very much enjoy being part of the loft life but they do not want to be necessarily part of a bigger project. This is confirmed by Kristian Holm who explains that there is also a relatively high turnover of tenants.

“It is not an ‘easy’ location - in terms of its very physical structure. Some people get also tired of it.” (K. Holm)

The **City of Copenhagen** plays a decisive role even though Refshaleøen is privately owned. Indeed Refshaleøen was designated perspective area by the City of Copenhagen, which also limited development opportunities before 2021. The main reason behind this is that the City is primarily concerned with selling properties in Ørestad and NordHavn, two new building complexes located respectively in South and North Copenhagen. Ørestad and NordHavn recently witnessed massive developments and construction of new apartment and office structures. However, due to the financial crisis and lack of attractiveness of the area there are many vacant properties still waiting to
be sold. This is exactly the same reason why the area owned by AkzoNobel in Prags Boulevard was established to have development opportunities not before 2017.

4.1.1 Stakeholders’ characteristics: partial conclusions

Some patterns have emerged in the analysis of the actors involved for each case. There are common elements in the stakeholder composition of these projects and also in their interests and motivations. Three main elements are worth to underline.

First of all, influential external stakeholders are the same in all four cases: private owners (RE developers) and the Copenhagen Municipality. A second consideration is that both private property owners and the municipality seem sharing the same objective: economic growth and especially increase in property market value (with the exception of Bolsjefabrikken). While in the case of private developers this is manifest, the municipality pursues also complementary goals such as social and cultural enhancement, implemented at the local level with neighborhood councils.18 This may indicate that the governance framework and macro interests at play are a fixed variable when it is about creative urban regeneration projects in Copenhagen. A third observation concerns the actual users/creative entrepreneurs and the reasons why they initiate and participate to these projects. It appears that there are essentially two extremes of motivations that drive creative people: to make business or to experiment artistic and creative practices. The cases analyzed in this thesis move along this continuum. DARE2mansion and Skabelonloftet are definitely business oriented, while Bolsjefabrikken users see their project as an opportunity to challenge the capitalistic model. It is more difficult to place PB43 in one of these extremes, as this case is positioned somehow in between the continuum.

These three considerations are important to develop further the two levels of analysis. In fact:
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18 It was difficult however to get feedbacks from municipal officials and politicians that would not stick to rhetoric. Interesting in this sense was the interview with S. Johannesen, journalist of the Danish newspaper Information and author of articles about creative sub-cultural movements in Copenhagen. According to him: “They do it for the sake of citizens but also for the sake of economic growth. This explains why at the end these projects are only temporary.”
1. Having stated that the motivations that drive creative people belong to two extremes, how do they organize themselves? Is there a correspondence between these extremes of interests and the organizational structure? This refers to the first research question and will be discussed in the next section (4.3).

2. Having looked at the interests of both municipality and private investors, it appears that they are aligned and directed towards a neo-liberal agenda promoting area regeneration and economic growth. This argument will be further explored and pushed forward in the following sections (4.4 and 4.5). We now saw which are the interests of the municipality in this kind of projects. But how does the City intervene in creative urban regeneration? What is it the City’s approach towards creative clusters? This is very much tied to the second research question and the understanding or Copenhagen’s current urban governance. Therefore it will be discussed more in depth through the analysis of external stakeholders’ dynamics and relative governance mechanisms.

4.2 Dynamics between internal stakeholders: organizational structures

This section addresses this question: **RQ1 Is there a correspondence between internal stakeholders’ interests and organizational structures?**

Relationships between internal actors were analyzed in order to highlight the type of organizational structures characterizing each case. At a first look, it seems that the four cases belong to two distinct typologies of organizational structure. In particular DARE2mansion and Skabelonloftet have a clear and rather rigid structure, with a hierarchical system in which actors at higher levels act as gatekeepers. In PB43 and Bolsjefabrikken there is a more open and participatory model. However, these are only hasty conclusions. In fact this separation is not that rigid: also in PB43 and Bolsjefabrikken there are gatekeepers and internal hierarchies do exists, only at a subtler level. A more detailed analysis of the structures for each case is presented below. In particular some internal ‘gaps’ are highlighted in order to show that internal dynamics are not that straightforward. The case of Skabelonloftet is not presented in this section since no further aspects need to be analyzed. The
organizational structure is very clear: the loft is managed by Anette Holmberg who controls the communication with the owner and selects the tenants.

**PB43**

The first aspect to mention about PB43 is that there is a gap between PB43’s formal structure and the way in practice it organizes itself, which is characterized by openness and flexibility. As noted by Ivan Korolev, member of the board, in his report on PB43\(^{19}\): “It is apparent that there is some form of organization present but it is hard to describe and make sense of, because it is highly informal and ever changing. And the same goes for the purposes of PB43, which […] are highly stratified and sometimes innately paradoxical.” (p. 2) More specifically, Ivan Korolev talks about a “loosely structured network that is highly influenced by the temporality and uncertainty of the entire enterprise, and which has a natural resistance to any crystallization of an organizational structure. Here, the fluidity of the ‘organization’ is its main characteristic, as well as its apparent mixing with other external organizations.” (p. 3).

In spite of the highly flexible and fluid nature of PB43, users organized themselves into project groups and formed a board to represent and administer the space. Decisions are made through the central board, which is formed by representatives from each building. “Board members are recruited on a voluntary basis and their tasks include organizing workdays, general assemblies, larger events, communicating with AkzoNobel, Givrum.nu, the media, and keeping track of contracts and the financial well being of PB43. There are sub-groups on the board, one that focuses on communication, and another on the practical upkeep of the site.” (p.7). Informal communication and recreational time are essential in PB43: “It is true that there is a fundamental organization in place at PB43, complete with a board of directors, various functional groups, and clearly separate tenant groups. But most internal communication occurs, and most decisions are made in casual situations with little regard for official roles of the members.” (p. 15). What also emerged from the interviews is that people who put lot of efforts in PB43 are not necessarily the ones attending formal

\(^{19}\) Ivan Korolev “Understanding PB43 – MACA June 2012”
meetings. More than their formal role in the organization, the time people actually spend in PB43 can be a good proxy of their involvement in the project, since much is going on in informal conversations and lunchtime. The totality of members seems to interact mainly when larger events occur, while people usually do not interact much during the day as they take care of their own projects. It is therefore clear that the formal structure does not necessarily correspond to the actual one, which is much less rigid and framed. However, a second and apparently contradicting aspect emerged. The open and unstructured nature of PB43 also leaves space for some key individuals to exercise influence in decision-making. In practice “the central administration is not run by a group of thirteen voluntary board members but by a small group of key individuals that act as nodes between different tenant groups.” (Korolev, 2012, p. 7)

“The composition of users is not written down and it is very dynamic. That’s why it is also difficult to manage. There are 25 user groups, 50 persons using regularly the space and 180 people in the contact list. Only a few persons are coordinating this.” (Steen Andersen, Chairman of the board)

There are few persons that are very involved in PB43 and therefore more influential. These persons act as gatekeepers in the flow of communication with the municipality. One clear example is that Steen Andersen and Kasper Find, respectively chairman and member of the board, are also part of the committee of Amager Øst local council. In particular Steen Andersen is the formal chairman of the board and he is also the one having most contact with the media, as he occasionally writes newspaper articles about PB43. Finally, being the formal chairman, he is the person who signed the second contract with AkzoNobel. It seems thus that in his specific case the formal role overlaps the informal one. This is confirmed by the fact that other members interviewed see him having a very strong level of power in the decision-making.

**DARE2mansion**

DARE2mansion reflects at the end the structure of the private company behind it. First of all, even though in DARE2mansion there are no persons employed, but only associated partners and free agents, the two main initiators of the project, Kris and Laila, are the ones involved in decision-
making when it is about the house. Consequently, even though in DARE2mansion people operate through a loose network of collaborations, the organizational structure is rather clear and defined.

“I would say that Kris and Laila are the ‘backbone’ of this place, also because they are here all the time.” (May-Britt Buchardt)

The five partners meet once a month and discuss operative and strategic issues, the latter related to future investments and opportunities. People working in DARE2mansion are very much involved: they do not only share an office space, but also a vision and values. In DARE2mansion ideas and creative inputs flow, the atmosphere is informal and there are no rules. People are “emotionally engaged”. However, Kris and Laila are the ones taking decisions. This is not perceived ad ‘top-down’ but legitimated by the fact that they have a strong vision for the future of the project.

“Kris and Laila are extremely good at ‘painting the big picture’, at communicating the vision. And they also have the capacity to make people feel at home.” (MBB)

This seems to be a great asset for the mansion because when people bound the network gets stronger. But most importantly, they are the ones that invested most of the money in the project.

**Bolsjefabrikken**

Definitely more complicated is the situation in Bolsjefabrikken, also because the two buildings in Lærkevej and Ragnhildgade differ significantly from each other in terms of spirit and organizational structure. Similarly to PB43, the formal structure does not correspond to the actual one.

Formally Bolsjefabrikken is an association. A general assembly meets once a year and appoints a board of directors, made up of 14 people - who also manages the money gathered through donations. Only a few weeks before the interview with them, Lærkevej and Ragnhildgade became two separate organizations that however stay under the same umbrella organization. This separation is due to the fact that the two buildings have specific physical conditions, but also the spirit of the members involved and the type of activities organized are very different. This is why in this section the two buildings are analyzed separately.
Bolsjefabrikken in Lærkevej has a flat organizational structure based on consensus democracy.

“We are formally organized as an association, but in practice we don’t follow the power structure of an association. There must be room for everyone, and the belief at the factory is that the only way this can happen is if everyone has the same power.” (B. Henningsen)

Everyone can join the meetings and use the space. Bolsjefabrikken in Lærkevej is very open, but also – in its own way – structured.

“We have an economy group and a booking group. The idea here is that there is a group responsible for each part of the place, and that they can do what they want with this part. So there are many small projects within the bigger project. The idea is though that you are here because you want to be a part of the bigger project as well. We have some ground ideas here, for example we want no hierarchy and we go for decentralization. Therefore the responsibility goes out to the groups. Every month all the groups in the house have a meeting together to discuss common issues.” (Janus) 20

And representatives indeed do meet to make decisions and plans together. The monthly meeting in Ragnhildgade instead has been recently cancelled. As already mentioned the two buildings are different for many reasons. Also in Ragnhildgade the formal structure does not correspond to the informal one: it’s a fluid organization where people move in and out. However, to this flexibility does not correspond the same openness and the same commitment that characterize the members of Lærkevej. This was immediately perceivable during the on-site observations and the personal participation to one of their meetings. The atmosphere was not inviting but also the mere physical access to the structure was difficult, being the building literally closed to the outside. This difference can be explained by the physical structure of the buildings: while in Lærkevej there are no closed rooms, in Ragnhildgade people can actually lock their own ateliers and studios, so that they become closed private ‘boxes’. Also, on the contrary to Lærkevej, the isolated location of the building in Ragnhildgade allows to organize big concerts and parties. Besides that, people tend to care only about their own projects. It is for these reasons that Ragnhildgade has become a sort of

20 From the interview to Janus, source: TeamsWiki.
anarchic entity. And in such an environment it is more likely that subtle power structures emerge. Charisma and informal leadership therefore tend to give direction to the organization. An interview with Jos Vlerken, one of the members of Ragnhildgade and chairman of the board, was extremely useful to get some insights on this organization.

“The board has no actual influence, it is only a formality for the municipality. But it has no authority in the eyes of people.” (J. Vlerken)

Along with the formal structure in fact there is another hierarchy:

“There is a hidden hierarchy, that goes deeper. There is consensus agreement, but you have to take into account also social pressure and charisma.” (J. V.)

Indeed there is a group of key individuals made up by Sarah, Djawed, Maja, Mads and Jos, who mostly communicate with the property owner, Copenhagen Ejendomme: “The relationship with the property owner and how the whole thing is managed is not very clear. I think in general there are not clear relationships with the external environment, there’s not an overview of the situation. It’s sort of undermanaged, because people don’t want to take responsibilities” (J.V.)

There is a fundamental gap between the way the organization claims to be - open and democratic, and the way it actually functions. In the interview Jos talked about a “locked down social structure” where people “got entrenched”.

“There is not such a communal spirit. The general attitude is working against this. If you really want to change things, I am afraid people wouldn’t really bother.” (J.V.)

This explains why there is almost no interaction between the top and the ground floor of Ragnhildgade. When asked about the real organizational structure, Jos answered that only 10 people are really relevant. Sarah and Djawed seemed to be key leading figures. “They are very involved and active”. This was clear also during the visit to the Factory.

“They take care of the external communication and also they are the one taking responsibility. When you are responsible and take initiatives then it’s natural you acquire leadership.” (J. V.)
4.2.1 Organizational structures: partial conclusions

The first thing that emerged is that there are two extremes or two different categories of organizational structures: DARE2mansion and Skabelonloftet are characterized by clear roles and hierarchies, with a few people at the top acting as gatekeepers – thus controlling the flow of information and financial resources. In general the formal structure corresponds to the actual one. PB43 and Bolsjefabrikken are more open and flexible, their structure is not rigid but is instead dynamic and the formal organization does not necessarily correspond to the actual one. In this section the objective was to give an answer to the first research question by testing the hypothesis. Is it true that when interests are related to profit-making structures are more rigid and top-down, while when the goal is creative experimentation the structure is open and flexible? A first superficial answer would be yes. In the first section of this chapter it was discussed how these cases are characterized by two distinctive categories of interests: PB43, DARE2mansion, Bolsjefabrikken and Skabelonloftet move along a continuum where at the two extremes there are profit goals and non-profit ones. It could be therefore claimed that there is a correspondence between the two interests extremes and the two organizational extremes. However, the correspondence does not seem to be so straightforward. Some ambiguities exist: gatekeepers do exist also in PB43 and Bolsjefabrikken. Also in these places there are hierarchies and ways of exercising power, but they are subtler. A closer look to these realities showed that there are several gaps and paradoxes in the way they are organized. On one hand in fact the organization is more flexible and open than it is formally on paper. On the other hand, the same openness and lack of clear boundaries make possible for some key individuals to exercise influence in the decision-making process.

4.3 Dynamics between internal/external stakeholders: governance models

This section explores the dynamics between internal and external stakeholders and their role in the governance mechanisms of each case. This means that we entered the second level of analysis, which refers to governance and investigates deeper the role of the agents of urban policy-making (which, in the specific context of Copenhagen, seem to be municipality and private investors). The goal is to answer to this research question: RQ1 Is there a correspondence between stakeholders’
interests and governance models? This inevitably leads and introduce to the second research question, which will be discussed in section 4.4.

The hypothesis underlying this research was that to certain interests correspond certain governance models. It was assumed that when the primary goal is to foster creative experimentation and cultural democracy, the municipality has a stronger presence and consequently governance is characterized by public-private partnerships. According to this logic also the flow of investments and monetary resources would correspond to a model controlled by the public bodies. Reversely, private forms of partnerships would appear in case the primary goal was related to economic and real estate development.

The research done has shown that dynamics do change according to each case because the actors are different. However, there is not a substantial difference in the governance models that characterize the four cases selected, even when users’ interests vary significantly. Indeed there is the predominance of one type of governance structure, as further discussed at the end of this section. Governance structures are analyzed through the type of partnership between the actors (whether is it public-private or private-private, top-down or bottom-up) and the source of investment and funding.

**PB43**

PB43 started as partnership with the private owner AkzoNobel and the private organization Givrum.nu. It is independent from the municipality but it got some funding for individual projects from public entities such as Amager Øst Lokaludvalg, (for the urban garden and the hall renovation, the latter with DDK 73.000 for materials expenses) and the Danish Arts Council. The flow of financial resources is structured as following: the municipality finances Amager Øst Lokaludvalg, which in turn gives money to PB43 (which needs to apply for funding for each individual project). The choice of how to allocate the budget is always and inevitably political. According to a member of PB43, this choice is influenced by the extent a project can guarantee an advancement in someone’s career by taking credit for it. Besides this, the involvement of the municipality is
minimal. In particular it emerged that communication is limited to the application for funding and to the request for authorizations and permits for the staging of public events. Susanne Skovgaard, secretary of the Mayor and member of the cultural department of the municipality, said that the communication between PB43 – and Givrum – and the city officials is regular. This seems to be the same with Amager Øst Lokaludvalg.

“Communication is continuous, there’s very close contact, also because two members of PB43 are actually in the board of the council.” (SKS)

However, it seems like there is a communication gap with the municipality. According to a member of PB43, when it is about getting funding from the city “the real knowledge stops at the first entry level.” PB43 and the city council are two very separate realities, and this is not only because it is essentially a private initiative.

“People want to keep their job and thus they do not want to be too much involved. Otherwise, they could compromise their role in the city. This explains also why there’s a tendency now to outsource social projects” (I. Korolev).

This communication gap does not influence directly the decision-making in PB43, but it does make more complicated the access to information when it is about funding and applications for grants. The system is not really top-down, it is democratic and flat but “only if you really go there and ask.” This communication gap is explained by the fact that the City is interested in longevity.

“They want to see a project that lasts over time, 10 years. This gap is made stronger by the fact that we had a temporary contract with AkzoNobel. It was only until 2012. Now we extended it to the end of 2016, and hopefully things will change.” (I. Korolev)

**DARE2mansion**

As already said, DARE2mansion is a 100% private project where its initiators are also owning the space. The governance model is pretty straightforward and therefore just a few words will be spent in this section. One thing worth to underline however is that DARE2mansion was supported
financially also by the municipality, in particular Områdeløft Haraldsgade, even though in minimal part. This local council granted DDK 100.000 for the construction of the bird-wall and the fence at the entrance of the mansion, a project called ‘DARE2connect’ because the goal was establishing a connection with the locals. Another aspect worth to mention is that due to former agreements between the old owner of the property and the municipality, the building can be bought back by the city after 2020 at a symbolic price. This obviously threatens DARE2mansion’s position in the future. For this reason DARE2mansion is not immune to the municipality’s plans and it will have to lobby in order to guarantee its place in the future. This explains why the advisory board of DARE2mansion has started a dialogue with politicians and the local development council. With the investment plan for North Campus in mind it would be extremely counterproductive for the municipality to take advantage of this contractual clause and turn hundreds entrepreneurs out of DARE2mansion. Laila Pawlak seemed very confident about this. According to her the area has so far only two pre-conditions to “grow in a Silicon Valley’s style”: the presence of educational and research institutions and of big corporations headquarters (such as IBM). A third factor is missing: the over representation of start-up companies. This would explain DARE2mansion’s leverage power in its relationship with the municipality.

**Bolsjefabrikken**

Also (and especially) in the case of Bolsjefabrikken the initiative was bottom-up. For what concerns Lærkevej 11 the model is characterized by an agreement between the users and a private owner, while the building in Ragnhildsgade is owned by the city and managed by Copenhagen Ejendomme. However, there is no formal contract regulating this relationship.

> “Once we sign a proper contract, we will have to respect so many rules... And the City wouldn’t know how to deal with all this regulation so at the moment we are waiting before getting the paper signed.” (B. H.)

> “The agreement is that they ‘house-sit’ and we don’t put any money in the building. They take care of everything, and in exchange they have it for free. The agreement at the moment is still informal,
waiting to be formalized. It is not that easy because we have to see how much they have already contributed with the renovations and then compensate this with the market price they should pay for the rent.” (JDP)

Relationship with the municipality is positive, but people of the Bolsjefabrikken are a bit skeptical.

“They kind of like us. But with working with the local council you got to be careful not to play only on their rules. Sometimes it also seems they want to take the grant for what we have been making in this part of the Candy Factory. Really they don't do anything else than renting the place to us.” (Janus)

The money issue is particularly delicate in the case of Bolsjefabrikken since it is very much connected to its independence.

“We appreciate the interest that the municipality has in creativity and sub-cultural movements, but we want to stay independent. The city sees in this kind of projects a way to promote itself in the global competition. We might be more utopian than others... that’s why it is so much harder to get funding and secure the future of this place.” (B. Henningsen)

Bolsjefabrikken goal is to stay independent from both municipality and privates. A proclamation in black letters stands at the entrance of the building saying: “Help, we need to get five million crowns without getting into debt or be municipal!”

"Basically, we are here because we made it here. They do not take credit from us, and they should not come and put us into a growth discourse”. (S. S. Jensen)

"We are not interested in becoming a pawn in competition between cities. It's certainly not why I'm running around here 30 hours a week for free.” (D.Kimouche)21

---

Skabelonloftet

The case of Skabelonloftet is relatively simple because the initiative was entirely private, as well as the ownership of the building. However it has to be underlined that the City does interfere when it concerns the future development of the island.

"Politicians do have the power to influence this process". (A. Holmberg)

It was the municipality to establish the guidelines for temporary use in Refshaleøen, setting that new applications should include "small manufacturing companies, for example creative industries, and collective facilities, sports and leisure facilities, museums, theaters, galleries, concert halls, cultural centers, restaurants and environmental services."(København Kommune, 2009b, p. 7).

4.3.1 Governance models: partial conclusions

Is there a correspondence between stakeholders’ interests and governance models? Also here the answer is not straightforward. One first aspect seems to emerge: the 4 cases share the same type of governance model. In fact, they all started as bottom-up initiatives and are not regulated in any way by the public authorities. They are all characterized by partnership between private actors, more specifically the property owners and the creative users. Only in the case of Bolsjefabrikken in Ragnhildgade the building is municipally owned, but there is no formal agreement. The fact that all buildings but one are privately owned can be explained either by the unwillingness of the City to support this kind of project or the unwillingness of creatives to deal with municipal landlords. The second option seems more likely since the artists and creatives interviewed expressed their concern about being ‘controlled’ or being part of municipal plans.

However, the answer to the research question is not so univocal. There is not a correspondence with internal stakeholders’ interests because no matter the case considered, the model is the same. But if we look at the external stakeholders’ interests and roles, it can be argue that there is a correspondence. It was previously discussed how municipality and private investors interests and power follow the same unchanged pattern. Accordingly, the mechanisms that regulate their
relationships do not vary. The answer to the research question therefore is two-fold, and needs to be contextualized according to whether we are looking at the internal or at the external stakeholders.

In any case, the hypothesis has to be confuted. Indeed, it was assumed that when the primary goal is enhancement of creativity and experimental practices there is a stronger role of the municipality, with public-private partnership. No case showed a significant direct involvement of municipal bodies. **As a common factor the municipality does not intervene in a direct way.** In the relationship with creative entrepreneurs it operates indirectly by financing some specific projects, giving authorizations for large public events and providing technical guidance. For what concerns the relationship with private property owners instead, there are interesting power dynamics since the City can, and actually does, **influence the development scheme of an area even when this is privately owned.** This is especially the case of Prags Boulevard and Refshaleøen Island. In these cases we assist to a scenario where municipal interests – at least when it is about urban regeneration – are aligned to the ones of private real estate investors. To this it corresponds a governance model in which the municipality is almost absent in terms of direct intervention for the creative entrepreneurs. The City does not intervene directly but it is very interested in these spaces. In particular, creative buildings such as the cases analyzed seem to assume relevance as part of broader area development plans. It could be thus stated that **the City operates almost as a private actor.** This reinforces the argument that was made at the beginning of the discussion (4.1), and emerged even more clearly with the identification of stakeholders’ interests. The scenario seems to be dominated by two main actors: municipality and private RE investors.

What can be said about the inclusion of different stakeholders and agendas in the urban regeneration plans of the city of Copenhagen? Are we assisting to a more open and inclusive model of urban governance? Despite the claimed need for new and more complex models of urban governance (see among others: Ache, 2000; Bassett, 2002; Taylor, 2009; Baycan-Levent, 2009), this does not seem to be the case of Copenhagen. Looking at the four cases selected, users have

---

22 This is consistent with what discussed in the theory, where it was claimed that a general trend has emerged where private and public interests became much more blurred.

23 This point will be clarified in the next section.
freedom at the operative level and initiatives come from the bottom. However, this is limited to a temporary period, until the area will be designated to other developments. The private owner is the one having the authority and power to eventually decide about the building’s future and its function. It can be argued, looking at these cases, that we are not assisting to more participatory models of governance since the decision-making is restricted to a few categories of actors. In this scenario of substantial laissez-fair from the municipality, it seems that it remains space only for capital investment. Artists and creative entrepreneurs are not included in broader area regeneration plans, and it is dubious how much of these initiatives will be integrated in future developments. This is exactly what happens in PB43, Candy Factory, and Skabelonloftet. Different is the case of DARE2 because the initiators of the projects are also the owners of the building. It can be thus claimed that also for the cases selected “security ultimately depends on ownership” (Evans 2001, p. 174).

Through an analysis of the specific cases’ governance mechanisms, it was possible to draw a more general argument about Copenhagen’s urban governance and the main forces behind it. It must be underlined that these are the dynamics and governance mechanism that regulate creative urban regeneration processes. These arguments thus cannot be simply transferred to the overall approach that Copenhagen has to the creative industries. The situation is complex, as different levels of governmental actions intertwine and cross each other.

In the next section, there will be an attempt to clarify these mechanisms better and also to understand at which stage of the evolution of the creative city discourse Copenhagen is placed.

4.4 What can be said about Copenhagen’s overall context?

**RQ2:** Looking at these cases, what can be inferred about the current state of the art of creative urban regeneration in the city of Copenhagen?

This final section of the discussion develops further the arguments that are made about the new entrepreneurial-style governance model that is characterizing Copenhagen. The goal is also to understand what phase of the creative city discourse Copenhagen belongs to.
The argument about the interests of Copenhagen municipality and its **entrepreneurial role** is supported by the research of other authors who studied Copenhagen’s public policy trends. Desfor & Jørgensen claim that “economic growth has become the primary goal of urban policy” (2004, p. 482), and according to Bayliss (2007) “public policy in Copenhagen over the last 10 years has been strongly influenced by the need to compete successfully on an international stage with the city acting as the nation’s “growth locomotive” (p. 896). This would explain why the City, even though it does not intervene directly on the creative spaces, it does interfere with the larger area development plans.

Making a step back, something can be inferred from the interviews and the analysis of the cases: there is definitely a pattern in terms of abandoned buildings becoming spaces for cultural innovation. At least this is what interviewed people claimed.

"It is a trend everywhere, but especially in Denmark and Copenhagen, where it has become a 'movement'. I don't know how big it is, but it is certainly where interesting stuff and innovation is happening at the moment. The increasing focus on these spaces is explained by the fact that they provide a flexible framework to attract people that otherwise would be excluded - as it happens in more institutional environments" (J. Koefold-Melson)

This movement seems guided by **spontaneous projects and initiatives** that emerge in a bottom-up way, like PB43, DARE2mansion, Bolsjefabrikken and Skabelonloftet. What clearly emerged is that the City does not directly interfere with these spontaneous movements: they are not regulated. The municipality does not have a defined agenda on creative re-use of urban derelict areas and in particular creative clusters such as the cases selected. The way the City intervenes is indirect and marginal - at least when the scope is limited to the single creative space. It operates indirectly by financing some specific projects, giving authorizations for large public events and providing technical guidance or business counseling.

"There is not an overall explicit strategy, it depends from case to case. There's nothing very specific: it's more about giving broad directions, so that it’s possible for cultural entrepreneurs to develop their own project. Cultural organizations and entrepreneurs can do whatever they want - if
it's legal, of course." (S. Skovgaard)

Interestingly, this lack of regulation and strategic planning is related to the fact that creative clusters (even in their smallest form of creative buildings) are perceived as being generating value only for what concerns city image and area investment. It seems that they are not considered as essential catalyst for creative industries growth, innovation, and cultural production\(^\text{24}\). In other words, the spatial element of these realities seem to be overlooked, at least for purposes other than city marketing and real estate investment. Here it is appropriate to quote again Pratt (2009, p. 1043): “cities are wasting what are currently one of the most dynamic industries as ‘starter fuel’ for property development and residential expansion when the cultural industries could be used to develop more substantial economic and cultural agendas.”

My argument here is that the production potential of creative buildings and creative urban agglomerates is not at the center of the political discourse in Copenhagen. This does not mean that Copenhagen is not focusing on cultural production. Amenity-based approaches and strategies oriented towards the stimulation of cultural consumption have been largely surpassed with the integration of measures that stimulate also the production side. In this sense it would be wrong to claim that Copenhagen is still in the first generation phase of the creative city discourse. Copenhagen does support the growth of creative industries, and indeed this is becoming increasingly the main focus. However, it does not do it at the spatial level.

This explains why the value that these spontaneous initiatives can generate is not incorporated at a more strategic level. In this sense building-based initiatives (such as the ones analyzed throughout this thesis) do not contribute much in shaping future urban policies. Urban-regeneration strategies and the development of creative industries clusters are not strategically combined. Yet it is exactly the presence of these experimental places dedicated to the exploration and promotion of cultural innovation that can contribute to the growth of local creative industries\(^\text{25}\).

\(^{24}\) Rather, they are seen as catalyst for area gentrification.

\(^{25}\) As exhaustively discussed in Chapter 2.3.
There are three possible explanations for this lack of spatial focus.

The first one is that in Copenhagen there is a lack of acknowledgement of the economic benefits of spatial agglomeration. This is a very interesting aspect because if this were really the case, it would be a counter-trend of all the existing research and theory. However, investigating of this point is far beyond the scope of this thesis.

A second explanation is that the city of Copenhagen does realize the benefits of agglomerations but it consciously does not promote spatial agglomeration. There might be thus more strategic reasons behind this lack of direct intervention. Especially after the experience of Kødbyen, the Meatpacking District in West Copenhagen, a flagship regeneration project where the City planned to concentrate creative entrepreneurs, politicians and public bodies acknowledged that “direct top-down planning is unlikely to generate creative environments” (Bayliss, 2007, p. 900). The Meatpacking has in fact become a highly gentrified site with trendy nightlife, popular restaurants and bars, art galleries and fancy creative offices. Michael-Ryan Andersen, consultant for the creative industries in the City business department, explained that this experience reinforced the belief that what is needed is rather appropriate framework conditions to spur business growth. Hence the focus on services support such as: advice on start-up, business development, fundraising, permissions, access to incubators, training, export promotion, networking, etc. This is also in line with the proposals of the Creative Task Force, which suggested the creation of one entry point to offer shared services to the creative sector. This also reflects Darren Bayliss’ studies of Danish governance trends governance (2004, 2007). He noted in fact that: “Copenhagen’s approach seems to be more aimed at establishing basal favourable conditions for the sector. This can be seen in the suggested free zones in culturally “rich” environments where creativity is meant to flourish in a more laissez-faire planning framework, aided by loosely organized economic, technological and professional support structures that are proactive, flexible and attuned to the sector’s needs.” (2007, pp. 900-901).

The third reason is connected to the political set-up of Copenhagen, and the fact that there are three different departments whose scopes converge when it is about urban regeneration projects and

26 In the interview hold on November the 1st – see appendix.
27 Set in Spring 2012 by the Copenhagen Municipality and made up of a few representatives of the creative industries.
creative centers. These projects are especially complicated because there are various levels through which the city operates: business, culture, and urban planning. These three departments have separate budgets, but also very different approaches and cultures.

“These are three different perspectives that should go together, but there are also very strong traditions in the cultural, urban and business mentalities. In particular while we focus on business framework conditions for the creative industries, the cultural department tends to keep separated business and culture. Similarly, the urban planning department tends to underestimate the cultural and social value of urban areas. But business, cultural and urban values are highly interconnected.” (M. R. Andersen)

In particular it emerges that the urban department does not acknowledge the value of the unplanned. Politicians are not very concerned with the possibility of having creative centers within the context of urban regeneration, probably because there is not a full acceptance of spontaneous movements: they seem to be much more concerned with planned development.

“If we talk about urban regeneration projects, I think that creative or cultural houses are not quite understood in a synergic way. This is because it is politically and culturally complicated. Probably the potential of these private spontaneous initiatives is not fully exploited.” (M. R. Andersen)

There is a great potential of synergies that, however, is not implemented, because of a lack of a holistic approach. This makes also more difficult to place Copenhagen into the evolution of the creative city discourse – since there are three different agendas that refer to three different ideas of what the creative city should be.
5. Conclusion

Through a critical review of the existing theory, it was shown how the creative city concept has evolved toward a complex set of elements where consumption and production intertwine. In particular, it was argued that creative clusters represent a key factor for urban and economic regeneration. These creative clusters can take the form of former industrial buildings converted into creative centers. In these particular spaces - because they deal with urban regeneration processes - there is the involvement of a multitude of stakeholders and interests. Hence the need for new and more inclusive models of governance that take these interests into account.

The case study on four different realities of the city of Copenhagen enabled to ground these issues in real-life examples. The scope of the analysis included the dynamics between stakeholders and the underlying urban governance mechanisms. These were the two research questions this thesis wanted to address: (RQ1) Taking in consideration the configurations of stakeholders’ interests and characteristics (in terms of power, influence, alliances) is there a correspondence in terms of organizational structures and models of governance? (RQ2) Looking at these cases, what can be inferred about the current state of the art of creative urban regeneration in the city of Copenhagen?

**Results** showed that the interests of internal stakeholders move along a continuum where extremes are: profit making vs. creative freedom. The main external stakeholders are municipality and private RE investors: their interests are aligned and refer to growth-driven and property-led urban development. Looking at the internal organizational structures, it emerged a correspondence with the interests at play, consistently with the hypothesis. However, some interesting ambiguities emerged in particular for the case of PB43 and Candy Factory. On one hand in fact the organization is more flexible and open than it is formally on paper. On the other hand, the same openness and lack of clear boundaries make possible for some key individuals to exercise influence in the decision-making process. Looking at the governance models instead, it emerged a situation where the municipality is almost absent in terms of direct intervention for the creative entrepreneurs. However, these creative spaces do assume relevance as part of broader area development plans. In this sense the municipality operates almost as a private actor, and an entrepreneurial model seems to
dominate - where decision-making is restricted to a few categories of actors. Artists and creative entrepreneurs are not included in broader area regeneration plans. Interestingly, this is explained by the fact that the spatial element is overlooked in terms of potential for production. Building-based initiatives therefore do not contribute much in shaping urban policies.

There are also a few limitations that need to be acknowledged and addressed. First of all, it was difficult to access some information because of the lack of transparency around some cases’ organizational composition and, in a few occasions, the reluctance of some actors to collaborate. This was especially the case of the more grass-root PB43 and Bolsjefabrikken. This explains also the second limitation, which is a lack of quantitative data supporting the findings of the qualitative research. In fact, it was impossible to reach a significant sample of respondents for a quantitative survey method. Other limitations refer primarily to those generally attributed to the case study approach (see Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2001). More specifically, the fact that results cannot be generalized in the conventional sense, because by definition case studies are not typical. Moreover, it is not easy to represent the complexity examined. Finally, qualitative case studies are limited to the sensitivity of the researcher, hence "they are strongest when researcher expertise and intuition are maximised, but this raises doubts about their “objectivity”" (ibid.). This is especially true for what concerns the understanding of very delicate dynamics, as in this case. In particular, the intuitions about the political attitude might be partial and therefore need further investigation. One more thing can be said about the case study. "The case study proliferates rather than narrows. One is left with more to pay attention to rather than less" (Stake, 1978, p.7). Indeed this is what happened.

These results lead to interesting implications and open up to new considerations. In terms of practical implications, even when there is a total lack of direct public intervention, the fact that municipality and private investors dominate Copenhagen's urban governance does affect the life of creative clusters. A suggestion is that politicians and public bodies acknowledge the value of these spontaneous spaces, also in terms of policy-making. It is not argued here that the municipality should intervene more directly. As said also at the beginning of this thesis, rather than a direct intervention, governments and policy-makers should pay attention to those resources that support
risk and experimentation: ‘third-spaces', informal and vernacular, where creatives can exchanged ideas. These spaces are in fact crucial to sustain and shape creative production. What the city officials can do instead is to test more inclusive governance models by incorporating artists and creatives in urban development strategies and decision-making processes.

Finally, there can be some interesting directions for future research. The presence of organizational gaps and ambiguities suggests that it is worth to analyze the two organizational extremes more in detail. Are the two typologies of organization so much different? Is it true that a few individuals act as gatekeepers also in more participatory models (such as PB43 and Bolsjefabrikken)? A further research could thus try to understand whether there are substantial differences between these typologies of organizations. In case there are, it can be inferred with more certainty that interests actually do affect the type of organizational model. It would be interesting in this sense to test RQ1 also on other cities than Copenhagen, in order to see if these correspondences can be generalized or represent a peculiarity of the Danish context. Another future direction of research is a deeper investigation of the attitude that Copenhagen's authorities and politicians have towards spatial agglomeration and in particular creative clusters. Is it true that the benefits of spatial agglomeration are not acknowledged?

Lastly, it can be interesting to investigate whether there are concrete opportunities for more participatory models of urban governance in Copenhagen.
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Appendix

List of people interviewed

1. Christian Fumz – Givrum.nu – 04/06/12
2. Jesper Koefoed-Melson – Givrum.nu – 03/10/12
3. Ivan Korolev – coordinator PB43 – 28/09/12
4. Steen Andersen – Chairman PB43 board – 11/10/12
5. Søren Kærsgaard Snarberg – Amager Øst Lokaludvalg – 01/10/12
6. Laila Pawlak – Founder of DARE2mansion – 04/10/12
7. May-Britt Buchardt – Office manager DARE2mansion – 17/10/12
8. Jos Van Vlerken – Bolsjefabrikken Ragnhilgade – 04/10/12
9. Benny Henningsen – Bolsjefabrikken Lærkevej – 14/10/12
10. John Dahl Pedersen – Københavns Ejendomme – 30/10/12
11. Susanne Skovgaard – Municipality of Copenhagen – 08/10/12
12. Anette Holmberg – Founder of Skabelonloftet – 10/10/12
13. Kristian Holm – Photographer and tenant at Skabelonloftet – 10/10/12
14. Claus Hovmöller – Plan and leasing consultant at REDA – 23/10/12
15. Sven Johannesen – Journalist – 15/10/12
16. Michael Ryan Andersen – Copenhagen Business Service – 01/11/12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Paradigms</th>
<th>Main features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900s-1910s</td>
<td>City as a work of art</td>
<td>Separation between high art and popular culture/mass entertainment, also codified in spatial terms with the agglomeration of elite cultural institutions and venues such as museums, libraries, gardens and concert halls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910s-1950s</td>
<td>Cultural zonation</td>
<td>Urban spaces narrowly defined into mono-functional zoning. Provision of civic-cultural centers in a hierarchical way, with highbrow facilities in the city center and community neighborhood venues in the suburbs. Culture is related to public welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s-1970s</td>
<td>Flagship facilities</td>
<td>Flagships new facilities as result of arts/corporate sponsorships and developer coalitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s-1970s</td>
<td>Cultures of communities</td>
<td>Community arts movements challenging institutional approaches and the rational planning paradigm, as well as historic preservation and heritage conservation movements. First programs that include culture in community and economic redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s-1990s</td>
<td>Culture in urban development</td>
<td>Search for new sources of investment and employment generation: arts assume economic relevance and culture is seen as a “consumption, production and image strategy” (Evans, 2001). The aim is creating a new urban image to attract mobile capital and workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s-2000s</td>
<td>The creative city</td>
<td>Cultural led regeneration becomes pervasive and strategies are cyclical and integrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** Evolution of the Creative City concept. Source: adapted from Freestone and Gibson

![Figure 1](https://example.com/figure1.png)

*Figure 1 Source: Scott, 2010*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB43</td>
<td>Internal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Creative users</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Creative freedom, business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AkzoNobel</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>RE investment, reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Municipality</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Area regeneration, city image, RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Amager Øst</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Local community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local residents</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Local community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Givrum.nu</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Become a recognized player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visitors</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARE2mansion</td>
<td>Internal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partners</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mansioners</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Områdeløft</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Local regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Municipality</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Area regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsjefabrikken</td>
<td>Internal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Users</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Creative freedom and political ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Municipality</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Maintenance cost, city image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private owner</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Maintenance cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visitors</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skabelonloftet</td>
<td>Internal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A. Holmberg</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tenants</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private owner</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>RE development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Municipality</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Area regeneration, RE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Summary of stakeholders’ composition and characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Internal stakeholders’ interests</th>
<th>Organizational structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB43</td>
<td>Creative freedom (but also business opportunities)</td>
<td>Flexible, open, participatory, but with some hidden hierarchies/gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARE2mansion</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
<td>Rigid and top-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsjefabrikken</td>
<td>Creative Freedom</td>
<td>Flexible, open, participatory, but with some hidden hierarchies/gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skabelonloftet</td>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
<td>Rigid and top-down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3** Summary stakeholders’ interests and organizational structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models of governance</th>
<th>Key players in urban governance</th>
<th>Type of urban governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom-up initiative</td>
<td>Municipality and private RE investors</td>
<td>Not inclusive and participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private-private partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect public intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4** Summary of the governance mechanisms.
Picture 1 PB43: the entrance, opening at 68 sq meters gallery, the yard, a lecture in the tower and the 
urban garden. Photo M. Mussapi

Picture 2 DARE2mansion: meeting room, office facilities and outside areas. Photo M. Mussapi
Picture 3 Map of the development plan of Science City North Campus. Source: Science City North Copenhagen Development Plan. Published June 2011 © University of Copenhagen

Picture 4 Bolsjefabrikken in Lærkevej and Ragnhildgade. Photo Klaus S. Jensen, M. Mussapi
Picture 5 Skabelonloftet: entrance and common spaces. Refshaleøen area. Photo M. Mussapi