OpenHeritage

heritage re-use policie

Mapping of

5

and regulations in

September 2020

Project Full Title	Organizing, Promoting and Enabling Heritage Re-use through Inclusion, Technology, Access, Governance and Empowerment						
Project Acronym OpenHeritage							
Grant Agreement No. 776766							
Coordinator	Metropolitan Research Institute (MRI)						
Project duration June 2018 – May 2022 (48 months)							
Project website www.openheritage.eu							
Work Package	WP1: Mapping of current heritage re-use policies and regulations in Europe						
Deliverable	1.2 report Complex policy overview of adaptive heritage re-use (synthetizes inputs from Tasks 1.1 1.3)						
Delivery Date	December 2019 / revised version September 2020						
Author(s)	Loes Veldpaus (UNEW); Federica Fava (ROMA3); Dominika Brodowicz (SARP)						
Contributor(s)	Dóra Mérai (CEU); Nicola Vazzoler, Giovanni Caudo, Mauro Baioni (Roma3); Markus Kip (UBER); Katarzyna Sadowy, (SARP); Iryna Sklokina, Sofia Dyak (CUH); Karim van Knippenberg (UGENT); John Pendlebury, Sarah Dyer, Hannah Garrow, Bruce Davenport (UNEW); Joep de Roo, Alina Cristiana Tomescu (Eurodite).						
Reviewer(s) Beitske Boonstra (UGENT); Miranda Iossifidis (UNEW)							
Dissemination	Public (PU)						
level:	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (CO)						



This document has been prepared in the framework of the European project OpenHeritage – Organizing, Promoting and Enabling Heritage Re-use through Inclusion, Technology, Access, Governance and Empowerment. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 776766. The sole

responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors. It does not necessarily represent the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EASME nor the European Commission is responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Contents

0	E>	Executive summary4					
1	In	Introduction7					
	1.1	Ob	jectives and Scope	7			
	1.2	Ар	proach - methods and operational approach	8			
2	Se	etting	the scene to adaptive reuse: an overview of the European context	12			
	2.1	Yea	ar of Cultural Heritage 2018 – a shift in heritage, culture, and building	14			
	2.2 and	Th Urba	e European Union's current and future programmes on Culture, Heritage, an relevant to adaptive reuse	15			
	2.	2.1	New European Agenda for Culture & work plan	16			
	2.	2.2	Adaptive reuse in the wider urban and building sector				
	2.	2.3	Adaptive reuse in the European Research context				
	2.3	Co	ncluding remarks				
	2.4	Re	ferences	22			
3	TH	HEMA	TIC ANALYSIS	25			
	3.1	int	roduction	25			
	3.2	Ad	aptive Heritage Reuse across Europe	25			
	3.	2.1	Heritage				
	3.	2.2	Conservation	28			
	3.	2.3	Limits of Acceptable Change	29			
	3.	2.4	Capitalising on, Using, and Commodifying heritage	29			
	3.3	Pla	Inning and the integration of heritage and planning systems	30			
	3.	3.1	Levels of Governance, regional integration	31			
	3.	3.2	Governmental approach	31			
	3.4	Us	e, Re-use, Adaptive Re-use	33			
	3.	4.1	Provided definitions	33			
	3.	4.2	Positioning adaptive reuse	34			
	3.	4.3	Use and reuse	34			
	3.	4.4	Heritage significance: use and character	35			
	3.	4.5	Politics of reuse	35			
	3.	4.6	Procedures and regulation	36			
	3.5	Pai	rticipatory governance	37			
	3.	5.1	Participation and community engagement	37			
	3.	5.2	Other-than-public actors	38			
	3.6	Inf	luence of EU programmes	38			
	3.7		ritage as a resource				
	3.	7.1	Funding and financing	39			
	3.	7.2	Specific examples of funding mechanisms:	41			
4	Сс	ountr	y overviews				

0 Executive summary

This report presents the interim findings of Work Package 1 for the OpenHeritage project, funded under the EU's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement 776766). OpenHeritage aims to identify and analyse the practices of, and policies for, adaptive heritage re-use in Europe. Drawing on the observations and results of these analyses, we aim to develop inclusive governance and management models for marginalized, non-touristic heritage sites and test them in selected "Cooperative Heritage Labs". In order to develop an understanding of the different policy, regulatory and financial contexts of adaptive heritage re-use, in this work package (WP1) we investigated policies, regulations and funding initiatives related to heritage in fifteen countries across Europe.

The fifteen countries were selected upon the basis of hosting either a Cooperative Heritage Lab or an Observatory Case: Austria; England (UK); Flanders (Belgium); France; Germany; Hungary; Italy; Netherlands; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Slovakia; Spain; Sweden, and; Ukraine. All are in Europe and most are in the EU, with the exception of the Ukraine and the UK. Policy analysis was undertaken at the level of the nation-state, or country level (England and Flanders). Data was gathered through systematic documentary analysis supplemented by expert interviews. As such this report stands as a significant contribution to understanding the context in which adaptive heritage reuse occurs in Europe. Furthermore, the report contextualises the Observatory Cases and the Cooperative Heritage Labs.

The report is organised into four sections. After an introductory section, section 2 looks at how adaptive use might be understood at a European scale. In recent years we have seen an increasing EU influence on cultural heritage policy and adaptive reuse through its data gathering activities (e.g. Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe), promotion and celebration of cultural heritage initiatives at local, national and regional levels (e.g. the European Heritage Label), and, critically, new funding and spending programmes. Cultural heritage is increasingly understood as a mechanism for addressing European goals of cohesion and European integration and 'unity in diversity'.¹ In terms of furthering an agenda for cultural heritage generally and adaptive heritage reuse specifically, the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage was extremely significant and has led to a range of subsequent actions, including the European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage and the Cultural Heritage in Action project. Furthermore, heritage and adaptive reuse are increasingly prominent in the EU's funding programmes relating to research, innovation and knowledge exchange (e.g. <u>OpenHeritage</u>; <u>Clic</u>; <u>Rock</u>; <u>Ruritage</u>). Opportunities are arising directly within the sphere of cultural heritage and adaptive heritage reuse but also through the mainstreaming of the relevance of adaptive heritage reuse into broader cultural and urban programmes.

Section 3 undertakes a provisional thematic analysis, engaging with the country-level data. Section 4 includes an overview of the country data for each of the fifteen countries. Section 3 shows that whilst many forms of regulation and policy can be impactful when it comes to adaptive heritage reuse, generally it is law and policy

^{1 &}quot;United in diversity", the motto of the European Union, first came into use in 2000. https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/motto_en

H2020 PROJECT Grant Agreement No 776766

relating to cultural heritage and urban planning that are most significant. However, approaches to adaptive heritage reuse are conditioned by more than just those frameworks. We therefore analysed the local, regional, and national governance context of policies, practises, priorities, and actors in planning, heritage, building regulations, and resourcing and financial tools, and also included wider influences such as policy on participation, culture, and sustainability. Adaptive reuse is only considered an explicitly in policy terms in a small number of countries and it is even more rare that national or local governments play a direct role in leading innovation in this area. Where adaptive heritage reuse is relatively easy, authorities tend to have a facilitating role. Our findings show, that governance is a major theme in conditioning the ease or difficulty with which adaptive heritage reuse can be effected. Reuse usually requires interaction with at least heritage and planning regulatory regimes, making project development complex. This tends to be easier where decision-making for heritage and planning is integrated, and/or happens at the same spatial scale (government level) or, better still, made within the same authority. In addition, the level of discretion provided to those dealing with adaptive reuse cases to engage with the specific demands and tailor-made solutions often needed in cases of adaptive heritage reuse is influential. Unsurprisingly, also how well-resourced policies and institutional systems are, makes a difference.

We also saw changes to the approaches to adaptive heritage reuse after / due to more general, global and structural moments. For example, we saw approaches change due to the ending of Soviet-backed socialist regimes, EU integration and the financial crisis of 2007/8. The latter for example directly and indirectly stimulated a more liberal approach to adaptive heritage reuse in some countries. Adaptive heritage reuse became central in some of the key 'recovery' policy agendas e.g. urban regeneration, tourism development, the creative industries, environmental quality and 'localism'. The direct impact of the EU is greatest in recent accession countries where spending programmes on e.g. regional development or tourism can exert considerable influence. We expect the COVID-19 pandemic to influence the context of adaptive reuse too.

Introduction to the research

1 Introduction

The adaptive reuse of buildings and places that have lost their former use is a practice as old as buildings and places themselves. The term 'adaptive re-use' appears in the early 1970s, at a time when large-scale urban reconstruction was gaining political traction across Europe and beyond; in this context, recycling (heritage) buildings and putting them to new use became a distinctive practice to study and analyse. The study can be traced to (1) evolving ideas of heritage protection, potentially closing off the option to demolish and redevelop (Ashworth, 2011); (2) evolving architectural praxis (Scarpa and others) that sought to define new dialogues between old and new fabric; and (3) evolving ideas of urbanism, informed by e.g. Jane Jacobs, placing an emphasis on the utility of old, adaptable buildings and informal building practices (Jacobs, 1961). In this context, heritage became increasingly used by cities to develop their identity, claim to uniqueness, and attractiveness, and as such heritage and its (adaptive) reuse became important for local investment and economic growth(Provoost, 1995; Sassen, 2011). There are many ways of undertaking reuse, ranging from facadism (removing most of the historic fabric), to very sensitive interventions in the historic fabric, to eclectically mixing layers of history. Approaches can involve creating an analogy or contrast with the material from the past; (re)creating space by restoring a building back to one specific period in time; removing (usually newer) fabric; or inserting or attaching new (contrasting) elements through to simple 'light' reuse. Adaptive reuse is often considered a practice and research tends to be case studies. Recent work, mostly within architecture, does take social and cultural considerations into account yet ultimately are design-oriented (Plevoets and Cleempoel, 2019; Stone, 2019; Swensen and Berg, 2017; Wong, 2016). To contextualise and add to that work, we focus explicitly on the regulatory context in which adaptive heritage reuse takes place. We also position our work in the growing interest in the instrumental nature of heritage (Veldpaus and Pendlebury, 2019). In a context of austerity, where the state doesn't (any longer) prioritise large investments in heritage as a cultural good, adaptive reuse has emerged as a policy aim, and heritage investment tool. It is seen as a way to create financially more viable and environmentally sustainable ways to achieve regeneration and conservation, as we will show in this report. A second report (Mérai et al., 2020) develops a typology of reuse approaches, building on the findings of the work resented here.

1.1 Objectives and Scope

OpenHeritage is an EU-funded research and innovation project which aims to identify and test the best practices of adaptive heritage re-use in Europe and develop inclusive governance and management models.

In order to develop a more precise understanding of the policy contexts in which heritage can be re-used, this particular report provides an overview of the relevant legal frameworks, policies, and funding mechanisms in fifteen countries across Europe. This report is "*Deliverable 1.2: Complex policy overview of adaptive heritage re-use"*, and as such, it synthesizes inputs from Task 1.1. (Institutional and regulatory context of adaptive heritage reuse); Task 1.2 (Funding mechanisms and economic models); and Task 1.3 (Territorial development and architectural regulations).

The aim of the research presented here is to develop an overview and understanding of the current policies and legal frameworks regulating and influencing adaptive re-

use practices, including the financial and funding mechanisms. As such this report stands as a significant contribution to understanding the contextual conditions in which adaptive heritage reuse occurs, focussing on the 15 European countries as well as the EU level.

As such the Research Objective is: to develop a contextual and thematic understanding of the workings of the legal frameworks, policies, and funding mechanisms through and under which heritage assets can be re-used.

The **Research Questions** guiding the work were:

- 1) At EU level:
 - a) How are various EU programmes, policies, and funding mechanisms supporting, or intending to support, adaptive heritage reuse?
- 2) At country level:
 - a) What are the main legal, policy, regulatory, and financial frameworks around adaptive heritage reuse, at a local, regional and national level, and how do they influence adaptive heritage reuse processes?
 - b) Who are the main actors and funders in adaptive heritage reuse?
 - c) What are the barriers and openings created in the national systems?
- 3) What are the patterns and themes that appear across countries, creating an understanding of similarities and differences between systems and approaches?

1.2 Approach - methods and operational approach

Data collection

At EU level: The main aim was to understand the trends and relevance of adaptive heritage reuse in relation to current and upcoming EU programmes and funding structures. The data were collected thematically by the Task Leads (SARP, ROMA3, UNEW). This was done mainly through desk research, and interviews with two EU officials (Becquart, 2019; Hofman, 2019). The data was combined through a policy review, providing an overview of the various EU programmes, policies, and funding mechanisms supporting adaptive heritage reuse. Some of the data also came from the country level analysis (RQ2) which formed a basis for understanding the workings (or potential) of various policy and funding programmes.

At country level: The data for the countries considered in this report was gathered using a template: Country Datasheets. These were first developed in the period after the first consortium meeting in Budapest (June 2018) and provided to all the partners for pilot studies and comments. Based on this, the structure of the datasheet was further discussed and evolved in the OpenHeritage project meeting in November 2018 (Barcelona) in collaboration with those working on other WPs (specifically WP2 and WP3). In their reviewed form, they were then used for the collection of data in each country. Data was collected between January and August 2019.

The final datasheets had four sections:

- SECTION I: Policy Overview and Definitions as they are used in the countries legal framework / policies;
- SECTION II: Schematic Overview of main actors in adaptive reuse;
- SECTION III: Interview report;
- SECTION IV: Bibliography and Country specific literature.

The sections will briefly be introduced further below.

The objectives of the Datasheets were to, per country:

- Develop a good understanding of the national frameworks OpenHeritage operates in;
- Identify bottlenecks and barriers, as well as supportive measures and good practice;
- Gain an overview of all countries, create a resource that helps those interested to gain a better understanding of other contexts
- Contextualise the specificities and learnings from OCs and CHLs

After an inventory on language skills and access to experts through networks, each of the partners in WP 1 was assigned the task of completing the template for one or various countries and languages. This included collating laws, policies, and financial data in planning, heritage, building regulations, financial mechanisms, and where deemed relevant in related fields of sustainability, civic engagement, and arts and cultures.

In collecting the data, we emphasised the importance of being inclusive and broad when it comes to heritage. Therefore, we gave the explicit instruction that heritage should be considered in the *broad sense*, beyond listed buildings and formalised heritage. Where possible, we asked researchers/authors to make a distinction between policy, regulation, and funding for formalised forms of heritage (e.g. listed buildings) and broader interpretations (e.g. historic environment, cultural-historic areas). We defined adaptive reuse as referring to any reuse/repurposing of any building (heritage - but in the broad sense) for which there have to be changes to the characteristic (material) aspects of the building.

WP 1 PARTNER						
CEU	HU	RO				
CUH	UA	SK	AT policy	EU financial		
ROMA3	IT	ES	PT	EU policy		
SARP	SARP PL F		AT financial			
UBER	DE	SE				
UGENT	FL (BE)					
UNEW	NL	EN (UK)	EU policy			

Table 1: country templates, work division

Datasheet sections:

Section 1 of the Country Datasheet first asks for an overview of definitions used, e.g. heritage, conservation, and adaptive reuse, in order to understand how this terminology is more specifically defined in each country. This is followed by a detailed overview of national, regional, and local-level laws, policies and procedures with regards to:

- Planning: How adaptive reuse is influenced, steered, or legally affected by • planning, land-use (including things such as (land) ownership, common law). This includes territorial integration (or the lack thereof) and the integration between levels of governance.
- Heritage: How heritage is defined in policy formally and informally: e.g. listed, • not-listed or not-yet-listed, as well as different conceptualisations of heritage

(that may have different legal implications, (e.g. archaeology, buildings, landscapes, tangible / intangible).

- Building regulations: Main building codes and regulation, architectural as well as technical, e.g. seismic design; fire safety; physical accessibility; health and safety; modern (sustainability) technologies (e.g. insulation, acoustics, heating, PV panels).
- Finances / Market : Funding and financing mechanisms and trends (e.g. centralisation /decentralisation, austerity, circular economy, types of partnerships & partners), the description of mechanisms and legislation regarding the mechanisms (eg. possibility of PPP, grass-root initiatives)
- Incentives / Barriers: that stimulate or impede the market. Which tools are used, e.g. taxes, incentives, is there a focus on some issues over others?
- Additional topics where suggested, and completed when deemed relevant:
 - Socio-economic development and public policies
 - Participation, community led initiatives, civic organisation(s), localism
 - Culture, Arts /Crafts
 - Environmental / Ecology / Sustainability

The aim of the datasheet is to undertake a policy review, by collecting data that describes different formal structures per country. The approach was that someone not familiar with the planning / heritage / funding structures in the country being described should be able to understand the information provided in the datasheet.

Section 2 of the Country Datasheet provides a schematic (graphic) overview of the main governance bodies, with a focus on planning and heritage departments and agencies, but including others involved in adaptive reuse of the historic environment where relevant. This scheme aims to show the relation between different involved actors, for better understanding of data presented in section 1. For example: is the heritage authority a regionally or locally devolved national office, is heritage managed through the municipality, or a combination of those?

Section 3 of the Country Datasheet asked for interview reports based on a number of interviews (in the local language) with policy officers and practitioners, using a list of provided questions (semi-structured interview). Through these interviews, and sometimes also presentations, conferences and discussions with expert informants we obtained specific information regarding:

- Policy practices, how are things done, what is the policy focus, how do policies work (or not) in practice
- How all the different bits of the data gathered in section 1 and 2 interact,
- Where /how things happen despite policy /regulation,
- Where innovation lies
- What are considered good practices, bottlenecks, or challenging issues.

These interviews were aimed at increasing the understanding of the policy context and practices, as well as filling gaps where data or policy wasn't readily available otherwise.

Data Analysis:

Based on the data sheets (up to 50 pages of data) country overviews (4000-5000 words) for each of the countries were developed, following a pre-defined structure. This was done with the help of the partners who completed the country datasheet,

and we sought internal and external review. The data was summarised and analysed, and these country overviews can be found at the end of this report.

These country overviews were then analysed in relation to each other to address the third research question: What are the patterns and themes that appear across countries, creating an understanding of similarities and differences between systems and approaches? We looked at general understandings of important definitions, e.g. heritage, conservation planning, adaptive reuse, asking how they are defined, how distinct or common are definitions, are there patterns or similarities across countries? We also developed a thematic analysis, to reveal the issues and influences that come up across countries, such as (lack of) discretion, (limited) integration of heritage and planning policies, funding priorities (e.g. regional development, tourism)a and how they support or hinder adaptive heritage reuse. We also highlighted some exceptional and emerging practices.



2 Setting the scene to adaptive reuse: an overview of the European context

Adaptive heritage reuse policy is present within EU heritage and culture policy and, more recently, in the EU's urban and regional development agendas. This overview addresses these different contexts, starting with the main field: heritage.

The EU coordinates, supports, and supplements policies and measures around culture, without having legislative powers; culture and heritage are seen as national matters. Whilst the idea of a shared culture (and heritage) as part of European identity has been around since the 1970s, the EU's (limited) competence in the field of heritage was only established in the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992.² Ever since, the EU's interest in its own past and more generally constructing a European past has been growing, as manifested in its policy discourse (Lähdesmäki, 2014, 2019), as well as funding allocations. Funding projects like OpenHeritage is part of this. The ways the EU constructs its past relates of course to how it defines its policies and plans for the future. It links notions of culture, heritage and European identity not in the least to support cohesion and European integration. The new programme on culture and creative activities and enterprises, for example falls directly under the 'Cohesion and Values' heading of the EUs 2021-2027 financial framework (Pasikowska-Schnass, 2019). The EU's motto since 2000 is "United in Diversity". Cultural heritage is seen as one of ways this finds tangible expression. As such, heritage explicitly informs how future challenges are tackled, addressing European cohesion, convergence, diversity and creativity across all areas of the economy, society, culture and governance.

Even without legislative powers, the EU has been rather successful in mainstreaming heritage, through shifting perceptions regarding the societal and economic value of heritage and its role in sustainable development. This has turned heritage into an enabling force that stimulates change, which can bring life to places that suffer from economic and physical decline. One of the main challenges for heritage has been the slow shift from it being a 'cultural good' led by state investment to a 'commercial good' with its financially independent models of private (and civic) investment. This is one of the drivers for a stronger focus on adaptive reuse, as it is seen as a potentially financially viable solution to conservation. Another challenge is that the heritage sector is relatively reactive and struggles with performance management, monitoring and overall data collection in comparison to other areas of the economy. The 2015 "Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe" report (Europa Nostra, 2015), opened a door for improvement by providing data to support the mainstreaming of heritage and more EU investment. The report for example makes visible that over 300,000 people work in the EU cultural heritage sector, and a further 7.8 million jobs are indirectly linked to heritage. The European Commission's Eurobarometer (2017) in addition reported that 68% of Europeans consider the presence of cultural heritage when choosing holiday destinations. These statistics reveal how important heritage is to the wider economy, which is leading to more substantial commitments by the EU, in terms of e.g. funding and programmes.

^{2 &}quot;Action by the Community shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action in the following areas:- improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples;- conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance;"

Within this wider context of mainstreaming and integrating heritage into wider policy and funding frameworks, the EU is starting to explicitly promote adaptive reuse of heritage as a practice. Adaptive reuse presents itself as crosscutting concept, embedded in the document and projects hereafter discussed.

2.1 Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 – a shift in heritage, culture, and building

Adaptive heritage reuse is well represented in the EU's current 'future' plans developed for the next budget period. This is a culmination of various initiatives by a wide range of actors over the past two decades. However, a clear shift can be seen in the context of the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 (EYCH). 2018 was designated as the European Year of Cultural Heritage by the European Commission, and it presented the opportunity for the heritage (and related) sectors to both evaluate and look ahead. The results of the year include new agendas on culture and heritage in Europe, as well as the more concrete inclusion of heritage in the EU's Urban Agenda (discussed below). The aim of the EYCH was to promote and mainstream more people-centred, inclusive, and sustainable approaches to heritage through integrating heritage in a wide range of projects and EU funding programs.

The legacy of the European Year of Cultural heritage 2018, as found in various agendas and intertwined with European programmes and projects, is very supportive of adaptive reuse practices. Perhaps the most directly supportive outcome of the 2018 EYCH related to adaptive reuse, is the Leeuwarden Declaration (Architects' Council of Europe, 2018), specifically focused on adaptive-reuse; Adaptive re-use of the built heritage: preserving and enhancing. The values of our built heritage for future generations. The main recommendations of the Leeuwarden Declaration regard the development of a smart and quality-based process for adaptive reuse. It promotes "processes that favour and ensure flexibility, participatory approaches, innovation, quality-based procurement, multidisciplinary teams, financial viability and good storytelling can contribute to successful projects in the long term." For this, it recommends flexibility with respect to regulatory frameworks and standards; Participation of citizens; Temporary uses of unoccupied spaces; Active responsibility of the competent public authorities; Quality-based procurement; Multidisciplinary teams & collaborative approaches; Financial viability, making preservation of heritage values is compatible with the economic; and finally good story-telling. This is followed by specific recommendations in relation to developing a reflexive dialogue between past, present and future; a multi-scale and territorial approach; and developing case-by-case as well as knowledge-based approaches.

Moreover, the EU is developing the *European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage*, which aims to "*capture the momentum created during the European Year of Cultural Heritage, through a continued series of short to medium-term actions*". The aim of the Framework is "*to set a common direction for heritage-related activities at European level, primarily in EU policies and programmes*." This is complemented by a work plan adopted by the Council of the European Union "Conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022" setting priorities and defining concrete actions to address cultural policy. It sets out five priorities for European cooperation in cultural policymaking: Sustainability in cultural heritage; Cohesion and well-being; An ecosystem supporting artists, cultural and creative professionals and European content; Gender equality; and International cultural relations (see more below).

The European Framework for Action received input from multiple important international heritage and culture networks and stakeholders. There is a clear interest in and commitment by them towards adaptive reuse, as can be see in their recent statements. <u>Europa Nostra's Berlin Call</u> to Action stated "*We must ensure and enable adequate investments, public and private, into quality heritage-led regeneration of our neighbourhoods, cities and countryside based on creativity, innovation and adaptive re-use*". The Council of Europe (CoE) developed a European Heritage Strategy for the 21st century, which shows they are invested in adaptive reuse. Reuse of heritage is recommended (with the use of traditional knowledge and practice) as a way to ensure that "*heritage is taken into account in sustainable spatial development strategies and programmes*" (challenge D5). Finally, *Culture Action Europe* in their Fast Forward Heritage manifesto have recommended a "*regenerative approach to cultural heritage based on an active engagement with present cultural production and contemporary society*".

2.2 The European Union's current and future programmes on Culture, Heritage, and Urban relevant to adaptive reuse

Based on the Leeuwarden Declaration, wider learnings from EYCH, and the promotion of adaptive reuse through a wide range of heritage and culture stakeholders, adaptive reuse has found its way into the *European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage*. The framework is based on five pillars:

- Cultural heritage for an inclusive Europe: participation and access for all;
- Cultural heritage for a sustainable Europe: smart solutions for a cohesive and sustainable future;
- Cultural heritage for a resilient Europe: safeguarding endangered heritage;
- Cultural heritage for an innovative Europe: mobilising knowledge and research;
- Cultural heritage for stronger global partnerships: reinforcing international cooperation.

Each of the pillars corresponds to a limited number of clusters of actions. Adaptive reuse is a crucial factor among the cluster action identified within the second pillar, *Cultural Heritage for a Sustainable Europe*, which includes: a) regenerating cities and regions through cultural heritage; b) promoting adaptive re-use of heritage buildings; and c) balancing access to cultural heritage with sustainable cultural tourism and natural heritage.

Focus upon adaptive reuse extends beyond the heritage sector. The EUs most recent Cultural Programme 'Creative Europe' includes it as a topic, with actions set out in the Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022. One of the proposals is to pay more attention to architectural quality and cultural heritage, and promoting the idea of 'Baukultur' (Swiss Confederation and European Ministers of Culture, 2018) through mobility of the sector's operators, capacity-building, conservation and awareness raising of the potential of cultural heritage. There is also a recommendation by the European Alliance for Culture and the Arts to include support for culture, arts and heritage (more explicitly) in many other EU funding programmes (European Alliance for Culture and the Arts, 2018). As part of mainstreaming culture in the other policies sectors, they recommend culture, arts and heritage to be horizontally included in and financially supported within a wide variety of EU programmes.³

EU programmes have significant potential for the stimulation of adaptive reuse of heritage, for example, through focusing on heritage reuse in teaching and research, or emphasising the relevance of culture, heritage, and adaptive reuse in urban regeneration. If the presence of cultural activities is a major factor for the attractiveness of urban and rural regions, then we probably also need to think about the physical (and connected virtual) spaces these activities take place in, and who benefits from them. Investing sensitively in the reuse of buildings can be a way of supporting currently marginalised communities in a way that is meaningful for them. This is just one way in which to use culture and heritage to foster social empowerment, civic engagement and participation, and the wider acceptance of pluralism and diversity. Furthermore, adaptive reuse could easily form a bigger part of climate and sustainability programmes (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle).

2.2.1 New European Agenda for Culture & work plan

The Council conclusions on the <u>Work Plan for Culture</u> 2019-2022 (Council of the European Union, 2018 C 460/10) builds on the <u>New European Agenda for Culture</u> (adopted by the European Commission in May 2018). The three strategic objectives of the New Agenda for Culture is 1) harnessing the power of culture and cultural diversity for social cohesion and well-being by promoting cultural participation, the mobility of artists and the protection of heritage; 2) boosting jobs and growth in the cultural and creative sectors by fostering arts and culture in education, promoting the relevant skills, and encouraging innovation in culture; and 3) strengthening international cultural relations by making the most of the potential of culture to foster sustainable development and peace.

In the 2019-22 Work Plan for Culture, (adopted 27 November 2018) this is translated into five priorities for European cooperation in cultural policy-making. One of them is the *sustainability of cultural heritage*. Within this plan there are various upcoming actions relevant to adaptive reuse of heritage First, there will be support for a <u>peerlearning scheme</u> for cities and regions on three topics related to cultural heritage policies: participatory governance of cultural heritage, adaptive reuse of built heritage and quality of interventions on cultural heritage. The aim is to look at best practices of (1) long-term cultural investment plans established prior to investing in cultural heritage restoration, (2) sustainable cultural tourism, and (3) adaptive re-use of built heritage. This peer learning between EU experts and officials at national and regional levels will operate through meetings and site visits.

The Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022 plans for sustainability of cultural heritage to also be pursued by the following actions (Council of the European Union, 2018):

• Experts will identify and exchange good practices and innovative measures in relation to climate change and the historical environment. Specific focus should be given to the energy efficiency of historical buildings, the design and

³ For example, they suggest it should be (better) integrated across Horizon Europe, Single Market Programme, European Regional Development and Cohesion Fund, European Social Fund+, Erasmus+, Rights, Justice and Values Fund, European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development, LIFE – Programme for the Environment and Climate Action, Asylum and Migration Fund, Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument, and InvestEU Fund.

transformation of the cultural landscape, and the safety of heritage under extreme climate circumstances.

- Awareness-raising and capacity-building of national heritage experts on sustainability of cultural heritage.
- Developing quality principles for cultural heritage interventions: guidelines governing the next generation of EU funds will be developed, ensuring quality principles for conservation and safeguarding in heritage.
- Alternative funding for cultural heritage: due to the strong pressure on public budgets devoted to cultural heritage, alternative sources of funding are being developed, from public/private partnerships, to the involvement of lotteries and tax credit for donations. The role of foundations will also be examined in this context. The aim is to identify new sources of funding for cultural heritage and transferable best practices in order to promote its economic sustainability.

In Creative Europe, Cultural Heritage (Directorate General for Education and Culture, 2019) a programme is developed in the context of follow-up to the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage. The European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage is supported through various actions, such as European Heritage Days, and the European Heritage Label. The idea of rewarding quality is also pursued through various prizes in Architecture (e.g. EUMies, European Union prize for contemporary architecture – Mies van der Rohe award) and Heritage (European Heritage Awards/Europa Nostra Awards). Whilst the EUMies award is not and `adaptive reuse award' there is a trend towards receiving and awarding adaptive reuse projects in recent years; the EC is currently considering the possibility of creating a specific prize to reward the best adaptive reuse projects of heritage buildings/sites (Becquart, 2019).

Responding to the increased focus on adaptive reuse, ICOMOS (2019) published the European quality principles for EU-funded interventions with potential impact upon cultural heritage. The objective of this study is "to provide guidance on quality principles for all stakeholders directly or indirectly engaged in EU-funded heritage conservation and management." Adaptive reuse appears amongst the critical determinants of quality regarding cultural heritage design, with new, extended, and temporary uses considered valuable approaches to ensuring the contribution of built heritage to society. The quality principles emphasise that new uses should be compatible not only with heritage concerns, but also respond to community and sustainability needs.

2.2.2 Adaptive reuse in the wider urban and building sector

There is also a clear uptake of heritage in the urban context, as evident from the 2016 Urban Agenda for the EU 'Pact of Amsterdam' which since 2019 has an additional Culture / Cultural Heritage focus (EU, 2019). The key challenges, problems and opportunities areas determined (2019) are almost all directly relevant to adaptive reuse. They include: tourism, creative and cultural industries, transformation, adaptive reuse and urban reconversion, financial sustainability, resilience of cultural and natural heritage, and integrated/interdisciplinary approaches for governance, funding and knowledge sharing in a cultural heritage based urban development.

Adaptive reuse is also relevant in the context of the EUs Cohesion Policy (EU, 2020) which aims to help overcome regional inequalities (support the 'overall harmonious development') in terms of the economy, overall wealth and development opportunities. The Cohesion Fund (CF) has been focused on supporting environmental

H2020 PROJECT Grant Agreement No 776766

measures, transport networks, smart energy management and renewable energy use in the housing sector. Whilst there is nothing stopping member states from using this money for adaptive reuse in these sectors, it is also not explicitly stimulated. Cohesion policy is also funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Cohesion Fund (CF). The ERDF's thematic objective of "*Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency*" has can be used for project that protect, promote and develop cultural heritage. The ERDF particularly encourages creativity and innovation, so adaptive reuse projects could be accommodated. Projects can benefit from direct support or technical assistance for preparation of project proposals and feasibility studies, as well as receive advice on use of financial instruments. <u>URBACT</u> and <u>INTERREG</u> Europe are part of <u>ERDF</u> 2014-2020, offering opportunities to regional and local governments to develop and deliver better policies for adaptive re-use. From a quick review of projects, it seems the uptake for (heritage) projects that use this for adaptive reuse support could be increased.

Regional development investments are also starting to be directed towards heritage, for example through Urban Innovative Actions (UIA). This is an Initiative of the European Union that provides urban areas with resources to test new and unproven solutions to address urban challenges, as part of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). The most recent call has heritage as one of its call topics. Future ERDF and cohesion funds have been set out to focus on a Smarter Europe, a Greener, carbon free Europe, a more Connected Europe, a more Social Europe, a Europe closer to citizens. There are no particular commitments to adaptive reuse at this level, but there is potential for that e.g. in the next 'Interreg' programme (2021-2027).

Heritage (and potentially its adaptive reuse) is supported in rural contexts by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development through its <u>LEADER</u> programme, which offers support for the promotion, enhancement and maintenance of cultural heritage assets and events. LEADER-supported projects should be particularly focused on protection against damage and degradation, as the programme covers costs of construction and/or restoration of buildings and other physical assets, including general costs (e.g. architectural and engineering fees). Moreover, the programme supports projects that enhance, restore and upgrade the cultural and natural heritage of villages and rural landscapes, making LEADER an attractive vehicle for adaptive reuse, especially in regions that support rural tourism and agribusiness.

There are also specific grants, for example through the <u>EEA and Norway Grants</u>, funded by Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. These calls have two goals: to contribute to a more equal Europe and strengthen the relations between the 3 funding countries and 15 beneficiary countries.⁴ Current funding calls focus on topics such as restoration and revitalization of cultural heritage (CLT01).

The relevance of culture and heritage in relation to economic development is clear from the Davos Declaration (Swiss Confederation and European Ministers of Culture, 2018) "The adaptive re-use of our built heritage presents itself as a necessary strategy to meet the challenges expressed in the Davos Declaration and achieve highquality Baukultur in Europe. It is seen as "a new, adaptive approach to shaping our built environment (...) that is rooted in culture, builds social cohesion, ensures

⁴ Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia

H2020 PROJECT Grant Agreement No 776766

environmental sustainability, and contributes to the health and well-being of all". This is well aligned with the Leeuwarden Declaration (2018) as it strongly recommends developing new and adaptive approaches to shaping the built environment, and working with existing structures, focusing on developing culture, building social cohesion, ensuring environmental sustainability, and contributing to health and wellbeing. Baukultur in the Davos Declaration (2018) "embraces every human activity that changes the built environment. [...] Baukultur encompasses existing buildings, including monuments and other elements of cultural heritage, as well as the design and construction of contemporary buildings, infrastructure, public spaces and landscapes." And it recommends a human-centred approach to the way the environment is shaped. There are three elements which express a direct connection between the approach proposed in the Davos declaration and adaptive reuse: 1) time factors: high-quality Baukultur includes the "quality of the processes of creation and design and the capabilities and competencies of all those involved in the construction"; 2) new needs: by stressing the *social function* of the built environment, the central importance of "layout and design that is attuned to the users' specific needs" emerges, establishing a direct link with issues relate to environmental psychology; 3) a comprehensive vision: putting the care and preservation of cultural heritage and more contemporary ways of shaping the environment on the same level.

The Architects' Council of Europe who organised the conference where the Leeuwarden Declaration was adopted, also recognises the key role of adaptive reuse among architectural solutions aimed at promoting circularity (Architects' Council of Europe, 2019). In the value-oriented hierarchy of actions conveyed in the document, renovation and adaptive-reuse are principal elements of a so-called "cultural approach", i.e. an approach based on maintenance and re-use as the best strategy for both preserving and improving the built environment and avoiding waste generation.

2.2.3 Adaptive reuse in the European Research context

The upcoming EU framework programme for research, Horizon Europe, has "climateneutral and smart cities" as one of its five mission areas. Within that, there will be a cluster (Cluster 2) on Culture, creativity and inclusive society which has relevance for adaptive reuse, as it will focus on, amongst other things, the "*safeguarding our cultural heritage, exploring the potential of cultural and creative sectors, and promoting socio-economic transformations that contribute to inclusion and growth, including migration management and integration of migrants*" (European Parliament, 2019; IETM - International network for contemporary performing arts, n.d.).

This is the first time that cultural and creative sectors are this extensively integrated in an EU programme for research. The cluster on culture, creativity and inclusive society is explicitly aimed at cohesion and integration, meaning the research in this context likely focuses on mobilising culture and heritage for these goals. Cultural Heritage is one of the three Key Research and Innovation orientations within the "Culture, Creativity and Inclusive Society" cluster, with the aims of1) achieving better, wider and more equal access, understanding of and engagement with cultural heritage; 2) supporting the emergence of a sense of belonging based on the common roots and riches of the diversity of European cultural heritage; 3) Enhancing the governance of European cultural heritage institutions and networks (Horizon Europe, 2019). Central to these aims is the improvement of protection, enhancement and conservation, and establishing more efficient restoration of European cultural heritage, increasing the quality standards for conservation and restoration. The Horizon Europe Culture, Creativity and Inclusive Society" cluster programme is very broad. The reuse of existing heritage assets is explicitly promoted in the section on cultural heritage. There are various other objectives that support, or can be supported by, adaptive reuse, e.g. sustainable and inclusive cultural tourism; job creation; education and (skills) training to make the existing cultural heritage protection practices compatible with societal transformation; develop cutting-edge conservation and restoration technologies and methods and innovative, integrated, sustainable and participative management models, and; connect cultural heritage with the creative and cultural sectors.

Within the current H2020 framework there are also projects funded which already focus on adaptive reuse and heritage-led regeneration e.g. <u>CLIC</u>, <u>ROCK</u>, <u>RURITAGE</u>, and <u>ILUCIDARE</u>. Of course, there are many wider cultural and heritage projects within H2020 such as UNREST; COHERE; REINVENT; TRACES; TAMA; ECHOES, as well as projects in the context of JPI-CH, HERA, and ESPON also have relevance in this context.

Below is an overview of examples of direct and indirect, financial and non-financial support for adaptive reuse:

Funding programme	Strand/action	Description/ relevant funding calls			
	The EU major rese and innovation.	earch programme for the period of 2014-2020 focused on technology	€80 billion		
		SC5-22-2017: Innovative financing, business and governance models for adaptive re-use of cultural heritage – research and innovation actions.			
	Societal Challenges	SMEinst-12-2016-2017: Boosting the potential of small businesses in the areas and priorities of Societal Challenge 5, where proposals for SMEs on cultural heritage for sustainable growth are eligible.	€29.679 million		
Horizon 2020		SMEInst-62-2016-2017-SC6-CULT-COOP: New business models for inclusive, innovative and reflective societies, where proposals for SMEs in creative sectors and cultural heritage are eligible.			
	SC5-20-2019 Transforming historic urban areas and/or cultural landscapes into hubs of entrepreneurship and social and cultural integration				
	Industrial Leadership	NMBP 05-2017 Advanced materials and innovative design for improved functionality and aesthetics in high added value consumer goods.	617.016		
		NMBP 35-2017: Innovative solutions for the conservation of 20th century cultural heritage.	€17.016 million		
		NMP-21-2014 Materials-based solutions for the protection or preservation of European cultural heritage.			
	Projects to follow	Projects focused on stimulation of economic activity and social integration in historic sites: ROCK project, CLIC project, RURITAGE project, OpenHeritage project, HERACLES	€25 million		
Creative Europe		Strong focus on transnational mobility, audience development, capacity building, partnership working. Encourages seeking innovative ways to re-use of cultural heritage for contemporary requirements and digitisation.	€1.46 billion		

	Peer-Learning Scheme on Cultural Heritage for Cities and Regions can be used for seeking good practices in adaptive re-use.	
Erasmus+	Focus on boosting skills and employability (especially youth), modernising education and capacity building, innovation and good practices.	€14.7 billion
The Cultural and Creative Sectors Guarantee Facility (CCS GF) is managed by ESIF	Established by the European Commission and managed by the European Investment Fund to enable SMEs in the CCS to access loans that normally would not be available for them due to their type of business activity or lack of tangible assets. Expected to create more than €600 million of new loans and other financial products. Provides training for financial intermediaries to adopt specific credit assessment approach.	€121 million
Europeana	An online resource that may be relevant in researching information for conservation statements that inform a scope of adaptive re-use projects. Set up in 2008, contains 54 million items (images, texts, sounds, videos from over 3700 archives, libraries and museum collections across Europe.	Requires €8 million/year to operate
Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME)	Task force on "Circular Business and Financial Models for Cultural Heritage Adaptive Reuse" established by EASME, DG Research & Innovation in close cooperation with the CLIC partnership provides expertise and advice on linking financing and business models for the re-use of built heritage in cities to circular economy models.	NA
URBACT III	As a know-how programme, URBACT supports networks of cities to develop pragmatic, sustainable and integrated solutions through promotion of best practices, capacity building and peer learning.	€96.3 million

2.3 Concluding remarks

The potential for heritage to assist the achievement of other policy goals has been an increasing focus for policymakers in recent decades. Initially this has stemmed from heritage communities seeking to demonstrate the importance of the historic environment, beyond a sense of intrinsic cultural worth. However, an understanding of this potential now extends more widely across a wide range of policy-makers dealing with place, including, for example key priorities focused on climate change, and the importance of collective identities. Adaptive heritage reuse lies at the intersection of such considerations, occupying a position where the past and the future are mediated; heritage is sustained but given new purpose as part of ongoing social, economic, environmental and cultural transformation. The recognition of the potential of heritage in this way has, as a result, been increasingly recognised in policy and programmes at the European level, as detailed above, and both promoted by the EU and other relevant Europe-level organisations.

In upcoming EU programmes and budgets, adaptive reuse has been more actively put on the agenda than previously, as part of various agendas. There are increasingly diverse pathways being explored and created to integrate and mainstream heritage, at least partly through promoting adaptive reuse. Not only will adaptive reuse continue to grow within the heritage and cultural agendas, but we anticipate it will

also be further integrated in other agendas such as economic (growth) and regional development agendas, the quality of the built environment and architecture, as well as the 'green' agendas around material sustainability, recycling, and waste reduction in the near future.

2.4 References

Architects' Council of Europe (2018) 'Leeuwarden Declaration: preserving and enhancing the values of our built heritage for future generations'.

Architects' Council of Europe (2019) 'Statement of the Architects' Council of Europe (ACE) Designing for a Circular Economy World Circular Economy Forum, 4--5 June 2019, Helsinki'. Available at: https://www.acecae.eu/uploads/tx_jidocumentsview/ACE_EWCF_Statement_FINAL.pdf.

Ashworth, Gregory (2011) 'Preservation, Conservation and Heritage: Approaches to the Past in the Present through the Built Environment'. Asian Anthropology, 10(1): 1–18.

Becquart, Hughes (2019, December 5) 'Policy Officer Creative Europe Programme (EC) Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture'.

Council of the European Union (2018) 'Council conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022 (2018/C 460/10)'. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2018:460:FULL (accessed 21 July 2020).

Directorate General for Education and Culture (2019, August 23) '2020 annual work programme for the implementation of the Creative Europe Programme C(2019) 6151'.

EU (2019) 'Urban Agenda for the EU'. FUTURIUM - European Commission. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/urban-agenda (accessed 26 May 2020). Text.

EU (2020) 'Glossary: Cohesion policy'. Available at:

https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/what/glossary/c/cohesion-policy (accessed 21 July 2020).

Europa Nostra (2015) Cultural heritage counts for Europe: full report. eds. Giraud-Labalte, Claire, Pugh, Katrina B., Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, Sneška, et al. Krakow: International Culture Centre.

European Alliance for Culture and the Arts (2018, June 18) 'Reaction of the European Alliance for Culture and the Arts to the European Commission's proposal for the EU future budget'. Available at: https://allianceforculture.com/reaction-of-the-european-alliance-for-culture-and-the-arts-to-theeuropean-commissions-proposal-for-the-eu-future-budget/ (accessed 21 July 2020).

European Parliament (2019, March 20) 'European research priorities for 2021-2027 agreed with member states'. Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20190311IPR31038/europeanresearch-priorities-for-2021-2027-agreed-with-member-states (accessed 21 July 2020).

Hofman, Maciej W. (2019, November 14) 'Policy Officer Cultural Policy (EC) Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture'.

Horizon Europe (2019) 'Annex 2 CULTURE, CREATIVITY AND INCLUSIVE SOCIETY'.

ICOMOS (2019) European quality principles for EU-funded interventions with potential impact upon cultural heritage. Paris: ICOMOS International.

IETM - International network for contemporary performing arts (n.d.) 'Horizon Europe 2021-2027: what place for culture? | IETM'. Available at: https://www.ietm.org/en/horizon-europe-2021-2027-what-placefor-culture (accessed 21 July 2020).

Jacobs, Jane (1961) The Death and Life of Great American Cities. Random House.

Lähdesmäki, Tuuli (2014) 'The EU'S Explicit and Implicit Heritage Politics'. European Societies, 16(3): 401– 421.

H2020 PROJECT Grant Agreement No 776766

Lähdesmäki, Tuuli (2019) 'Founding myths of EU Europe and the workings of power in the EU heritage and history initiatives'. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 22(5–6): 781–798.

Mérai, Dóra, Veldpaus, Loes, Kip, Markus, Kulikov, Volodymyr, and Pendlebury, John (2020) *Typology of current adaptive heritage re-use policies* (No. OpenHeritage: Deliverable 1.3). Budapest, Hungary.

Pasikowska-Schnass, Magdalena (2019) Creative Europe programme 2021-2027 (PE 628.229).

Plevoets, Bie, and Cleempoel, Koenraad Van (2019) *Adaptive Reuse of the Built Heritage: Concepts and Cases of an Emerging Discipline*. Routledge.

Provoost, Michelle (1995) 'ReArch. New designs for old buildings'. Available at:

https://www.crimsonweb.org/spip.php?article161 (accessed 19 December 2019).

Sassen, Saskia (2011) 'When Cities Become Strategic'. Architectural Design, 81(3): 124–127.

Stone, Sally (2019) UnDoing Buildings: Adaptive Reuse and Cultural Memory. Routledge.

Swensen, Grete, and Berg, Sveinung K. (2017) 'Use of Redundant Industrial Buildings as Injections into the Cultural Sector in Norway'. *Planning Practice & Research*, 0(0): 1–15.

Swiss Confederation, and European Ministers of Culture (2018) 'Davos Declaration 2018 - Getting the measure of Baukultur - Conference 2019'. Office fédéral de la culture Section Patrimoine culturel et monuments historiques.

Veldpaus, Loes, and Pendlebury, John (2019) 'Heritage as a Vehicle for Development: The Case of Bigg Market, Newcastle upon Tyne'. *Planning Practice & Research*, 0(0): 1–15.

Wong, Liliane (2016) Adaptive Reuse: Extending the Lives of Buildings. Birkhäuser.

Adaptive Heritage Reuse across 15 European countries

3 THEMATIC ANALYSIS

3.1 introduction

For this analysis, we collected data on legal and regulatory frameworks, government policies, and finance and funding mechanisms to give an overview of the formal structures for each of the fifteen countries of the OpenHeritage project. The country overviews are presented in chapter 4 of this report. These overviews create a contextual understanding of the conditions in which heritage can be re-used, including the main actors, the barriers and openings created in the formal structures.

This chapter of the report presents the thematic analysis of the country overviews to address the research question: to reveal the patterns and themes that appear across countries, in order to understand the similarities and differences between systems and approaches. This is a review and overview picking up on recurring themes, across the various national systems, but by no means are all themes present in each country. The aim is to reveal significant themes as well as the different ways a theme relates to adaptive reuse. For example, when *ownership* emerges as a theme, then the goal is to try and understand if and how different types of ownership (e.g. public or private) have an effect on adaptive reuse.

3.2 Adaptive Heritage Reuse across Europe

Unsurprisingly, the main domains regulating *adaptive reuse of heritage buildings* are broadly in planning (including design and building regulations) and heritage (mostly built heritage), including the legislations, policies, procedures, programmes, and attendant funding priorities. Other programmes and policies that influence adaptive reuse, include sustainability (e.g. energy-saving) programmes, crisis recovery acts, and participation and tourism policies. The latter are often related to significant events such as joining the EU and the financial crisis, or under the influence of global goals such as the SDGs. The impact of EU funding and policy programmes on tourism for example, become visible in countries joining the EU, and the 2008 crisis brought about recovery acts that stimulate reuse (including reuse of heritage).

The analysis shows that heritage and reuse are not clear-cut terms. Definitions of heritage tend to be broadened beyond legal status by cultural and or planning policies and are also sometimes extended or 'stretched' by the influence of international instruments such as conventions by UNESCO (IHC, HUL) and CoE (Faro, Landscape Convention). Adaptive re-use, despite being a common term in some heritage circles, is not included in policy by most countries analysed here. In some cases, this is simply because adaptive reuse of heritage is not a very common practice, and in others it is such a common practice that it is not mentioned in policy documents.

This means we also need to question what is meant by 'adaptive reuse' in different countries; there are diverse terms, but also divergent practices. Sometimes there is specific terminology (e.g. *herbestemming* in Dutch). However, adaptive heritage reuse is more commonly implicit in other terminology, which can make it complex to unpack. Terms used to encompass adaptive reuse might include heritage restoration or rehabilitation, but equally reuse can be embraced in more contentious terms such as reconstruction, or part-reconstruction, reusing the materials or design rather than the actual building. Equally, adaptive reuse can relate to projects where reuse has

been undertaken with little visible or material intervention. In the context of activism, we can consider temporary reuse as those practices which don't change the building but shows its potential, protests demolition, or provides a glimpse of alternative futures. It is also difficult to be firm about how adaptive reuse as a concept relates to areas or archaeological sites. It can for example be implicit in urban regeneration or recycling terminology, but also in landscape design.

As such, the variance in definitions and terminology has to be kept in mind when reading the country overviews. The overviews are based on desk and literature research, as well as expert interviews. The latter are mostly reflections by practitioners on the relative importance of policies and procedures. They were important because the use of discretion and making exceptions is not uncommon in the field of adaptive reuse. At one extreme, this can mean discretion to enable drastic and negative interventions in heritage buildings. Equally, there is evidence of very interesting practices emerging 'against the odds', in this space of discretion, and thus at least on case level overcoming some of the barriers in a system. Our focus here however is on the formal systems, the legal and regulatory frameworks, government policies, and finance and funding mechanisms. Where possible, we do include the type of practices and projects these formal systems encourage or discourage, without going into detail on specific practices.

Bottlenecks – mentioned by many interviewees – are tied to the complexity, density and contradictions within the planning and heritage systems (e.g. Flanders, France, Germany, Italy). This can refer to issues of overlapping responsibilities and plans or lack of coordination and cooperation (e.g. England, Austria, Portugal, Spain) between different levels of government as well as between heritage and planning authorities. These issues are not specific to adaptive reuse, but are more pronounced in projects that require the collaboration of heritage and planning systems.

In the following section we unpack the themes that run across the different national adaptive reuse contexts further, focusing in particular on the integration of policies, programmes and procedures around (land-use) planning and heritage. Formal heritage protection systems are usually aimed at determining what is deemed 'acceptable' when it comes to changing listed buildings. The heritage policiy and funding programmes steer, widen, or specify what is currently acceptable. Mostly, adaptive heritage reuse decision-making takes place in a wider context of urban plans and policies, where changes of use, buildings, character, or ownership are regulated to varied levels, are also important. As such, the context of planning and urban design policies and procedures is influential. In many countries we see how a lack of overlap between the two domains makes adaptive reuse more difficult.

The chapter also discusses the changing roles and responsibilities of different actors in the processes around adaptive reuse, as well as the influence of EU programmes. This is followed by an overview of understanding heritage as a resource, and the finance and funding mechanisms that influence adaptive reuse.

Table 2: The fifteen OpenHeritage case study countries

AT	Austria	HU	Hungary	RO	Romania
FL	Belgium (Flanders)	IT	Italy	SK	Slovakia
EN	UK (England)	NL	Netherlands	ES	Spain
FR	France	PL	Poland	SE	Sweden
DE	Germany	PT	Portugal	UA	Ukraine

3.2.1 Heritage

This section considers how is heritage is defined in the countries studied. Most countries have a *national* Act, setting out a system of registering and listing heritage assets at a national level. This can also be defined sub-national level such as on the level of Flanders and England, instead of Belgium and the UK. In Germany the definition is constitutionally devolved at a regional level - federal states - with 16 heritage Acts.

In most of the countries, general definitions of heritage are common, e.g. monument, area, garden, landscape, archaeology. In some cases, there are also more specific categories, such as architectural or military heritage (Hungary) and 'work of recent architectural interest' (France). There is often a division between movable, or cultural, and immovable, or built, heritage, as well as between tangible and intangible heritage.

In defining heritage, many countries make mention of statements along the lines of 'bearing witness to' or 'being created by human expression or interaction with its environment'. This indicates that its human legacy is one of the main criteria when defining heritage.

Some examples of definitions of heritage include:

- Reflect the identity and creative power of the society, more specifically the local communities (Hungary).
- Contribution made by Spaniards to universal civilization and its contemporary creative capacity (Spain).
- Inherited from the past, interaction between human and the environment, reflection and expression of continuously evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions, offer a frame of reference to them and to future generation (Netherlands).
- Expressions of human activity (Sweden).
- Bearing value from the past to the present (Ukraine).
- Being a testimony of a bygone era or event, and the value material or immaterial given by ancestors and defining our culture (Poland);
- Created by humans and/or the landscape, all cultural expression of communities which are valued as such within a certain frame of reference and passed on to coming generations (Flanders)
- Created by human beings (including remains and traces of human work and artificially constructed or shaped soil formations) (Austria)

Subsequently, most countries provide further criteria when specifically discussing built or moveable heritage, in the form of the kinds of values that are deemed relevant for heritage designations. Common criteria include:

- . historical;
- aesthetic, artistic, architectural, compositional;
- research, scientific, technical; •
- cultural, cultural-historical, craft;
- environmental, natural, landscape;
- urban, morphological, setting and surroundings.

Other values referred to include use and socio-economic value, (PL, NL) innovation value (NL) and ethnographic, civil, social, and public value (ES, IT, NL, FL)

International documents such as the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage have had some impact; many countries have updated their regulations by including reference to intangible heritage, albeit often separately from tangible heritage, and not necessarily with associated protection measures. Thus, in most legal systems the idea of heritage as material and tangible – old – objects, prevails. If intangible elements related to these heritage assets are referred to, such as traditional uses or practices, they tend to be evaluated in a conventional fashion, for example, through considering 'proper' use, or making connection with traditional building skills.

National heritage lists and registers contain buildings and areas with historical and cultural significance. Most countries also have the opportunity to list such sites at a regional or local level, although this often comes with different (often lower, locally determined, or even no formal) protective measures. The concept of 'setting'- the direct context of the heritage asset – is part of most heritage systems. This is either formally set, for example, the area 50 metres around a listed building, or more generally defined, such as the setting of a listed building, defined by how it affects the significance of the heritage asset. The concept of a 'setting' allows decision-makers to consider the impact development might have upon how a heritage building is understood in the wider urban landscape. What is legally defined as heritage or a monument is often broadened by the influence of national or international cultural, heritage and planning documents, which can widen or stretch legal definitions. There are different ways in which definitions can be broadened to include more elements and aspects of the landscape, the historic environment, cultural practices or community value; through their inclusion in policy and descriptions, but also through concepts in planning policy such as "setting" or "character".

Importantly, most countries make a distinction between the definition of heritage, and what is being protected as such. That is to say that not all heritage is protected in an equal manner, but all sites and spaces with a protected status are defined as heritage.

3.2.2 Conservation

"Conservation" in a legal and policy context is defined in all countries around ideas of protection, restoration and maintenance of material (and sometimes immaterial) aspects of heritage (e.g. DE, PT, FL, SK, HU, UA, PL, IT, RO, ES, AT). Some of these countries are very focussed on the material harm and aspects of heritage where conservation is mostly about material condition; notions of authenticity and integrity, protecting from (further) harm, and recreating parts when lost (PL, UA). There are

also countries that use a more general description of caring for, managing, paying attention to the historic environment, and supporting the quality of the living environment (e.g. NL, SE, EN). In most countries, conservation can also apply to the spatial characteristics of an area. Some countries include use in what can be controlled for heritage purposes (HU, PT, NL, IT)

The importance of research and documentation is also mentioned by many countries, (e.g. DE, FL, PL, SR, NL, IT), for recording heritage sites and assets. In some countries this is also explicitly linked to public use of, and access to heritage (e.g. NL, FL, IT)

Overall, two principal regulatory systems can be distinguished in accordance with levels of protection; that is, unitary and graded systems, with the latter tending to a somewhat greater scope for discretion and negotiation. For example, the Italian legal system is built on a binary approach: heritage assets can be protected (1) or not protected (0). In other countries, legislation is based on a more nuanced system, for example using grades of protection (as for example in England), or a "scale" of cultural significance varying from (inter)national to local interest as in Spain, Portugal, Hungary, Romania, Sweden, the Netherlands, and England. This ultimately allows for different levels of flexibility, as the different nuances permit different limits of acceptable change. In many countries, as we will discuss below in more detail, parts of the historic environment are also protected through the planning system, through the creation of conservation areas (EN), areas of culture-historical value (NL) or settlement images (HU).

3.2.3 Limits of Acceptable Change

Due to the negotiation of graded systems discussed above, significant "grey zones" can emerge in the legal context - as is particularly evident in England and Hungary. - Here discretion applied by local planners and heritage officers significantly influences what the limits of acceptable change are. This means there is potential for local development through adaptive reuse, when officers are positively inclined towards adaptive reuse. At the same time the discretion in the protection process might threaten the value of these cultural asset, as it also creates space to allow for (partial) demolition, and facadism. Discretion can also hamper adaptive-reuse process, when the heritage or planning officers time for or interest in supporting and exploring alternatives is limited, or only applied to a select group of people.

The limits of acceptable change defined by different heritage systems play a significant role in adaptive reuse projects, especially where protection is strict due to the significance of the building or the way the system works (binary). However, especially in the 'grey' zones, some level of protection often comes from the planning system, for example through the recognition of the 'character' of an area, or certain use patterns. This protection can be legally binding, but often is guidance, a suggestion, and how it is implemented is thus at least to some extend up to the discretion of local planning and heritage officers.

3.2.4 Capitalising on, Using, and Commodifying heritage

An overall tendency towards capitalising on "cultural-historical values" is evident in all the countries. In policies, we can see an overall shift towards understandings of heritage as a resource for development, for engagement, and for branding, rather than solely a cultural asset significant in defining national identity and history. The flexibility of the legal and regulatory context in England and the Netherlands is

pioneering in this regard, as there is the explicit mention of economic and use value of heritage in policies. This is a trend that has been reinforced by international documents, such as the HUL recommendation and the Faro Convention. As a result, there is room for flexibility, and a willingness to 'use' heritage, which can facilitate adaptive reuse projects. It often however also stimulates gentrification and commodification. In other countries this shift is visible, but more in the context of stimulating tourism (PT, HU, IT, RO) which can, but doesn't necessarily, facilitate processes adaptive reuse. In for example, Romania, some adaptive reuse projects are realised under the Regional Operational Programme on sustainable development and the promotion of tourism, including the sustainable restoration and capitalisation of cultural heritage and the establishment or modernisation of a connected infrastructure.

3.3 Planning and the integration of heritage and planning systems

Spatial planning, akin to heritage, tends to have a framing at national level, that varies in its remit and influence. Planning usually sets a framework for future development at the national scale, addressing issues such as infrastructure, water, and economic development. However, not all countries have a National Planning Act (e.g. Austria). As an important domain that regulates reuse processes, a wide variety of ministries and government agencies are responsible for planning and spatial developments, from ministries of environment or industry & innovation, to transport or internal affairs. Where planning is located reveals and influences what planning is considered to be *for* (e.g. economic growth, sustainable development, environmental quality), and thus the national narrative or focus of the planning agencies. This also influences whether adaptive reuse of heritage is stimulated or not. When economic growth is the core objective in a planning system, demolition to make space for new buildings is often preferred over adaptive reuse. This can be because the value of heritage is seen as low, or the difficulty of developing heritage is perceived to be too high and costly, with the latter often occurring because of legal restrictions.

In recent years, some countries have introduced new policies focussed on a "high quality living environment" (NL, SE) integrating more sectors (environmental, spatial, design, culture, social, environmental) than previously. The "quality" of the "living environment" is often partly described by definitions such as "character" related to the types of use and users in the area, as much as aesthetics. This is often developed through land use requirements as well as setting guidelines for (new) architectural or urban design in existing areas, which includes management of the existing environment and thus heritage and adaptive reuse.

Sustainable development of the historic environment can also be part of the narrative affecting planning and heritage policies e.g. in Portugal, France, England, and the Netherlands. This can be through being more open to sustainability measures (e.g. PV panels) in heritage buildings, and by seeing heritage in the context of waste reduction and material recycling. Nevertheless, new trends and paradigms such as the circular economy have made little impact on heritage policies. In some countries (e.g. Portugal, Italy, and Spain), the shift from a construction-oriented system to one based on reuse/rehabilitation requires sustainability innovations in the building sector, these attitude changes can be slow to emerge.

3.3.1 Levels of Governance, regional integration

Planning decisions are to a large extent devolved to local government, within a national general regulatory framework, and potentially a regional level of cohesion, harmonisation, or coordination. The decision-making regarding (listed) built heritage often takes place within national systems of administration.). The extent to which local level governments have power over heritage-related decision-making varies significantly between countries. A 'mis-match' between levels of government where decision-making takes place can influence the ease with which adaptive reuse can happen. Less influence over decision-making at a local level tends to make adaptive heritage reuse more difficult.

The power of local government to designate and manage heritage depends on various factors. Some have none, or limited legislative power to designate, whilst they do get the legislative responsibility to protect what is listed at the national level. Some local authorities can designate locally, but have little to no legislative power to enforce protection, or lack the resources to do so. They may be responsible for protection of national heritage without having a say in designation, or receiving support for this protection. There is also considerable variation in how heritage and planning are integrated at the local level. It is much harder to achieve integration when decisionmaking for heritage and planning systems is made at different governmental levels, and this affects the realisation of adaptive reuse projects as they generally require both forms of approval. Some countries have heritage and planning officers combined within local authorities (e.g. in England and the Netherlands), whether they are part of the same internal department or not. Other countries have separate administrations, or combine the two. In Italy and England, for example, heritage is designated and managed through devolved regional / local offices of the cultural heritage agency, independently from local government.

The use of terms such as character, significance, and guality, in planning, influence adaptive heritage reuse, as they create a 'grey zone'. This is a space where levels of protection, and thus the limits of acceptable change, can be negotiated, as they are guiding rather than restricting. These terms can refer to style, material, landscape structures, local practices and traditions, the particular use and users of an area, or a combination of these factors. Such a context may allow for more flexibility than terms such as "listed building" when it comes to reuse and other interventions. Regional or strategic plans as well as design guidelines for areas tend to help define the environmental character. Land use plans can also be used to facilitate this by indicating use or character areas.

3.3.2 Governmental approach

Governments at different spatial scales have a key role in setting the policy context for adaptive heritage reuse. This doesn't mean they also push for innovation in the field. In most countries, governments (local, regional, and national) tends to have significant heritage assets in their property portfolio. Despite this, they are rarely to be found at the forefront of innovative practice in adaptive reuse. In response to the 2008 financial crisis for example, many countries turned to asset disposal, including heritage assets, as an austerity measure for quick economic gain. Instead, the crisis could have been used to develop or support demonstration projects, whereby the government make it possible for assets to be taken over and "revived" by a particular community, and become of value through adaptive reuse. Where such efforts are made, (e.g. Netherlands, England, Portugal, Italy, Poland) for example through tools

like 'community asset transfer' and 'pubic-public partnerships' they are often very much austerity-driven, shifting maintenance and operation costs onto communities rather than supporting and facilitating communities.

Government ownership could also mean that they are proactive in piloting heritage reuse themselves. For example in the Netherlands, the Central Government Real Estate Agency is stimulating new reuse approaches by undertaking 'unusual' reuse projects for their own ministries, and through exploring new forms of public-private financing and partnerships with the market (e.g. DBFMO: Design Built Finance Maintenance and Operate) for adaptive reuse of a listed national monument. Such forms of proactive testing or piloting is the exception rather than the norm though. Instead many governments tend to be risk averse, reactive, and at best facilitative. More common are national and regional policies that help create a 'market' for reuse, by restricting sprawl (e.g. in Italy), or by focusing on more efficient use of existing resources & recycling (sustainability policies) as well as mapping vacant space, and supporting (or hiring) 'match makers' between users and vacant space (FL, NL).

Barriers to adaptive reuse are often related to risk, which can mean risk in terms of administrative processes. De-risking the process of adaptive reuse, through clearer regulator frameworks, would be welcomed in many situations. The relative unpredictability of building and permit processes is an issue in many countries, especially when it relates to bottom-up processes, where the people undertaking a project are novices and often doing it only once. Risk can thus lie in complex-to-navigate systems, leading to high procedural fees, and making approval hard to access due to a lack of entry 'into' the system, compounded where there is a lack of certainty whether approvals will be received. There are also issues facing more seasoned adaptive reuse project developers, such as the variety of approaches across one country because of different legal systems per region, (e.g. Germany) or uncertainty because of the differing level of discretion and approach across local authorities (HU, EN). A lack of support, interest, or simply a lack of capacity to deal with the number of applications can also lead to very long waiting periods in adaptive reuse projects.

At a national level, some countries have very specific programmes to facilitate and steer investment in reuse of heritage, and offer funding programmes to invest in particular parts of the city or country e.g. High Street (EN) villages and rural areas (HU), industrial areas (RO, EN), churches (NL, FL), deprived urban areas (IT, PT, HU), housing (SE, AU, UA), youth (IT) and tourism potential (HU, PT).

Many decisions also relate to the fiscal base of local authorities. Where revenue is derived from heritage led tourism (e.g. tourism tax, job creation), reuse is more common than where the main income is obtained through business taxes. In general we see a move towards more "useful" heritage, both in terms of how reuse is funded (through its new *use* rather than the heritage itself) and the integration of heritage in other policies (in relation to youth policy, community engagement, the creative sector, tourism, character, peace building). This means we can see heritage becoming fully commodified and utility-focused. Rather than telling the stories of the asset in a multivocal way, and engaging a wider range of stories and voices, stories that help 'sell' the building or help fund the buildings reuse and/or protection are prioritised.

3.4 Use, Re-use, Adaptive Re-use

3.4.1 Provided definitions

This table contains the definitions of adaptive reuse per country as provided by the researchers, based on legal definitions and interviews. Adaptive reuse as a professional, empirical understanding is present in all countries under study. Policy definitions are scarcer, and a legal definition only present in Sweden.

Table 3: adaptive reuse definitions per country

DE: "Umnutzung" (re-use) or "Nachnutzung" (after-use) is frequently used and a variety of terms are used to describe different measures that are applied in adaptive re-use but which are not specific, such as rehabilitation, renovation, refurbishment, reconstruction, etc.

EN: common practice, included in the term "conservation", defined as sustaining and enhancing the significance of a heritage assets. Often bringing vacant / poor condition heritage buildings back into use.

ES: closest term is rehabilitation (rehabilitación): the "structural or functional adaptation work of buildings which pays attention to their architectonic characters." This is related to the owners' duty to improve their property (deber de mejora). Clear definitions of affiliated terms such as regeneration (regeneración) and urban renovation (renovación urbanas), are lacking.

FL: The re-use of heritage falls within the remit of conservation, which includes the mapping, registration, documentation, selection, listing and re-using heritage.

HU: In practice adaptive reuse is simply giving new function to an old building. For heritage, terminology of "proper" use is employed, meaning that a buildings new use has to be suitable to its intrinsic value, and a use that does not damage the heritage values of the building;

IT: "riuso/recupero" is often used and refers "to re-use and rehabilitation" of buildings and zones that have lost their original use

NL: herbestemmen (verb) literally means giving a new 'destination / designation' or to re-assign, giving a new use to an old(er) building. This includes, but is not limited to listed 'monuments', (cultural) landscapes, and conservation areas (Policy definition)

PL: Legally in architectonic administration language "adaptation" means that no building works are needed to change the use, or at most a refurbishment, which doesn't require any permit. Conservation recommendations can include specifications on the manner of using the monument, as well as on the scope of acceptable changes that may be introduced in this monument can be provided.

PT: The re-use of heritage falls within the remit of reabilitação / rehabilitation

RO: No formal definition, processes through which the building or a set of buildings which lost its original purpose is actively adapted to the new function in technical, constructional, architectural, and urban aspects, with preservation of its spatial structures.

SE: the legal definition is the "alteration of a building: one or more measures that modify a building's design, function, use, appearance, or cultural-historical value"

SK: In Slovakia adaptive reuse (konverzia) is considered as processes through which a building or set of buildings which have lost their original purpose are actively adapted to a new function in

technical, constructional, architectural, or urban aspects, with preservation of its spatial structures. The result is consistency of the new function with the spatial design, historical background, and the context of the place.

UA: In practice, it is defined as the contemporary use of the cultural heritage object without changes of its heritage value, including restoration of elements of historical and cultural value. A widely used term is "museumification" which is considered the best method of preservation. There is a push from experts to include revitalization and heritage reuse, and not only museumification.

3.4.2 Positioning adaptive reuse

Reuse is positioned differently in each country. Often it is seen as a catalyst for development and, implicitly, a means for boosting property markets and gentrification. In some countries it is explicitly positioned as a tool for urban regeneration (PT, IT). In these countries heritage reuse is (partly) funded through urban regeneration money, usually with a focus on deprived areas. In other countries reuse is much more directly related to solving vacancy (IT, RO, NL) and often also restricting urban sprawl (e.g. IT, NL, FL), or to facilitate the creation of more direct links between heritage and their communities (FL, EN). In countries where reuse is less common within formal policy frameworks, heritage is still being reused, but in a more bottom-up way. This can mean, for example, projects led by activists, by protest groups (against demolition), and cultural practitioners in need of affordable studio space. This may occur in an illegal or semi-legal setting (e.g. through squatting, occupation, etc).

As mentioned in the introduction, adaptive reuse may be a common term in some heritage circles, but it is not included as a term in policy by most countries we looked at. In some countries this is simply because adaptive reuse of heritage is not a common practice, whilst in others the inverse is true: it is not mentioned due to it being such a common practice.

Even when heritage and/or reuse are not a policy priority at a national level, reuse of heritage still occurs. Adaptive heritage reuse is sometimes stimulated and funded through a strong regional identity framework (Spain, Austria) in addition to the possibilities offered by local authorities (PL, UA, HU, RO) and temporary reuse discussed so far. It is also clear that adaptive heritage reuse aligns well with some market-sectors, in particular the creative industries and the IT sector, where the reuse of certain type of buildings is fashionable, with aesthetics linked to a certain ethics of sustainability, culture, recycling, anti-corporate. Through for example the creative Europe programme the EU is also supporting this trend to some extent.

3.4.3 Use and reuse

Understanding practices of *use* and in particular *change of use*, is crucial to analysing adaptive reuse. Use can be linked to land either indicating zones (e.g. commercial area, residential area), or per plot (land use plan, most countries) or to existing buildings (UK).

In most cases, change of use needs to go through an approval process. This may involve regional, provincial and municipal rules (e.g. Flanders) or consistency with land-use and/or development plans (e.g. Italy, German, Austria). In some countries, practitioners felt there was a lack of guidelines on use and specifically the impact of use on cultural assets (Hungary, Romania). Overall, more flexibility in terms of change of use is often granted under the pressure of the market (e.g. Hungary, Ukraine, Sweden), which conversely potentially affects heritage protection.

Mechanisms and practices to facilitate reuse include:

- In some circumstances, change of use between particular types of use can be • allowed without planning permission (permitted development rights). However, the lack of regulation can also lead to problems, and in heritage contexts (e.g. conservation areas) these rights are usually revoked.
- Temporary use options can be important to bottom-up reuse processes, which often start with a temporary situation. This is linked to the option to temporarily change the use of a building (in land use context) or in other ways provide (temporary) exceptions. In some cases, this will have to be made possible on a national level (e.g. in NL by crisis and recovery act stating local authorities can decide to allow a temporary change of use from 1 day up to 10 years). In others it is a local level decision already possible within the (often legally binding) land use plan.
- Possibilities to temporarily unlock 'on hold' public land or buildings for certain • initiatives, by their owners, usually governments.
- Some cities and countries are developing "vacancy" maps (NL, IT, FL, UA) or "heritage@risk" lists (UK) which are a good start for further thinking about urban regeneration, especially when linked to restrictions upon urban sprawl. Such initiatives can also help prioritise reuse actions for certain areas / assets (e.g. NL, UK). In Ukraine, an inventory was undertaken by Council of Europe rather than the state or a city, which hasn't led to the same results (e.g. new approaches from state to vacancy), but it may be helpful local actors.
- Other initiatives include Matchmakers (regional or local) between vacant • buildings and users looking for a building, and Monument Mentors, experts advising on (volunteers, through local government, consultancy) navigating procedures as well as guiding the general process of adaptive reuse especially for one-off projects.

3.4.4 Heritage significance: use and character.

Use can be a defined part of the heritage "character" for an area or building. In the case of high streets for example, new use might be required to be at least 50% commercially focussed to keep this character. Another example is often seen in (former) industrial areas, where reuse is focussed on continuing the "industrial" character by e.g. concentrating on new forms of manufacturing, innovation or the creative industries. We found no examples of adaptive reuse whereby the use of a building was confined to its historic purpose – this points to the inherently generative capacity of adaptive reuse.

3.4.5 Politics of reuse

Heritage is always political, and as such interventions in heritage are inherently political as well. Whose histories are being interacted with, erased, highlighted? Who belongs, feels at home or has the resources to invest their time or money? These issues are more visible in some contexts than others. Post-socialist contexts often have strong reactive policies and actions towards more recent histories, leading to rejection of some histories and heritage legacies, and even to demolition of communist legacies in the built environment (UA) and a lack of appreciation for the heritage or buildings that refer to these histories; and at times a nostalgia for these

histories. This easily leads to neglect and disrepair, and eventually demolition. In other cases, potential heritage is not recognised as such, for example industrial sites in Romania, in the context of very recent and ongoing industrialisation.

Conversely, the adaptive reuse of some types of heritage is very attractive because they have the *right* aesthetics and size (e.g. trends around industrial heritage in many countries) or a particular meaning to a particular community, for example religious heritage. This leads to an interest in investing in buildings or areas because of "character", either commercially or communally.

Heritage has the power to mobilise communities, investors, governance at different levels. It is a platform to invest in, that can be protected and reused 'together'. But it is crucial for academics and practitioners to reflect critically on the relationship between communities and heritage, as reinforcing ideas of 'roots' and belonging can also explicitly exclude and create un-belonging.

3.4.6 Procedures and regulation

Efforts to secure better integration between regulations and a more co-ordinated approach were evident in some countries. National or regional coordination of approaches to heritage and reuse support integration. This can be done through 'soft tools' such as sharing practices, knowledge, experiences, examples, and undertaking joint pilots. This can help de-risk and clarify the process, especially in situations where local authorities have a lot of power to decide. Often however, there is no funding for such programmes. Local authorities could benefit from joining peer-to-peer networks, as well as specific peer-learning schemes on cultural heritage for cities and regions supported by EU funding.

Even when decisions are not made at the local level alone (e.g. national heritage) local government can have a lot of influence in how and if reuse happens through the way local planning (and heritage) officers advice or judge issues in relation to design quality and heritage values. How advice is offered is also important; is it free, are advisors positive towards reuse, are there example projects, opportunities to discuss plans early in the process, is there a willingness to facilitate reuse? Even when national frameworks set procedures and policy, it is at a local level that they are applied, agreed on; most adaptive reuse practice will initially be decided upon at local level.

Building regulations and guidance are mainly set at the local level and function in combination with local or regional plans. The majority of countries opt for non-standard solutions to be applied to listed buildings, creatively solving issues related to energy efficiency, health and fire safety, either on a case-by-case basis, and/or because the legal framework already provides some exceptions (e.g. energy measures). This does not mean that all challenges are easily solved. To stimulate the application of some regulations, additional funding is sometimes available (for example around energy), or access is provided to specific (low interest) loans in some counties.

Moreover, in some countries, e.g. Portugal and Spain, the shift from a constructionoriented system to one based on reuse/rehabilitation is in parallel with the updating of building codes and regulations, establishing exceptional, proportional or flexible criteria aimed at supporting adaptation processes. Considering the "co-evolutionary" approach which forms the basis of community-led adaptive reuse, it is also worth

highlighting the idea of "proportional and progressive improvement", recently introduced in Portugal's Rehabilitation Legal Regime (95/2019) to allow for more flexibility and proportionality in renewal interventions. "Special" regimes are also at the core of regulations specifically designed to deal with rehabilitation of areas, assuring a higher level of flexibility, for example in Germany.

Experiences with regulations around urban commons currently being implemented in Italy show the significance of administrative innovation in terms of public-privatepeople partnerships (4Ps) and, more broadly, in relation to public procurement and tendering. Procedural aspects and requirements to participate in public tenders or to initiate projects, such as: fee for pre-application (e.g. EN), costly guarantees (e.g. IT), tenders based on principles of "low expenditure" or "construction efficiency" (e.g. PT, SP), are counter-productive to innovation and risk-taking actors. Thus, revising the way that public tenders and procurement processes and criteria are set up, as well as which assets and funding are granted, might facilitate a significant step forwards in designing a more open and also a more accessible and thus potentially more participative context. This, it should be noted, regards not only the initial phase of the process but also the evaluation framework through which projects are assessed and thus supported in the implementation phase.

3.5 Participatory governance

3.5.1 Participation and community engagement

Material aspects are predominant in how most cultural heritage is addressed and managed. Even though community engagement is becoming a crucial element in many national debates, in practice, few countries have already put participatory tools to shape the urban environment in place. Alongside community-oriented planning tools, mechanisms of asset transfer are established with the aim of facilitating the devolution of decision-making powers from the state to the community. Whereas in England these tools are indirectly linked to adaptive reuse, by empowering local community in the planning process, in other countries, such as Italy, they explicitly convey a supportive measure for heritage enhancement and reuse.

Since the 2008 financial crisis, more attention is being paid to facilitating community initiatives and participation, if only as a way to deal with the effect of austerity measures on local government. In countries where the state and/or expert-oriented approach still prevails, community initiatives are less promoted, and may even be actively discouraged through creating difficult bureaucratic structures to formalise and organise. In the Netherlands and England for example, the reorientation of the system has put a strong emphasis on people's actions (do-democracy) and decision-making (Big Society). In the case of France, Portugal, Italy, and Spain, community-led adaptive reuse initiatives exist, but are still a minority within the construction sector, lacking structural support from central and local governments.

In participation and community engagement, the recognition (and thus regulation) of temporary (change of) use, as a tool is also important. Temporal factors are crucial elements of both community engagement and heritage adaptive reuse, and making temporary use, or temporary change of use, possible means making community action more feasible. In many countries there are no significant regulations and/or policies as part of a long-term strategy based on progressive (phased, temporary)

renovation, reuse, adaptation of built heritage, and this is can foster squatting and illegal appropriation.

Moreover, by considering cultural heritage adaptive reuse as a continuous process, it should be noted that the focus on community involvement is mostly concentrated in the initial phase of the process, regarding raising awareness, providing information or decision making. Subsequent stages in the process, such as project construction (e.g. DIY practices), management and implementation, are rarely mentioned or included in local regulations and never considered in national acts in the form of social innovation tools to be applied within the construction sector. More positive examples include Polish revitalization programmes explicitly based on the involvement of local community in the preparation phase, management of the process and final evaluation of results. In Vienna, self-build housing co-operatives (Baugruppen) are promoted and are a way to encourage self-organisation throughout the construction phase. Aside from these experiences, a case-by-case approach seems to prevail, often showing political bias: rules about uses can be relaxed with the aim to favour specific developers (e.g. Hungary), specific contracts might be defined to access particular assets (Spain, Italy). This seems to show a deficiency in term of people-oriented strategy in territorial development.

3.5.2 Other-than-public actors

Austerity measures, and a general lack of funding in most countries has led to further devolution of responsibilities around heritage, to lower tiers of government, but also commercial actors, third sector organisations, and communities. However, this devolution doesn't always correspond to the devolution of funds and power. Changing responsibilities in governance, without changing access to resources (funding, power, knowledge and experience) leads to procedural issues. It also means new actors bring their own approaches and aims, without the same democratic accountability as the (local) state. The third sector (including NGOs, universities etc) can have a role in filling the gap creating by a lack of local state capacity. Thus in some countries some of the work around making adaptive reuse visible is done by local and regional architecture centres (NL, FL), accreditation bodies (such as RIBA in the UK) or through work commissioned by national urban / heritage knowledge centres, which is often state funded, or through universities. This may encompass training days, workshops, the undertaking of studies, offering specific or additional certification or accreditation, and creating discussion platforms, for adaptive reuse, urban transformation and regeneration. Such actors also sometimes facilitate or guide processes, consult, or do match making and share their knowledge, or create platforms for others to do so.

In some countries there is evidence of non-governmental public bodies (often in partnership with government) working towards adaptive reuse for their needs; sometimes universities and housing associations are at the forefront of reuse initiatives (e.g. SE, NL, IT, DE).

3.6 Influence of EU programmes

The potential influence of EU integration seems very high, particularly through funding programmes. This is most visible in recent EU accession countries. EU integration for some countries also came with a significant increase in territorial funding, leading to an uptake in urban regeneration and reuse projects, e.g. through the Regional

Development Fund, which (co) funds programmes such as Interreg, Leader, Creative Europe, the European Social Fund, and the Cohesion Fund. These EU funds and themes determine the policy focus, such as tourism for economic development. Direct stimulus for adaptive reuse through these funding pots could be more clearly directed towards reuse; whilst it is currently possible, this agenda is not necessarily highlighted.

Investment in heritage and reuse is often instigated by potential economic gain, mostly tourism (HU, PT, UA) potential, or urban regeneration (PL, IT, PT) which is often directly linked to EU investment and programmes. The economic crisis in many countries led to 'recovery' legislation and policies that focussed on seeking EU support for regeneration. We see a move to reuse as opposed to new build after crises in different European contexts (e.g. 1999 SE; 2008 UK, NL, PT, IT).

3.7 Heritage as a resource

Heritage is often perceived as a resource for tourism and linked with the tourism-led development of specific areas (Italy, Portugal, Spain, Romania). In the case of Romania, cultural heritage projects are realised under the Regional Operational Programme on sustainable development and the promotion of tourism, including the sustainable restoration and capitalisation of cultural heritage, and the establishment or modernisation of a connected infrastructure. Heritage is widely used as a branding and marketing tool, and historic environments create a favourable climate for specific groups of users that might be engaged in reuse projects, such as artists, education workers and start-ups. Projects can be facilitated by financial mechanisms, such as providing low rent and longer lease options; rent and facilities 'package deals'; and shared facilities. In some countries (Netherlands, Ukraine) this has been supported by private investors.

In some situations, publicly-owned heritage buildings have been sold to private investors as a means of repairing public budgets, for example during the 1990s in Germany, and the Netherlands after 2008 economic crisis. This procedure could also lead to unlawful actions, for example, in Ukraine and Romania where historical sites have been sold to private investors based on administrative decisions.

3.7.1 Funding and financing

Most heritage protection funding relates to national state budgets. Especially in Eastern Europe countries there are hardly any examples of private bodies, apart from listed property owners who are responsible for keeping heritage sites in good technical condition. The significant findings are:

Ministries tend to supervise most substantial funds. However, specific projects are realised on local level from municipal budget. For instance, in the Netherlands all levels of government have a strong interest in stimulating adaptive reuse, in terms of support and facilitating the process, being partner etc. In centralised systems, Ministries of culture, infrastructure, regional development or economic development hold the most significant budgets and oversees the protection of heritage, in countries like Belgium (especially Flanders) and Spain there is decentralisation, and regions are responsible for protecting and financing heritage. Analysis shows that in countries like Portugal and Poland, public funds for heritage protection is increased by money raised through fines on illegal demolition or exportation of heritage.

- In some cases, like Belgium and England, there are special funds or foundations involved in heritage protection. The source of their budgets can be philanthropic, a national lottery, and revenues from fund management. In England, funding for adaptive re-use comes from a variety of sources, but by far the most significant is the National Lottery Heritage Fund. In Flanders, the NGO Vlaamse Erfgoedkluisoperate, cooperates with local heritage initiatives, developers and owners. They offer information, support, and alternative funding tools (offering loans, owning property rights or by (co-) financing initiatives by searching for partnerships with all kind of actors).
- On the other hand, in countries like Poland, Hungary, Ukraine and Romania there are no dedicated funds for adaptive heritage reuse, but there are funds for the protection and preservation of heritage sites.
- Building restoration or preservation may be co-financed from EU grants (Poland, Slovakia, Spain), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Bank for Development of the European Council, EEA grants (Romania, Ukraine).
- In some cases, for instance Hungary, the role of church was emphasized, where building renovation is based on a mixed financing system relying on the state, church, municipal, and private financial support.
- There is not much evidence of purely social, community re-development funding like cooperative or crowdfunding. Yet, there are positive signals from the creative industries including IT start-ups and cultural practitioners who prefer to work in places with "soul" for two reasons; the creative convivial atmosphere and cheaper rents. Crowdfunding is being encouraged in some places through matching, or topping up crowd funded moneys, and developing a brochure 'tips for crowdfunding for culture and heritage.
- There is a general challenge across the countries to make private investment in heritage financially attractive or economically viable. When private investment is not deemed viable, public budgets are the main source of financing, when municipalities feel the obligation to invest for "greater good", rather than for profit. Funding the renovation of historically important sites in city centres is usually not a challenge. Such sites are well taken care of, usually protected (listed), in good technical condition and locations for public institutions (museums, theatres etc.) or safe investments for international funds (offices, hotels etc.).
- In Some countries (e.g. France and Austria) there are grants for the rehabilitation of housing assets available, including historic housing. These are mostly geared towards dwellings that are suffering from high levels of degradation or danger and may include restoring the water, energy or sewerage supplies, installing adequate sanitary facilities or adjustments for access such as a ramp.
- In practically all countries, regions can supplement state aid with grants, loans, interest subsidies or loan guarantee mostly relating to housing provision or improvement.
- Public-private partnerships (PPP) in heritage protection are not common. They are used in countries including Italy, where the National Heritage Act (CBCP) recognizes donations (erogazioni liberalior mecenatismo culturale), based on tax exception or reduction, and sponsorships, which promote conservation and the enhancement of cultural heritage. The sponsor's endeavour is rewarded through the positive association between the project and the sponsors name,

image or brand. In other countries, for instance Poland, Ukraine and Romania PPPs are not used for heritage protection neither for heritage adaptive re-uses.

- It is important to note that in some countries (e.g. Poland) restoration and conservation can be subsidised from public sources, but adaptive re-use cannot.
- There are hardly any examples of funding environmentally-oriented adaptive re-use projects, apart from cases regarding energy efficiency.
- Polish examples show that there is a system of several Ministry programmes including: the Protection of Monuments; Polish Cultural Heritage Abroad; Protection of Archaeological Monuments; War Graves and Cemeteries; Places of Remembrance and permanent commemoration in the country; Places of National Remembrance Abroad. All these programmes apply to heritage buildings and sites, with no specific mechanism related to the adaptive re-use.

Our analysis also focused on financial incentives and barriers to public and private involvement in adaptive heritage reuse. This showed that adaptive reuse projects do not offer many tax reliefs or other incentives. In general, investment in heritage sites leads to more challenges and costs for private investors in comparison with regular investment in the real estate market on an empty plot (e.g. Hungary, Ukraine). However, there are tax reliefs for investors taking part in heritage preservation, repairs in listed buildings. Furthermore, projects connected with heritage re-use are usually funded as a part of urban regeneration programmes. In almost all countries, information about tax reliefs or other incentives are evident, but practice shows that such tools are not always attractive, and there are discussions how they should be applied and to whom addressed.

3.7.2 Specific examples of funding mechanisms:

- Administrative authorities in France are authorised to subsidise up to 40% of the actual expenditure for the maintenance and repair work required for the conservation of buildings or parts of buildings that are inscribed as historic monuments. There is tax relief for up to 50% of costs for individuals after the renovation works are completed and carried for a maximum of 5 years.
- In Spain, various laws have recognised the importance of stimulating private funding in the work of cultural heritage organisations. In some instances this is done through tax reductions for expenditure on a) conservation, reparation, restoration, promotion and exhibition of a property of cultural interest according to Historical Heritage regulations; b) building rehabilitation as well as the improvement of their infrastructure or architectural, archaeological, natural or landscape ensembles and World Heritage properties.
- In Romania, private investment and sponsorship in cultural heritage is not particularly encouraged and there is a lack of initiatives to raise the interest of the public sector to invest or to develop sponsorship.
- In Hungary, corporate tax reduction for organizations is provided for the maintenance or renovation of listed monuments. Costs of maintenance can be reduced from their basis of tax assessment for up to 50% of their profit; organizations can reduce 100% of the costs of renovation on the basis of assessment twice in the five years following renovation.
- In the case of Italy, in order to overcome PPP bottlenecks, a so-called Art Bonus was introduced in 2014, directed at publicly-owned heritage, as opposed to private assets. It is a tax exemption for charitable contributions that individuals or companies make supporting public cultural heritage. The aim of the donation has to be the maintenance, conservation and restoration of cultural public

assets and/or the sustenance of cultural public institutions such as museums, libraries, archives, archaeological parks etc.

- Other general incentives included the deduction of maintenance costs from income tax when residential, from corporate tax (only when asset is on the books for a specific period of time) or transfer tax/stamp duty.
- Low interest finance mechanisms, such as low interest mortgages for listed residential buildings, which also creates a favourable situation for other kinds of investment (from the bank), as they are then more likely to provide additional financing or a special low interest sustainability and heritage loan if needed.

Analysis of gathered materials also included influence of ownership types on available funding. This showed that:

- In the case of private buildings, especially historic properties, grants are available for individuals. In countries like France, there are grants for the rehabilitation of housing assets available, including historic housing. These are mostly for dwellings that are suffering from high levels of degradation or danger. Renovation projects can also be subsidised in England and Belgium.
- In countries such as Poland, Ukraine, Hungary there are no specific funds or financial support for adaptive heritage re-use for private owners, but schemes for protected monuments are defined every year, and owners of protected monuments can apply for state support for the maintenance and renovation of the monument from national funds.
- In Poland, private owners and organisations, as well as the local authority owners of a monument are obligated to finance all kind of works concerning given monument. All owners may apply for a public subsidy. The Ministry of Culture and National Heritage and Voivodship Monument Conservation Officer (WKZ) can award subsidy to the registered monuments (RZ). Local authorities at each level – community, county or voivodship – can also award subsidies based on the respective resolution. Received finances come from the central, regional or local budgets.

4 Country overviews

The country overviews focus on the different levels and departments of government, and how they interact to regulate adaptive reuse. Where relevant, the regional and local levels are illustrated, with the specific regions and municipalities the OpenHeritage OCs or CHLs are located in. The overviews all follow the same structure, which is as follows:

Institutional and regulatory context of adaptive heritage re-use: an overview of heritage and planning, regeneration, urban strategies, land use, regulation/governance i.e. the context for adaptive reuse. Data source: mainly the template on heritage and planning, draws on interview report where relevant. Includes information on the national, regional and local level.

Main actors of the heritage management and re-adaptive use: a short introduction to relevant governmental actors, as well as their modes of collaboration, integration, working practice(s). Data source: from all boxes in templates, national, regional, local.

Cultural and Built heritage adaptive reuse regulation and development: This section looks at the building level, heritage, building regulation, intervention, use (e.g. change of / temporary). Data source: mainly from the template on heritage and building regulations, draws on interview report where relevant. Includes information on the national, regional, and local level.

Funding, financing and incentivizing adaptation: the framework for financing adaptive reuse projects. Data source: mainly from the boxes on finances and incentives, and draws on interview report where relevant. Includes information on the national, regional, and local level.

Participation, culture and sustainability: the 'additional' policy & funding available to adaptive reuse / that supports adaptive reuse (e.g. through participation requirements, cultural policy, sustainability measures). Data source: if provided in the final three boxes of the template and/or as integrated throughout the template, in planning /heritage/building boxes. Includes information on the national, regional, and local level as relevant or provided.

Trends for adaptive reuse in country: this section merges the trends (the first question in each topic in the template) with bottlenecks, obstacles and supportive measures toward adaptive reuse, (the final question in each topic) as well as interview report. Includes information on the national, regional, and local level as relevant or provided.

Labox: Only for the countries with an CHL we also included a focus-paragraph on city/region context for the CHLs (IT, PT, UK, DE, PL, HU) application of general principles in the specific locality of the living lab.

H2020 PROJECT Grant Agreement No 776766

AT	Austria	HU	Hungary	RO	Romania
FL	Belgium (Flanders)	IT	Italy	SK	Slovakia
EN	UK (England)	NL	Netherlands	ES	Spain
FR	France	PL	Poland	SE	Sweden
DE	Germany	PT	Portugal	UA	Ukraine

Table 4: the fifteen countries OpenHeritage has case studies in