Temporary uses in contemporary spaces. A European project in Rome

Rossana Galdini

Department of Social and Economic Sciences, Faculty of Political Sciences, Sapienza University of Rome, Via Salaria113, 00198 Rome, Italy

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT

Temporary uses represent innovative and experimental solutions to give new life to disused facilities and spaces while conserving their historical, identity and environmental value. By offering the opportunity to assign new functions and meanings to abandoned places and create economic and social development, these practices can play a strategic role in promoting an integrated approach as a starting point for urban regeneration processes. Based on these assumptions, this paper aims to investigate how temporary uses of disused urban spaces can interact in a practical sense with formal planning systems and urban policies. To do so, it analyses a European project implemented in Rome aimed at fostering temporary activities in public space and reactivating several disused areas by directly involving the local community. The paper proposes a few observations touching on two issues: firstly, whether the temporary use of disused space can be a practical opportunity to not only re-design urban space but also establish a new governance model. Secondly, whether such practices can effectively address the needs and aspirations of citizens, as a precondition for improving quality of life in the city.

1. Introduction

The dynamics at work in the contemporary city spur critical reflection on urban transformation processes and the need to identify operational strategies which can be used to formulate new ways of interpreting and formalizing urban spaces. Over the past decades, several studies and research projects have investigated the potential contribution of temporary uses to urban development in Europe. The temporary character of these transformations allows citizens to use the spaces for creative urban living solutions, involving them in their city's future (Lehtovuori & Ruoppila, 2012).

There are multiple reasons why temporary uses practices are becoming increasingly common. These include the recent economic crisis and resulting need for recycling and re-use strategies, concerns over preserving architectural heritage, limited resources, insurgent urban activism, and an ever-growing awareness of the importance of sustainable development. Furthermore, technological changes and uncertainty in the labour market give rise to social innovation, creativity, new cultural trends and a host of flexible and transitory practices. These significant changes call for a multidisciplinary reflection on planning tools.

In Europe, the need to adapt the landscape and its structures to social, political and economic changes and a broad sense of historical continuity have given rise to a conservational approach to saving heritage and site-specific identity. Alongside this trend, the spread of urban re-use practices testifies to an emerging innovative approach in

which temporary uses are conceived as a holist, integrated strategy that enhances the creativity and resilience of the spatial, social, environmental and economic conditions of contemporary cities. As a matter of fact, temporary urbanism represents an alternative method of urban design and planning aimed at activating a space in need of transformation and impacting the surrounding socio-economic environment. Temporary urbanism is the temporal designation of urban processes; the key concepts for this theoretical approach are time and temporality (Madanipour, 2017). Temporality reflects the contemporary utilitarian notion of time; the fragmentation of society and, at the same time, the need for experimentation and innovation. Temporary urbanism also includes temporary, informal, and above all bottom-up practices. These temporary uses are performed by the public, private and civil society actors. Temporary urbanism emphasizes the role of new actors in the shaping of places (Henneberry, 2017).Temporary users are also the promoters and, at the same time, beneficiaries of such transformations, while the transformations themselves have provided an impulse for more synergies with local government bodies as well.

Conserving (natural or historical) heritage is no longer the only node of urban re-use. Temporary uses in particular are not solely an informal activity driven from below by marginal groups or urban subcultures. Overcoming the idea that such practices are necessarily occasional or random has increasingly led these uses to be considered a crucial element for processes of urban and territorial transformation. The main target of such attention is disused spaces suited to becoming urban laboratories for strategically reinventing specific parts of the city,

their role and the facilities they host.

Over the past few years, the issue of residual spaces has aroused considerable interest and promoted in-depth theoretical knowledge of the subject, leading to an abundance of projects based on temporary actions. Small-scale incremental projects such as temporary gardens, playgrounds, and market places with their collective character pave the way for social innovation, promoting social cohesion and environmental values. They support economic activities and the valorisation of heritage while compensating for or counteracting the weakness and rigidity of formal policies. The act of re-using these spaces is a chance to test out proposed projects, verifying their effectiveness and, if users agree, making them permanent.

Despite several successful projects, temporary use cases in Italy continue to represent valid yet rare and largely unknown experiments. Over the past few years, however, several initiatives addressed to local authorities or active citizens have focused attention on public property and the possibility of its re-use while also promoting public-private partnerships. Recently, measures have been adopted to encourage the participation of local communities in protecting and valorisation local areas, fostering the recovery of existing assets. However, this issue calls for further analysis.

The strategy of temporary use can be considered an instrument for reactivating collective spaces, a planning goal, and as such it has come to play a strategic role in the process of urban regeneration. Current trends reveal that urban regeneration interventions have gradually shifted from being place-oriented to being people-oriented (Marra, Barosio, Eynard, & Marietta, 2016). Whereas in the first stage regeneration favored the improvement of spaces, facilities and economic aspects, planners now focus on social support and people-oriented policies which also include environmental protection and care initiatives. This is achieved through more integrated actions adopting a participatory framework. Temporary use practices seem to combine these two aspects within an integrated and contemporary approach (De Smet, 2013).

Based on such reflections, this paper focuses on the theme of temporary use and valorisation of disused areas, in particular public spaces, in order to investigate the potential and challenges of temporary spaces. This study seeks to develop a theoretical interpretation of this phenomenon through a critical evaluation of its effects and potential future implications. To do so, it analyses the EU-funded project TUTUR - *Temporary Uses as a Tool for Urban Regeneration*, which aims to develop a legal instrument for promoting the temporary use of disused buildings and spaces, streamlining associated bureaucratic processes and paving the way for new experimental models. What relationship is established between temporary uses and urban regeneration processes?

This is the main question this paper attempts to answer by analysing the chosen case study and referencing other European examples, the potentialities and limitations of these practices and their possible transfer to other contexts.

The findings of the TUTUR project stress the potential of temporary uses as a specific type of spatial planning which can offer a chance to establish a dialogue between the various public and private stakeholders, potentially offering effective economic, social and environmental advantages to the areas involved.

2. Research approach and methodology

The general aim of this paper is to explore and interpret the extent to which many current practices of temporary use in Europe might play a strategic role in promoting an integrated approach as a starting point for urban regeneration. The specific goals are to verify 1. Whether temporary uses of unused city spaces can also have permanent effects on the contexts in which they are situated, and 2. Whether temporal and informal uses succeed in meeting the neglected needs of the community.

The paper is therefore concerned with the process rather than the results of the analysis of the case study in Rome.

The main questions address these issues:

1. Whether experimenting with and supporting temporary uses can make planning more flexible and capable of adapting to the challenges posed by changes currently underway while also contributing to the creation of a new governance model.
2. Whether temporary uses in public spaces can succeed in creating contemporary places, taking full advantage of the potential of in-between spaces.

Two main problems needed to be addressed to test the above hypotheses: firstly, whether temporary uses of disused spaces represent an opportunity to not only re-design urban space, but also innovate governance more generally. Secondly, whether such practices can successfully meet the needs and aspirations of citizens, as a prerequisite for developing policies with the efficacy to improve the quality of the environment and urban life.

How can temporary uses be integrated into long-term urban regeneration processes? How might we facilitate the reactivation of the marginal, in-between spaces that characterise contemporary cities?

These are the main questions this paper seeks to answer. It is not clear whether authorities will be able to further develop the potential of such practices in the future. The TUTUR project in Rome did not have an influence in terms of long-term change.

To these ends, a qualitative research project was carried out: the analysis of existing literature and data was complemented by direct observation of the locations and participation in the meetings organised as part of the project in Rome. During the research it was possible to exchange opinions, information and knowledge with people who are involved in the project. These also provided some useful elements to in-depth analyse the ongoing process.

The paper offers some theoretical insights on the issue of temporary uses and intermediate spaces while also attempting to verify the hypotheses suggested by the theory on the basis of the outcomes of the case study.

The findings were subjected to factual and interpretative practices through which reality acquired visibility (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 3).

Secondary data was collected from a variety of sources: literature reviews, documents, materials taken from dialogues with social, economic and institutional actors involved in the project, websites, books, internal records, interviews, institutional and administrative documents, EU project reports, previous studies in the field of temporary uses, reviews of relevant literature, and websites, as well as documents on European examples, decrees and norms (Urban Catalyst, 2003; Urban Pioneers, 2007; Temporiuso, 2009; Oswalt, Overmeyer, & Misselwitz, 2013; Tutur Final Report 2015, Refill Urbact-Reuse of vacant spaces as driving force for innovation on local level, 2016; Raumlabor, 2018; Decreto 'Sblocca Italia' ('Unlock Italy' Decree), 2014) to name just a few, with elements being added to compare different practices on urban re-use. In the first phase, analysis focused on several interpretations proposed by the literature on the issue of temporary use. Subsequently, further attention was paid to the concepts of temporariness, informality and social innovation, understood respectively as opportunities, triggers for action, and outcomes of the spread of such practices.

The study of different cases in Europe seems to confirm that the "time" factor influences the methods, process and outcomes of the interventions under way. Indeed, the "temporariness" of such actions is an important strategic variable (Galdini, 2015; Inti, 2010). This variable is in turn situated in the so-called *in-between* dimension, a transitory phase between the old and new intended use or between a temporary and permanent solution. This temporal and spatial dimension seems to better adapt to the fragmented nature of the contemporary city. In light of this insight, the research analysed intermediate spaces, potential venues for multiple activities. The second part of the paper

was concerned with the analysis of the case study, an observation of the ways the EU TUTUR project was implemented in Rome and a critical evaluation of its outcomes. The discussion was based on social and spatial elements, the legal aspects affecting this case of re-use, relations between citizens and institutions, social and economic impact, difficulties and future prospects. The goal was to focus on methods that may facilitate the implementation of temporary uses, encouraging dialogue between the various social stakeholders and institutions and fostering public debate on the issue of planning and design. The final part highlighted the critical aspects brought to the fore by this case study. The summary of the results and related discussion outlined pathways for future inquiry.

3. Perspectives on temporary uses

Over the past decade, temporary uses have been spreading in Europe to an unprecedented degree. Active citizenship practices claiming the right to use and manage communal assets (Arena & Iaione, 2015; Harvey, 2012) have been emerging, driven by economic factors as well as the growing attention paid to urban spaces and the environment in general. Scholars in various fields have focused on the issue of temporary use, analysing the spatial opportunities and social implications of temporary uses in urban areas. The results of these studies encompass different political perspectives and backgrounds, connected to the contexts in which temporary practices develop or the opinions of those observing them. However, it is possible to identify two main trends: (1) a growing awareness of the complexity of the problem and its multiple implications and (2) a political spin on the debate given the current historical moment characterized by the acceleration of gentrification processes and austerity policies.

The first suggestion of the complexity of temporary uses can be seen in the fact that such practices are defined in multiple different ways. Lehtovuori and Ruoppila (2012) define temporary uses as "*those uses that carry a development-orientation, i.e. carry the capacity and aim to explore further potentials of the places they are located in. Hence, they form a category between momentary events and permanent (re)development.*"

This definition supports the goal of this research project, that is, to acknowledge that temporary uses have the potential to give rise to permanent actions as well. The uncertainty but also possibility of these practices is highlighted in the definition by Honeck (2015) "*which labels a spatial use carried out for a limited time on a vacant land with no foreseeable development demands*" […] "*Temporary use may develop to a 'longer-term use of a higher urban quality'*" (BMVBS, BBR, 2008: 107).

Whether or not a space manages to change from a waiting space into a potentiality place is closely related to the action of the various subjects involved in organizing and managing the project, as well as the various operational levels. It is also connected to the type of space, their morphology and potential use value. These aspects complicate the launch of structured and well-accepted processes.

Some scholars have granted special relevance to temporariness as a value or, vice versa, a limitation of these practices. The definition of temporary uses as secondary uses clarifies these two different interpretations.

Supporters of the former theory, such as Haydn and Temel (2006), claim that "*temporary uses are those that are planned to be non-permanent from the outset. We understand the idea of temporariness to be determined not by the duration of use: temporary uses are those that seek to derive unique qualities from the idea of temporariness*". Bishop and Williams (2012) share this idea, emphasising that the characteristics and value of temporary use are generated precisely by the fact that the actors promoting such use, users, developers, and planners, intentionally frame the use as transient.

Another relevant aspect which is not easy to implement is the relationship between temporary uses and master plans: these small-scale changes are conceived as the first step in carrying out lasting changes. Thus, these practices are most effective when used in conjunction with long term planning efforts (Lydon & Garcia, 2015: 2). Some benefits of temporary uses include highlighting creativity, encouraging entrepreneurship, providing incentives to property owners to maintain their properties, and supporting environmentally sustainable development (Blumner, 2006:8). Regarding the latter hypothesis, a few authors argue that these practices are temporary, marginal and alternative (De Silvey & Edensor, 2012; Hou, 2010), without any chance of becoming primary (Nemeth & Lanhorst, 2014). The concept of temporariness requires critical evaluation: on one hand, it favours informal, flexible, transitory and sometimes even illegal practices involving the various stakeholders and promoting local participation, providing rapid responses to residents' demands. On the other hand, it highlights the difficulties in implementing such practices if there is a lack of continuity in funding, cooperation, interaction with stakeholders and institutions. The case study analysed here falls under this critical category. What seems to be the driving force of temporary uses is often informality as a response to the unmet needs of the community. Actions based on informality and temporariness are a way of testing out the functionality, relative innovativeness of and consensus enjoyed by the practices in question before the supply of innovative services becomes established. Such projects offer a way of evaluating the effects of such services and their repercussions on structural aspects as well as cultural and social capital, thus promoting personal re-use if the project is found to work well (Berruti & Palestino, 2014).

The second main trend in the critical evaluation of temporary uses, which is inevitably connected to the first, is the gradual politicisation of discourse. As the case study below highlights, procedural complexities and lack of flexibility in regularity norms often prevent practices from continuing over time. The perceived value of temporary uses lies mainly in their ability to promote urban regeneration processes. The results are not guaranteed, due to the risks associated with institutionalisation itself. Concerning the politicisation of the debate, the analysis by Honeck (2015) dwells on changing conditions and administrative structures in spatial, economic and legal terms in reference to temporary uses. These trends can be summarised as "*from informally tolerated to a formally sanctioned activity.*" *Temporary uses are often regarded as* "*motors of gentrification*" *and* "*fields of self-exploitation.*" Whereas in the 1990s the innovative use of empty areas in cities undergoing crisis such as Berlin and Leipzig was unanimously celebrated, today such initiatives meet with scepticism. This attitude is partly due to the increase in public protests against the recapitalisation of the areas used in an informal way or the socially exclusive character of many temporary uses that address the middle class or, more recently, the creative class, thus excluding the poorest members of society. Many authors initially took a positive stance towards urban development in investigating their object of study (Ferguson, 2014; Lydon & Garcia, 2015; Oswalt et al., 2013), and this celebratory position has been analysed by several critical papers over the past few years (Ferreri, 2015; LaFrombois, 2015; Spataro, 2016). Today, the gentrification processes associated with re-use practices are one of the most widespread side effects linked to urban regeneration initiatives. Authors such as Colomb (2012), Tonkiss (2013) or Spataro (2016) have emphasised the problematic role temporary re-use plays in the context of neoliberal urban policies, with intermediate uses being exploited as drivers for growth or as pioneering gentrification instruments. Local politicians and real estate investors have often used this aspect to increase economic profitability (Colomb, 2012; Overmeyer, 2007).

Some other critical insights focus on political instability and administrative discontinuity, together with the conflict that may arise between owners and tenants, or between the institutions and community, thus preventing the practices from continuing and being fully implemented and, in so doing, unravelling the benefits they had produced thus far. On the contrary, several examples of temporary use manage to achieve consensus by permanently integrating into the areas in which they are situated (Oswalt et al., 2013), highlighting their potential ability to meet the new demand for a social city. An aspect

which is problematic but rarely studied in the literature on temporary uses concerns the location of temporary spaces. As they are place-based, what areas are potentially more suitable for temporary uses? According to Lehtovuori and Ruoppila (2012), almost any urban location can have the potential for some kind of temporary use. Adopting the distinction made by Urban Pioneers (2007), they refer to central and marginal spaces leading to two different kinds of temporary use. In central locations, the question is how to intensify use even further while respecting practical and legal limitations. These aspects make new investment difficult. In marginal areas, the question is instead how to invite the first users to an unknown or vacant area. To create a comprehensive analytic framework of temporary uses, the authors propose to take into account a third spatial condition, namely "areas losing significance". A great amount of recent literature face the issue of unused or under-used areas object of the next paragraph.

4. The in-between dimension of temporary spaces

The challenging role assigned to temporary uses re-focuses our attention on the issue of temporary space. Temporary uses can be considered a valuable tool in developing challenging locations, giving new function and meaning to obsolete spaces/buildings. Considered inactive spaces without any identity or functional ties to the city, in reality these are also spaces offering opportunities and resources for urban development. Starting from the late 1980s, in-between areas have become the subject of several studies and subsequent categorisations. Trancik (1986) defined urban voids as lost spaces, critical spaces, unable to contribute positively to their surroundings; Cameron (2003) re-valued them by using the term *vacant land*, and identifying them as a "natural dynamic component of every city that is constantly evolving." Residual spaces often appear as *terrain vagues*, islands within the city deprived of any effective integration and lying outside urban dynamics (De Solà Morales, 1996).

Richardson (2015) reversed this interpretation to frame residual spaces as one of the outcomes of globalisation processes and consequences of post-Fordism. Voids have the potential to become full of meaning, functions, opportunities, and identity. Over the past twenty years, several analyses have been carried out and a series of definitions have been created to define the abandonment, decay and often degradation and neglect that characterise certain spaces of contemporary cities, including but not limited to *liminal space*, *in-between space*, *neglected space* and *intermediate spaces* (Banerjee (2001), Clement (2005), De Girolamo, 2013).

They appear to be *waiting spaces* in a transitional phase between old and new intended uses. They can be public or private spaces and they are areas that present both risks and potential, sites of degradation or fertile grounds for innovation. In the contemporary city, these spaces often become places through practices of use, and develop informal economies and self-organised services, thereby catalysing new forms of cities (Oswalt, 2006). As fragments of the city, they act as nodes of change and can offer solutions where traditional planning strategies have failed (De Smet, 2013).

Through re-use practices, intermediate spaces play a strategic role in the architectural, social, and environmental field. They promote an integrated approach as a starting point for urban regeneration processes (Galdini, 2017). From an architectural perspective, abandoned spaces that undergo some sort of 'reinterpretation' and reassessment change their use and function, maintaining their original image or changing it to better connect to the contemporary world. In this case, the project also involves an effort of mediation and connection between past and future.

In relation to temporary use in general and the specific case study in particular, this paper aims to show that disused spaces provide an opportunity in terms of environmental sustainability (Lombardi, 2008), making it possible to regain possession of the "territory as a common good" (Magnaghi, 2012) and build or change a living environment.

In the (open) public spaces of the contemporary city, collective subjects are engaging in informal and temporary practices with special attention to social aspects, sharing and cooperation. This new 'active citizenship' pursues the goal of reinventing a city, re-building it according to the citizenry's needs and aspirations (Harvey, 2012).

5. The European TUTUR pilot project

Some of the above-mentioned theoretical insights on the issues of temporary uses and intermediate spaces can help to analyse and interpret the European pilot project TUTUR (Temporary Uses as a Tool for Urban Regeneration), which is part of a wider programme called URBACT.

The TUTUR project also involved the Municipalities of Bremen in Germany, Alba Iulia in Romania and Rome in Italy, and its overall purpose was to introduce the method of temporary use in urban regeneration to the cities participating in the network. The main objectives were sustainability and inclusiveness: the project promotes economic and environmental development by reusing urban voids in the city with the involvement of public administrations, local inhabitants and stakeholders. As the Tutur report highlights, one of the program's main objectives was to transfer the practice and methodology coined by the temporary use agency of Bremen, *Zwischen Zeit Zentrale* (ZZZ), to other European cities. In this program, the municipality of Bremen established a collaboration with an NGO to work at different scales and with different users on 50 properties in its territory. The German city played the role of an "experience provider" (Elisei, 2014).

This policy cross-cuts other planning instruments and has three main objectives: 1. networking people; 2. Focusing on unused/under-used places to foster socio-economic, cultural initiatives; 3. connecting input coming from the bottom up with top-down requirements. The key words of Bremen's ZZZ methods are the same ones considered central for the analysis of the case study in Rome, key principles that could be transferred to other projects. This agency's objectives can be listed as follows:

Cultural: support of cultural and creative projects.
Economical: reducing operating costs for vacant properties.
Spatial: activation of vacancies, especially in urban redevelopment areas
Social: fostering citizen participation.
Organisational: supporting coordination and decision-making processes between the various departments of the German City Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR) implementing these new approaches in management routines.
Cooperative: Testing new forms of coordinated cooperation between the private sector and public actors.

The ZZZ was a local project, but as a pilot project of the Federal Institute for Research on Building, (2009–2012) it also tested a new approach for urban and social development for other cities as well (Elisei, 2014).

The ZZZ agency played multiple innovative roles in terms of approach and content.

The approach of ZZZ was project-orientated and experimental, and it did not receive any EU-funding. Its aim was "to 'wake up' sleeping, vacant buildings and areas, both public and private owned, by establishing temporary uses there and thus upgrading the real estate and its surrounding districts." ZZZ has activated many buildings on a temporary basis and supports the City Administration in its long-term urban planning plans.

The Bremen examples testify to the extent to which temporary uses can contribute to both economic development and social cohesion in the neighbourhoods involved in the project. (Mages, 2017). The primary investment of TUTUR was thus made in the periphery of Bremen,

an approach that suggested a concrete medium and long-term vision. The project provides, for example, affordable spaces for start-ups and job opportunities for young people and migrants. Regarding methods, the Local Support Group composed of representatives of social, political, cultural and economic institutions played a leading role and information was used to promote the project and develop public relations. Bremen practices and methodology have represented the starting point for implementing temporary use policies and projects in Alba Iulia and Rome, above all following a good governance and partnership-oriented approach.

6. The TUTUR project in Rome

The choice of this case study reflects the research aim of exploring the potential and limitations of temporary uses through a project which, although guided and promoted by local administrations, is based on the active involvement of local residents. Implemented in collaboration with the Urban Transformation Department, Urban Planning and Implementation Office and Municipio III of Rome, TUTUR aimed to develop a regulatory instrument to allow for and promote the temporary use of disused buildings, paving the way for new experimentational models.

The selected area, located north-east of Rome, is highly populated (approximately 250,000 inhabitants) and characterized by social housing facilities and an uneven infrastructure system. The project involved citizens, institutions and associations already present in this area.

The administration's main objective was to formulate new policies and planning tools aiming at enabling the temporary use of urban voids, integrating these uses within a more comprehensive urban regeneration process. After a massive growth trend leading to sprawl, the city administration's goal was to avoid expansion and safeguard green-fields. To this end, temporality was considered the key strategy for reaching this goal.

Rome's city plan does not include any specific strategy for temporary use; temporary uses are part of the informal realm and policy does not support the short timeframes of these kinds of activities. Often, the city administration has tolerated and eventually formalized these uses through specific agreements. Since the 1990s, new initiatives have been launched in peripheral areas of Bremen involving local projects for economic and social development. However, temporary uses are still regarded as an exception rather than an integral part of planning, an issue that the TUTUR project sought to address directly. It also looked for ways and instruments to deal with both public and private properties. Rome's participation in TUTUR was aimed at activating unused and under-used physical capital as leverage for the creation of employment, economic and social development opportunities. The final goal of the project was to foster urban regeneration processes in these peripheral areas of the city. TUTUR was launched in 2014 and, over its 16 months of activity, it dealt with three issues in different areas of Municipio III:

1. Temporary uses or *in-between uses*, while waiting for major transformation projects and as a way to take action before degradation worsens. The project also aimed to turn the Viadotto dei Presidenti, one of the areas involved in the project into a bicycle path. The Viadotto dei Presidenti, extends along a path defined by the 1962 urban development plan that was intended to have served as the hub for a high-capacity road system. This viaduct (today a forgotten space) is an infrastructure located in the North- Eastern periphery of Rome. Construction work on it was abandoned more than ten years ago and has never been completed. The idea was to revitalize and transform these unused spaces into a cycling and pedestrian path and reimagining the neglected spaces under the viaduct, revitalizing them with leisure and cultural activities.
2. Temporary uses to create a micro-fabric of neighbourhoods services:

in the case of Montesacro, there are many abandoned or under-used areas which could provide social and cultural as well as productive services to the neighbourhood. The theatre in the school is an example of functionality reassignment of a cultural container. The idea was to build a network of local services in the abandoned facilities of the Montesacro area with the involvement of the local community.
3. Temporary uses for green area maintenance. The Viale Adriatico market had the goal of stimulating social interaction in the urban network, focusing on the quality of the environment and services for citizens.

The Agency in Rome is composed of the city administration (the Planning Department) and a local support group (local stakeholders from the public and private sectors as well as civil society and informal associations) that will match the available sites with potential users, several associations working in the area, and the G124, a group of six architects under the leadership of the famous architect Renzo Piano.

The activities planned for improving stakeholders' participation on the issue of temporary use included:

1. Creating a local support group;
2. Organizing workshops and visits with private associations to map the unused spaces;
3. Grouping participants (100 people) according to their interests;
4. Organizing meeting, debates, urban walks, and talks with experts
5. Selecting the areas on the basis of local needs (Elisei, 2014).

The selected areas are located in the middle-class neighbourhood of Montesacro and they are all unused spaces, but their local socio-economic context is very different.

In the area of the Viadotto dei Presidenti the aim was the re-activation of the forgotten spaces to test the potential of temporary uses in the regeneration of the neighbourhood.

The project's value lies in its symbolic power to transform this area through a participatory process. The idea of temporary use attracted the interest of not only residents but also institutions and various interest groups. Over the span of the project, the space hosted several cultural activities such as concerts, theatre performances, children's games, debates and a photography exhibition. Through temporary use of this area, the space underneath the viaduct was reactivated by creating a connection between the neighbourhoods separated by the infrastructure, i.e. putting in a children's playground and positioning two cargo containers, one hosting a bicycle workshop and the other a small meeting room for local associations.

Another planned action involves re-using the Viale Adriatico Market, a plan developed in collaboration with a few associations and universities from the territory. The Market, which dates back to the mid-20th century, had been showing signs of obsolescence. The programme of activities intended to revitalize it included maintaining the booths and green areas, painting the surfaces and restoring street furniture, all of which were carried out together with the various local associations.

The third and final intervention developed by TUTUR took place at the Don Bosco school. In the basement, a disused theatre and dining hall were regenerated for use in cultural activities addressed not only to students but to all the citizens of Municipio III. This project provided local associations with an opportunity to take part by managing the activities addressed to residents outside of school hours.

One of the first outcomes of this project was a map of the voids existing in the selected territory, created by means of the City-Hound social network. City_Hound on line platform created by T-Spoon Studio (Environment Architecture) helped to identify 70 abandoned spaces in Rome's third district and, at the same time, to map the answer of these forgotten spaces (Henneberry, 2017: 239).

A census of unused spaces was then carried out along with a survey of local needs. Problematic areas were identified as well as the spaces

most suitable for temporary use experimentation. A brief handbook for citizens and local administration bodies was drawn up to outline the procedural rules for re-use proposals. These different temporary uses actions revitalised the areas in question, creating a common language with the public space around them. The project triggered civic collaboration around temporary use with foreign scientists from the University of Arkansas and the Eutropian association cooperating in an attempt to define shared objectives for a diverse model of urban development.

7. Results and discussion

The TUTUR project in Rome provides a great deal of food for thought in terms of critically evaluating temporary uses, specifically in relation to the local dimension of the project as well as the Italian legal framework and international dimension. The analysis of this case study does seem to confirm the hypotheses outlined above, at least in part.

The Rome-based project demonstrates that public administrations can support and incentivise local bottom-up initiatives in the attempt to integrate them into the planning process. It also highlights that, here as in Bremen, the local support group plays a central role in organizing participatory activities. Indeed, the TUTUR report defines this process as a win-win procedure that promotes inclusiveness among the actors involved and fosters trust in the institutions.

The TUTUR methodology puts the community at the centre of the planning phase and decision-making process. However, this aspect of city governance is still quite new in relation to such practices. Municipalities have yet to develop structures and frameworks which can enable them to most effectively take advantage of the potential of temporary use. In several cases, such initiatives are still led by citizens and creative entrepreneurs. This aspect calls for a renovation of the culture governing urban changes, a culture which currently still justifies the imposition of permanent and formal uses.

Regarding practical outcomes, the TUTUR project provided solutions to the residents' needs for rapid measures. It also raised a few questions.

Can a viaduct, an abandoned market, and a school turn into devices with the capacity to regenerate an entire neighbourhood?

The obvious answer is that these temporary actions can be considered catalysts for a broader project, a chance to offer and test out possible options. Although the area under the viaduct had been inaccessible for years, at the end of the project it was an open space where people of every age and kind can meet to take part in numerous activities, ranging from children's games, recycling and re-use laboratories, exhibitions and concerts.

As Mages (2017) has pointed out, "*experimenting with temporary uses within the framework of TUTUR allowed the city to open up its properties to new uses while involving inhabitants.*"

The interest of this project would appear to lie more in its methods than in its actual results. The main outcomes were 1. The activation of a shared trajectory towards the re-arrangement of these areas; 2. The organisation of participatory activities: the different stakeholders in the project engaged in **w**orkshops, focus groups, and "urban walks". The project entailed the broad involvement of local groups, suggesting a reflection on the role played by an active citizenry as well as the various organisations and groups in the area and their ability to take an active role and use such spaces as a field of experimentation for different types of spatiality.

Antonio T., one of the social actors involved in the project, stressed that the TUTUR activities have revealed "*the existence, to his great surprise, of a wide group of people living in the neighborhood who are interested in cooperating and are willing to put their energies into the construction of a space for the community.*"

Over the past few years, the number of stakeholders has increased. We can observe that residents are asking for greater involvement in city governance to take part in the development of their city. This point calls

into question the way cities are currently being governed. The temporary use of vacant places can represent the first step to facilitate a shift in governance, granting increasing room to city-making. Regarding the results of the TUTUR project, the point worth stressing is the potential of temporary uses, that is, the fact that they represent a specific type of spatial planning. This type of planning effectively offers a chance to establish a dialogue between the various public and private stakeholders, potentially offering decisive economic, social and environmental advantages to the areas involved. Roman City Councillor Caudo, the Planning Commissioner of Rome, stated in an interview that TUTUR was an attempt to "*give remaining fragments back to the city, with the active involvement of the residents. In Europe, re-use practices are changing urban contexts and their spaces creating relations, social practices and employmen*t."

The analysis of the case study reveals strong as well as weak points. The outcomes of the TUTUR project support the potential connection with the temporariness of practices and their ability to provide prompt solutions to the specific needs expressed by the community, although in this specific case these solutions have been limited to the duration of the project. Patti (Patti and Polyak, 2015)

one of the project coordinators, explained that in her vision the concept of temporary does not necessarily imply short term. Rather, it refers "*to the transitional and experimental character of such practices. The particular value of these practices lies in the fact that they represent a chance to activate uses in the in-between period, seizing the opportunities created by non-use*". An evaluation of the project, however, reveals that although temporariness has favored these transitory practices, involving the various stakeholders and promoting local participation, it has also highlighted the difficulties entailed in implementing such practices.

These users seldom have the financial means and opportunity to realize their projects in conventional ways. The uncertain condition of the waiting space often compels these users to become "temporary users", frequently forced to "move" when the site they are using is re-integrated in the prevailing spatial cycle. TUTUR in Rome highlighted a series of weaknesses tied to the specific context as well as more general information that speaks to temporary re-use and its implementation in other European countries as well. If, as several such examples show, temporary uses can trigger medium- and long-term processes and become urban catalysts (Oswalt et al., 2013), in this respect the TUTUR case has fallen short of expectations.

In this case, the temporary project has not given rise to a long-term path. Once the initiative was over, the area was abandoned once again and came to serve as a shelter for the homeless. The bureaucratic processes also remained unchanged because new political leaders took over.

This conclusion leads us to some considerations, which refer also to the document summarising the TUTUR project. On one hand, it is imperative that continuity be ensured in the dialogue between local administrations and local actors regardless of political membership. On the other hand, there is an urgent need to provide a uniform and coherent set of regulations for temporary uses. It is clear that these temporary projects in Rome must be inserted within a wider, general plan that can guarantee continuity in supporting initiatives, allocating funding and implementing actions or, conversely, in changing direction when temporary outcomes do not meet the recipients' expectations.

This paper shows how knowledge and interaction contribute to the transfer of knowledge in international cooperation projects. However, the goal of transferring the Bremen model to Rome faced a number of obstacles. Namely, the rigidity of processes, unsustainable rent levels in these unused areas (indeed, they remain empty to this day), and the absence of a legal framework thanks to which it would be possible to cooperate with external partners. In the case of Bremen, for example, the positive outcomes of the Urbact programme are mainly due to flexible rules in dealing with temporary initiatives. Such flexibility implies less transparency, however, and Italian bureaucracy in contrast is not tolerant of lower levels of transparency.

As Patti highlighted, "*Although spontaneous civic uses took place in public-owned spaces in Rome, we did not have any regulatory frameworks for such actions. Rome is more rigidly regulated than Bremen in terms of public procurement, security and zoning. Rome and Bremen are very different in term of political framework what is possible to learn from the German experience is the central role that collaboration with regional and national stakeholder have played*".

Despite multiple success stories, this specific case study confirms the limitations of practices when they come face to face with administrative and financial discontinuity, lack of regulations or norms that lack the flexibility to adapt to ongoing changes.

Furthermore, the analysis of several cases in Europe reveals other points of weaknesses, mainly connected with the contextual conditions in which re-use agencies and institutional stakeholders find themselves working. In general, a lack of economic resources often leads participants to create instruments to ensure the financial sustainability of the projects. Italy displays a certain delay in adopting new policies and cultural trends on any level, and this is particularly true of regulatory frameworks. The issues of public assets and the re-use of disused assets have only recently been included on the agenda of the various administrations. In many cases, temporary uses in Italy are still seen as experimental forms not yet officially included in urban planning. In particular, the case of Rome also shows that the city plan lacks specific regulations governing the occupation of temporary sites in which to launch re-use initiatives at zero cost, for example. With regards to Rome, some measures have been adopted to improve this situation. One such measure is Resolution 219 of 2014, which approved the criteria and methods for freely loaning or leasing properties owned by the municipality to be used for projects offering cultural, social and entrepreneurial activities. This resolution provides for the implementation of re-use practices to being about a dynamic transformation of existing assets through the direct involvement of citizens and the practical application of subsidiarity principles. This resolution represented the first important phase for the concession of municipally-owned properties. Through public tenders, they can be entrusted to associations, social cooperatives, and foundations with social missions, but also public and/or private enterprises. In line with the provisions of article 24 of Law 164/2014, the so-called "Unlock Italy" (Sblocca Italia) decree, citizens are given a broader role in shared management, including the re-use or regeneration of real estate and unused areas. Through this resolution, the Municipality of Rome adopted an integrated approach capable of fostering cultural growth, economic development and social cohesion in the city and in the suburbs in particular. The question at this point is, will temporary uses become an ordinary practice in the next few years? Will there be a series of measures capable of affecting urban planning instruments, effects of climate change, public-private partnerships, and the integration of initiatives aimed at both physical rehabilitation and satisfying social needs?

The hope is that we can move from good Italian practices, undoubtedly valid but still not widespread, to real policy in this area.

8. Conclusions

The analysis of numerous projects carried out in Europe and our case study leads us to reflect on the role of the spatial, temporal and planning dimension of the various practices being enacted in the spaces of the contemporary city. Temporary uses, in particular, bring the issue of in-between spaces to the foreground (Hertzberger, 2009; Van Heick, 2008). In relation to such practices, in-between spaces represent an intermediate zone that favours encounters and interactions between "different worlds and distinct spaces" like a "residue which tends to approach something 'beyond itself'" (Cerrocchi, 2008).

Thanks to the transformable and temporary character of their elements, spaces become flexible and capable of adapting to spatial and functional changes over time.

From a multidisciplinary point of view, *in-between spaces* offer a

spatial and social perspective to connect time and space with people's experiences. As the same time, they can be seen as fields of mediation between needs and aspirations. Moreover, these dimensions express the potential overlapping of different human activities and the multifunctionality of individual spaces containing different functions and meanings.

In contemporary architecture, the "in-between" conceptual principle introduced by Van Eyck has been extensively used as a theoretical basis for planning and to produce new theories, practices and policies.

Observing and analysing the temporary operational practices and methods originating from such ideas and discourse, we can uncover interesting results that often cut across the projects' initial intentions:

1. They promote new governance models with variable, flexible, strategic and cooperative institutional and territorial features;
2. They make citizens not only passive recipients of services but rather active subjects and promoters of collective action (Cognetti, 2014) who invoke the right to own the city (Lefebvre, 1968);
3. They reinforce the idea that urban planning is a tool capable of triggering virtuous processes of transformation that may also be sustainable if they are based not only on material resources but also foster greater equality, more social justice and better quality of life.

Although they may be viewed as transitory and isolated projects, the incremental changes involved in these practices have the potential to form part of a broader, integrated urban regeneration strategy that negotiates between past, present and future development.

The in-between city with its complex and indeterminate character may come to represent an exciting field into which future research might delve.

Acknowledgements

References

Arena, G., & Iaione, C. (2015). *(a cura di). L'età della condivisione. La collaborazione fra cittadini e amministrazioni per i beni comuni.* Roma: Carocci.

Banerjee, T. (2001). The future of public space: Beyond invented streets and reinvented places. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 67*(1), 9 Winter.

Berruti, M. F., & Palestino, G. (2014). La via italiana all'uso temporaneo e alla produzione di servizi innovativi per la città. Riflessioni a partire da Napoli. www.planum.net ISSN 1723-0993. http://media.planum.bedita.net/a1/f8/berruti_palestino.pdf.

Bishop, & Williams (2012). *The temporary city.* Oxon: Routledge.

Blumner, N. (2006). *Planning for the unplanned: Tools and techniques for interim use spaces in Germany and the United States. Occasional paper.* Berlin: Deutsche Institut für Urbanistik.

BMVBS/BBR- Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung; Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (Hg) (2008). *5 Jahre Stadtumbau Ost - eine Zwischenbilanz.* Berlin: Zweiter Statusbericht der Bundestransferstelle.

Cameron, S. (2003). Gentrification, housing redifferentiation and urban regeneration: Going for growth in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Urban Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098032000136110 November 1.

Cerrocchi, D. (2008). Malie dell'essenziale. In-between la quintessenza. *Hortus*(5) (Febbraio).

Clement, G. (2005). *Manifesto del Terzo paesaggio.* Macerata: Quodlibet.

Cognetti, F. (2014). *(a cura di). Vuoti a rendere. Progetti per la reinterpretazione e il riuso degli spazi nell'edilizia pubblica.* Milano: Fondazione Politecnico di Milano.

Colomb, C. (2012). Pushing the urban frontier. Temporary uses of space, city marketing, and the creative city discourse in 2000s Berlin. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 34*(2), 131–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9906.2012.00607.x.

De Girolamo, F. (2013). Living landscapes -landscapes for living paesaggi abitati time and regeneration: Temporary reuse in lost spaces. *Journal of Urbanism, 2*(27) (ISSN 1723 0993).

Decreto-legge sblocca Italia 12 settembre 2013, n.133https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/atto/serie_generale/caricaDettaglioAtto/originario?atto.dataPubblicazioneGazzetta=2014-09-12.

De Silvey, C., & Edensor, T. (2012). *Reckoning with ruins.* Sage publicationhttp://phg.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/11/27/0309132512462271https://doi.org/10.1177/030913251246227.

De Smet, A. (2013). The role of temporary use in urban (re) development: Examples from

Brusels. *Brussels Studies, 72* (November 12th).

De Solà Morales, I. (1996). *Presentey futuros. La arquitectura en las ciudades.* Barcelona: Actar.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Elisei, P. (2014). TUTUR. Baseline study. http://tutur.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/BaselineTUTURfinal06052014.pdf.

Ferguson, F. (2014). *Make shift city: Renegotiating the urban commons.* Berlin: Jovis Verlag.

Ferreri, M. (2015). The seductions of temporary urbanism. 'Saving' the city: Collective low-budget organizing and urban practice. *Ephemera, Theory and Politics in Organization, 15*(1), 181–191.

Galdini, R. (2015). L'uso del temporaneo nei processi di rigenerazione urbana. *SociologiaUrbana e Rurale, 107,* 20–34. https://doi.org/10.3280/SUR2015-107003.

Galdini R. (2017). Ripensare gli spazi pubblici. Spazi temporanei e pratiche informali a Berlino, Sociologia urbana e rurale XXXIX, Vol. 113: 27–38. doi10.3280/2017-113007.

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel city. From the right to the city to the urban revolution.* London-New York: Verso.

Haydn, F., & Temel, R. (2006). *Temporäre räume: Konzepte und stadtnutzung.* Basel: Birhhäuser.

Henneberry, J. (2017). *Transience and permanence in urban development.* Oxford: Wyle & Sons.

Hertzberger, H. (2009). *The School of Herman Hertzberger. Alle Scholen. Dom: 010 Publisher.*

Honeck, M. (2015). Zwischennutzung als Soziale Innovation. Von alternativen Lebensentwürfen zu Verfahren der räumlichen Planung. *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung,* (3), 219–231.

Hou, J. (Ed.). (2010). *Insurgent public space: Guerrilla urbanism and the remaking of contemporary cities.* London and New York: Routledge.

Inti, I. (2010). *Riuso temporaneo. Un appello per possibili politiche pubbliche. Abitare il futuro … dopo Copenhagen.* Napoli: Clean.

LaFrombois, H. (2015). Blind spots and pop-up spots: A feminist exploration into the discourses of do-it-yourself (DIY) urbanism. *Urban Studies, 54*(2) (February).

Lefebvre, H. (1968). *Le droit à la ville.* Paris: Éditions Anthropos.

Lehtovuori, P., & Ruoppila, S. (2012). Temporary uses as means of experimental. *Urban Planning, 4*(1), 30.

Lombardi, P. (a cura di) (2008). Riqualificazione e riuso. Innovazione e partecipazione. Celid: Torino.

Lydon, M., & Garcia, A. (2015). *Tactical urbanism: Short-term action, long-term change.* Washington, DC: Island Press.

Madanipour, A. (2017). *Cities in time. Temporary urbanism and the future of the city.* London: Bloomsbury.

Mages, H. (2017). 6 recommendations for cities that aim to join an URBACT transfer network. https://www.blog.urbact.eu/2017/10/6-recommendations-for-cities-to-aim-to-join-an-urbact-transfer-networks/.

Magnaghi, A. (2012). a cura di*ll territorio bene comune.* Florence: Florence University Press.

Marra, G., Barosio, M., Eynard, E., & Marietta, C. (2016). From urban renewal to urban regeneration: Classification criteria for urban interventions. Turin 1995–2015: Evolution of planning tools and approaches. *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal, 9*(4), 367–380 January.

Nemeth, J., & Lanhorst, J. (2014). Rethinking urban transformation: Temporary uses for vacant land. *Cities, 40*(Part B), 143–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.04.007 October 2014.

Oswalt, P. (2006). *Shrinking cities, international research. Vol. 1.* Ruit, Ostfildern: Hatie Cantz.

Oswalt, P., Overmeyer, P., & Misselwitz, P. (Eds.). (2013). *Urban catalyst: The power of temporary use.* DOM Publishers.

Overmeyer, K. (2007). *Urban pioneers.* Jovis verlag GmbH.

Patti, D., & Polyak, L. (2015). From practice to policy: Frameworks for temporary use. *Urban Research and Practice, 8*(1), 1.

Richardson, J. T. (2015). Contradictions, conflicts, dilemmas, and temporary resolutions: A sociology of law analysis of Shari'a in selected western societies. In A. Possamai, J. T. Richardson, & B. Turner (Eds.). *The sociology of Shari'a: Case studies from around the world* (pp. 237–252). New York: Springer.

Spataro, D. (2016). Against a de-politicized DIY urbanism: Food not bombs and the struggle over public space. *Journal of Urbanism, 9,* 185–201.

Tonkiss, F. (2013). Austerity urbanism and the makeshift city. City, Volume 17, 2013 - Issue 3. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2013.795332.

Trancik, R. (1986). *Finding lost space.* New York: Van Nos-trand Reinholdw.

Urban Pioneers (2007). *Berlin: Stadtentwicklung durch zwischennutzung, Berlin.* Berlin:jovis: Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung.

Van Heick (2008). *Collected articles and other writings, 1947–1998, Vincent Ligtelijn and Francis Strauven, eds.* Amsterdam: SUN291–292.

Further reading

Urbacthttp://urbact.eu/urbact-italia.

Raumlabor (2018) Berlin https://raumlabor.net.

Refill Urbact-Reuse of vacant spaces as driving force for innovation on local level, 2016; https://urbact.eu/Refill.

Studio Urban Catalyst (2003). Urban Catalyst, strategies for temporary uses. Potential for development of urban residual areas in European metropolises www.templace.com.

Temporiuso (2009). http://www.temporiuso.org/?page_id=1067.

TUTUR-Temporary Use as a Tool for Urban Regeneration/URBACT Final Report. http://tutur.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/FINAL_RE-PORT_TUTUR_.

Temporary Use as a Tool for Urban Regeneration/URBACT Final Reporthttp://tutur.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/FINAL_RE-PORT_TUTUR_.

Tutur-New Europe-Cities in Transition https://citiesintransition.eu/place/tutur.

www.urbanistica.comune di roma.it/images/uo-qualita/tutur/tutur/-final report.