

Chapter 8

Temporariness in architectural regeneration

Aylin Orbasli and Joanna Karmowska

INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters have considered regeneration as a long term investment in an area through securing the future of buildings and places of architectural and communal significance. This chapter expounds the temporal dimension of regeneration and specifically focuses on short term or time bound interventions, considering their longer term implications for architectural regeneration in the context of the economic and social sustainability of places.

Temporary structures have always been a fixture of urban and rural places, allowing spaces to be used for different functions, such as weekly markets or seasonal festivals. In rural areas temporary structures provide accommodation for seasonal agricultural workers, while entire towns are temporarily constructed to house pilgrims (Mehrotra and Vera 2015). In many parts of the world, temporary street vendors contribute to diversification of the retail offer and activate public spaces in the urban realm. There are also a host of other temporary activities that combine the need for an activity or use with a space that is permanently or temporarily redundant and vacant.

These types of temporary interventions, some of which are trendily referred to as ‘pop-ups’ are emerging as a recognised component in the process of urban regeneration in the UK and across Europe (Bishop and Williams 2012; St Hill 2015). Pop-up architecture has become a regular thematic focus of design events, including the Venice Architecture Biennale since 2016 (Figure 8.1). The trend is epitomised by images of re-purposed shipping containers, street food outlets and other functions that are prefixed with the word ‘pop-up’ (St Hill 2015). Often initiated by grass roots movements and/or young entrepreneurs, pop-ups generally involve the temporary use of a redundant space for a commercial, semi-commercial or charitable/community function. Temporary interventions come in multitudes of size, shape

and duration and can be characterised by their function, type of space they occupy, intended purpose, instigators or duration and longevity.

[INSERT FIGURE 8.1 VENICE HERE]

Temporary, locally initiated (and sourced) interventions are often viewed as a commitment to a locality. From an urbanism perspective, they highlight the dynamic nature of the built environment and its accompanying social fabric, where change and innovation are inseparably incorporated into everyday rhythms of daily life. Temporary interventions are being actively encouraged as part of urban regeneration in the spirit of co-creation, a shared activity of place making between planners and users (Fernandez 2015). Nonetheless, temporary activities, especially those with commercial purpose, can spearhead new opportunities but also represent conditions of precarity. While the flexible nature of a temporary venture can support the development of new products and services and test their viability, temporality can also be linked to the hand-to-mouth nature of the less permanent business model.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the characteristics and implications of a growing trend of temporary and short term approaches being adopted in architectural regeneration. In doing so the chapter will explore the condition of temporariness and its implications for the urban environment, evaluate the roles various actors take on in the processes of temporary urbanism, and reflect on the physical, socio-economic, political and cultural implications in the context of architectural regeneration.

THE NOTION OF TEMPORARINESS AND ORGANISATIONAL TEMPORARINESS

Zeiderman *et al.* (2017), in discussing the New Urban Agenda adopted at the UN Habitat III conference, argue that although cities have always been unpredictable, uncertainty has taken on a greater urgency, which affects all cities, not just those in developing countries. The twenty-first century is being defined as the urban century, with patterns of rapid urban growth being experienced alongside urban shrinkage as centres of economic power shift. In both contexts temporary interventions, can prove to be suitable for the trial of new or novel solutions and represent useful tools supporting these processes and mediating new concepts for an area. They can enable experimental interventions with little risk to the local communities as well as to local buildings.

The various forms of temporary interventions in the urban environment are closely linked to the temporary nature of organisations that instigate these ventures. Pop-up ventures can be said to

constitute an extreme form of a temporary organisation. The distinctive character of temporary organisations has now been recognised in contemporary management literature (Janowicz-Panjaitan *et al.* 2009) with studies across a number of industries, including theatre, film making, construction, IT, biotechnology, consulting and emergency response (DeFillippi and Arthur 1998; Gann and Salter 2000; Bechky 2006; Sorenson and Waguespack 2006; Bakker 2010). In terms of purpose, temporary organisations are often considered as appropriate for experimental initiatives, bringing new and at times controversial solutions to existing structures and testing markets (Bakker and Janowicz-Panjaitan 2009). Through overcoming some of the traditional barriers to change at the personal as well as organisational levels, better interaction in the process of design of products and services can be achieved. Because of their limited period of existence, such organisations also tend to involve lower fixed costs and generally less irreversible investment of resources. In case of failure, they can be quickly terminated with relatively little disturbance to the organisational sponsor and individuals involved, thereby allowing more risky and innovative ventures (DeFillippi 2002; Sydow *et al.* 2004).

As Heidegger (1962) postulates, time forms an inseparable part of human experience, where past and future are reflected in the present, and an organisation's form and activity is a reflection of both the past and the anticipation of the future (George and Jones 2000). Whilst time runs in cycles in permanent organisations, it is linear in temporary ventures, making time in this context a scarce and valuable resource (Lundin and Soderholm 1995; Ibert 2004). In temporary ventures, the decision-making process is altered in a way that decisions and actions respond to emergent events, rather than representing long-term strategies aimed at sustainable development. The main focus of a temporary organisation is on the present, rather than the past or future (Bakker *et al.* 2009). While it is argued that the trend of moving to increasingly temporary arrangements in organisations is unsustainable (Bauman *et al.* 2015), within the twenty-first century context of accelerated time, contemporary organisations are shortening their temporal horizons to operate according to a logic of speed and instantaneity (Eriksen 2016).

Temporary organisations are characterised by an intentional termination point, which is incorporated into the organisational life span from the very beginning. Their existence may be limited to just a few hours, and may extend to several years; what is important is that there is an intended termination point of the venture. While the timing of this final point might be adjusted during the life of the organisation, it is its existence that strongly impacts on the organisational form and process and its embeddedness into the local context (Karmowska *et*

al. 2017). Architectural interventions linked to temporary businesses may also pay less regard of the local context as they become 'reversible' elements in the townscape.

Critically, the temporary nature of a venture can alleviate some of the obstacles that face small business start-ups such as lengthy rental agreements, the need for substantial start-up capital, and enable less stringent planning consent or a reduced burden of business rates (Hay 2011). This component of freedom fosters creativity and innovation in function, design and choice of business models. Having limited time, however, the short term organisation focuses its efforts and resources on achieving this aim, rather than considering employees' well-being or building team relationships (Grabher 2004; Saunders and Ahuja 2006).

Both a rising interest in and reliance on temporary interventions and activities in the present day demonstrates a response to the need for flexibility and agility required of the resilient city and a good fit with more dynamic approaches being taken in urban development and regeneration practices. The growing popularity of temporary ventures may also be related to the recent changes in the employment market where workers increasingly seek flexible forms of employment (including self-employment) to be able to combine work with other activities or responsibilities. While this may lead to problems and disappointments in times of economic downturn (Bauman 2010), flexible working arrangements allow women to compete on a more equal level and for employers to better access this talent pool. Millennials or Generation Y also expect greater flexibility and autonomy from their employers and see flexibility as a definer of career success (Cogin 2012; Morris 2018). This does not necessarily mean some of the more precarious aspects of temporary interventions have disappeared. On the contrary, conditions of precariousness continue to traverse many aspects of urban and rural life. Temporary interventions can play a role in empowering financially weaker players and engendering creativity and innovation.

The notion of temporality can also be associated with austerity and poverty, and as a solution borne out of need. In some contexts, it is hailed as an opportunity and a means of instigating change, whatever form that might take. Street vendors for example are often micro-entrepreneurs and the availability of public space provides opportunities to conduct business that would traditionally not be available to groups that lack of capital, language skills or even documentation, such as migrants or women (Franck and Stevens 2007). In other scenarios, organised community groups step in temporarily to fill a gap where central services have failed to deliver. Temporary uses of spaces therefore become a process of adjustment and resistance through a series of adaptive and creative interventions (Madanipour 2017).

[INSERT FIGURE 8.2 YANGON HERE]

DEFINING 'TEMPORARY' IN THE URBAN CONTEXT

A wide ranging terminology has come to describe various forms of temporary uses and interventions. As an emerging field, a number of new terms and definitions abound. Projects may therefore be referred to under different terms by different commentators.

Temporary architecture is defined as 'short lived structures for a multitude of purposes either designed for specific events or self-initiated and grass roots platforms for participatory design, experimental and innovative and intended for a public use and engage the public as participant or protagonist' (St Hill 2015: 2). Temporary interventions or pop-ups can involve the temporary use of a redundant space for a commercial, semi-commercial or charitable/community function (Ferrerri 2015). The temporary character of the use is marked by a set deadline of a venture before it comes into operation. Instigators range from private, public and third sector organisations to organised community groups and even protest groups (Bishop and Williams 2012). Most typical temporary uses include shops, bars and restaurants, venues for exhibitions or other cultural events, such as theatre or music, but less common uses such as circuses, homeless shelters, or drop-in clinics are also evident. Pop-ups may be independent structures on public or unused land or placed within an existing building.

Pop-ups make temporary claims on existing built and open spaces and re-appropriate spaces within existing buildings. It is not uncommon for buildings or land awaiting re-development to be utilised for a temporary use until the re-development is realised. Such short term uses are often referred to as 'meanwhile uses'. The meanwhile use of an otherwise unused building or space can invigorate the space, reduce crime and anti-social activity and enable the trial of potential future uses for forthcoming development.

'The increased frequency of short-term events, in particular the temporary construction and use of space, has become known as temporary urbanism' (Madanipour 2017: 3). Public space at neighbourhood level is often the focus and also has its roots in the traditional production and shaping of shared neighbourhood spaces such as commons and village squares. The use of often modest but 'tactical' interventions that improve the urban environment and demonstrate the viability of potential change is referred to as 'tactical urbanism'. They are often grass roots

instigated or initiated by the authorities as a means of engagement (Lydon *et al.* 2015). A typical project would be the creation of a make-shift park on vacant land.

Adaptive urbanism is conceived within the physical and operational space between the formality of the planning system and the informality of users shaping a space. Fernandez (2015) argues that for places to be able to adapt to conditions of austerity, uncertainty and insecurity, the formal planning system needs to allow for users to have an input into the spaces they use and to adapt them through temporary uses, in what he describes as the co-creation of spaces.

KEY PLAYERS AND DRIVERS

The formal planning and governance systems are built around controlling or eliminating unpredictability (Madanipour 2017), and are typically based on permanence and linearity of process. Real estate-led regeneration or development generates economies that over supply certain types of space in boom times while squeezing others out, critically jeopardising the sustainable mix in which weaker, fledgling economies and innovation can survive. Oswalt *et al.* (2007: 276), however, argue that while traditional planning often lacks the tools to tackle these inequalities, temporary uses can provide the ingredients for the 'energetic, vital and humane city' to survive. In some parts of the world traditional forms of urban and territorial plans are no longer adequate to respond to the current pressures of rapid urban growth, making rapid and customised responses that are easy to implement an essential planning tool.

More informally, instigators of temporary projects are often those who are on the threshold of the regulated workplace or society. Even in developed countries immigrant communities have been observed making temporary use of their dwellings or front yards to set up small businesses, as the only way in which they can start building their life in a new location (Hamdi 2013). Thus temporariness also becomes an urban dialogue between the formal and informal sectors, unused spaces being the only option some will have, enabling 'financially weak players the opportunity to grow in a protected but unsubsidised environment and become active participants in the shaping of their city' (Oswalt *et al.* 2007: 278). For more affluent groups it is seen as an opportunity to set up independently and a means to test business ideas, instigate cultural and creative activities, or to give something back through community or youth focused initiatives. Critically, development is removed from being the exclusive domain of economically powerful investors, and is shared with less affluent, but often more creative actors.

A new dynamic is being forged, between development that is shaped by large companies affecting bigger scale changes and with little local connection and understanding of a locality (Madanipour 2003), and a growing band of small scale entrepreneurs who make use of the range of spatial opportunities on offer. Smaller businesses are perceived as more innovative than larger firms, which can be attributed to operating within higher risk of failure (Honjo 2000), but also to the fact that they are often managed by their owner (contrary to employed managers in larger businesses), which results in a wide variety of business motivations. While delivering value to shareholders would be a predominant aim of a large business, motivation of smaller entrepreneurs involves passion or increased creativity, and often results in comparatively high level of optimism, sometimes even over-confidence; factors supporting experimentation and innovation (Hart and Oulton 1996; Ucbasaran *et al.* 2010; Breugst *et al.* 2011; Simon and Shrader 2012; Cardon *et al.* 2013; Im *et al.* 2013). Pop-up businesses create more edgy, different and unique products and services for the market and fill gaps that are only evident when working at a small local scale. It is the new dichotomy of urban development: the big developments which also act as places where global capital is being parked, and a fluid layer of innovation and locally specific and often temporary interventions to actually make places work at a local level.

The advocates and actors of temporary architecture are often young architects and designers 'pushing the boundaries of architecture' and subverting 'preconceptions of what our cities should be like' (St Hill 2015: 2). For relatively inexperienced architects a highly visible temporary intervention can become a career enhancing opportunity. These forms of engagement can help new practices find their direction or ethos and inform future projects and the ways in which they approach them. For many young architects temporary structures provided job opportunities and visibility in the 2008 economic downturn (Epstein-Mervis 2016), and for some an opportunity to engage with historic buildings. Some temporary interventions rely on an investment of time by the key actors, whereby the capital invested is self-initiative and social networks rather than assets of monetary value. As temporality becomes the norm, a number of architecture practices have started to make designs for temporary structures their core business.

At the same time a new dynamic is introduced through the platform of social media that on the one hand fuels a desire to seek out new and novel experiences 'to share', but also facilitates quick and effective promotion and marketing of events or initiatives to selected user groups (Deslandes 2013). It is this phenomenon that has enabled pop-up ventures to thrive, as they attract customers via social media and customer reviews. A perpetual quest

for new experiences also drives pop-up ventures' impermanent, unexpected and at times slightly irreverent nature (Epstein-Mervis 2016).

Within an environment of multiple players and rapidly changing availability of space, Oswalt *et al.* (2007: 278) identify the role for go between agents, often 'agile and capable individuals', who have the capacity and experience in accessing funding and working through bureaucracies and can also be negotiators. Such players are especially vital in the early stages of a project and can be the project owner, property owner or even someone in a municipality. As temporary interventions and adaptive urbanism practices and their multiple actors challenge the mechanisms of classical planning, municipalities are also nudged into becoming pro-active as enablers. For property owners it is often a case of seeing an otherwise empty building being used but requiring negligible investment on their part, it can also bring additional benefits of publicity and security. However, they may also be concerned about not being able to remove temporary users in a timely fashion or be put off by the bureaucracy involved.

Against the disparate and fragmented nature of instigators and users, institutions or organisations that act as coordinators can play an important role in matching supply (empty spaces) with demand (users). One such example is *ZwischenZeitZentrale* (ZZZ for short) in Bremen in Germany, an organisation that provides a support service to link up meanwhile users seeking spaces with temporarily vacant spaces across the city (Jégou 2017). Fleming (2004) suggests a role for creative intermediaries who can support creative industries in building entrepreneurial capacity, bringing their products to markets, providing a unified voice and critically a marketing mechanism. For local actors to become engaged there also have to be support initiatives that are put in place such as capacity building, business training, support with marketing and the like. Creative ideas can be used to facilitate funding applications and support from authorities and other funders (St Hill 2015).

Apart from being planned, temporary interventions can also be informal, accidental or spontaneous and at times illegal (Bishop and Williams 2012). As such they may be borne out of protest and activism, such as re-organising an urban space for the public good or squatting in an underused building to draw attention to it. In London, pressure from local community groups was instrumental in ensuring that regeneration plans for Hornsey Town Hall, retained its function as an arts venue at the heart of the community. By organising temporary events, the campaign drew attention to the attractive modernist interiors of the Town Hall and helped shape plans for its future use. During the regeneration process, a number of community focused interim uses were housed in

the building with plans for these to evolve into more permanent arrangements on completion of the project (Figure 8.3).

[INSERT FIGURE 8.3 HORNSEY TOWN HALL HERE]

THE ROLE OF TEMPORARY INTERVENTIONS IN REGENERATION

As urban planning practice shifts away from ambitious long-term master planning (Verebes 2014) and previously available regeneration funds are reduced, short term and small packages of interventions are increasingly being seen as paving the way forward to longer term revitalisation and for unlocking the potential of sites (Bishop and Williams 2012). In the context of architectural regeneration temporary interventions are the coming together of permanent existing buildings with temporary functions. Considering urbanism as a combination of physical space and social activity, existing buildings bring a sense of permanence and also shape the character of streets and neighbourhoods. Temporary uses are dependent on cost-effective access to space and reliable infrastructure that can be readily available in an existing building. Even though they are temporary and 'parasitic' they often leave a trace, if only as an influence over an area or by making a place visible again, including to investors.

Based on the premise that architectural regeneration is a process to find feasible new uses for existing buildings and places (Orbaşlı and Vellinga, this volume), temporary interventions contribute to architectural regeneration at different levels. In the context of the building, through both legal means and uses borne out of protest, they draw attention to the historic and social values of a place and generate interest for continued and future uses. Their scale and business models engender creativity with the potential to influence economic growth. At a neighbourhood level they activate spaces, foster local engagement and ultimately strengthen the capacity of local networks. Finally, in the context of urban planning they are part of the toolkit of the new flexible and adaptive approaches to planning.

Short term temporary uses can generate interest in a historic building and its unique qualities and can also kick start the regeneration of an area by introducing new uses and businesses and by attracting inward investment to an area. They can act as catalysts for change; they can be used to test an idea or demonstrate it to potential users or decision makers whereby the temporary intervention is a stepping stone rather than a stop gap use. Temporary tenants in the property would normally make some adaptations for their own purpose, that may further inspire new uses of the site. Notably, one temporary use often instigates others, eventually leading to a cluster of

formal and informal networks and functions. The development and regeneration inspired by a temporary use of a site is not limited to this site, but can as well happen in another part of the area. In Manchester, UK ready availability of empty warehouses, factories and shopfronts in the 1980s and 1990s enabled many young entrepreneurs to set-up independent record companies and recording studios, subsequently establishing a vibrant urban culture and leading to the regeneration of city's central industrial districts of Ancoats and the Northern Quarter (Misselwitz 2004). As was the case in Manchester, the creative identity of most pop-ups can contribute to the 'cultural and social capital of cities' (Oswalt *et al.* 2007: 281).

Intermediate or meanwhile uses can contribute to urban development, especially in times of economic decline. A temporary use for a vacant shop for example could be for a local community function such as a drop-in centre or a start-up opportunity for a fledgling local business. This is in contrast to the long lead-in times required for investor-led redevelopment or regeneration projects. Temporary use is another form of urbanism that can complement more traditional forms of developments. For example, in post-industrial cities like Detroit and Philadelphia in the United States, the gaps emerging in large expanses of housing are being filled by community-centred temporary uses that include greening, urban agriculture and art installations. By replacing vacancy with use and activity the community is also being rejuvenated (Harrison 2014).

Many years of austerity in Athens have resulted in many vacant shops and derelict sites. Some of these serve unemployed young people to take advantage of their creativity, running art projects, clubs, cinemas and restaurants (Harris and Nowicki 2015). With youth unemployment in Athens reaching 45% (Trading Economics 2018), these activities serve local communities and keep the sites alive, but they also represent elements of social regeneration, where young people engage in constructive activities rather than fall into deprivation out of boredom and lack of opportunities. The unfinished buildings of Athens are discussed in more detail in the chapter by Troiani and Dawson in this volume.

Temporary interventions also allow for more intensive use of space and for multiple uses of the same space, potentially extending its economic 'yield', increasing footfall and associated safety. The use of a square as a marketplace not only makes use of the space but also animates it. Other temporary uses, such as urban beaches or theatres attract users to these urban destinations, increasing footfall and wider spread of economic benefits. The short term nature of some events is the very thing that makes them interesting and memorable.

Furthermore, temporary uses can draw attention to and instigate community involvement with local historic buildings and cultural heritage assets (Lashua 2013) as well as promote place identity. They can also help to re-define the identity of a place, especially in sites suffering from having a negative image. New temporary uses may help to shift perceptions by engaging a local community with a place in new ways. Rejuvenating run down high streets or underused market places is also about recognising the cultural significance of these places to the area and its community. It is therefore not only about the architecture that is created or the interventions made, but also how a project engages local users (St Hills 2015).

Temporary structures that are commonly deployed to provide shelter and rebuild basic urban functions following a disaster might evolve to become part of a city's fabric, albeit temporarily. After the earthquake in Christchurch, New Zealand, for example, flexible, fast and low cost pop-up solutions such as container shopping and urban parks were set out in a short period of time (Anderson 2014; Harris and Nowicki 2015). Many of the projects in Christchurch also exemplify a grassroots and community-led approach to reconstruction. The container mall was constructed by local building owners as a quick way to re-start their businesses, whilst communities helped to activate open spaces with makeshift parks and recreation areas, including spaces between designated redevelopment sites as a means of re-invigorating the downtown (Brand and Nicholson 2016). This process ensured the old centre of Christchurch was not side-lined in favour of investor-led developments that favoured unhindered new locations on the urban periphery, and demonstrated the potential of urban regeneration through 'large scale collaborative projects' (Brand and Nicholson 2016: 168). This example also demonstrates how collective actions by community-led initiatives can positively impact on a type of urban regeneration that upholds locally held values.

Temporary interventions are now also being considered for the role they play in the context of urban resilience (Brand and Nicholson 2016). First and foremost is the positioning of temporary interventions in the context of flexibility, which is also supported by their relative independence and the fact that the failure of a venture is less likely to upset an entire system. Temporary interventions are not only able to rebound reasonably rapidly, they are also likely to become part of a mode of operation for more permanent fixtures, businesses and social spaces, especially following set-backs or disasters as discussed above. Through their capacity to fail without significant impacts, they also create opportunities for constant learning.

Critiques of temporary uses have pointed out that they can also be an opportunistic marketing ploy for high-end retail jumping on a trendy bandwagon (Madanipour 2017) or a gimmick employed by

developers to fill vacant properties or land, improve marketing and appear hip (St Hill 2015). In other instances, a one-off event can generate short term interest that cannot be sustained. The creation of a mock-theme park spearheaded by the artist Banksy in the disused Tropicana centre in the English coastal town of Weston-super-Mare in the summer of 2015 is an example of one such novelty attraction (Epstein-Mervis 2016). Named 'Dismaland', the attraction intended to highlight social inequalities, attracted a global audience to this otherwise little known seaside town, delivering a significant boost to the local economy (Zebracki 2018). In the immediate follow up, the event prompted the local council to invest in the Tropicana building, enabling it to be used for a variety of different events. It can be argued that Dismaland was simultaneously a political statement and a well-intended urban regeneration strategy. However, limited local engagement during the process and the prohibitive cost of sustaining an event with the calibre to remain popular curtailed the longer term impacts (Zebracki 2018).

LONGER TERM IMPACTS AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

The longer-term benefits or sustainability of short-term pop-up initiatives has not as yet been systematically investigated in any great depth. The very experimental nature of temporary interventions and the built-in capacity to fail means that there is limited forward planning or long term intention such as regeneration outcomes building into the planning stages of projects. An EU funded project, Urban Catalyst, identified some long term effects of spontaneous, temporary uses and argued that the unplanned phenomena of temporary uses can be successfully incorporated into the planning and management of cities. The study identified benefits both at the site and beyond, as projects become permanent, or relocated to another location (Oswalt *et al.* 2007). More longitudinal studies are needed to establish the long term impacts of temporary interventions on the conservation of historic buildings and area-based regeneration, improved community relations and cohesion, as well as business creation and economic development.

On the other hand, there are numerous examples where a project intended as a stop-gap or temporary intervention has become integrated more permanently into the urban grain. One such example is Gabriel's Wharf on London's South Bank, created by the Coin Street Builders co-operative as a cluster of temporary shop units intended to raise funds for housing projects prior to being developed. Its popularity as a leisure facility, and increasingly as a contrast to the sleek and 'corporate' environment growing around it, has made it a popular destination and a permanent fixture on what has since become highly valuable river-front land (Figure 8.4).

[INSERT FIGURE 8.4 GABRIEL'S WHARF HERE]

Another often cited success story of sustained temporary uses that have gained a level of permanence is the old railway lands behind Berlin's Ostbahnhof, Spreeraum Ost, taken over by community groups since 1998 and developed for a range of cultural and social projects. In Zurich in Switzerland, an old silk factory that has been run by a collective since 1980 holds events, facilitates workshops and hosts workspaces in the creative industries. In both examples what originated as informal and intermediate uses have evolved into permanent and profitable ventures that also contribute to the cultural fabric of their respective cities (Oswalt *et al.* 2007).

Although temporary uses can draw attention to underused buildings, Tonkiss (2003) argues that in a neo-liberal urban agenda temporary uses are simply a means of keeping land warm for a more opportune time for development and potentially act as seed funding for profit-led development. This profit-led approach to regeneration often leads to the rapid displacement of local businesses and gentrification (Shaw *et al.* 2004). In earlier chapters in this volume Shaw and Orbaşlı discuss how historic areas with a strong presence of cultural and creative industries often experience rapid rates of gentrification. This is also becoming evident in short-term place transformations and pop-up type regeneration initiatives, such as that experienced at Brixton Market in London. Following a local campaign to save the historic arcades from development, the use of the empty market stalls by small start-up food businesses on short leases not only revived the old market building but also very rapidly turned it into a popular tourist attraction (Figure 8.5). The popularity of the market triggered rent increases which resulted in many of the local businesses being replaced, with the short term leases that had worked for them also facilitating their rapid displacement. Furthermore, the growing popularity of the market was widely seen as an instigator of house price increases (Ferrerri 2013).

[INSERT FIGURE 8.5 BRIXTON MARKET HERE]

Although temporary structures and installations might have a low impact on the eco-system of the sites they occupy, questions must be raised about their environmental credentials as they also epitomise a throw-away culture. In a study on the afterlife of a number of prominent temporary structures for *dezeen* magazine Winston (2016) identified two distinct trends, one of transporting and rebuilding the structures elsewhere and the other of dismantling and re-using or re-cycling components. In one example the use of borrowed components such as pallets, enabled them to be returned for continued use.

Tonkiss (2013) points out how the more altruistic and community focused temporary projects are becoming substitutes for public services in an environment of a shrinking public sector. Contrarily, the temporary nature of initiatives also renders them expendable in the eyes of the authorities, especially when the spaces they occupy can be reclaimed for lucrative development opportunities.

Others have questioned whether the growth in temporary interventions that are becoming more commonplace today are no longer short term prequels that inform longer term and more permanent developments but a sign of an urban future that is both more precarious but also more creative (Madanipour 2017). Oswalt *et al.* (2007) argue that temporary use is becoming a strategic planning tool in opposition to traditional master planning, and 'the conventional tools and techniques of city design are fundamentally unable to manage change' (Verebes 2014: 93). In these arguments temporary interventions are positioned as components of an organic and fluid planning approach that moves away from processes that work towards a defined end product. This viewpoint is a more dynamic reflection of the theoretical position of architectural regeneration that recognises architecture as an ongoing process of adaptation and change (Orbaşlı and Vellinga, this volume). However, it could also have long term adverse impacts on the historic environment, which will still require from time to time serious investments in fabric conservation.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has considered the role temporary interventions can play in the regeneration of the historic environment. Not only is there a growing prevalence of temporary interventions being documented, but it is also being argued that temporary is the new constant, as temporary uses become more appropriate responses to an increasingly complex and fluid state of planning in the contemporary world.

We have discussed the various ways in which temporary interventions contribute to the re-use and regeneration of existing buildings through prolonging their use and drawing attention to their values, character and potential. Projects of a temporary nature also empower community actors to have a voice in the shaping of their own environment. The innovativeness of temporary projects is part of their added value, often introducing commercial as well as cultural alternatives, that if successful become established as future new uses. The creative dynamic of the temporary is less likely to be maintained in a more permanent use and intervention that follows on from it, when the innovators themselves often move on to other ventures.

Temporary uses and the growing availability of spaces in which they can locate provide opportunities for small or marginalised players and community groups to realise ventures and projects; but simultaneously also support the interests of larger players on the market. Temporary installations and pop-up venues are favoured by established businesses as a means of promoting their 'brand' identity, whilst building owners stand to gain from short term and meanwhile users, at times using creative sector businesses or functions as leverage to attract other businesses into their premises.

Temporary projects share the same challenges with more permanent regeneration projects, most notably the prospects of displacement and gentrification. Once temporary projects prove the economic worth of a place, or attach a desirable character to it, it is not uncommon for the smaller and often locally-initiated ventures to be outpriced by more mainstream operators. These small ventures are further jeopardised by the short term arrangements that had supported them at the onset.

Amongst the lessons learnt from various projects and players, one is that temporary structures should not be equated with throwaway architecture; on the contrary they should be seen as building blocks for an improved environment that engenders a sense of place and belonging. This is the case in the socially conscious models, but also tackles issues such as High Street decline by not only replacing shops with shops but introducing other types of new uses that can serve local communities, maintain or build a sense of place and support social sustainability (St Hill 2015). The recognition of temporary uses, organisations and built interventions as drivers of regeneration, also needs to be supported by regulatory frameworks and supports, such as tax breaks, that will nurture such ventures and those instigating them.

FURTHER READINGS

Beekmans, J. and de Boer, J., (2014). *Pop-up City: City-Making in a Fluid World*. Netherlands: BIS Publishers.

Bakker, R.M., (2010). Taking stock of temporary organizational forms: A systematic review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. **12**, 466-486.

Bishop, P and Williams, L., (2012). *The Temporary City*. London: Routledge.

Franck, K. and Stevens, Q., eds., (2007). *Loose Space*. London: Routledge.

Kenis, P., Janowicz-Panjaitan, M. and Cambre, B., eds., (2009). *Temporary Organizations: Prevalence, Logic and Effectiveness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 56-85.

St Hill, C., (2015). *This is Temporary: How Transient Projects are Redefining Architecture*. Newcastle: RIBA Publishing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, C., (2014). How temporary 'cardboard cathedral' rose from the ruins to become most recognized building in Christchurch. *The Guardian* [online]. 17 September. [Viewed April 2018]. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2014/sep/17/temporary-cardboard-cathedral-ruins-christchurch-new-zealand-earthquake>

Bakker, R.M., (2010). Taking stock of temporary organizational forms: A systematic review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. **12**, 466-486.

Bakker, R.M., B. Cambre, and K. Provan, (2009). The resource dilemma of temporary organizations: a dynamic perspective on temporal embeddedness and resource discretion. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan and B. Cambre, eds. *Temporary organizations: Prevalence, logic and effectiveness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 201-219.

Bakker, R.M. and M. Janowicz-Panjaitan (2009). Time matters: the impact of 'temporariness' on the functioning and performance of organizations. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan and B. Cambre, eds. *Temporary organizations: Prevalence, logic and effectiveness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 121-141.

Bauman, Z., (2010). *44 letters from the Liquid Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z., Bauman, I., Kociatkiewicz and Kostera, M., (2015). *Management in a Liquid Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bechky, B. A., (2006). Gaffers, gofers and grips: Role-based coordination in temporary organizations. *Organization Science* **17**(1), 3-21.

Beekmans, J. and de Boer, J., (2014). *Pop-up City: City-Making in a Fluid World*. Netherlands: BIS Publishers.

Bishop, P and Williams, L., (2012). *The Temporary City*. London: Routledge.

Brand, D. and Nicholson, H., (2016). Public space and recovery: learning from post-earthquake Christchurch. *Journal of Urban Design*. **21**(2), 159-176.

Breugst, N., (2011). *Entrepreneurial behaviour in social context: The role of families, teams and employees for entrepreneurial individuals*. Dissertation at Rat der Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena. [Viewed 27 May 2018]. Available from: https://www.db-thueringen.de/receive/dbt_mods_00019410

Cardon, M.S., Gregoire, D.D., Stevens, Ch.E. and Patel, P.C., (2013). Measuring entrepreneurial passion: Conceptual foundations and scale validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*. **28**(3), 373-396.

Cogin, J., (2012). Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. **23**(11), 2268-2294.

DeFillippi, R. and Arthur, M., (1998). Paradox in project-based enterprise: the case of film making. *California Management Review*. **40**, 125-139.

DeFillippi, R. (2002). Information technology and organizational models for project collaboration in the new economy. *Human Resource Planning*. **25**(4), 7-18.

Deslandes, A., (2013). Exemplary Amateurism: Thoughts on DIY Urbanism/ *Cultural Studies Review* [online]. **19**(1), 216–27. [Viewed February 2018]. Available from: <https://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/csri/article/view/2481>

Epstein-Mervis, M., (2016). The rise and rise of pop-up architecture. *Curbed* [online]. 9 March. [Viewed June 2018]. Available from: <https://www.curbed.com/2016/3/9/11180920/architecture-history-temporary-banksy>

Eriksen, T.H., (2016). Overheating: the world since 1991. *History and Anthropology*. **27**(5), 469-487. Available from: doi: 10.1080/02757206.2016.1218865

Fernandez, M., (2015). Adaptive Cities: co-creating spaces beyond austerity. *Edge Condition* [online]. **5**, 106-107. [Viewed 1 March 2016]. Available from: <http://www.edgecondition.net/vol-5-placemaking.html>

Ferreri, M., (2013). *Occupying vacant spaces: precarious politics of temporary urban reuse*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Queen Mary University of London, UK.

Fleming, T., (2004). Supporting the Cultural Quarter? The Role of the Creative Intermediary. In Bell, D. and Jayne, M., eds. *Urban Villages in the Contemporary City*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 94-108.

Franck, K. and Stevens, Q., eds. (2007). *Loose Space*. London: Routledge.

Gann, D.M. and Salter, A.J., (2000). Innovation in project based, service enhanced firms: the construction of complex products and systems. *Research Policy*. **29**, 955-972.

George, J.M. and Jones, G.R., (2000). The role of time in theory and theory building. *Journal of Management*. **26**(4), 657-684.

Grabher, G., (2004). Temporary architectures of learning: Knowledge governance in project ecologies. *Organization Studies*. **25**(9), 1491-1514.

- Hamdi, N. (2013). *Small change: about the art of practice and the limits of planning in cities*. Routledge.
- Harris, E. and Nowicki, M., (2015). Cult of the temporary: is the pop-up phenomenon good for cities? *The Guardian* [online]. 20 July. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/jul/20/cult-temporary-pop-up-phenomenon-cities>
- Harrison, S., (2014). In Between: Places of Resilience in the Postindustrial City. *Interventions | Adaptive Reuse*. **05**, Birkhauser, 33-39.
- Hart, P.E. and Oulton, N., (1996). Growth and size of firms. *The Economic Journal*. **106**(438), 1242-1252.
- Hay, K., (2011). *How can the temporary use of empty retail space most effectively reduce high street vacancies in the UK*. M.A. dissertation, Oxford Brookes University.
- Heidegger, M., (1962). *Being and time*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Honjo, Y., (2000). Business failure of new firms: An empirical analysis using a multiplicative hazards model. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*. **18**(4), 557-574.
- Ibert, O., (2004). Projects and firms as discordant complements: organizational learning in the Munich software ecology. *Research Policy*. **33**, 1529-1546.
- Im, S., Montoya, M.M. and Workman, J.P., (2013). Antecedents and consequences of creativity in product innovation teams. *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*. **30**(1), 170-185.
- Janowicz-Panjaitan, M., Bakker, R.M. and Kenis, P., (2009). Research on temporary organizations: the state of the art and distinct approaches toward 'temporariness'. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan and B. Cambre, eds. *Temporary Organizations: Prevalence, Logic and Effectiveness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 56-85.
- Jégou, F., (2017). *Temporary Use as an Asset to Reduce Exclusion*. URBACT report. [Viewed June 2017]. Available from:

http://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/media/temporary_use_as_an_asset_to_reduce_exclusion_-_ddsv_bremen.pdf

Karmowska, J., Child, J. and James, P., (2017). A contingency analysis of precarious organizational temporariness. *British Journal of Management*. **28**(2), 213-230.

Lashua, B., (2013). Pop-up cinema and place-shaping: urban cultural heritage at Marshall's Mill. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* [online]. **5**(2), 123-138. [Viewed March 2014]. Accessible from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/19407963.2013.789728>

Leighton Chase, J., Crawford, M. and Kaliski, J. eds. (2008), *Everyday Urbanism*, New York: The Monacelli Press.

Lundin, R. and Soderholm, A., (1995). A theory of temporary organization. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. **11**(4), 437-55.

Lydon, M. and Garcia, A., (2015). *Tactical Urbanism: Short-term Action for Long-term Change*. Washington: Island Press.

Madanipour, A., (2003). *Public and Private Spaces of the City*. London: Routledge.

Madanipour, A., (2017). *Cities in Time: Temporary Urbanism and the Future of the City*. London: Bloomsbury.

Mehrotra, R. and Vera, F., (2015). Kumbh Mela: Designing the World's Largest Gathering of People. *Archdaily* [online]. 28 April. Available from: <https://www.archdaily.com/624425/kumbh-mela-designing-the-world-s-largest-gathering-of-people>

Misselwitz, P., (2004). Manchester – City Profile. Manchester/Liverpool II.I Studies Part 1. *Shrinking Cities working document* [online]. 30-39. [Viewed July 2019]. Available from: http://shrinkingcities.com/fileadmin/shrink/downloads/pdfs/II.1_Studies1.pdf

Morris, C., (2018). 61 million Gen Zers are about to enter the US workforce and radically change it forever. *CNBC* [online]. 2 May. [Viewed 3 August 2019]. Available from:

<https://www.cnn.com/2018/05/01/61-million-gen-zers-about-to-enter-us-workforce-and-change-it.html>

Saunders, C.S. and Ahuja, M.K., (2006). Are all distributed teams the same? Differentiating between temporary and ongoing distributed teams. *Small Group Research*. **37**, 662-700.

Shaw, S., Bagwell, S. and Karmowska, J., (2004). Ethnoscapes as spectacle: Reimagining multicultural districts as new destinations for leisure and tourism consumption. *Urban Studies*. **41**(10), 1983-2000.

Simon, M. and Shrader, R.C., (2012). Entrepreneurial actions and optimistic overconfidence: The role of motivated reasoning in new product introductions. *Journal of Business Venturing*. **27**(3), 291-309.

Sorenson, O. and Waguespack, D.M., (2006). Social structure and exchange: self-confirming dynamics in Hollywood. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. **51**, 560-589.

St Hill, C., (2015). *This is Temporary: How Transient Projects are Redefining Architecture*. Newcastle: RIBA Publishing.

Sydow J., Lindhqvist, L. and DeFillippi, R. (2004). Project-Based organizations, embeddedness and repositories of knowledge: Editorial. *Organization Studies*. **25**(9), 1475-1489.

Oswalt, P., Misselwitz, P. and Overmeyer, K., (2007). Patterns of the Unplanned. In Franck, K.A. and Stevens, Q., eds. *Loose Space*. London: Routledge, 271-288.

Tonkiss, F., (2013). Austerity urbanism and the makeshift city. *City*. **17**(3), 312-24.

Trading Economics, (2018). Greece youth unemployment rate 1998-2018. *Trading Economics* [online]. [Viewed 8 June 2018]. Available from: <https://tradingeconomics.com/greece/youth-unemployment-rate>

Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P., Wright, M. and Flores, M., (2010). The nature of entrepreneurial experience, business failure and comparative optimism. *Journal of Business Venturing*. **25**(6), 541-555.

Verebes, T., ed., (2014). *Masterplanning the Adaptive City: Computational Urbanism in the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge.

Winston, A., (2016). Burnt, recycled, sold: the fate of 2015's temporary pavilions. *Dezeen* [online]. 14 June. [Viewed February 2019]. Available from: <https://www.dezeen.com/2016/06/14/2015-temporary-pavilions-fate-burnt-recycled-storage-sold-serpentine-gallery-milan-expo-moma-ps1/>

Zebracki, M., (2018). Regenerating a coastal town through art: *Dismaland* and the (l)imitations of antagonistic art practice in the city. *Cities*. **77**, 21-32.

Zeiderman, A., Kaker, S., Silver, J., Wood, A. and Ramakrishnan, K., (2017). *Urban Uncertainty: Governing cities in turbulent times* [online]. London: LSE Cities. [Viewed June 2017]. Available form: https://files.lsecities.net/files/2017/05/Urban-Uncertainty-report_LSE-Cities.pdf

Captions

Figure 8.1 Temporary structures have been an increasingly popular topic for the Venice Biennale such as this model for a temporary floating school. The exhibition itself meanwhile is a collection of temporary constructions in the historic buildings of the Arsenale (Photograph by Aylin Orbaşlı, 2016)

Figure 8.2 In Yangon in Myanmar temporary street vendors and ad-hoc cafes provide employment to more economically vulnerable groups as well as providing an active commercial dynamic with the more permanent shops (Photograph by Aylin Orbaşlı, 2013)

Figure 8.3 At Hornsey Town Hall in London the upper floor used as a pop-up restaurant provided the space with a temporary use prior to the construction phase and enabled public access to a place of architectural significance that had not been possible once the town hall function had ceased (Photograph by Anna Rose, 2016)

Figure 8.4 Gabriel's Wharf in London, a popular destination and 'temporary use' that has lasted for over two decades (Photograph by Aylin Orbaşlı, 2019)

Figure 8.5 Trendier uses and the emergence of chain restaurants are gentrifying Brixton's historic market arcades following a locally driven regeneration through temporary uses (Photograph by Aylin Orbaşlı, 2019)

Figure 8.6 A pop-up cafe in the popular Kazimierz district of Krakow, Poland makes use of an empty plot and some reclaimed materials (Photograph by Aylin Orbaşlı, 2019)