Cultural brownfields in European cities: a new mainstream object for cultural and urban policies

Dr. Lauren Andres

Centre for Urban and Regional Studies
University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK
Office : +44 (0)121 414 5021
Fax : +44 (0) 121 414 3279
L.Andres@Bham.ac.uk

Dr. Boris Grésillon

UFR de Géographie et d'Aménagement, UMR Telemme
5, rue du Château de l'Horloge BP 647
13094 Aix-en-Provence Cedex 2
boris.gresillon@free.fr
33(0)4 42 52 42 40

Lauren Andres is Lecturer in spatial planning at the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (University of Birmingham). Educated in France she joined the University of Birmingham in 2009. She is particularly interested in the role of culture in urban regeneration in Europe and the paradigm of the creative city. She also explores coping practices and strategies of everyday resilience developed by individuals and communities facing various social and economic pressures, particularly in the current context of austerity.

Boris Grésillon is Professor at the School of Geography (Aix en Provence). After defending his PhD on the cultural landscape of Berlin he joined the University of Provence as a lecturer in human and cultural geography. His main areas of research include the relation city and culture and the geography of art, particularly in France and in Germany. He also brings his expertise to the 2013 Marseille-Provence ECOC event being involved in various institutional and more informal discussion groups.

Abstract
This paper develops the concept of "cultural brownfields" and discusses how organic cultural projects developed in derelict sites have been progressively included in mainstream cultural and urban planning strategies and policies over the last ten years. To do so the paper assesses the transformation of three mature cultural brownfields in Berlin, Marseille and Lausanne and their distinctive internal and external dynamics. It develops a typology of cultural brownfields which stresses the diverse nature of these spaces and their differential role in cultural and urban planning policies. The paper concludes by highlighting a series of policy lessons for urban planning and cultural strategies.

Keywords: Cultural brownfields, cultural policies, urban planning, Berlin, Marseille, Lausanne

1- Introduction

Since the 1960s, some of the most striking images of desindustrialisation have been those of abandoned and derelict factories and warehouses, commonly now named brownfield sites (see e.g. Healey et al., 1992; Marshall, 2001; Adams & Watkins, 2002; Couch et al., 2003). The existence of such derelict sites has been at the centre of much state-led or private sector regeneration projects. In recent years culture has often had a driving role in these regeneration projects with the economic benefits of cultural facilities (for example museums, concert hall) and cultural industries commonly stressed as key features of urban policy (Moomaas; 2004; Miles and Paddison, 2005). As noted by Pratt (2009) the role of culture in urban regeneration policy, and in framing the urban cultural economy, has led to the development of several areas of academic and policy-led analysis: the evaluation of cultural and planning policy; gentrification; the role of the representation of cities and the way this links into place-based competition for inward investment; the creative class and the creative city; the global cities literature; and finally the business clusters debate.

Parallel to the rising importance of culture in urban policy, there is evidence of organic and bottom-up projects developing on brownfield sites. In advance of any formal process of re-development, artists have sought to move into these empty buildings because of benefits such as cheap, or no, rents, few constraints in term of maintenance and flexibility of usage (Bordage, 2001; Drake, 2003). Till the 90s these organic projects have not been integrated been into mainstream urban and cultural policies both at local and national level. They have been distinct from traditional cultural facilities (e.g. museums), even more so from the cultural industries sector and did not hold much interest for public policy actors. The rise of a more holistic approach to culture-led regeneration within the narrative of the creative city, over the last ten years has thus led to a paradigm shift whereby organic and bottom-up cultural uses have been progressively included in formalised cultural and urban planning policy and strategy both at local and national level (Andres, Grésillon, 2011).

Although attention is now given to the origins of these organic cultural projects (see for example Groth and Corijn, 2005; Shaw, 2005), little work has examined how they have been incorporated to mainstream policy throughout Europe. Most recent work in this area focuses on the impact of artistic bottom-up initiatives at a neighbourhood and city level stressing the role of artists as pioneer agents of gentrification[1]. Consequently not much evidence has been provided on how the transformation of a set of key informal cultural spaces in European cities has been significant in broader urban and cultural policy. Moreover there is a lack of comparative analysis of similar initiatives across Europe as there is no common framework and shared concept for interpreting and assessing brownfield cultural regeneration led from the bottom-up. Consequently this paper's starting point is to position the translation term of "cultural brownfield" as a concept drawing on its wide recognition in the French literature (see Raffin, 2000 and 2007; Gravari-Barbas, 2004; Vivant, 2006, 2009; Lextrait and Kahn, 2005). After examining how cultural brownfields have progressively become a mainstream object for cultural and urban policies the paper then assesses the transformation of three

---

[1] See for example in America (particularly New York) (Zukin, 1982, 1983, 1996; Ley, 1996), Germany (Kunzmann, 2004; Manske, 2007; Ebert and Kunzmann, 2007), France (Raffin, 2000 and 2007; Gravari-Barbas, 2004; Vivant, 2006, 2009; Lextrait and Kahn, 2005; Shaw, 2005), Great Britain (Attfield, 1997; Green, 1999; Pratt, 2009; Ambrosino, 2007; Ambrosino and Andres, 2007, 2008), Switzerland (Weckerle et al., 2007; Raffin, 2002) or Holland (Bruin and Maso, 1982; Draaisma, 2003; Shaw, 2005).

mature cultural brownfields in Berlin, Marseille and Lausanne and their connection to public policy agenda. Thus it develops a typology of cultural brownfields and highlights a series of policy lessons for urban planning and cultural development.

The work presented in this paper draws from a series of research projects (see for examples Andres, 2006, 2007, 2008a, 2008b, 2009, 2011a; 2011b; Grésillon, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2008; 2010; Andres and Grésillon, 2011) including funded research (Andres, 2008; Grésillon, 2002, 2010), the organization and participation to national and international research seminars and conferences and regular fieldtrips[2]. These studies have brought an in-depth understanding of cultural brownfields in a wide range of European cities; they have been supported by primary research and fieldwork based on participant observation and semi-structured interviews conducted with key stakeholders (for e.g. artists, local and national policy makers, planners, local residents, economic actors) and secondary sources to provide a detailed analysis of the existing literature produced in French, English and German, together with technical documents and interviews.

2– Building the concept of cultural brownfields

A range of expressions have been used to describe cultural initiatives that have settled in urban brownfields which relate to their artistic and cultural function (*nouveaux territoires de l'art* (Lextrait, 2001), *kulturell umgenutzte Brache* (Block-Künzler, nd), *kulturell rehabilitierte Brache)*, or to their alternative and unusual nature (*indeterminate spaces* (Growth and Corijin, 2005), *freezones* (Urban Limited, 2004), *places of alternative culture* (Shaw, 2005), *kunstfabrik* (Barry and Hansen, 2008; Siebenhaar, 2005; Matthies, 2010), *alternatives Kulturzentrum* (Papenbrock, 2010; Marcolli, 2010), *espaces off* (Vivant, 2006)). We argue here that a widely used concept in French, "friches culturelles" (cultural brownfields) (Ruby, Desbons, 2002; Gravari-Barbas, 2004, Poggi and Vanhamme, 2005; Grésillon, 2009; Henry, 2010; Andres & Grésillon 2011) bridges the various terminologies mentioned above. *Friches culturelles* or *cultural brownfields* refers to organic, bottom-up alternative cultural projects settled on derelict sites which differ from any squatting activities. In France such cultural brownfields were core to a programme led by the Ministry of Culture from 2000 to 2002 which assessed the importance of alternative cultural experiences and stressed their role for cultural policy:

> "*we were interested by the role of artists and their uses in transforming the environment. We thought that brownfields, by their non-status, were a wonderful space for freedom. We wanted to incorporate these adventures, these experiences and laboratories as matters of concern for public responsibility*"[3].

The outcome was the recognition of 30 key "alternative cultural initiatives" and a set of recommendations for national and local cultural policies (Lextrait, 2001). It also legitimized the use of "cultural brownfield" as a way to describe and present these "*New Art Territories*" in urban and cultural policy.

---

[2] L. Andres is a guest lecturer at the Grenoble School of Planning and a Guest Research associate at the Research Centre Telemme, Aix en Provence; she regularly gives lecture at the department of planning and geography of the University of Lausanne and organizes regular study fieldtrip in France, Germany and Holland. B Grésillon is a lecturer at the University of Aix en Provence since 2001. He lived in Berlin for 7 years and was an invited professor at the Technical University of Berlin in 2005-2006. He currently shares his research time between France and Germany.

[3]Interview L.A, July 2006

Building on the concept's recognition in French and to its capacity to provide an explicit wording to name such initiatives, we use "cultural brownfield" as a generic concept referring to organic cultural spaces developed in brownfield sites and progressively included into cultural and urban policy across Europe (Grésillon, 2009; Andres & Grésillon, 2011). We apply the concept to three case studies: *Tacheles (*Berlin), *Flon (*Lausanne) and *La Friche* (Marseille) in Germany, Switzerland and France respectively. Whilst the three cities offer three different urban profiles and are representative of what we highlight as three trajectories of transformation they were selected on the basis of the following criteria:.

- The variety of expressions used to describe cultural brownfields has stressed the diversity of initiatives across European cities. We consider that this diversity relates not only to the actors involved, the nature of the uses and the process leading to their transformation, but also to the urban and socio-economic context in which the cultural brownfield was originally developed. *Tacheles*, *Flon* and *La Friche* have all been settled in former industrial factories / warehouses and their transformations were the result of bottom-up initiatives and complex governance arrangements between the three key stakeholders (cultural actors, local authorities and land owners).

- The three case studies represent the processes leading to the increased inclusion of cultural brownfields in cultural and urban policy. They are all recognized nation-wide as leading examples of cultural brownfields. In addition, the three cities offer three different urban profiles. Berlin is the pioneer city for organic cultural alternative spaces in Europe due to an over-supply of derelict buildings after reunification. Marseille brings a complementary example of a crisis and of urban depopulation where cultural brownfields have been used in an innovative strategy of urban re-development. Lausanne as a counter example stresses the fact that cultural brownfields can also settle in highly dense urban areas (where huge pressure is exerted on lands available for development). Consequently the lessons that can be made from them are replicable to other contexts and case studies.

- Finally we look at mature cultural brownfields whose transformations have begun at least 15 years ago allowing us to assess the projects' impact and their inclusion as mainstream objects into cultural and urban policies. This enables a critical assessment of the paradigmatic shifts that have affected their transformations.

3- The changing nature of culture and paradigms

The way cultural brownfields have progressively been included into more holistic cultural and urban policy relates, in part, to the evolving meaning of culture. The merge of both, the anthropological definition of culture as a way of life and its aesthetic meaning (the arts as a public good for suitably educated people), leads to culture's contemporary definition as a "culture of class diverse in background but with a disposable income, which uses cultural spaces" (Miles, 2005, p. 892). This evolution highlights a change in the nature of cultural activities and their use in urban policy within new social, economic and political objectives (Miles and Paddison, 2005). As noted by Moomaas (2004 p. 508) there has been 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". The more holistic meaning of culture also refers to the rise of the recent paradigm of the creative city (Florida, 2002) which policy makers have now widely integrated in their strategies and policies of economic and cultural development. In this regard Evans (2009,

p.1005) quoting the Greater London Authority argued that the "creative city – and 'space' – promotion is therefore a global phenomenon as quasi scientific policy rationales are adopted in cities and states seeking to claim their share of the knowledge economy and cultural city ranking (GLA, 2008)". This change in the nature of cultural activities and their use within new social, economic and political objectives has indeed impacted urban policies, particularly regeneration policies.

Culture has been a pillar of urban regeneration since the 1970s in the USA and the 1980s in Europe (e.g. in Glasgow, Barcelona and Bilbao), through the development of vast flagship projects (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1993; Paddison, 1993; Garcia, 2004). Within mixed use projects cultural facilities have been an economic and symbolic driving force in the transformation of industrial and port cities enabling urban authorities to break their physical decline (Bianchini, 1999, Garcia, 2004). Within entrepreneurial approaches culture has been given an increasing branding role as Miles and Paddison (2005, p. 833) note. "The idea that culture can be employed as a driver for urban economic growth has become part of the new orthodoxy by which cities seek to enhance their competitive position". Whereas initially they focused on core key flagship facilities related to "spectacular consumption", cultural regeneration then evolved towards localized policies aiming to foster the creative economy (Stern and Seifert, 2010) and to promote spaces, neighbourhoods and areas used for cultural and creative productions (Evans, 2009). This led to the design of new cultural and creative quarters aiming to revitalise neglected or deprived neighbourhood by strengthening or developing the local 'creative economy'.

Cultural clustering policy is actually not only interesting because it stresses a "turn in urban cultural policy-making" particularly in the way more comprehensive policy are developed using cultural clusters as a "new, alternative source for urban cultural development" (Moomaas, 2004, p.520) but also because it highlights how an initially organically-led process of redevelopment has been transferred in the agenda of policy-making (typically Soho in New York or Hoxton in London, see for e.g. Zukin, 1982 and Pratt, 2009) under the narrative of the cultural and creative city. Organically evolving cultural clusters, as opposed to planned cultural district, haven't received much focus from urban planners (Stern and Seifert, 2010). It is only recently that such alternative clusters have been included in a more holistic approach of cultural and urban policy which indeed is not insignificant with regard to the inclusion of cultural brownfields as mainstream object for these policies.

This changing meaning of culture and its impact of cultural and urban policies have indeed differently impacted cities. In this regard, Marseille, Berlin and Lausanne offer three distinct perspectives.

4- Three cities, three profiles

Marseille is a typical crisis and shrinking port city. Its traditional local economy entered decline in the 1950s with peak deindustrialisation in the 1970s enforcing existing economic decline, unemployment and depopulation. The city's central core suffered from severe degradation and impoverishment; industrial brownfield sites became common feature of the urban landscape. Marseille lost 150, 000 inhabitants between 1970 and 1990: its population fell to 800, 000 inhabitants in 1990 from 950, 000 (Donzel, 1998). While awaiting any strategic regeneration policy, its transformation began with artists increasingly attracted by the wide range of available derelict spaces and supportive local authorities (*La Friche* is one

of these projects). Cultural initiatives therefore began to play a key role in the recovery of the city. Typically in France cultural policies are shared between the central government (with regard to main cultural and heritage facilities and programmes considered of national public interest) and local and regional authorities (essentially through strategies of socio-cultural development on the one hand and socio-economic development on the other hand). Marseille has thus been characterized by 'mixed' cultural policies. From the 1970s the municipality supported a set of cultural institutions (museums, theatre etc.) and projects of socio-cultural development as part of its urban renewal policies. Then, from 1995 a shift towards cultural regeneration marked the beginning of the use of culture for its capacity of fostering urban development and branding. The launching of Euroméditerranée, a large public-led regeneration project, in the same year, marked the beginning of the economic and urban recovery of the city in which culture has played a crucial role. Nowadays cultural regeneration is still a key component of the regional re-development of Marseille culminating in 2013 when the city will be European Capital of Culture.

Berlin's cultural renaissance began in the post 1989 period. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the city gave alternative artists an unprecedented opportunity never seen before in Europe. Within a few months, many factories in East Berlin were shut down and no one took any interest in the fate of these buildings, apart from artists who played a very active role in the regeneration of the city. Berlin thus very quickly became the capital of cultural brownfields (Grésillon, 2002; 2004) with exemplary projects such as *Tacheles* or *Kulturbrauerei*. Although cultural policies have been in the core of public policies since reunification even today its cultural and artistic dynamism contributes to the strong economic attractiveness of Berlin for investors and tourists (Grésillon, 2002). Whereas in all other German cities, culture is only funded by the regional and local governments, Berlin has had a special status; from 1995, the city, facing major economic, urban, social and financial challenges was allocated a unique funding (the *Hauptstadtkulturfonds*) aiming to partially support key cultural institutions put at risk. Despite being relatively marginal, this exception made by the German Constitution stresses a consensual ambition of preserving culture as a national good. This progressively evolved towards a more economically-driven objective; the organization of exhibitions or festivals (the 'Love Parade' for example) have been recognized for their economic outputs and inserted in the overall cultural-economic strategy of the City Council.

Lausanne, finally, is not an industrial city *per se* as it became a city of services gathering banks, hotels, insurance companies from the beginning of the 20th century (Racine, 2001). The city is however recognized for its cultural assets, for tourism and is internationally known as the Olympic Capital, hosting the headquarters of the International Olympic Committee. Geographically, the city is built on three hills and has been constrained in its spatial development. As a result only the western industrial areas (including the *Flon*) which historically hosted storage warehouses have offered spaces for alternative cultural uses and a set of temporary initiatives. These initiatives were highly influenced by the counter-cultural youth protests of the early 1990s (particularly in Zurich, Bern and Basel) which led to the creation of a set of autonomous alternative cultural centres (*Röte Fabrik* in Zurich or *Kulturzentrum Reithalle* in Bern) which have now been included in local cultural policies. Indeed as in Germany, Swiss cultural policies are essentially shared between the regional government (canton) and the municipality. The federal government has only a regulating and advisory role in the exception of a small number of projects of national interest. Over the years, the municipality's cultural policy has aimed to position Lausanne as a European cultural capital thanks to well-know cultural institutions (Béjard Ballet for example) and foster its attractiveness for both residents and tourists.

5- Assessing the transformation of cultural brownfields and their distinctive internal and external dynamics.

Tacheles, *La Friche* and *Flon* are three examples of mature cultural brownfields which share a set of common generic features from which an analytical framework can be developed to assess their internal and external dynamics leading to their transformation. The first one is time: all of them are characterized by a trajectory of transformation of more than 15 years. Secondly is the urban context which despite being different has been favourable for the development of alternative cultural uses due to specific urban, economic, political or planning conditions. Governance arrangements are the third feature implying that all three cultural brownfields are organically built within a bottom-up approach. Regulation, as the fourth feature, stresses the progressive regulation and normalisation of the cultural brownfield from a more-or-less unplanned initiative to a planned project. Fifthly is the 'impact' in other words the medium and long-term effect of the cultural brownfield at neighbourhood (e.g. on the real estate market) and city (image) levels, and on cultural urban policies.

Table 1: Analytical framework to assess the dynamics of transformation of cultural brownfields

Key features	Impact of internal and external dynamics
Time	Long-term transformation (more than 15 years), in different stages
Urban context	Set up in a specific urban, economic, and planning context favourable for these projects to settle in brownfields
Governance arrangements and leadership	Bottom-up approach, limited number of actors involved in controversial or consensual discussions and negotiations
Regulation	Progressive regulation and normalisation (from unplanned initiative to planned project)
Impact	Long-term impact at neighbourhood (real estate market) or city (image) levels, and on cultural urban policies

This analytical framework can be used to assess a variety of cultural brownfields. In this paper we focus on three examples: *Tacheles, La Friche* and *Flon*

Tacheles is a former department store, partially destroyed during World War II and left derelict by the local authorities ever since. Located in East Berlin, not far away from the city centre, it is representative of a cultural brownfield developed by the counter-cultural movement; its transformation is highly controversial particularly as it struggles to sit within a clear strategy of cultural development in the city.

Tacheles proclaimed itself as a centre of rebellion rejecting all forms of established power. The artists created an association and turned this cultural brownfield into the counter-culture centre of Berlin during the 1990s (Grésillon, 2004). The first years of its existence were tense as several police raids tried to evict the squatters who were not welcomed by the city council in the historic core of Berlin. Nevertheless quickly *Tacheles* managed to gain a strong local, regional and national visibility thanks to various exhibitions and festivals. In 1995 the president of the Bundestag (the federal legislative body) visited *Tacheles* and financial support was subsequently offered to the space as an "artistic facility" and the building was listed in order to avoid its demolition (Grésillon, 2004; Shaw, 2005). As the cultural brownfield was recognized for its creativity, its assets were also valued by developers. The city of Berlin never decided to formally integrate *Tacheles* into its cultural or planning policies, as priority was given to key cultural institutions due to financial pressures. However

it did stress its contribution to Berlin's new image particularly with regards to counter and youth culture, artistic dynamism, and cosmopolitism. However, developing a creative or cultural district was not in the agenda of public policies and in 1998 the *Tacheles* was sold to a developer, Fundus. The site's fate was therefore sealed as noted by one of the resident: this space

> "*hasn't only been a utopia, as many said, but a reality or at least am implemented utopia. Numerous exhibitions, events, gigs took place here and not elsewhere. But at a moment, when there is a lack of money, creativity isn't enough to make a space like this one live. In addition, the space was chased by developers of the New Berlin and we weren't able to live anymore as in the 1990s*"[4].

Fundus was well aware of the importance *Tacheles* had attained and decided to renovate the building. It also offered a ten-year lease to the artists' association. However the cultural actors were not able to sustain their initial project and adapt to the new model of development offered by Fundus. As noted by Martin Reiter[5], coordinator of *Tacheles* in 2004

> "*it has always been a fight to stay here. Nevertheless the conflict that is currently affecting the space has been more cultural than related to real estate issues. What is in question has been the concept of a self-managed cultural space contrary to a neo-liberal management of art and culture*".

> *Tacheles* always rejected a shift towards a more traditional alternative space. Today it still exists but has lost its artistic vitality. It is presented by the city of Berlin as

> "*a set of spaces, courtyards and streets, providing a mix of traditional architectural elements, retail outlets and restaurant, a designer five star hotel, office space, apartments and a series of courtyards run by the artists of Art Forum Tacheles*"[6].

> However, its overall impact as a cultural and development catalyst has been remarkable. From the 1990s *Tacheles* fostered the revitalisation of the district leading to a series of redevelopments, including public spaces as the *Oranienburgerstrasse*, nowadays an attractive street for young people, artists and tourists and was a catalyst in the gentrification of the neighbourhood (Bernt, 2003; Grésillon, 2004). Whereas the cultural brownfield representative of the counter culture movement has disappeared, the name and brand of *Tacheles* remains a symbolic image for the city used in marketing of the "*Quartier am Tacheles*", a new district currently composed of luxury housing developments.

Insert Figure 1: Le Tacheles (Author, 2009)

La Friche in Marseille is located in a former tobacco factory situated in the industrial district of La Belle de Mai, a short distance from the main train station and the city centre. *La Friche* is the leading example of cultural brownfield in France particularly as it was established through an immediate partnership between cultural actors and local authorities. From being an innovative example of cultural brownfield it has become a flagship project for urban regeneration without deeply changing the initial cultural ambitions of the project.

---

[4] Interview B.G, June 2008
[5] Interview B.G, May 2004
[6] Senate Department of Urban Development :
htt://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/bauen/grosse_projekte/en/tacgeles.shtml, accessed May 2003

It owes its existence to the then deputy mayor responsible for culture, frequent visitor himself of cultural brownfields in Europe, who in 1991 gave the directors of two small theatres the task of developing a cultural project in this brownfield. The project was part of a formal strategy of local cultural development aiming to reuse brownfields for a small number of years in order to interfere positively with the regeneration of these neighbourhoods:

> "*we all know that it is in the most awful districts that New York started to exist. Downtown New York and its lofts have been created thanks to brownfields and abandoned workshops. I knew that Marseille was a miserable and economically devastated city (...). My idea was that if a cultural company managed to do something with a space then... something would happen. Once this was over, the group will go elsewhere*"[7].

Once SEITA, the owner of the site, had signed a temporary lease allowing the artists to settle, and the City Council had allocated the necessary funding, an association, Système Friche Théâtre (SFT), was created and began developing cultural activities (Roulleau-Berger, 1996; Andres, 2008a; 2011b, Bénit and Grésillon, 2002; Vandamme and Loubon, 2001). The status of the space has always been legally binding.

> "*Our status has always been in order. Having a lease signed with the Seita has been favourable as it helped us to secure some City funding; it gave an institutional dimension to the project as we were not considered as marginal people or squatters. This has qualified and legitimized the project. It wasn't a place where anything could be done. We have always fought against the image of a squat and an underground space*"[8].

Very quickly SFT organized a series of key events and developed a strategy of cultural development which gave an immediate recognition to the space. In 1995, the Socialist-run City Council was replaced by a right-wing administration. The new Mayor immediately decided to back the project, reflected by the comments of one of the deputy mayor: "*This is a very interesting space of experimentation. I believe very strongly in the fact that culture precede or accompany economic development*" (Leroux, 1995). The City Council ensured also that it was included in the regeneration programme Euroméditerranée, in 1995. Once the project launched, *La Friche* was very quickly used in planning policies as a way to "*develop the cultural dimension of Euroméditerranée*" (IGF, CGPC, 1997); it was compared to "*an exceptional asset due to its numerous initiatives that have been developed in the areas of theatre, music, plastic art and heritage conservation*" (Préfecture des Bouches du Rhône, 1995). High ambitions were given to the project: "*the Belle de Mai factory needs to be what Soho and the Village are in New York at the level of South France or even further*" (Etablissement public Euroméditerranée, 1996). Typically for the former head of economic development, the factory and its three units have been an asset to develop the sector of cultural industries[9]. In addition to having a key role in urban policies *La Friche* was therefore raised as a best practice for national cultural policies. It became the flagship project of cultural brownfields; Fabrice Lextrait (a key member of SFT) was commissioned by the Ministry of Culture to write the report on cultural brownfields and *La Friche* was the obvious place to host the launching conference of the "New Art Territories" (see above section 2).

Today, even if the site's role has remained somewhat marginal in the renewal of the Belle-de-Mai neighbourhood, the project has achieved and even surpassed its initial ambitions. La

---

[7] Interview L.A, April 2006
[8] Interview L.A, April 2007
[9] Interview L.A, February 2007

Friche, together with the future Museum of European and Mediterranean Civilizations (MUCEM) is an integral part of the city's application as 2013 European Capital of Culture (Grésillon, 2008; Autissier, 2008, Andres, 2011a, 2011b). The mutation of *La Friche* over the last 20 years has become symbolic of the importance given to alternative cultural sites, both in terms of a neighbourhood's cultural revival and of a city's national international cultural aura. The cultural brownfield as a space, a project and an identity remains intact even though the project is progressively evolving towards a more institutional structure: *La Friche* became the first cultural Co-operative Company of Collective Interest (SCIC) in France in 2007 and is the legal tenant of the unit for 40 years, free to manage and develop the property as it wants. This is significant of how the scope of cultural policies has evolved from a focus on mixed socio-cultural and local economic development to a core ambition of economic development.

Insert Figure 2: La Friche (author, 2010)

Flon in Lausanne is a former storage platform, covering 5.5 hectares in the centre of the city and is privately-owned by a real estate company. Under-used since the 1950s, its redevelopment was constantly blocked due to planning constraints. Overtime though, its organic-led transformation led to a complete rebranding of the area and its economic gentrification.

From the early 1980s a series of failed planning applications led the owner to offer leases with low rates to cultural actors and local businesses (such as art galleries, restaurants, night clubs, etc.). These actors transformed the derelict warehouses and created a new alternative quarter, known as *Flon-Flon*, which quickly acquired a 'trendy' image; it was called Lausanne's Little Soho by the local media (Péclet, 1994). The creativity of the space was recognized by one of the occupants as a key factor of interest, characteristic of the nature of cultural brownfield:

> "*when I arrived in this district, I felt in love. It was an atypical neighbourhood, not really ordered, not Swiss in other words. A controlled anarchy was in place and this attracted a lot of interesting people. The landlord was ok to rent some units at very interesting prices as long as people agreed to do up their spaces (installing heating, water, toilets…). We had the authorisation to paint the façades, to organize barbecues…*"[10].

Its 'alternative' character contributed to the success of some of the businesses:

> "*My clients are collectors who are used to these kinds of spaces, as in New York. People know these neighbourhoods that function as villages. (…) From 1990 when I arrived, my gallery immediately worked very well*"[11].

The essence of the regeneration has sat with the desire to develop an innovative and attractive cultural district. Such an organically-led transformation was the result of very positive support from the local population, but also from the owner and the city council. This was stressed by the decision to maintain the site's atypical character as the basis for the regeneration project launched in 1999.

> "*The cultural affectation of the Flon is a recent phenomenon that has allowed the rehabilitation of the district in the eyes of the population of Lausanne. It needs to be encouraged. This district presents a potential of development for the creation of un multi-cultural path un-realizable elsewhere: Metropole hall, new jazz school, MAD*

---

[10] Interview L.A, January 2007
[11] Interview L.A, February 2006

discotheque, new cinema, galleries, café-theatre, casino of Montbenon, can create a dense network of cultural events able to generate supplementary activities (restaurants, bars, dancing clubs) thanks a synergy effect" (Ville de Lausanne, 1999).

Even though not all the economic and cultural actors were able to pursue their activities, some of them are still benefiting from the financial returns on the site's image. The Head of the planning department in Lausanne City Council described the evolution of the district as follows:

"*everybody comes to talk about the Flon about everything and nothing. It's a phenomenon that been developed organically. It is not a product that the City tried to sell. When we launched the regeneration project, we didn't know it will be so successful. It has become a touristic attraction; it is part of the trendy image of Lausanne*"[12].

In the newest version of the Lausanne Gallimard and Michelin travelling guides the Flon is labelled as "*a district worth the visit*". However whereas the overall assessment of the regeneration is positive (particularly for policy makers and economic actors), its transformation is also criticized for having led to gentrification.

"*The Flon is not accessible for a lot of people. It's too expensive. In addition there are some security issues in the eastern part of the site that haven't been solved*"[13].

The Flon-Flon doesn't exist anymore. Only its image and identity is still visible through a set of activities reflecting the specificity of industrial districts reinvested by cultural uses. However sustaining the image of *Flon-Flon* as a cultural quarter is still crucial for the private land owner. This is particularly true for its innovative character as the area participates not only to the branding of the place, to the marketing and cultural strategy of the city but is also a factor, amongst others, to justify high rental rates for commercial premises.

Insert Figure 3: Le Flon (author, 2008)

These case studies therefore reflect three types of cultural brownfields' transformation. The table bellows summarizes the key features of these transformations. Reflective lessons on the patterns of cultural brownfield in Europe can therefore be discussed to stress how their nature has influenced their inclusion in cultural and urban planning policies.

Table 2: Key features of the transformation of *Tacheles*, *Belle de Mai* and *Flon*

Key Features	Impact of internal and external dynamics		
	Tacheles	**La Friche**	**Flon**
Time	1990-1998: controversial period between local authorities and counter-cultural actors 1998-onwards: in-depth transformation of the space due to its purchase by a developer	1991-1995: project included in a local strategy of cultural development 1995-onwards: cultural flagship project for Euroméditerranée and 2013 ECOC	1990-1999: shift from a no man's land to the Flon-Flon village 1999-onward: transformation in a trendy and creative quarter
Urban context	Post reunification, unprecedented number of available urban brownfield,	Economic crisis with a wide range of derelict areas then urban regeneration from the	Few derelict sites available, pressures on land available for development, context of

---

[12] Interview L.A, June 2006
[13] Interview L.A, December 2010

	context of economic / urban renaissance	mid-late 1990s	economic growth
Governance arrangements	Very conflicted relations between cultural actors, local authorities and developer (Fundus)	Part of win-win relations between cultural actors, local authorities and land-owners.	Informal arrangements during *Flon-Flon* period leading to formal negotiation when redevelopment is launched
Regulation	Shift from a counter-cultural initiative to a flagship but superficial alternative project. Excluded from core urban and cultural policies	Sustainable development of a bottom-up project immediately part of local cultural policy and quickly used within broader urban regeneration policy.	Unplanned and organic character of the district became a driver for the regeneration of the district of the cultural policy of the city (tourism)
Impact	Led to gentrification and strongly impacted the cultural image of the neighbourhood and of the city of Berlin	Local, regional, national and international recognition. Impact on cultural and urban policies as a catalyst and a flagship project	Rebranding and economic gentrification of the district

6- Discussion: Reflecting on the patterns of mutation of cultural brownfields in Europe

Building upon the key features of these three cultural brownfields, on their influence on urban and cultural policy and on urban redevelopment, as well as drawing on the changing nature of cultural paradigms, three distinct types of cultural brownfields can be identified: alternative cultural brownfields (*Tacheles*), inherited from social movements and counter-culture; branding cultural brownfields part of a consumption and gentrification path (*Flon*); and creative cultural brownfields (*La Friche*). These three types reflect different trends with regards to their use in cultural urban policy and highlight a series of policy lessons, particularly for urban planning and cultural strategies.

Table 3: A typology of cultural brownfields

Types	Transformation paths	Nature of cultural and urban policies
1- **Alternative cultural brownfields**	- An adaptive process towards a more conventional and less conflictual space progressively included in urban and cultural policy - Disappearance as a physical entity as a result of the incapacity to respond and cope with the external economic, cultural and political pressures.	- Strong social and community and organic-led focus. - Cultural policy serving social and political goals. - Culture used as a tool to enhance community-building - Limited planning and urban impacts at neighbourhood level
2- **Branding cultural brownfield**	- Artificial use of the 'trendy' image of organically-transformed quarters as part of cultural policies of city-banding and city-marketing - Ad-hoc construction of a trendy alternative image with the prospect of securing strong economic and cultural outcomes	- Cultural economic policy. - Culture part of strategies of branding, city marketing, place-making and tourism - Cultural planning policies: cultural districts and quarters or flagship art and cultural facilities or events - Purpose of culture-led regeneration

		and development
		- Strong urban policy focus at city and regional level
3- **Creative cultural brownfield**	- Creation of the cultural brownfield within a public-private partnership and well-planned strategies of urban, cultural and socio-economic development - Ad-hoc creation of a "pseudo" cultural brownfield by local authorities	- Creative city and Creative class paradigm - Holistic consideration of the benefits of cultural industries for economic development - Political acknowledgement of the role of artists and other bohemians in revitalizing neighbourhoods or districts - Urban planning purposes are secondary, branding and economic objectives being primarily of consideration

Alternative cultural brownfields directly result from alternative cultural spaces developed in the 1970-80s. These spaces are inherited from the squatter movement and characterised by the importance of (severe) conflicts between artists / cultural actors and local authorities. Such alternative spaces sit within an ideology of opposition to a dominant capitalist model and tend to have a very strong influence as a territorial and symbolic marker on the surrounding areas and city. They also reflect the decade of new social movements and the beginning of the use of culture as an "integral part of urban policy and politics" (Kong, 2000, p. 387), which "prompted politicians to give greater political and cultural autonomy to the grassroots and use cultural policy as a tool to enhance community-building" (Kong, 2000, p.386 quoted in Garcia, 2004, p. 315). These spaces therefore have a strong social and community focus.

In this context, the transformation path of such cultural brownfields has tended to take one of two directions: 1) an adaptive process moving towards a more conventional and less conflictual space which is progressively included in more holistic urban policy and politics; 2) their disappearance as a physical entity as a result to the incapacity to respond and cope with the external economic, cultural and political pressures. For example, *Tacheles* refers to the second category. This is also true for numerous rebellious and spontaneous brownfields in Berlin, which, because they did not manage to secure their insertion in cultural and urban policies, have since disappeared (Ebert and Kunzmann, 2007). It can be argued that such a failure is related to the fact that because these spaces were the last avatars of counter-cultures squats, it was difficult for the local authorities to assess their potential *per se* as they were not enhancing community-building due to their constant oppositional attitude. In such cases the perspective of valuing the space from a real estate perspective was the only possible outcome particularly as cultural stakeholders were not able to adapt, negotiate and respond, more positively, to conflicts. Typically, in Berlin, by 2000, even if many illegal sites, such as *Bar 25*, were threatened with closure, most of them have been able to negotiate and sustain their existence in a more supportive cultural policy context promoting the 'creative' city (Lange, 2007; Manske and Merkel, 2007; STADTart and Kunzmann, 2007).

On the hand other (well-known) spaces such as *Ufa Fabrik* (Berlin), *Röte Fabrik* (Zurich), *Melweg* (Amsterdam), *Laiterie* (Strasbourg), *Halles de Schaerbeek* (Brussels) managed to surpass conflicts and accept a form of contractualisation and regulation with local authorities adopting a more holistic definition of culture and cultural policies (not only including traditional cultural facilities). Often the political support for these cultural brownfields has also been secured for social and electoral reasons. Consequently in Europe there are a series of key cultural spaces typical of this first type, some of which have a perennial status as flagship cultural alternative projects (see examples mentioned above), others in a more uncertain situation (e.g. the *Brise Glace* in Grenoble).

Alternative cultural brownfields are therefore not the most common type of cultural brownfields as they are inherited from youth demands against a restrictive definition and use of culture. From a policy point of view, they require delicate negotiations not only with the cultural residents but also with the local communities. Such cultural brownfields imply a strong political position in favour or against these spaces which induces a connection with broader cultural paradigms in which branding cultural brownfields (below) can sit. From an urban planning perspective these cultural brownfield fit with the idea of using culture to enhance community-building but have limited implications from a (re) development point of view; any impacts will essentially be noted at neighbourhood level.

Branding cultural brownfields are often inherited from the gentrification path of industrial districts (particularly Soho in New York, see Zukin, 1982) valuing the role of artists for local decision makers and the generalised ambition of promoting cultural districts. It also sits within a shift between a previous conception of culture as a factor of community enhancement towards a tool for urban, economic and social regeneration (Bianchini, 1999; Kong, 2000, Garcia, 2004). This period of "cultural economic policy" (Kong, 2000, p. 387) where culture becomes part of strategies of branding and city marketing (Bianchini, 1999) has given a new role to cultural policies now incorporated within broader ambition of creating competitive urban spaces (Evans, 2003). This period is significant in the development of new cultural projects influenced by the ambitions of creating cultural districts/quarters or flagship art and cultural facilities or events. It is also correlated with the aim of fostering the attractiveness of places and cities for tourists which explains the attention paid to city branding: "It is with tourism, therefore, that branded arts and entertainment shares common characteristics, since resorts and destinations have long been branded and pre-packaged" (Evans, 2003, p. 418).

This second type of cultural brownfield relies on the wider acknowledgement of the economic benefits of culture, the recognition of the 'artistic dividend', and the perception of artists and art centres as real contributors to the economy (Markusen and King, 2003) and to regeneration. The organic and permissive character of these spaces is still a key characteristic of these cultural brownfields but it is temporary. Being an urban and territorial marker as a trendy place is crucial for these brownfields not only at the scale of the building but within the area in which it is located. Nevertheless the essence of this trendy image is flexible and can be modified overtime (as in the *Flon*).

The strong economical and market-led nature of these cultural brownfield leads to two potential transformation paths:

i) an artificial use of the trendy image of the site once the standstill period is over as in the *Flon*. Even if the creation of the *Flon-Flon* was not planned as such, it was nevertheless quickly included in the development and the marketing strategy for the district. The trendy

character was also sustained in paying attention to the aesthetic of the building and the overall design of the area. The image of the cultural brownfield becomes a trade-mark that is preserved while the alternative essence of the site no longer exists. Hoxton, a district close to the central financial district in London (see for example Pratt, 2009; Ambrosino, 2007) provides a good example of this. All these new, initially organically-led quarters, are included in cultural policies of city-branding and city-marketing promoted by city councils and, as it is correlative with a rise of real estate values, valued by developers.

ii) a construction of a trendy alternative image from the beginning of the project due to the belief that the artificial creation of a cultural brownfield in an adequate flexible building can attract cultural actors. This pattern is significant for the Custard Factory in Birmingham (Porter, Barber, 2007; Lavanga et al., 2008). In 1988, a developer specializing in creative and artistic enterprises purchased an abandoned plant (The Custard Factory). He invited three artists (Space Ltd, n.d), who had already contacted him, to move into the building. Within a few months, 70 artists had set up their workshops. The space initially planned for theatre groups and young artists was rehabilitated using national, regional and European grants and the site was extended to include neighbouring buildings. It is now the flagship project of Digbeth positioned as one of the cultural and creative district of Birmingham by the City Council (Andres, Chapain, 2010). The economic dimension of culture and the prospect of the economic outcomes of cultural development are here the core drivers.

Branding cultural brownfields are therefore an example of the trend stressing the importance of culture for urban development and regeneration. Here the core focus is not so much on cultural uses and policy but on the impact of such projects, strategy or policy at neighbourhood, city and regional level.

Finally **creative cultural brownfields** reflect the last trends towards cultural brownfields, inherited from the reinterpretation by local authorities of successful examples such as *La Friche*. It also sits in a context where the promotion of the creative city and of alternative forms of culture is a key objective of local authorities (see section 2 and 3). It acknowledges the benefits of cultural industries for economic development (Pratt, 1997) and the importance of having cultural workers for cultural and non-cultural economy (Markusen and King 2003; Markusen and Schrock 2006; Markusen and Gadwa, 2010). As noted by Markusen and Gadwa (2010, p.381) it is included in the causal claim that arts and cultural physical investments as well as artists and other bohemians help revitalize neighbourhoods or districts (e.g., Bianchini, Fisher, Montgomery and Worple 1988; Landry, Bianchini, Ebert, Ghad and Kunzman, 1996; Lloyd 2002, 2005; Lloyd and Clark 2001).

Therefore the key specificity of this last type of cultural brownfields is that cultural brownfields are labelled as a cultural brownfield and will look and may function as such. However, the initial steps (i.e. creating, from scratch, and launching the cultural alternative initiative) are not organically-driven but implemented within a partnership between public authorities and cultural actors. Throughout Europe, numerous examples of cultural brownfields can be found (Vandamme and Loubon, 2001; Raffin, 2007), *La Friche* being the precursory example of this type. Typically driven within a closed partnership between cultural professional, the city council, and the land owner, La Friche has always been a strategically-driven and bottom-up cultural project. While using the aesthetic of an alternative cultural space and promoting new forms of alternative cultural initiatives to build its reputation, its strategy of development as a cultural project was well constructed and planned with specific urban, cultural and socio-economic outcomes. The recent inauguration of other similar cultural brownfields in various French cities (e.g. *Les Récollets* in Paris, *Lieu Unique* in Nantes, *La Condition publique* in Roubaix, and most recently *Saint-Sauveur Station*

inaugurated in Lille in 2009) or German cities (e.g. *RadialSystem* funded in 2006 by the choreographer Sasha Waltz in Berlin) is symptomatic of this recent trend of embedding alternative spaces in a more inclusive strategy of cultural development.

Nevertheless there is also a more paradoxical situation where a "pseudo" cultural brownfield is entirely built by local authorities. This has been the case in Lyon with "*Les Subsistances*" which was supposed to be a duplication of *La Friche* (the director of La Friche was even employed as a consultant at the initial stage of the project[14]). The project failed to be accepted by the artists' community and was rapidly reconfigured as a more traditional cultural facility. More recently the largest cultural project launched by the (Socialist) Mayor of Paris, Bertrand Delanoé, the *104*, is illustrative of how the idea is not just to establish a new artistic and cultural space, but also to promote a cultural policy promoting a dynamic and creative mayor. The *104* is a very large site dedicated to artistic production and distribution, (35,000 square meters costing more than €100 million). It has been developed in 2008 on an industrial brownfield previously occupied by former funeral parlours. Developed by the City Council, the *104* barely owes its designation as a 'cultural brownfield' to its content (artists at work) and the recipient (a former industrial brownfield).

This last type of cultural brownfield highlights a transition in the way cultural brownfields have characterised the European cultural and urban landscape. To a certain extent it probably marks the end of an era and a turning point for cultural studies research. There is currently far less space available for artists to settle in a complete informal and organic way[15]. The recognition of the economic benefits of culture and particularly the role of alternative culture in re-branding places, and as a component of the creative city, has participated to the reduction of opportunities for artists to invest spaces in a spontaneous manner. On the other hand it has resulted in the inclusion of cultural brownfields in holistic cultural policy in which the assets of alternative and organic experiences are recognized for their inputs in urban development and are explicitly linked to urban planning policies. However contrary to branding cultural brownfield, economic and city-marketing concerns are increasingly the core drivers of creative cultural brownfield, with urban planning objectives being secondary.

The way these cultural brownfields are used in cultural and urban policies is different highlighting the diversified nature of these spaces particularly the governance arrangements between "organic" actors and local authorities as well as the time scales of these arrangements. Obviously each type addresses a set of challenges and questions for future research. It is extremely difficult for alternative cultural brownfields, in other words, historic and traditional cultural brownfields, to be developed nowadays as the contextual elements that forged their birth no longer exist. The question for future research is then how these brownfields will continue to evolve in a cultural landscape prioritizing cultural economic development and how their heritage will be retained or transmitted. What will be their adaptive evolution? Branding cultural brownfields raise a set of issues related to the merchandised use of artists and culture and the limits of the deals and negotiations that can then be made between stakeholders who have singular interests towards these derelict spaces. Could the introduction of more flexibility in the planning system and additional financial supports for temporary re-use of space be a tool to provide adequate spaces for cultural production and bet of the probable economic benefits of such new practices? Finally creative cultural brownfields and particularly their paradoxical examples address a key question: what is the future of cultural brownfields? From the moment artists and cultural actors are not

---

[14] Interview L.A, April 2006 with P. Foulquié and in July 2006 with the initiator of the Subsistances, D. Trouxe
[15] This actually poses a new question which is not developed in the paper due to word constraints: what are the new sites and spaces available for artists to settle in a informal and organic way?

considered as crucial stakeholders for the creation of cultural brownfield how can the organic essence and innovative character of these spaces be created and then sustained? In other words, ultimately, can holistic cultural policies lead to the disappearance of cultural brownfields?

Consequently, drawing back on the key objectives of the paper, we can conclude that the insertion of cultural brownfields as a mainstream object for cultural and urban policies has not only be facilitated by new cultural paradigms (within a more holistic meaning of culture) but has also be related to the changing natures of cultural brownfields and their ability to be transformed overtime. In addition not only cultural brownfields have been included in broader cultural and creative policies in which both traditional and alternative culture sits, they have also been inserted in urban planning strategies of redevelopment and regeneration. The process of bridging the core objectives of these policies has been crucial in the recognition of the assets and outcomes of cultural brownfields for public and private actors. The typology of cultural brownfields developed in this paper stresses the diversity of these spaces/projects and of their transformation paths. This indeed opens further areas of research as other paths may emerge due to the dynamic nature of cultural brownfields and the cultural paradigms in which they sit.

References

Adams, D., and Watkins, C., 2002. Greenfields, Brownfields and Housing Development. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Ambrosino, C., 2007. London and the Creative City paradigm, Rising East, 7, Available from: http://www.uel.ac.uk/risingeast/archive07/academic/ambrosino.htm

Andres, L., 2006. Temps de veille de la friche urbaine et diversité des processus d'appropriation : La Belle de Mai (Marseille) et le Flon (Lausanne), Géocarrefour, 81, 159-166.

Andres, L., 2007. Action publique et population locale à l'épreuve des trajectoires de mutabilité des friches urbaines : Les cas du Flon à Lausanne et de la Belle de Mai à Marseille. In : B. Bouquet, ed. Territoires et action sociale, Paris : L'Harmattan, 225-244.

Andres, L., 2008a. La ville mutable. Mutabilité et référentiels urbains : les cas de Bouchayer-Viallet, de la Belle de Mai et du Flon. Thesis (PhD). Pierre Mendes France University.

Andres, L., 2008b. Les friches urbaines : entre chancre et chance, éphémère et pérennité. In : C. Vallat, ed. Pérennité urbaine ou la ville par-delà ses métamorphoses (Volume3), Paris : L'Harmattan, 95-108.

Andres, L., 2009. La ville mutable. Le cas de la friche de la Belle de Mai (Marseille), Faire Savoirs, 111-120.

Andres, L., and Chapain, C., 2010. Des activités culturelles aux industries créatives à Marseille et à Birmingham : vers un système complexe de gouvernance multi-échelles, paper presented at the 5th Rencontres Internationales en Urbanisme, Grenoble.

Andres, L., and Gresillon, B., 2011. Les figures de la friche dans les villes culturelles et créatives. Regards croisés européens, L'Espace Géographique, 1, 15-30.

Andres, L., 20011a. Marseille 2013 or the final round of a long and complex regeneration strategy? Town Planning Review, 82(1), 61-76.

Andres, L., 20011b. Alternative initiatives, cultural intermediaries and urban regeneration: the case of La Friche (Marseille), European Planning Studies, 19(5), 795-811.

Autissier, A.M., 2008. Capitales européennes de la culture. Rapport pour la Commission européenne. Bruxelles : Commission Européenne.

Barry, D., and Hansen, H., 2008. The SAGE handbook of new approaches in management and organization. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Benit, C., and Gresillon, B., 2002. Des tabacs à l'art contemporain. La réhabilitation de la manufacture de la Belle de Mai et ses conséquences sur le quartier, Industries en Provence, 10, 20-24.

Bernt, M., 2003. Gentrification, urban renewal and neighborhood struggles in Prenzlauer Berg, INURA Bulletin, 24, 4.

Bertoncello, B., and Rodrigues Malta R., 2003. Marseille versus Euroméditerranée, Annales de Géographie, 632, 424-436.

Bianchini, F., 1999. Cultural planning for urban sustainability. In : L. Nyström and C. Fudge, ed. Culture and Cities. Cultural processes and urban sustainability. Stockholm : The Swedish Urban Development Council, 34-51

Bianchini, F., Fischer, M., Montgomery, J., and Worpole, K., 1988. City centres, city cultures: the role of the arts in the revitalisation of towns and cities. Manchester: The Centre for Local Economic Development Strategies.

Bianchini, F., and Parkinson, M., ed., 1994. Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Block-Künzler, G., nd. Siedlungsentwicklung: Umnutzung von Industriebrachen am Beispiel Gelsenkirchen, Institut für nachhaltige Flächennutzung und Umweltkommunikation, Available from: http://www.flaechennutzung.nrw.de/fnvnrw3/ressources/brennpunkte/Brennpunkt_Gelsenkirchen.pdf

Bordage, F., 2001, Les fabriques, lieux imprévus. Besançon : Editions de L'imprimeur.

Couch, C., Fraser, C., and Percy, S., 2003. Urban Regeneration in Europe. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Donzel, A., 1998. Marseille : l'expérience de la cité. Paris: Anthropos.

Draaisma, J., 2003. The Amsterdam experience: a general view on the specific Dutch ways of dealing with temporary uses. Draft paper to the studio urban catalyst project.

Drake, G., 2003. This place gives me space: Place and creativity in the creative industries, Geoforum, 34, 511-524.

Ebert, R., and Kunzmann, K., 2007. Kulturwirtschaft, kreative Räume und Stadtentwicklung in Berlin, DISP, 4, 64-79

Etablissement Public Euroméditerranée., 1996. Euroméditerranée à Marseille : un grand projet d'aménagement et de développement. Marseille: EPAEM.

Evans, G., 2003. Hard-branding the cultural city – from Prado to Prada, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 27(2), 417-440.

Evans, G., 2009. Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy, Urban Studies, 46(99), 1003-1040.

Florida, R., 2002. The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life, New York: Basic Books.

Garcia, B., 2004. Cultural policy and urban regeneration in Western European cities: Lessons from experience, prospects for the future, Local Economy, 19(4), 312-326.

GLA., 2008. London: A Cultural Audit. London: GLA.

Gravari Barbas, M., 2004. Les friches culturelles : jeux d'acteurs et inscription spatial d'un anti-équipement culturel. In : C. Siino, F. Laumiere and F. Leriche, ed. Métropolisation et grands équipements structurants, Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 277-300.

Grésillon, B., 2002. Berlin métropole culturelle. Paris : Belin.

Grésillon, B., 2004. Kulturmetropole Berlin, Berlin: Berliner WissenschaftsVerlag.

Grésillon, B., 2008a. Capitales européennes de la culture. In : Y. Bertoncini, T. Chopin, A. Dulphy, S. Kahn and C. Manigand. Dictionnaire critique de l'Union européenne. Paris : Armand Colin, 46-47

Grésillon, B., 2008b. Ville et création artistique : pour une autre géographie culturelle, Annales de géographie, 661-662, 179-198.

Grésillon, B., 2009. Marseille-Provence 2013, capitale européenne de la culture : une chance pour la ville ; une chance pour le territoire ? , Urbanisme, 373, 58-62

Grésillon, B., 2010. Pour une géographie de l'art : Ville et création artistique, Habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Paris-I.

Groth, J., and Corijn, E., 2005, Reclaiming urbanity: Indeterminate spaces, informal actors and urban agenda setting, Urban Studies, 42(3), 503–526.

Healey, P., Davoudi, S., O'Toole, M., Tavsanoglu, S., and Usher, D., 1992, Rebuilding the City: Property-led Urban Regeneration, London: E and FN Spon.

Henry, P., 2010, Quel devenir pour les friches culturelles en France ? D'une conception culturelle des pratiques artistiques à des centres artistiques territorialisés, Rapport de synthèse menée dans le cadre du projet, Haute-Normandie : CPER

IGF, CGPC, 1997. Rapport d'audit sur l'opération d'intérêt national Euroméditerranée à Marseille, Paris.

Kong, L., 2000. Culture, economy, policy: trends and developmnents, Geoforum, 31, 385-390.

Landry, C, Bianchini, F., Ebert, R., Gnad, F., and Kunzmann, K., 1996. The creative city in Britain and Germany. London: Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society.

Lange, B., 2007. Die Räume der Kreativszenen, Culturentrepreneurs und ihre Orte in Berlin. Berlin: Transcript- Materialitäten 4.

Lavanga, M., Stegmeijer, E., and Haijen, J., 2008. Incubating creativity; unpacking locational and institutional conditions that can make cultural spaces and creative areas work, paper presented at the 5th International Conference in Cultural Planning and Research, Istanbul.

Leroux L., 1995. A Marseille, la nouvelle municipalité réoriente la politique culturelle, Le Monde, 12 Dec.

Lextrait, F., 2001. Une nouvelle époque de l'action culturelle, Paris: Documentation Française.

Lloyd, R., 2002. Neo-Bohemia: art and neighbourhood redevelopment in Chicago, Journal of Urban Affairs, 24(5), 517-594.

Lloyd, R., 2005. Neo-Bohemia: art and commerce in the postindustrial city. London: Routledge.

Lloyd, R., and Clark, T., 2001. The city as an entertainment machine. In: K. F. Gotham. Critical Perspectives on urban redevelopment, Research in urban sociology, ed. Oxford: JAI Press/Elsevier, 357-378.

Manske, A., and Merkel, J., 2008. Kreative in Berlin. Eine Untersuchung zum Thema „GeisteswissenschaftlerInnen in der Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft", Discussion Paper SP III 2008-401, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.

Marcolli, P., 2010. Neues Leben auf alten Brücken, Basler Zeitung, 31 March.

Markusen, A., and Gadwa, A., 2010. Arts and Culture in Urban or Regional Planning: A Review and Research Agenda, Journal of Planning Education and Research, 29(3), 379-391.

Markusen, A., and King, D., 2003. The Artistic Dividend: The Art's Hidden Contributions to Regional Development. Minnapolis: University of Minnesota.

Markusen, A., and Schrock, G., 2006. The artistic dividend; urban artistic specialization and economic development implication, Urban Studies, 43(10), 1661-1686.

Marshall, R., 2001. Waterfronts in Post-industrial City, London: Taylor & Francis.

Matthies, R., 2010. Kulturbrache für alle, TAZ, 05 Aug.

Miles, M., 2005. Interruptions: Testing the Rhetoric of Culturally Led Urban Development, Urban Studies, 42(5/6), 889-911.

Miles, S., and Paddison, R., 2005. Introduction: The rise and rise of culture-led urban regeneration, Urban Studies, 42(5/6), 833-839.

Mommaas, H., 2004. Cultural clusters and the post-industrial city: Towards the remapping of urban cultural policy, Urban Studies, 41(3), 507-532.

Morel, B., 1999. Marseille : Naissance d'une métropole, Paris: L'Harmattan.

Paddinson, R., 1993. City marketing, image reconstruction and urban regeneration, Urban Studies, 30, 339-350.

Papenbrock, M., ed., 2010, Kunstgeschichte nach 1968 (Kunst Und Politik), Göttingen: V&RUnipress.

Peclet J-C., 1994. Lausanne, le Flon : une victoire à courte vue, L'hebdo, 15 Sept.

Poggi, M-H., and Vanhamme, M., 2005. Les friches culturelles, genèse d'un espace public de la culture. In : E. Maunaye, ed. Friche, squats et autres lieux. Avignon : Actes sud, 37-55.

Porter, L., and Barber, A., 2007. Planning the Cultural Quarter in Birmingham's Eastside, European Planning Studies, 15(10), 1327-1348.

Pratt, A., 1997. The cultural industries production system; a case study of employment change in Britain 1984-91, Environment and Planning A, 29, 1953-74.

Pratt, A., 2009. Urban regeneration: From the arts "feel good" factor to the cultural Economy. A case study of Hoxton, London, Urban Studies, 46, 104-1061

Préfecture des Bouches du Rhône., 1995. Premières propositions de l'Etat pour un schéma de cohérence d'Euroméditerranée, Marseille.

Racine J-B., 2001. Lausanne métropole : un siècle d'inventions et de transformations. In : A. Pitteloud and C. Duboux. ed. Lausanne. Un lieu, un bourg, une ville. Lausanne : Presses polytechniques et universitaires romanes, 125-131

Raffin, F., 2007. Friches industrielles, Paris : L'Harmattan.

Ragin, C., 1989. The comparative method. Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Roulleau Berger, L., 1996. Cultures de friches à Marseille, Les Annales de la recherche urbaine, 70,16-25.

Ruby C., and Desbons D., 2002. Des friches pour la culture ?, *EspacesTemps.net.* Available on : http://espacestemps.net/document338.html

Shaw, K., 2005. The place of alternative culture and the politics of its protection in Berlin, Amsterdam and Melbourne, Planning Theory and Practice, 6(7), 149-169.

Siebenhaar, K., ed., 1998, Kulturhandbuch Berlin: Geschichte & Gegenwart von A-Z. Berlin: B&S Verlag.

STADTart, Kunzmann, K., and Culture Concepts., 2007. Kreativräume in der Stadt – Integration von Kunst, Kultur and Co. In die Berliner Stadtentwicklung. Berlin: SEN-Stadt.

Stern, M., and Seifert, S., 2010. Cultural clusters: the implications of cultural assets agglomeration for neighbourhood revitalization, Journal of Planning Education and Research, 20(10), 1-18.

Urban Unlimited., 2004. The Shadow City, Rotterdam.

Vandamme, M., and Loubon, P., 2001. Arts en friche : usines désaffectées : fabrique d'imaginaire. Paris: Editions alternatives.

Ville de Lausanne., 1999. Rapport-préavis n°81 : Plan partiel d'affectation Plate-forme du Flon, Lausanne.

Vivant, E., 2006. Le rôle des pratiques culturelles off dans les dynamiques urbaines. Thesis (PhD). University Paris 8-Vincennes Saint Denis.

Vivant, E., 2009. How underground culture is changing Paris, Urban Research and Practices, 2(1), 36-52.

Zukin, S., 1982. Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.