

**OpenHeritage: Deliverable 3.8**

# **Recommendations and Suggested Roadmap for the EU**

**June 2022**

Project Full Title	Organizing, Promoting and Enabling Heritage Reuse through Inclusion, Technology, Access, Governance and Empowerment	
Project Acronym	OpenHeritage	
Grant Agreement No.	776766	
Coordinator	Metropolitan Research Institute (MRI)	
Project duration	June 2018 – Sept 2022	
Project website	www.openheritage.eu	
Work Package	WP3: Evaluation of adaptive re-use management: contrasting policies with practices	
Deliverable	3.8 Recommendations and Suggested Roadmap for the EU	
Delivery Date	June 2022	
Author(s)	Miranda Iossifidis, Ashley Mason, Loes Veldpaus (UNEW); Dora Mérai (CEU); Federica Fava (Roma3)	
Contributor(s)	Harald Mieg (HU Berlin); Hanna Szemző (MRI); Hanne Van Gils (UGENT); John Pendlebury (UNEW)	
Reviewer(s) (if applicable)	-	
Dissemination level:	Public (PU)	<b>X</b>
	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 Reuse 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

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>APPROACH .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1. OPENHERITAGE: AN OPEN AND HOLISTIC APPROACH TO HERITAGE</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1 Framework .....	11
1.2 OpenHeritage Experience.....	11
1.3 Future Challenges .....	11
1.4 Recommendations .....	12
<b>2. AHR FOR AN INCLUSIVE EUROPE: PARTICIPATION AND ACCESS FOR ALL.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Framework .....	13
2.2 OpenHeritage experience.....	13
2.3 Future challenges .....	14
2.4 Recommendations .....	15
<b>3. AHR FOR A SUSTAINABLE EUROPE: SMART SOLUTIONS FOR A COHESIVE AND SUSTAINABLE FUTURE .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1 Framework .....	19
3.2 OpenHeritage experience.....	20
3.3 Future challenges .....	20
3.4 Recommendations .....	21
<b>4. AHR FOR A RESILIENT EUROPE: SAFEGUARDING ENDANGERED HERITAGE .....</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1 Framework .....	23
4.2 OpenHeritage Experience.....	23
4.3 Future Challenges .....	23
4.4 Recommendations .....	24
<b>5. AHR FOR AN INNOVATIVE EUROPE: MOBILISING KNOWLEDGE AND RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1 Framework .....	27
5.2 OpenHeritage Experience.....	27
5.3 Future Challenges .....	28
5.4 Recommendations .....	29
<b>6. AHR FOR STRONGER GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS: REINFORCING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, BUILDING MOMENTUM.....</b>	<b>32</b>
6.1 Framework .....	32
6.2 OpenHeritage Experience.....	32
6.3 Future Challenges .....	33
6.4 Recommendations .....	34

<b>7. CONCLUSION: A MAINSTREAMING AND INTEGRATED APPROACH TO AHR.....</b>	<b>37</b>
7.1 Framework .....	37
7.2 OpenHeritage experience.....	37
7.3 Future Challenges.....	38
7.4 Recommendations .....	38
7.5 Concluding Summary.....	40
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>41</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the recommendations of the OpenHeritage project, funded under the EU Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 776766). The following report shares a series of policy recommendations for upscaling and multiplying good practices, suggesting an EU-level roadmap able to promote innovative approaches to the adaptive re-use of heritage. Key near future challenges and their impact on adaptive heritage reuse are considered, as well as how adaptive heritage reuse can contribute to addressing these challenges, drawing from OpenHeritage's experiences through six Cooperative Heritage Labs (CHLs) and sixteen Observatory Cases (OCs) within fifteen countries across Europe.

This report's structure is aligned with the five pillars of the European Commission's 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' (2019): inclusivity; sustainability; resilience; innovation; and global partnerships. The Framework promotes and puts into practice an integrated and participatory approach to cultural heritage, contributing to the mainstreaming of cultural heritage across EU policies. Within the Framework, clusters of actions are connected to each pillar, with the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings connected specifically to the 'sustainability' pillar. The United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals (2015) are, thus, highly relevant to adaptive heritage reuse policy and practice, therefore in this report we argue that these goals are equally entwined with OpenHeritage's approach to adaptive heritage reuse.

With these recommendations and roadmap for the EU we seek to foster the accommodation of new approaches to the adaptive reuse of heritage and build on our 'Interim report on the regional and territorial integration evaluation' (D3.5). Here, we extend the aim of the 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' to 'go beyond' the European Year of Cultural Heritage and reignite pre-pandemic momentum, sharing our experiences and insights in order to propose actions and strategies that we recommend be implemented by the European Commission. In this report, we draw on the results of OpenHeritage's analyses to propose how adaptive heritage reuse can be supported and, in turn, how it can support work towards goals in other policy areas. These recommendations seek to address EU-level policies and programmes, whilst taking into consideration the diversity of contexts within the European countries that OpenHeritage has specifically attended to and operated within.

## INTRODUCTION

OpenHeritage (OH) has, for the past four years (2018–2022), focused on adaptive heritage reuse. Adaptive heritage reuse refers to the change of function of a building or place from one use to another, in the process requiring a level of material change. By this we refer to both the reuse of buildings that are officially attributed with a heritage status (e.g. a formal designation as ‘listed’) and buildings without such legal status but which have heritage value and meaning for a given community. While strongly associated with the conservation of buildings that have been considered to be of historic value, adaptive heritage reuse is a term that is increasingly applied to a diverse range of historic contexts, including places and landscapes (Plevoets and Cleempoel, 2019; Wong, 2016).

Interest in the reuse of heritage emerged from architectural practice and conservation (Plevoets and Cleempoel, 2019). Beyond the preservation of heritage values, additional arguments for the reuse of buildings over the construction of new structures have been identified during recent decades, including for sustainability and resilience (Wilkinson, Remøy, and Langston, 2014: 4). The 2008 financial crisis provided further stimulus, with many countries experiencing a decline in new-build projects, while economic urban regeneration strategies promoted an increase in reuse projects (2014: 9). Responding to the ongoing climate crisis has equally provided an impetus for reuse practices rather than new build, where evaluation (of factors such as the embodied carbon) of existing buildings must now be taken into account before demolition can even be considered (Wong, 2016).

Adaptive heritage reuse (AHR) has not only emerged as a potential solution and policy aim in relation to both economic and environmental strategies in a number of countries but also more recently in EU governance and funding (Veldpaus, Fava, and Brodowicz, 2019). This forms part of a wider focus on instrumentalising heritage — often through reuse — by capitalising on the economic value of local identity and historic character as part of urban regeneration and tourism development (Chen et al., 2016; UNESCO, 2016; Pendlebury et al., 2018; Vehbi et al., 2019). AHR is considered to be more sustainable than new construction (Fouseki and Nicolau, 2018), and is often seen as part of the ‘reduce, reuse or recycle’ discourse through the reduction of material waste (Ross, 2020), as well as the containment of the embodied energy of materials and labour (Adams et al., 2014), something that has reached into mainstream architectural debate through, for example, the British *Architects’ Journal’s* ‘RetroFirst’ campaign.<sup>1</sup> This, too, in a context of the United Nation’s (UN) ‘Sustainable Development Goals’ (SDGs) (UN, 2015), the ‘European Green Deal’ (European Commission (EC), 2019–2024),<sup>2</sup> and

---

1. *Architects’ Journal*, ‘RetroFirst’, [n.d.], at:

<<https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/retrofirst>> [accessed 9 May 2022].

2. See: <[https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/european-green-deal\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/european-green-deal_en)> [accessed 29 June 2022].

the climate emergencies that local authorities have declared over recent years, makes the sustainability framing of AHR an increasingly attractive practice for policy makers. Thus, the heightened focus on AHR is connected to the development of specific policy programmes within the context of heritage and planning, but also to other policy agendas — such as urban regeneration, crisis recovery, tourism development, the support of creative industries, increasing environmental quality, increasing wellbeing and quality of life, promoting ‘localism’, and reducing carbon emissions.

Consequently, AHR is at the intersection of crucial policy concerns: environmental sustainability; participation; culture; health and well-being; and socio-economic development (Veldpaus et al., 2020). AHR occupies a position where the past and the future are mediated — heritage is sustained while simultaneously given new purpose as part of ongoing social, economic, environmental, and cultural transformation. In our current twenty-first century, heritage management is concerned with contributing to a better future. As such, we consider AHR as an area of heritage management that should be integrated into a range of EU policies. Our understanding of heritage management covers all heritage-related decision-making, including (but not limited to) preservation, conservation, protection (listing), interpretation, and presentation. Our recommendations concern not only policies, since we have seen that ‘good’ policies are not sufficient to guarantee that heritage is sustained; in order to ensure that policies are successful and goals are achieved, implementation methods and tools supporting heritage management practices are also necessary.

This report aims to demonstrate how AHR — as a tool for regeneration, waste reduction, and sustainable development — can contribute to fostering other EU policy goals and, at the same time, how the integration of AHR within strategies working towards these goals can contribute to the sustainment of cultural heritage in Europe. This will be done by engaging with SDGs, drawing upon other Horizon 2020 projects, and by building on the ‘European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage’ (2019), whose agenda we believe should be extended (EC, 2019a). The Framework is the most recent strategic document setting a common direction for heritage-related activities at the European level, with a special focus on EU policies and programmes. The Framework presents ‘promoting adaptive re-use of heritage buildings’ as part of a cluster of actions, while ‘promoting synergies with other sectorial policies’ is a further key feature (EC, 2019a: 5). In this report we build on the Framework’s approach to cultural heritage in order to propose a series of recommendations.

The following report shares policy recommendations for upscaling and **multiplying good practices**, drawing from OH’s deliverables (within WP1–WP5). It also suggests **a roadmap** for the EU-level **to foster the accommodation of new approaches** to the adaptive re-use of heritage sites. It does so by considering key **near future challenges** and their impact on AHR, as well as how AHR can contribute to addressing these challenges, drawing from OH’s work with sixteen Observatory Cases (OCs) and six Cooperative Heritage Labs (CHLs)

situated across Europe.

OH has previously undertaken extensive mapping of current AHR policies and regulations in fifteen countries across Europe, leading to a typology of these AHR policies ([D1.3](#)). In developing this typology, we offered a grouping of European countries according to national and regional differences and highlighted patterns within approaches to AHR that might allow for a better understanding of how to facilitate the transferability of AHR policies where possible. Assemblages of interdependencies were found; while difficult to disentangle, their extrication was crucial to determining where transferability may take place. We therefore sought to identify similarities and differences across these countries, with three typology groups subsequently identified, for projects where: 1) AHR is common and facilitated; 2) AHR is somewhat established as a practice or regulatory framework with some obstacles but trends towards more flexibilities; and 3) AHR is difficult. A key conclusion was the acknowledgement that successful AHR projects within these groups have the potential to influence policies. As such, this report prefaced an analysis of practices against policies ([D3.6](#)) — a comprehensive overview of successful adaptive heritage reuse models in Europe with an emphasis on the mechanisms that enable and support civic initiatives. Both reports focused on the three pillars of OH: resource integration, community and stakeholder integration, and regional integration. The outcomes revealed the necessity for contextual considerations, and attention to the specificities of projects, rather than general applications of AHR practices and mechanisms, largely due to identified inconsistencies across national and regional policy levels — including of integration — thus exposing a series of opportunities at the EU-level.

These recommendations seek to address EU-level policies and programmes, whilst taking into consideration the diversity of contexts within the European countries that OH has specifically attended to and operated within. These fifteen countries have each had different governance, policy, and regulatory systems, which we have analysed within the [WP1 report](#) and that can be accessed within the [database](#). Governance and policy systems in certain countries allowed for risk-taking and flexibility, permitting heritage reuse to accommodate adaptation, while in other countries these systems are found to be more risk-averse and inflexible ([D1.3](#): 9). This report seeks to address the ways in which policies, programmes, and funding at the EU-level might be able to address the disparity in approaches, in order to make it easier for local actors to engage in AHR practices regardless of the flexibility and integration of regulations and policies.



## APPROACH

In brief, the approach of OH has been five-fold:

- To build on the 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' (EC, 2019a).
- To draw on the findings from 49 OH deliverables — including a toolkit, policy analysis, a policy typology of fifteen European countries, and four policy briefs.
- To make recommendations geared towards specific groups within the policy typology from OH analysis.
- To extend recent EU policies, programmes, and approaches around cultural heritage, as well as connect to other Horizon 2020 project findings and recommendations.
- To link to the UN's SDGs.

The structure of this report follows the five pillars of the 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' (EC, 2019a). The Framework promotes and puts into practice an integrated and participatory approach to cultural heritage and contributes to the mainstreaming of cultural heritage across EU policies. Its five pillars are: inclusivity; sustainability; resilience; innovation; and global partnerships. Within the Framework, clusters of actions are connected to each pillar, with the adaptive reuse of heritage *buildings* connected specifically to the 'sustainability' pillar (EC, 2019a: 20).<sup>3</sup> For OH, however, AHR as a means of managing heritage does not *only* concern buildings, but also sites, landscapes, and cities. Equally, as demonstrated within the OH deliverables, AHR is in fact relevant for each of the other pillars of the Framework (inclusivity, resilience, innovation, global partnerships) and as such holds great potential for incorporation into the implementation of those policy goals. Subsequently, our recommendations bolster the Framework as it currently stands.

The 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' (EC, 2019a) provides an overview of commitments taken by the EC, focusing on four principles: 1) an holistic approach (tangible, intangible, and digital dimensions of cultural heritage as inseparable and interconnected); 2) a mainstreaming and integrational approach which 're-affirms and puts into practice the principle of mainstreaming cultural heritage in different EU policies,' set within the 'first document to set out an integrated approach to cultural heritage at the European level' (EC, 2019a: 8);

---

3. "During the European Year of Cultural Heritage, the European Commission and partner organisations implemented a range of actions to integrate cultural heritage into environmental, architectural, and planning policies. One example was promoting the transformation of Europe's industrial, religious, and military heritage for new uses. The European Year of Cultural Heritage fostered significant exchanges of knowledge and experience among stakeholders (architects and local/regional authorities, among others) and networks in the field of religious, industrial, and military heritage. During these exchanges it became clear that this approach to sustainability can also work effectively for other abandoned or underused heritage buildings: former schools, hospitals, railway stations, abandoned cinemas, theatres, hotels, offices, former public housing, and 'ghost villages'." (EC, 2019: 20).

3) evidence-based policymaking; and 4) multi-stakeholder cooperation. In the following document, we share recommendations that engage with each of these four principles, alongside the preceding five pillars, in conjunction with OH's own four analytical axes in relation to AHR policy: flexibility, integration, engagement, and resources.

The UN's SDGs (UN, 2015) are highly relevant to AHR policy and practice, since both seek to "shift the world on to a sustainable and resilient path" (UN, 2015: 3). In this report, we therefore argue that the SDGs are entwined with OH's approach to AHR. The 'Berlin Call to Action: Cultural Heritage for the Future of Europe' (Europa Nostra, 2018) and the 'New European Agenda for Culture' (EC, 2018) attend to the importance of embedding SDGs in cultural and heritage agendas. The recent report 'Heritage and the Sustainable Development Goals: Policy Guidance for Heritage and Development Actors' (ICOMOS, Labadi et al., 2021) and the 'European Cultural Heritage Green Paper' (Europa Nostra, Potts, 2021) highlight the ways in which cultural heritage and, in particular, adaptive heritage reuse play a crucial role in the EU's strategies for localising SDGs — "implementing the Paris Agreement, achieving the aims of the European Green Deal [...] building on the Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, the European Commission's 2018 European Agenda for Culture, and the Council's Work Plan for Culture 2019–2022" (Europa Nostra, Potts, 2021: 88).

With this report, we extend the aim of the 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' (EC, 2019a) to 'go beyond' the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) and reignite the momentum which may have dissipated in recent times due to the COVID-19 pandemic, sharing our experiences and insights in order to consider short- to medium-term actions and strategies that could be implemented by the European Commission. As a Horizon 2020 project, OH is complicit — the European Commission made substantial funding available for cultural heritage projects across different EU funding programmes, encouraging people-centred, inclusive, and sustainable approaches (EC, 2019a: 5). In this report, we draw on the results of OH's analyses to propose how AHR, as a practice explicitly promoted by the Framework, can be supported and, in turn, how it can support work towards goals in other policy areas.

# 1. OPENHERITAGE: AN OPEN AND HOLISTIC APPROACH TO HERITAGE

## 1.1 Framework

The 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' (EC, 2019a) takes a holistic approach to the inseparable and interconnected, tangible, intangible, and digital dimensions of cultural heritage. It understands cultural heritage as a resource for the future; it, too, conveys a social vision for cultural heritage with a focus on local communities, access, and engagement, promoting audience development (children, young people, and individuals with disabilities), with the aim of fostering social inclusion and integration. A further part of the Framework's holistic approach to cultural heritage is perceiving sustainability and innovation as central principles (EC, 2019a: 8).

## 1.2 OpenHeritage Experience

The OH project has encouraged an open and integrated concept of heritage — much like the Framework. Heritage, in OH, is seen as a process of mobilising the past in the present. Such a broad interpretation of heritage means a focus beyond materiality, aesthetics, and conceptions of 'old' and the 'past', instead opening out to immaterial heritage or "practices — such as traditions, festivals, language, and expressions — which are signifiers of culture and manifestations of social memory" (Knippenberg and Gils, 2021: 44), capturing local knowledge and memory, and examining a wide range of local histories. This aligns with the approaches of the Framework, CLIC (2017–2021),<sup>4</sup> ICOMOS (Labadi et al., 2021), and UNESCO (2016). An open approach allows the potential for increased flexibility in intervention and temporary use, as well as a wider range and deployment of resources to support AHR.

## 1.3 Future Challenges

- At the national-level, the European Commission invites Member States to draw up similar frameworks for heritage on a voluntary basis to complement the European Framework for Action. However, the national-level already dominates heritage policy and management, and in some countries this is inhibiting local-level actors from acting and thereby closing off opportunities. Thus, such national-level frameworks can become barriers to an open approach to AHR (ref).
- With the rise of nationalisms and populisms within the political climates of EU Member States, we need to continuously address these issues around heritage and reuse. Heritage can so easily — especially through AHR, where erasure, paving over, and change can be presented as 'neutral'

---

4. CLIC Project, at: <<https://www.clicproject.eu>> [accessed 24 April 2022].

interventions — be used to celebrate ‘dark’ and ‘toxic’ pasts. The reuse of heritage, in any situation, not just in the ‘dark or painful’ sites, needs to address links to problematic pasts, and understand what is celebrated and silenced (Wollentz et. Al, 2020; Kaya, 2020; Legnér, 2018: 78) (D3.6: 19).

## 1.4 Recommendations

AHR is understood by OH to be based on three pillars: regional, resource, and stakeholder integration. To this end, and in order to promote an open approach to heritage which will counter the aforementioned issues:

- **We suggest that there should be a further push towards a more coordinated promotion of a very open and inclusive understanding of heritage through the articles of the Faro Convention** (Council of Europe (CoE), 2005) by different organisations working in conjunction to encourage individual countries’ voluntary adoption of AHR frameworks.<sup>5</sup>
  - We propose that this could involve the showcasing of projects that explicitly embody such definitions through heritage open days, funding, and awards that include and apply to a very broad understanding of heritage. The European Heritage Days is one such initiative; a theme in forthcoming years could be the Adaptive Reuse of Heritage or, as Europa Nostra is already accomplishing, AHR could be celebrated more explicitly in terms of ‘good’ practice through annual awards.<sup>6</sup>
  - The OH [Database](#) offers an exemplar in the showcasing of AHR projects which can be seen to adopt an open approach to AHR, including [Stara Trzinca](#), where transparent communication and cooperation between different professionals was key. We therefore recommend that the database could be expanded with additional AHR project profiles, to further the dissemination of ‘good’ practice precedents.
    - Both of the above propositions involve ‘jumping through’ the national level to support the local level directly.

---

5. UNESCO, ‘Support to policy development in the field of intangible cultural heritage’, 10 November 2017, at: <<https://youtube.com/watch?v=qSPrqUYc0OA&feature=share>> [accessed 24 April 2022].

6. See: <<https://www.europeanheritageawards.eu/facts-figures/categories/>> [accessed 24 April 2022].

## 2. AHR FOR AN INCLUSIVE EUROPE: PARTICIPATION AND ACCESS FOR ALL

### 2.1 Framework

The Framework sees cultural heritage as having the potential to contribute positively to people's lives and to European societies as a whole by improving psychological and social wellbeing and strengthening social inclusion (EC, 2019a: 10).

There are different approaches to understanding participation. The Open Method of Coordination (OMC) working group on participatory governance of cultural heritage make distinctions between notions of participation in terms of *access* — enabling new audiences to use available culture on offer — and participation as *involvement in decision-making, creative processes, and the construction of meaning* (OMC, 2018: 20). The latter “recognises the audience as an active interlocutor, to be consulted — or at least involved — in planning and creating the cultural offer” (OMC, 2012: 7; cited in OMC, 2018: 20). The distinction between different mobilisations of ‘participation’ allows the OMC working group to identify obstacles to participation as gaps in capacity, incentive, and/or power (OMC, 2018: 21).

### 2.2 OpenHeritage experience

OH bases its recommendations on our experience analysing national and European policy, as well as the six CHLs and sixteen OCs, which explore approaches to making heritage accessible and how existing policies impact participatory practices. Regardless of the current condition of European policies, better integration of policies and implementation tools would make it easier for AHR practices to occur and thereby improve participation and accessibility. For OH, an inclusive AHR project aims to: 1) level the playing field between different types of actors; 2) strive for locally embedded projects with a positive impact on their direct environment; 3) stimulate social innovation; 4) to empower disadvantaged or non-conventional actors to participate in AHR processes ([D3.6](#): 99–100). Our findings indicated that these may be achieved through: the implementation of strategies to address discriminatory social conditions and socio-economic marginalisation and to counter spatially uneven development by supporting local initiatives in disadvantaged areas; policies that entail inclusive stipulations and social support; or, policies where the regulation of the urban commons is not aimed in a spatially or social targeted way, but its effects can also be inclusive, particularly in disadvantaged areas. Equally, in the OH experience, inclusivity can be promoted by: raising awareness of heritage; connecting heritage with people; exploring the multiple layers and voices of heritage; exploring and reflecting on different understandings of heritage; and using, or becoming, part of a wider area-based approach ([D3.6](#): 37–46). Supportive resources and tools that foster

inclusive and collaborative practices can help build the connections necessary to actualise the integration of policies at all levels.

## 2.3 Future challenges

- The private and third sector are increasingly playing a pivotal role in AHR processes, sometimes with the consequence of limiting participation and access. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) with differing legally binding partnerships and long procedures are, equally, not always suitable, or feasible. To counter this, public, private, and non-profit sectors are already working together in a multitude of ways (including through Community Land Trusts: Kip and Oevermann, 2022) to secure economically viable outcomes for heritage places, however there is potential to enhance this with improved (and shared) knowledge of what constitutes successful partnerships and the factors that need to be in place in order to facilitate their success.
- Meanwhile-use presents numerous challenges related to issues of fostering gentrification and questions of ownership (EU—ERDF, 2018: 27; [D3.6](#): 42). The successful involvement of communities in participatory practices relies frequently on relationship building and the establishment of trust among parties involved, which can become adversely affected by concerns over rights, precarity, and the (perceived) threat of displacement (Veldpaus, et al., 2020: 4, 6–7).
- Finding users for AHR sites: the challenges of working with local groups (including issues of trust, communication, and managing diverse interests / motivations) which adversely affect participation and access ([D3.6](#): 14).
- A broad interpretation of heritage means a focus beyond the material, the aesthetic and the 'old', and the incorporation of immaterial heritage, the capturing of local knowledge and memory, the accounting for a wide range of local histories, and then making these accessible through research, exhibition, booklets, websites, and/or social media, for example, which can be challenging in terms of ensuring that the material is accessible, accounts for all perspectives, encompasses a broad remit and that the activities created involve the community in all aspects (Knippenberg and Gils, 2021: 44).
- Where EU project funding addresses only short-term co-governance experiments, and the money is given to researchers rather than to local actors, the result is that funds are not always able to be directed to where they are most needed, but are limited to costs that meet specific research requirements (see, for example, the [Pomáz](#) CHL: while there has been considerable funding available for programming and experts, the funds have not been able to be used for other aspects that would enable the entire site to begin to generate income).
- Some national policy systems explicitly encourage civic engagement in the adaptive reuse of heritage and related areas (for example facilitating 'commons': Bloemen and Hammerstein, 2017; Iaione, 2016; Kip and Oevermann, 2022), while other countries have a more neutral position or

actively discourage such engagement (D1.3). These disparities in participation and access reveal that the successful implementation of AHR can be heavily dependent upon the policies of the country within which a project is situated, and thus a future challenge is how to overcome these inequalities, as well as how to work on the 'local' level (Stanojev, 2019).

- Resourcing, too, is a challenge: OCs such as [Largo Residências](#) demonstrated that AHR projects can be supported by policies that define priority areas where co-governance is favoured. The policy framework might introduce tools such as local offices and/or personnel costs to support participation at the local level and tailored solutions for urban regeneration (see D2.2, Chapter 5).
- The OMC working group on the participatory governance of cultural heritage argue that it is essential to inform relevant stakeholders that participation in the project/process is “not only about the right to participate but is also about taking on a shared responsibility for the care and management of cultural heritage” (OMC, 2018: 51). They also note that feelings of belonging can lead to the exclusion of others, and the importance of remembering that disputed cultural heritage exists in all societies (2018: 51). Here, 'common responsibility' means “not only forwarding your own interests or the interest of a group/community (either majority or minority), but also paying attention to the interests of others by giving equal importance to different values attributed by diverse communities” (2018: 51).

## 2.4 Recommendations

These recommendations address the following SDGs: 4, inclusive and equitable quality education; 8, decent work and economic growth; 9, industry, innovation, and infrastructure; 10, reduced inequalities; 11, sustainable, inclusive, and resilient cities and communities; and 16, peace, justice, and strong/inclusive institutions.

- **We recommend facilitating AHR where civic engagement and social benefit are priorities.** This entails an inclusive approach towards heritage:
  - Broadening the circle of potential stakeholders interested in the adaptive reuse of heritage sites.
  - Encouraging civic engagement in AHR projects through incentives, platforms, and resources (time, money, access) within institutional systems of planning and heritage.
  - Making heritage accessible through online content, including databases, videos, and platforms. (SDGs 4, 8, 10)
- **Recognising and supporting forms of civic engagement happening outside of (and perhaps despite) the institutional arrangements.** Civic engagement can happen in a variety of ways, not solely bottom-up initiatives, but also through public and private stakeholders. As such, we want to promote best practices, yet also still support those that are less

ideal. This includes encouraging and incentivising civic engagement in AHR projects through:

- Capacity building of local actors and civil servants.
- Creating and supporting existing networks of community organisations and AHR spaces which might help stimulate partnerships on the ground.
- Linking up existing network funding to bigger projects.
- Promoting and integrating youth and social work in the context of AHR as alternative to economic/tourism activities (see the [Naples](#) OC).
- Connecting AHR to work developed through the European Solidarity Corps<sup>7</sup> or Starts<sup>8</sup> could be one such way, alongside other forms of funding for the Cultural and Creative Sectors (CCS<sup>9</sup>). (SDGs 4, 8, 10, 16)
- **Promoting different types of PPPs in different contexts. Each (co)governance proposal poses its own challenges for an inclusive or effective open heritage programme. There is no 'one size fits all':**
  - In Group 1 and Group 2 typology contexts (regulatory framework with some obstacles but trends towards more flexibilities) the challenge will be to make the classic PPP structures and procedures more 'open' to local stakeholders and less complex in terms of administration ([D1.3](#): 17–18). At present, these legal procedures are very time consuming and require a very strong public partner, often also the owner of the site. Civic initiatives, in many cases, require a faster pace than conventional bureaucratic procedures (Interreg, 2021: 27).
  - In the context of Group 3 typologies (where AHR is more challenging), citizen initiatives rely more on different types of partnerships with private and public partners (Mérai et al., 2020). A rent-to-invest ten-year contract between citizens and a public partner, for example, may offer a sustainable alternative (see the [Bratislava](#) OC). (SDG 8)
- **We recommend developing an ethical meanwhile-use framework<sup>10</sup> which can be voluntarily adopted by different countries.**
  - The ethical meanwhile use framework can engage with a range of issues: with ethical story-telling and historical research; with ethical and sustainable ways of dealing with materials; with ethical collaboration especially with volunteers; with ethical partnerships; and with ethical participatory practices.
  - We recommend suggesting stimulating regulation (locally) so temporary (re)use can happen, for example by adjusting levies on use (such as business rates) or land use plans so it becomes possible to have 'temporary' use, or 'temporary change of use' (both are often not possible), whilst making sure appropriate quality controls and building regulations for the new use are in place.

---

7. See: <<https://europa.eu/youth/solidarity>> [accessed 26 June 2022].

8. See: <<https://starts.eu>> [accessed 26 June 2022].

9. See: <<https://culture.ec.europa.eu/funding/cultureu-funding-guide/discover-funding-opportunities-for-the-cultural-and-creative-sectors>> [accessed 26 June 2022].

10. See: <<https://morethanmeanwhile.wordpress.com>> [accessed 26 June 2022].



- Ownership issues are important, not only who the owner is, and their role in the reuse project, but also how facilitative the policy context is as shown in D1.3 (see e.g. the [Pomáz](#) CHL) ([D1.3](#): 13–15). A key question is how to secure the longevity of the site without relying on the owner. We therefore recommend that ethical meanwhile-use frameworks are sensitive and inclusive enough to cater to the particulars of varying project contexts and to thereby negate these issues. (SDGs 8, 9).
- **Ensuring that community actors are involved and are promoting inclusive governance models which support local commons initiatives.**
  - This involves encouraging social procurement for co-governance (see D5.6):
    - This also connects to the aim of reversing the general trend of public asset disposal, alongside promoting specific management policies for publicly owned AHR that aid the value and retainment of public properties.
  - We recommend capacity-building and facilitation processes that provide local communities with the tools and knowledge to work together with the other players of the quintuple helix (see the OH [glossary](#); Kip and Amacher, 2021). The creation of competencies, collaboration, and partnership, therefore, is not a short-term solution, it requires a long-term vision.
    - Linked to this is the promotion of multi-actor partnerships, which involve the possibility of using special forms of agreement that allow for less formal and more concrete procedures for the achievement of common goals. (see D3.4, D3.5) (see the [Naples](#) and [Turin](#) OCs as good examples that serve to improve the role of public actors from the perspective of the commons).
    - Aligned with this is a recommendation that any investment in local AHR research requires both a university and local partner organisation to ensure the integration of local knowledge in the design process.
    - The ability to be agile and be able to do something on the ground quickly should be a requirement — via a local partner.
  - This builds on the 'Pact of Amsterdam' (EC, 2016) which indicates the role of social dimensions and employment benefits of the adaptive reuse of cultural heritage, the 'Urban Agenda for the EU — Culture and Cultural Heritage Orientation Paper' (EC, 2019b), as well as the OMC working group on participatory governance of cultural heritage (OMC, 2018).
  - To facilitate greater participation at the local level, the 'Urban Agenda' suggests having forms of common management in compliance with possible EU regulation or guidelines (EC, 2020: 56). The first steps of this could include:
    - Organising AHR workshops with the population to share information about projects and connecting local actors to vacant available spaces.
    - Organising counselling for contracting authorities.

- Creating dedicated places or structures dedicated to sharing information and debate about projects, in order to share knowledge with all concerned stakeholders, raise awareness, and inform the general public (EC, 2019b: 51). (SDGs 4, 8, 10, 16).
- **We encourage a focus on responsible development. The EC needs to be clear when recommending AHR as a tool for tourism, social work, culture-led development, amongst others, to include 'have you considered' warnings.**
  - Connecting notions of resilience which focus on *buildings* with notions of resilience which emphasise the resilience of *citizens* themselves (Sani, et al., 2015: 72). Such inclusive terminology emphasises the mutual learning and adaptation process in AHR, whereby previously included actors are called upon to actively work against exclusionary processes.
  - Connecting resilience and anti-gentrification. This means ensuring that AHR projects address with a sense of responsibility for the consequences of ensuing development; in terms of (unintended) negative outcomes, and in terms of enabling future users to adapt the site to new uses and without greater constraints than faced in the present (D3.6: 16).
  - It is important for such civic initiatives to be conscious of this risk and possibly take preventive measures. Such measures may include promoting forms of community sharing initiatives and solidarity-building, as well as broader policies on circular economy or value capture (CLIC, Gravagnuolo, Lupu, and Palomba, 2021).
  - Civic initiatives could also engage with resilience strategies. Resilience in this sense implies particularly the ability to not be overly dependent on one source of income or support (see D5.6).
  - Responsible development can also derive from building more linkages between AHR and the cultural sector, in a way that creates value-oriented narratives around assets rather than solely leisure, and can be the first step towards mobilising local actors and their involvement throughout the adaptation process, from decision-making to programming and management, that in turn might foster social innovation (BEPA, 2010:9) (D3.6: 17).
  - Establish follow-on funding for Horizon 2020 labs to ensure “long-lasting and continuous processes of engagement” (D3.6: 66).  
Lastly, the involvement of local municipalities is needed to make sure that these measures work, and to coordinate the efforts of similar initiatives. (SDGs 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16)

## 3. AHR FOR A SUSTAINABLE EUROPE: SMART SOLUTIONS FOR A COHESIVE AND SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

### 3.1 Framework

One of the cluster of actions underpinning this pillar of the Framework is “supporting the adaptive re-use of heritage buildings” (EC, 2019a: 22–23). The Framework argues that “smart restoration and adaptive re-use of unused heritage buildings can bring economic and social dynamism to cities and regions, while reducing unsustainable urban sprawl” (22).

It highlights that the Leeuwarden Declaration on ‘Adaptive re-use of the built heritage: Preserving and enhancing the values of our built heritage for future generations’ (ACE, 2018) was adopted at the end of 2018 as a legacy of the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 initiative ‘Heritage in Transition’. This declaration argues for the sensitising of stakeholders to the benefits and challenges of AHR through peer-learning, and that this will enable AHR to be integrated into contemporary society and for the existing built environment to thereby be conserved sustainably, a necessary strategy to meet the challenges expressed in the Davos Declaration (OFC, 2018)<sup>11</sup> — including “the lasting effects of the economic and financial crisis, the fourth industrial revolution, accelerated urbanisation, the shrinking of peripheral regions, migration and social change, increasing inequality, climate change and environmental damage, and the major impact that these are having on our living environment” — understood as “a new, adaptive approach to shaping our built environment [...] that is rooted in culture, builds social cohesion, ensures environmental sustainability, and contributes to the health and well-being of all” (OFC, 2018: 8, 11).

Building on the Framework, the European Commission has since “support[ed] peer learning for local, regional, and national policy makers on the re-use of heritage buildings” (EC, 2019a: 22–23) in order to stimulate this sensitisation. As a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, and its impacts on travel and restrictions on venue capacities, the implementation of planned study visits and exchanges was significantly compromised, however ‘Cultural Heritage in Action’ was launched in 2020 to support exchange and build a learning community that would allow for evaluation of existing good practices of the re-use of heritage buildings in Europe and ensure transfer of knowledge among policy makers.<sup>12</sup> Undoubtedly, though, more peer learning could take place.

---

11. A second Conference of European Ministers of Culture under the title ‘Common Good, Shared Responsibility’ will meet in Davos in January 2023. At this meeting, the ministers will “discuss with representative of the private sector how to achieve high quality Baukultur together for Europe.” See: <<https://davosdeclaration2018.ch>> [accessed 26 June 2022].

12. See: <<https://culturalheritageinaction.eu>> [accessed 29 June 2022].

## 3.2 OpenHeritage experience

AHR projects in OH have demonstrated the potential to contribute to a broader process of working towards environmental sustainability in terms of:

- Promoting the adaptive re-use of heritage buildings, including through the example of living labs (see the OH CHL participatory [platform](#); Voytenko, et al., 2016), which has benefits including in reducing CO2 and NO2 emissions and waste (Watson, 2012).
- Balancing access to cultural heritage with sustainable cultural tourism and natural heritage — i.e. the integration of AHR with sustainable cultural tourism ([D3.6](#): 37).
- Regenerating cities and regions through cultural heritage. OH promotes the integration of heritage and planning; spatial and urban planning is one of the most important areas where environmental studies and heritage management intersect (see e.g., the issues of the *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* published since 2011).
- Adaptive heritage reuse is often combined with area revitalisation, especially in former industrial areas. This includes ecological rehabilitation with new biodiversity and social opportunities, combined with the development of new narratives (Eiringhaus 2020). Here, OH's principles of stakeholder (inclusiveness), regional, and resource integration are relevant (see the [Grünmetropole OC](#)) ([D3.6](#): 18).

## 3.3 Future challenges

- In our work we have found that greening agendas are increasingly identifying heritage as a key component, but that the 'recycle, reduce, reuse' approach can go much further in the current context of climate breakdown, for example with regards to waste management and infrastructure, particularly in the push to shift towards a circular economy (Girard, 2019).
- Within EU policy and programmes, adaptive reuse is often most present in relation to heritage and cultural contexts, rather than in relation to sustainability. While urban and regional development agendas are beginning to include AHR more explicitly — through green and circular economy, material recycling, energy, and growth agendas — AHR (and its sustainability benefits) tends to be more difficult to promote or implement when decision-makers don't have authority or discretion to deviate from a general set of standards, which are often developed with new (less sustainable) construction in mind ([D1.3](#): 23).
- An additional challenge is balancing the sustainability of cultural heritage with the benefits of tourism, not just in economic terms, but also for the well-being of local communities ([D3.6](#): 31).

### 3.4 Recommendations

These recommendations address the following SDGs: 7, affordable and clean energy; 11, sustainable cities and communities; 12, responsible consumption and production; and 13, climate action.

- **The EU has a role to play around regulatory frameworks, in terms of re-focusing the construction industry and influencing standards and regulations, including setting the criteria for nitrogen and carbon production from building processes and sustainability regulations.**
  - We recommend taking the focus away from new build and directed towards AHR.
  - And we suggest re-focusing procurement and regulations around tenders through sustainability criteria.
    - These build on ICOMOS' policy statement around SDG 12, to "integrate heritage as a starting point and source of inspiration for sustainable production and consumption" (ICOMOS, Labadi et al., 2021: 83).
  - Make adaptive reuse — in terms of the continued use and maintenance of older buildings — an essential policy in the construction sector as a means of avoiding/reducing consumption of new building materials and conserving and recycling the embodied energy of existing buildings, while respecting the structural integrity of buildings that were not designed to be dismantled.
    - This builds on ICOMOS' policy statement around SDG 7, where they suggest that we should "harness the potential of heritage for energy-efficient development models. Promote the maintenance, rehabilitation, suitable energy efficiency improvement, and sensitive adaptive reuse of existing buildings as a sustainable construction approach" (ICOMOS, Labadi et al., 2021: 58).
  - These recommendations resonate with the EU taxonomy on 'green finance' which supports the transition to a low-carbon, resilient, and resource-efficient economy with EU stakeholders as investors, large enterprises, SMEs, project promoters etc. The EU Taxonomy on 'green finance' sets performance thresholds (technical screening criteria) for six environmental objectives, requiring economic activities to: i) Substantially Contribute to at least one objective; ii) Do No Significant Harm to the other five; iii) comply with minimum safeguards (EU, 2020: 2). The environmental objectives are: 1) Climate change mitigation; 2) Climate change adaptation; 3) Sustainable and protection of water and marine resources; 4) Transition to Circular Economy; 5) Pollution prevention and control; and 6) Protection and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems (EU, 2020: 2). CLIC's Local Action Guide report argues that AHR initiatives can be considered in these economic activities, and as such "it is possible to assert how this type of activities [AHR] have or

may have a direct impact on the specified environmental objectives” (CLIC, Izulain, Garzillo, and Wildman, 2021: 39). This could include:

- Aligning ‘green financing’ for retrofit with AHR objectives.
- Targeted funding for AHR projects that address SDGs.
- Starting ‘at home’ through showcasing green AHR — where they work on their own buildings (e.g. Brussels quarter) to lead by example and pilot ideas, being a ‘good’ green client / commissioner. (SDGs 7, 11, 12, 13)

## 4. AHR FOR A RESILIENT EUROPE: SAFEGUARDING ENDANGERED HERITAGE

### 4.1 Framework

In the Framework, resilience is interpreted as the various ways in which cultural heritage is fragile and vulnerable to destruction and decay when faced with natural and man-made disasters and threats, including climate change, as well as conflict. They also consider low quality or ill-conceived cultural heritage interventions as another risk factor (EC, 2019a: 12). One of the clusters of actions around this aims to “raise the quality of physical interventions on cultural heritage implemented by national, regional and local authorities,” and in particular “when those interventions are EU-funded and are supporting capacity-building and the transfer of knowledge in this field” (2019a: 26–27).

### 4.2 OpenHeritage Experience

In OH we have focused on this latter cluster of actions. In terms of resilience, we have concentrated on a holistic understanding of *resourcing* AHR. A diversity in funding sources makes an AHR project more resilient and resistant to economic disruptions and political and business cycles. It can also be a tool to achieve crucial social goals such as engaging stakeholders, sharing power, and building a stronger community around a project. Within the OH CHLs, we have demonstrated that a mix of financial resources is essential for undisturbed development, highlighting the specific importance of reliable public funding ([D3.6](#): 133; [D4.6](#): 5). We found a shift from state ‘funding’ to private and civic ‘investment’ models to be one of the main drivers for a stronger focus on AHR, as it is seen as a financially more viable solution to conservation. This supports the idea of jumping over the national or state level in order to make it easier for initiatives (especially those that may be more local / mediocre) to access the support that they need in order to ensure their resilience.

### 4.3 Future Challenges

- Developing long-term strategies of regeneration that can include informality and interim activities/processes within better resourced process of restoration. Among others, the Grünmetropole project has proven how important it is to keep a real and consistent connection with the communities’ reality in the longer term (see the [Grünmetropole](#) OC).
- Upscaling and reinforcing the integration of ‘commons’ networks within city systems. Resourcing the commons would allow the local communities to become self-sustaining through a dedicated public budget, going beyond volunteering and seeking to assure continuity beyond a contingent and favourable policy context (Iaione, 2016; Bloemen and Hammerstein, 2017; Kip and Oevermann, 2022). Reaching a better coordination of sectoral policies seems to be a future challenge in the Scugnizzo Liberato project

(where activists also reclaim the need for policy recognition of the commons as practices of care that impact on the welfare system) but also in CHLs such as Hof Prädikow where strategies of adaptive heritage reuse need to be combined with job creation, namely relying on a long-lasting and continuous process of engagement that helps to refocus emerging needs and priorities (see the [Scugnizzo Liberato](#) OC and the [Hof Prädikow](#) CHL).

- Non-profit enterprises are usually not profitable enough to access financial markets and are considered too risky for private investors (Bugg-Levine, Kogut, and Kulatilaka, 2012; Patti and Polyák, 2017; Kickul and Lyons, 2020: 154; Hughes and Luksetich, 2004: 204, 218; Kaplan and Grossman, 2010: 112). Consequently, heritage can easily be placed at risk through lack of support. The challenge is how benefit and impact can be communicated differently to particular potential funders or investors — as being not only financial and economic, but also social and cultural — in order to access a diversity of funding sources and ensure a project’s resilience.
- What kind of resources — in terms of direct funding or fiscal incentives for AHR, and professional staff resources and organisations to support such projects — can be made available at the EU-level?
- What kind of incentives and waivers (e.g. tax, procurement, levies) and grants exist, and are these directed towards listed buildings or protected monuments only, or are they available for a broader range of heritage reuse projects?
  - Are such resources available for sites in private ownership, and are they for use and capital works, or only the latter?
  - At present these issues are mostly on a national or even local level, and the challenge of how policies at the EU-level can address them remains.

## 4.4 Recommendations

These recommendations address the following SDGs: 4, inclusive and equitable quality education; 8, decent work and economic growth; 9, industry, innovation, and infrastructure; 10, reduced inequalities; 11, sustainable cities and communities; and 16, peace, justice, and strong institutions.

- **We see the EU as playing a key role in supporting local actors to address bottlenecks, obstacles, and challenges at the state level by helping local actors and bottom-up initiatives to ‘jump through’ such hurdles at the national level by accessing specific funding and training to facilitate AHR.**
  - These recommendations seek to address disparities at the EU-level. With regards to AHR, some countries are reasonably well-resourced in terms of both funding (public and/ or private) and capacity (e.g. available experts, knowledge, information, support), while other countries do not have either.
  - In terms of facilitation and negotiating different levels of governance, make resources available for matchmakers (see e.g. the [Marineterrein](#)



- OC, where funding for reuse came partly in 2015 to make it suitable to host events related to the Netherlands EU presidency and as such funding was made available by the national government and the municipality).
- Ensure AHR is eligible for heritage funding and tax relief: AHR doesn't always benefit from heritage funding and tax reliefs, which can be curtailed for protection and preservation of (sometimes only publicly owned) formal and material heritage assets and not for their use or reuse.
    - For example, promote the use of old buildings for a variety of community, social and healthcare facilities if funding is available for community groups etc. (SDGs 8, 10, 11, 16)
  - **Financing AHR: Enabling complementary financing instruments for bottom-up initiatives**
    - In terms of EU funding and grants, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), European Structural and Investment Funds, and the Cohesion Fund provide support in the transition towards a circular economy, and to promote economic and social cohesion across Europe. These can be more targeted towards AHR at the local level through explicit mentions and a change of language towards recycling and reusing in general (not just heritage, but material and buildings), supported by actually favouring AHR practices (see CLIC, Gravagnuolo, Lupu, and Palomba, 2021: 11).
    - Develop reliable funding streams, from the European Investment Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the ERDF.
      - Unstable and unreliable public funding represents a serious challenge for bottom-up initiatives, who tend to have less savings and limited revenue streams. It also contributes to a large fluctuation rate of the personnel and endangers the social mission of the initiatives. Predictable funding streams support financial planning and contribute to long-term sustainability in the sector. In the long run, stable public funding can also encourage further private and civic investments and contribute to the expansion and stabilization of these initiatives.
    - Rethink public tender requirements, changing grant requirements (see also Section 5 on innovation).
      - For example, the funding priorities of the ERDF (2021–2027<sup>13</sup>) are really on point for AHR: “more competitive and smarter, through innovation and support [...]; greener, low-carbon, and resilient; more connected by enhancing mobility; more social, supporting effective and inclusive [factors], as well as enhancing the role of culture and sustainable tourism; closer to citizens, supporting locally-led development, and sustainable urban development across the EU.” We recommend that the funding priorities of this example could be taken up within further EU-level funds.

---

13. See: <[https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/funding/erdf/](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/funding/erdf/)> [accessed 26 June 2022].

- The Interreg 2021–2027<sup>14</sup> programme also seeks to help local, regional, and national governments across Europe to develop and deliver better policy. It strives for better regional governance through capacity building, with policy objectives for building a Europe that is: 1) smarter; 2) greener; 3) more connected; 4) more social; and 5) closer to its citizens through integrated urban (and non-urban) development. The EU and the 29 programme partner states provide up to 80% of the funds needed for cooperation covered under these objectives. This programme is a good start, and we recommend that this language be integrated into public tenders / procurement procedures. (SDGs 9, 11)
- **Help civic initiatives become visible to investors at the EU-level through promotion, networks, and so on.**
  - Alternative routes of funding AHR could be rendered more visible and explicit at the local level.
  - There could be targeted support for AHR in rural or peri-urban areas – AHR mobilised as a driver of local development (see D3.7).
  - Social enterprises that generate stable incomes look more attractive in the eyes of the right investors, which requires:
    - Advanced financial management skills (financial planning, revenue identification, expenditure analysis, risk management etc.).
    - Public authorities can facilitate civic actors in strengthening their skills in this area by a wide range of actions and tools (capacity building and mentoring programs, workshops, consultancy etc.).
    - Facilitate more capacity building and knowledge sharing around AHR funding and best practice in different European contexts at the local level, in local language. This helps provide guidance materials and groups who want to undertake such a project. (SDGs 4, 8, 10)

---

14. See: <<https://www.interregeurope.eu>> [accessed 26 June 2022]; see also <[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ua3Q1qexzi0&list=PLXXM7UvBjnhjcex\\_pQUPpQnoXk2kJ4C8&index=5](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ua3Q1qexzi0&list=PLXXM7UvBjnhjcex_pQUPpQnoXk2kJ4C8&index=5)> [accessed 26 June 2022].

## **5. AHR FOR AN INNOVATIVE EUROPE: MOBILISING KNOWLEDGE AND RESEARCH**

### **5.1 Framework**

In the Framework, innovation is understood as “not only technological; it also takes place in the social sphere,” with the acknowledgement that “the role of communities living with cultural heritage assets is changing.” They call for a “more participative approach in the safeguarding and management of cultural heritage” citing the OMC working group on participatory governance of cultural heritage (EC, 2019a: 12–13).

They argue that “there is a need for new models that engage local communities, as for example in the social economy, and a wide range of stakeholders through open, participatory, and inclusive processes,” and that transferring expertise is essential for long-term sustainability of Europe’s cultural heritage. To address the challenges above, the Framework entails three clusters of actions aiming at a) capitalising on technological tools for innovation on cultural heritage; b) fostering social innovation; and c) strengthening skills in the field of cultural heritage (EC, 2019a: 13).

### **5.2 OpenHeritage Experience**

In this section we build on our longitudinal work with CHLs in six countries to make recommendations that emphasise the ways in which innovation “takes place in the social sphere,” as advocated by the ‘European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage’. Indeed, we have found that the role of communities living with cultural heritage assets is changing and, as such, a more participative approach in the safeguarding and management of cultural heritage is called for.

OH has demonstrated that AHR enables social innovation beyond social or governmental experimentation, by: 1) addressing current, new cases of AHR across Europe; 2) extracting transferable models from this, which; 3) must all be socially inclusive and based on stakeholder integration.

The transferable AHR models have focuses in the areas of funding, governance, and AHR process management (see D3.7). Transferability in this context means high diffusion potential. OH provides the transferability proof for the identified European AHR models. The social added value of these AHR models results from social inclusivity and requires community integration. Drawing on the project’s open dialogues, interviews, and ethnographic engagement, we want to make several recommendations.

## 5.3 Future Challenges

Based on observations and experiences within the OH CHLs, we foresee several future challenges:

- Difficulties experienced by almost every CHL in OH, have been in establishing a permanent dialogue with the people living in the area, and in overcoming distrust to establish community integration. Equally, communication with public authorities has in certain cases been frustrated due to the long duration of proceedings and negotiations, which can in turn discourage engagement and participation (D4.6: 29). Especially post-pandemic, innovative digital tools have become increasingly key to collaboration, and indeed there has been a digital turn in engagement within the [Rome](#), [Pomáz](#), and [Praga](#) CHLs (D4.6: 5, 14, 36–38). A future challenge lies in ensuring longevity of engagement since a continued commitment is required, as well as critical reflection on how inclusive these platforms really are (see e.g. the [Marquês de Abrantes](#) CHL, D4.6: 100). There is therefore a question of who within the community is willing and able to take on this role into the future and how they can they be supported, and whether tools can be combined and/or shared amongst projects to facilitate wider knowledge and experience sharing.
- To innovate within an area requires understanding its context and collaborative opportunities. The [Praga](#) CHL and [Sunderland](#) CHLs, for example, have begun to create cultural and vacancy mappings of their wider local areas in order to support the further development of area-based partnership working (D4.6: 59). Future challenges are how this work can be continued and kept updated, how communities themselves can become involved, and how the mappings can be shared and communicated in an accessible and inclusive way to facilitate and support further outcomes.
- Future developments within CHLs require further financial support, therefore procedures need to be in place to ensure sustainability. Challenges ahead lie in the speed (and uncertainty) with which projects move on, and the funding / investments that will be available. The impacts of austerity measures are and will continue to be felt across EU countries, (see e.g. the [Sunderland](#) CHL where there is no direct follow up for the HAZ programme funding and investment though there are new investment areas i.e. the UK government's recent Levelling Up Fund, D4.6: 71, 75). Seeking mixed and innovative funding options (see e.g. the [Hof Prädikow](#) CHL where the cooperative shares financial instrument has been crucial, D4.6: 81) to mitigate uncertainty and risk will thus be a continuing challenge for many CHLs which will subsequently impact continuation of the innovation that has already occurred.
- A final key future challenge lies in competition. Regional development plans can sometimes lead to local organisations competing for the same financial resources or project applications, which is an impediment to the creation of a partnership framework. Equally, regional cooperation between municipalities can be informal and heavily influenced by political divisions; while, under the present financial situation, financial support from local

sources to help NGOs or civic organisations, too, is very limited leading to challenges in resourcing and governance (see e.g. the [Pomáz CHL](#), [D4.6: 115](#)). A key question therefore is how this competition can be alleviated at the EU-level in order to ensure innovation is not impeded.

## 5.4 Recommendations

These recommendations address SDGs: 4, quality education; 8, decent work and economic growth; 9, industry, innovation, and infrastructure; 10, reduced inequalities; 11, sustainable cities and communities; and 16, peace, justice, and strong institutions.

- **OpenHeritage recommends the ongoing support and promotion of living labs.** CHLs are a site of experimental encounter. This resonates with the current 'Work Plan for Culture 2019–2022' (CoEU, 2018b), which has creative ecosystems as a priority (2018b: 6).
  - At a regional level, governance institutions can stimulate networking, provide support through facilitating strategy processes, promote joint opportunity creation, and thereby develop the legitimacy of living labs (Katzy and Mensink, 2007). This could also be reflected at the EU-level (see D5.7).
  - It is important that projects are considered beyond their 'end' point, and that evaluation captures not only quantifiable and qualifiable 'impact' but also outcomes in relation to project ethnography, asking critical questions of the learnings that are able to be taken forward. This evaluation will require ongoing commitment and support.
  - We thus recommend establishing more funding for support, networking, knowledge production, and peer-to-peer exchange through living labs. This could be done through peer-to-peer learning grants.<sup>15</sup>
  - Living labs could be set up as important, 'neutral' spaces where new alliances can be developed and innovative co-creation processes can take place, but they need a wider remit than being part of a project (Dutilleul, Birrer, and Mensink, 2010: 68). Long term funding is important, as it is negligent to build a culture / coalition needed for these conversations to then let it fall away again after 3–4 years. This breaks down trust more than it builds. Therefore impact / follow on funding for labs, or at least 'lab support sessions' need to be funded by the EU to help labs apply for more money.
    - As previously referenced, the Interreg programme is suggesting and doing some of this already.<sup>16</sup>
  - We suggest that the different labs involved in ICLEI, CLIC, OpenHeritage, and Ruritage could come together post-Horizon 2020 to share knowledge, learning, and information and form their own informal

---

15. See: <<https://culturalheritageinaction.eu>> [accessed 26 June 2022].

16. See: <<https://www.interregeurope.eu>> [accessed 26 June 2022].

networks which can be sustained through EU follow-on funding. This could involve:

- Adopting, developing, and building on the OH [database](#).
  - Matchmaking 'handshake' partners across Europe to facilitate peer-learning.
  - Working on an EU-facilitated vacancy mapping (see below). (SDGs 4, 8, 9, 16)
- **We recommend open-source mapping of vacancy and underutilisation (crowdsourcing) which can facilitate AHR.**
    - There is a need for a publicly accessible and consultable overview of the vacancy and underutilisation of promising properties and locations. The EU can play an important role in bringing together existing databases and making them accessible to the public in a communicatively attractive and translatory way. This is because this data is often present in a rather fragmented way, and there is a need for an overview. The opening and democratisation of information on vacancy from archives and governmental databases can be combined with new forms of 'open source' and citizen-led mapping of vacant or underutilised space (see D5.7). (SDGs 10, 11)
  - **We recommend promoting innovative procurement procedures. The European Commission can play an important role in initiating and stimulating different kinds of public and private calls that give new cooperative ventures and coalitions more chance of success.**
    - This could involve rethinking public tender requirements and changing grant requirements. Three guiding conditions present themselves in this regard:
      - Encouraging and enabling new forms of ownership between purchase and rent, such as progressive rent-to-buy models.
      - Introducing 'slower' tendering procedures, where cooperatives / other types of initiators like civic groups are given the necessary time to set up a structure, work out business models, and find co-financiers. In addition, the evaluation criteria can be formulated in such a way that certain programs or combinations of programs are encouraged in developments where classic combinations such as housing and retail are often quickly reverted to.
      - Finally, cooperatives can also be given priority, support, and free advice early on in process (e.g., EU could fund national contact points). A lot of inspiration can be drawn from the German and Swiss contexts on such tendering procedures (Patti and Polyak, 2017).
    - To ensure that cooperative developments actually provide diversification and quality destinations, and that the forms of cooperation have the necessary sustainability, clear selection criteria will have to be elaborated. Such clarity will strengthen the creation of a transparent, accountable, and participatory framework.
    - Ensure that procedures are in place that consider living labs lasting beyond a project's end, to make them more durable and ongoing.

- Workshopping innovative regulations for the flexible use of space. This could build on the 'Culture for Cities and Regions' (KEA, 2017) project recommendations to consider:
  - Flexible contracts between the city and cultural AHR projects which have full independence if working towards key public policy objectives.
  - Opening-up new avenues for funding and investment in experimentation and innovation through shifting perspectives of what constitutes RDI for AHR. (SDGs 8, 9, 16)

## 6. AHR FOR STRONGER GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS: REINFORCING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, BUILDING MOMENTUM

### 6.1 Framework

The European Commission Communication 'Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe' (EC, 2014) outlined the role of cultural heritage in both international relations and development policies. It, too, emphasised the EU's commitment to nurturing cooperation on cultural heritage and to contributing to its protection, alongside global organisations such as UNESCO.

The Framework entails two clusters of actions to reinforce cultural heritage cooperation internationally. The first cluster targets geographical zones, but the second cluster entails horizontal/global actions aimed at strengthening cooperation on cultural heritage across the world. The Framework also suggests that the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)<sup>17</sup> can play a role in the protection of cultural heritage: "CSDP missions can promote, in cooperation with EU Delegations and other relevant EU partners, activities in the field of the protection of cultural heritage (identification, monitoring, mentoring, exchange of good practices and — within the framework of external financing instruments — building capacity of local partners for the protection of cultural heritage)" (EC, 2019a: 33).

### 6.2 OpenHeritage Experience

The COVID-19 pandemic undoubtedly profoundly altered everyone's relationships and connections, with the global feeling ever more local due to extensive interactions via digital environments as a consequence of in-person restrictions. All CHLs were adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic which limited not only physical, in-person community engagement and participation on a local level, but also impeded the visiting and thus potential cross-fertilisation of learnings from other labs. Community-building momentum was thus disrupted. Global supply chain issues, too, obstructed on-site construction with subsequent production delays and price hikes, in turn impacting the resourcing and financing of projects, as well as the availability of workers. Limitations on the numbers of workers allowed on-site at any given time, equally, led to schedule shifts previously unaccounted for. Impacts felt within one country had knock on effects on another, revealing all as embedded and interconnected with nowhere immune from the aftershocks. The difficulties faced reinforced the need for global connections and collaborations to overcome shared challenges.

---

17. See: <[https://www.eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/19-03241%20CSDP%20Buch\\_WEB.pdf](https://www.eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/19-03241%20CSDP%20Buch_WEB.pdf)> [accessed 26 June 2022].



## 6.3 Future Challenges

- The terminology around the practice of adaptive reuse can fall under many terms globally including regeneration, rehabilitation, restoration, and conservation. These inconsistencies can result in a lack of specificity in calls and requirements for funding, leading to a focus on protection (as in the Framework's suggestion of the potential role of the CSDP) rather than adaptive reuse.
- A major challenge to international cooperation is the shifting and differing perceptions locally regarding 'experts' versus 'participation'. Generally, the role of experts is an issue, and there is an emphasis on including 'other voices', but the dismissal of experts can easily shift towards an epistemological populism, where 'experts' are cast aside by populist governments in favour of developers (Harrison, 2018). This isolation and lack of openness can hinder collaborative efforts and learning across countries.
- All CHLs were adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic which restricted not only physical, in-person community engagement and participation on a local level, but also impeded the potential cross-fertilisation of learnings from other labs (Fava, 2022: 7). Future adverse events (including the continuation of the pandemic) could have similar impacts that will impede international cooperation and the building of collective momentum around a potential network of living labs. Developing appropriate digital communications and networking tools for sharing and disseminating knowledge and learnings of CHLs will therefore be an ongoing challenge.
- COVID-19 equally had a profound impact on the construction industry and global supply chains, leading to knock on effects for example in production delays, worker shortages, and material shortages. All of these in turn lead to rising costs and thereby financial issues for many construction projects. The global construction industry continues to feel the impacts, thus, alongside many nationally imposed austerity measures worldwide, financing of AHR projects will continue to be a challenge (Fava, 2022: 8). A key question will be how can EU-level support mitigate these issues?
- Globally we face the common threat of climate change which threatens international security on many social, cultural, and existential levels, including in relation to cultural heritage. Stronger international partnerships must thus be built around shared goals of averting environmental disaster. The global construction industry is a significant contributor to our current predicament, yet the global supply chain network is too complex to disentangle on a local, regional, or national level. Thus, international cooperation on aspects of built environment sustainability (which AHR can feed into, as often a more sustainable alternative to new-build construction) is required (UNEP, 2021: 27). Momentum can be built on and within current

movements, including the New European Bauhaus.<sup>18</sup> A key question will be how can the aspects considered be broadened to take into account, for example, the social and cultural aspects of sustainability in order to ensure international cooperation on multiple levels beyond the technical and scientific?

- A further future challenge to international cooperation is connected to labour. There are opportunities for new models of work in relation to AHR, both during construction and maintenance, since AHR is about long-term operation. The recent renovation wave<sup>19</sup> in Europe is frequently contextualised as a positive, but within Eastern Europe there is currently a labour shortage (while Western Europe holds the knowledge) (Juricic, Galic, and Marenjak, 2021). This is an obstacle, especially in countryside areas — i.e. structural employment — which in turn increases costs through the importation of labour from outside given communities. In some countries, subsidies within the construction industry are available, yet the trained workers needed to capitalise on these subsidies are not. The challenge is whether a community-based approach can match the numbers required. Within CHLs, training skills are developed thus preserving workers within local areas in order to overcome the issue of retention. This approach could thus be employed successfully in certain cases to develop a circle with sustainability (see the [Pomáz](#) CHL as an example where this works). But a key question is how can you measure the contributions made within a community-based approach so that people end up investing in the community? Measures therefore need to be in place to account for both the employed and voluntary work that makes bottom-up initiatives possible so that a sustainable cycle of employment and investment occurs.

## 6.4 Recommendations

These recommendations address SDGs: 4, quality education; 7, affordable and clean energy; 8, decent work and economic growth; 9, industry, innovation, and infrastructure; 10, reduced inequalities; 11, sustainable cities and communities; 12, responsible consumption and production; 13, climate action; 16, peace, justice, and strong institutions and; 17, partnerships for the goals.

- **We want to build momentum around AHR within European policy and recommend its explicit inclusion in order to reinforce international cooperation that can lead towards SDGs, as terminology varies across countries.**
  - The practice of AHR can fall under more general terms such as regeneration, rehabilitation, restoration, or conservation. This can mean

---

18. See: <[https://cdn.ymaws.com/elia-artschools.org/resource/resmgr/files/BH\\_statement\\_FINAL\\_revised\\_a.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/elia-artschools.org/resource/resmgr/files/BH_statement_FINAL_revised_a.pdf)> [accessed 26 June 2022].

19. See: <[https://energy.ec.europa.eu/topics/energy-efficiency/energy-efficient-buildings/renovation-wave\\_en](https://energy.ec.europa.eu/topics/energy-efficiency/energy-efficient-buildings/renovation-wave_en)> [accessed 29 June 2022].

- challenges, procedures, expertise, and responsibility are not made specific, and can for example focus on protection rather than adaptive reuse.
- This therefore entails building on AHR featured explicitly in the 'Leeuwarden Declaration: Adaptive re-use of the built heritage: Preserving and enhancing the values of our built heritage for future generations,' (ACE, 2018), the 'European Cultural Heritage Green Paper' (Europa Nostra, Potts, 2021), 'Heritage and the Sustainable Development Goals: Policy Guidance for Heritage and Development Actors,' (ICOMOS, Labadi et al., 2021); and the 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage' (EC, 2019a). (SDGs 11, 17)
  - **In response to differing local perspectives on 'expert' involvement, the EU should promote a good balance, with strong partnerships between experts and the other stakeholders.**
    - It is crucial that the contributions of 'experts' are not disregarded; backing could be gained from the building of a wider international network (see below) to foster good practices on partnership working with the EU's support. (SDGs 16, 17)
  - **We recommend connecting the Horizon2020 labs to international living lab networks, with funding made available for cross-sectoral peer-to-peer international networks.**
    - The cross-fertilisation of learnings from other labs in Europa and worldwide will further advance community-building momentum. Learnings can be about how living labs function as a method in research projects, and as a 'project' in community settings, as well as learning about the content of the work. We thus recommend that the EU support this networking.
    - Financial support could be achieved through the development of a dedicated European fund for AHR (see D5.6). (SDGs 4, 9, 17)
  - **We recommend building international cooperation and momentum around AHR in relation to common goals and threats, such as climate change, in order that AHR can be woven into a wider range of policies that might take into account broader aspects of sustainability.** The ecological argument broadens the horizon of possibilities for AHR, and it will be crucial to capitalise on this through consideration of:
    - The social aspects of sustainability (i.e. beyond the technical and the environmental) that could be linked through AHR in order to connect communities to both environmental and social justice goals.
      - There needs to be additional connections made that ensure AHR fits with certain sustainability agendas, as otherwise energy issues may impede its implementation. For example, there are projects which do not operate during the winter months in order to reduce energy consumption. A strong narrative can be built around this trend (or future challenge) that might think along the lines of sustainable food as seasonal, and therefore (cultural) buildings, too, as seasonal. This

trend would have social implications. The EU could promote AHR in relation to such broader aspects of sustainability.

- In many countries worldwide, we are increasingly expectant of everything being all at once, all the time, and perfect. But can we decrease our expectations? For example, in order to meet building / comfort requirements, cultural buildings, despite inconsistent usage throughout the day and/or year, end up being set up for extremes i.e., only a few days of -10 degrees. Such overinvestment is unsustainable. The EU can intervene to build momentum around the alternative solutions to this unsustainability that are afforded by AHR.
- The extreme push of the recent renovation wave in Europe and the rewriting of the minimum energy performance directive to meet the global challenge of climate change will have a profound effect on heritage — a lot may be lost (EC, 2021b). Therefore, for risk evaluation purposes, what are the most vulnerable elements must be considered. Timescales will be affected by different priorities — i.e. some will be done cautiously due to a lack of surety as to what extent it can be undertaken. The EU should therefore take steps to ensure that timescales and expectations are realistic. (SDGs 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17)
- **We recommend that the EU fosters international cooperation in relation to the labour of AHR.**
  - We recommend that the EU promotes volunteer management and the establishment of a legal framework for volunteers to fully capture the contributions and thereby promote circular sustainability, but also ethical and non-exploitative practices.
  - We recommend that the EU thinks in terms of smaller regions, rather than the current way of thinking — i.e. not at the national level, but jumping through it — as different regions require different approaches to labour and the development of training skills.
  - A sustainable circular model of training, employment, and investment will have consequences for the movement of the construction workforce globally and therefore will require international cooperation. (SDGs 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17)

## 7. CONCLUSION: A MAINSTREAMING AND INTEGRATED APPROACH TO AHR

### 7.1 Framework

The Framework promotes and aims to put into practice the “principle of mainstreaming of cultural heritage in different EU policies,” and builds on the 2014 Commission Communication (CoEU, 2014a: 2), as well as 2017 European Council conclusions (Eco, 2017: 3). It is the first document to set out an integrated approach to cultural heritage at European level (EC, 2019a: 8). The European Parliament (EP, 2015: 4), the Council of the European Union (CoEU, 2018a: 4), the European Committee of the Regions (EcoR, 2015: 1), and the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC, 2018: n.p.) support this approach (EC, 2019a: 4). As such, the Framework “seeks to cut across diverse EU policy areas: regional, urban, and rural development; education and social cohesion digital transformation; environment (including nature conservation); tourism; accessibility; the sustainability agenda and climate change adaptation; research and innovation; and external relations” (EC, 2019a: 8–9).

In their conclusion, they state that the actions presented in the Framework would be launched in 2019 and 2020, though this was undoubtedly adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, they do argue that the “principles identified can be seen as sketching the outlines of a longer-term vision for the management and safeguarding of Europe’s cultural heritage. Inspired by a wide range of policy documents adopted by the European Commission and the Council since 2014” (2019a: 14). They further continue:

While the Commission has the lead for the implementation of the activities presented in this Framework, its success will also be measured by the level of engagement of other EU institutions, the EU Member States, local and regional authorities, culture and cultural heritage organisations and civil society. (2014a: 14)

### 7.2 OpenHeritage experience

In OH we have undertaken extensive policy analysis and research within sixteen countries. The relevant policies and institutional structures are more integrated in some countries and more siloed in others, and we have equally found that the integration of heritage and planning policies tends to coincide with a broader understanding of heritage as a ‘useful’ element within urban planning, and within a system more geared towards reuse.

Such siloes are evident at the local level, and perhaps the potential of place is a possible solution for unintegrated policies. How can EU policies and programmes facilitate more integrated approaches? We suggest:

- Place-based funding programmes, rather than sectoral.
- Programmes that require collaboration and integration.
- Facilitating and funding AHR through non-heritage routes.

The increase in adaptive reuse practices is connected to the development of specific policy programmes within the context of heritage and planning, but it tends to (also) be linked to other policy agendas, such as urban regeneration, tourism development, the support of creative industries, increasing environmental quality, and promoting 'localism'.

Steers are also given by specific resource availability (e.g. EU funds) or the lack thereof (e.g. austerity). Moreover, we have observed that AHR is an explicitly stimulated process in an increasing number of different countries ([D1.3: 6](#)).<sup>20</sup>

### 7.3 Future Challenges

- Heritage value is not always placed in buildings but can be placed with the cultural or social spheres. A future challenge, therefore, is to be able to consider and identify other sources where AHR can be a positive side effect rather than being the main focus or agenda, as well as how to 'cut across' or integrate within diverse policies and agendas.
- A further challenge concerns language barriers, blocking communication between national and local levels, which may become an impediment to the facilitation and funding of AHR projects. How might inclusive communication be encouraged so that financial mechanisms and good practice exemplars are made fully accessible to all?

### 7.4 Recommendations

These recommendations address SDGs: 4, quality education; 7, affordable and clean energy; 8, decent work and economic growth; 9, industry, innovation, and infrastructure; 10, reduced inequalities; 11, sustainable cities and communities; 12, responsible consumption and production; 13, climate action; 16, peace, justice and strong institutions and; 17, partnerships for the goals.

- **We seek to build momentum around integrating AHR into other policy agendas. We recommend making AHR a more explicitly promoted solution and tool in EU policy and funding frameworks.**
  - Making AHR more explicitly favoured in social policies as well as those on culture, climate, tourism, regional development, and housing, with the goal of clearer and more visible integration into wider policy

---

20. From WP1: In the EU policy and programmes context, adaptive reuse is most present in the heritage and culture context, urban and regional development agendas are beginning to include it more explicitly entering greening and circular economy, material recycling, energy, and growth agendas.

- agendas. For example, AHR could be funded through climate-related planning initiatives (see Section 3 on sustainability).
- This aligns with the Framework's mainstreaming and integrated approach (2019: 8), and is also a recommendation found in various further reports (see: CLIC, Gravagnuolo, Lupu, and Palomba, 2021; ICOMOS, Labadi et al., 2021; and Europa Nostra, Potts, 2021).
  - It could be supported by building a working group comprised of experts and practitioners from Horizon2020 projects in order to integrate AHR into policy agendas. (SDG 17)
- **We strongly recommend facilitating and funding AHR through non-heritage routes.**
    - A major trend within Urban Agenda and OMC reports on cultural heritage is the recommendation for progressive cultural projects and initiatives to take advantage of already existing EU funds or programmes, including those outside the field of culture (EC, 2021a: 14). The precondition for cultural projects to be able to do this is having knowledge of such programmes. Taking advantage of existing EU initiatives is likely to become more relevant as a policy as budgets are further restricted following COVID-19 and ensuing austerity measures. The most obvious lever the EU has when it comes to behavioural change is in taking a flexible approach to the heritage it will fund. This will involve:
      - Improving local authorities' access to EU-level funding and information for AHR and the ways in which existing funding can be directed towards AHR.
      - Sharing expertise and examples: not just funding but information — a way to jump through the barrier at national level is to address the local municipalities directly, in national languages, and perhaps through independent civic partners.
      - This builds on the Urban Agenda's partnerships for inclusion (EC, 2016: 10). (SDGs 4, 9, 10, 17)
  - **The EU has a role to play around regulatory frameworks, we recommend the development of technical, practical, and procedural approaches aiding integration, such as:**
    - EU procurement and tender rules which stimulate reuse and recycling.
    - Building regulations (e.g. EN Eurocodes and ISO) and VAT rules which could be (re)developed with reuse (rather than either new built, or restoration) in mind. (SDGs 11, 12, 17)
  - **We recommend facilitating communication and accessibility between local municipalities and the EU, through:**
    - Identifying key national organisations and NGOs.
    - Making sure that when funding calls are advertised at national levels, they include synergies in terms of EU policies.

- A subsidy / funding guide — e.g. in Flanders the financial support for acquisition and management of immovable heritage.<sup>21</sup>
- Involving URBACT and Interreg programmes to work closely with municipalities and find/invest in key actors at the local level who can support initiatives directly and thereby 'jump through' the national level and connect with other levels.
- Funds are usually transferred from the EU to the national level with various subsequent distributors, but this centralisation is problematic – support for AHR could be driven through the support of municipalities and a rethinking of the structure of the distribution of redevelopment funds (see D5.7).
- The celebration of positive examples (awards, showcase, database) from various backgrounds to stimulate inclusive dialogue. (SDG 4, 8, 10, 16, 17)

## 7.5 Concluding summary

Drawing from our extensive experiences in six OH CHLs and sixteen OCs across Europe, within this report OpenHeritage have presented a number of challenges which we foresee affecting the future of AHR within the EU context. In order to meet these challenges — social, cultural, economic, environmental — we believe it is necessary for the European Commission to attend to all of the preceding recommendations, which we offer as an EU-level roadmap for adaptive heritage reuse that extends and integrates pre-existing policies and frameworks, in order to support not only adaptive heritage reuse but goals within further policy areas and, importantly, to promote strategies to assist 'jumping through' the national level.

---

21. See: <<https://www.onroenderfgoed.be/ik-wil-financiele-ondersteuning-krijgen>> [accessed 26 June 2022].



## REFERENCES

Adams, C., et al. (2014). 'Building with History: Exploring the Relationship between Heritage and Energy in Institutionally Managed Buildings.' *The Historic Environment*, 5.2: 167–81.

Architects Council of Europe (ACE). (2018). 'Leeuwarden Declaration: Adaptive re-use of the built heritage: Preserving and enhancing the values of our built heritage for future generations.' Available online at: <[https://www.ace-cae.eu/uploads/tx\\_jidocumentsview/LEEUWARDEN\\_STATEMENT\\_FINAL\\_EN-NEW.pdf](https://www.ace-cae.eu/uploads/tx_jidocumentsview/LEEUWARDEN_STATEMENT_FINAL_EN-NEW.pdf)> [accessed 24 April 2022].

Bureau of European Policy Advisers (BEPA). (2010). 'Empowering people, driving change: Social innovation in the European Union.' Publications Office of the European Union.

Bloemen, S. and Hammerstein, D. (2017). 'Supporting the Commons: Opportunities in the EU policy landscape.' Commons Network.

Bugg-Levine, A., Kogut, B., and Kulatilaka, N. (2012). 'A New Approach to Funding Social Enterprises.' *Harvard Business Review*: 119–23.

Chen, J., Judd, B., and Hawken, S. (2016). 'Adaptive reuse of industrial heritage for cultural purposes in Beijing, Shanghai and Chongqing.' *Structural Survey*, 34.4/5: 331–50.

Council of Europe (CoE). (2005). 'Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society.' Faro. Available online at: <<https://rm.coe.int/1680083746>> [accessed 9 May 2022].

Council of the European Union (CoEU). (2014a). 'Council Conclusions of 21 May 2014 on Cultural Heritage as a Strategic Resource for a Sustainable Europe.' (OJ C 183, 14.6.2014).

— (2014b). 'Council Conclusions on Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage.' (OJ C 463, 23.12.2014).

— (2014c). 'Conclusion of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on a Work Plan for Culture 2015–2018 (OJ C 463, 23.12.2014).

— (2018a). 'Council conclusions on the need to bring cultural heritage to the fore across policies in the EU.' (OJ C 196, 8.6.2018).

— (2018b). 'Draft Council conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019–2022: Adoption.' (13948/18 CULT 137). Available online at: <<https://eur->

[lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C\\_.2014.463.01.0004.01.ENG#https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C\\_.2014.463.01.0004.01.ENG](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.2014.463.01.0004.01.ENG#https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.2014.463.01.0004.01.ENG)> [accessed 13 May 2022].

Dutilleul, B., Birrer, F. A., and Mensink, W. (2010). 'Unpacking European Living Labs: Analysing Innovation's Social Dimensions.' *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 4.1: 60–85.

Eiringhaus, P. (2020). 'Inventing the Green Metropolis Ruhr, Germany: Postindustrial Greening Narratives and Critical History Culture.' In *Located Research: Regional places, transitions and challenges*, ed. by Campbell, A., Duffy, M., and Edmondson, B., pp. 253–77. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Europa Nostra. (2018). 'Berlin Call to Action: Cultural Heritage for the Future of Europe.' Available online at: <<https://www.europanostra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Berlin-Call-Action-Eng.pdf>> [accessed 9 May 2022].

European Commission (EC). (2009). 'Living Labs for user-driven open innovation: An overview of the Living Labs methodology, activities and achievements.' Luxembourg City, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

— (2014). 'Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe'. (COM (2014) 477 final).

— (2016). 'Urban Agenda for EU — 'Pact of Amsterdam''. Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Available online at: <[https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/policy/themes/urban-development/agenda/pact-of-amsterdam.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/themes/urban-development/agenda/pact-of-amsterdam.pdf)> [accessed 29 June 2022].

— (2018). 'A New European Agenda for Culture — Communication from the European Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions — A New European Agenda for Culture.' (COM (2018) 267 final).

— (2019a). 'European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage.' Publications Office. Available online at: <<https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/949707>> [accessed 24 April 2022].

— (2019b). 'Urban Agenda for the EU — Culture and Cultural Heritage Orientation Paper.' Available online at: <<https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/urban-agenda/culturecultural-heritage/library/culture-and-cultural-heritage-orientation-paper>> [accessed 9 May 2022].

— (2020). 'Urban Agenda for the EU: Partnership on Culture / Cultural Heritage — Final Action Plan.' Available from: <[https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/system/files/ged/master\\_final\\_action\\_plan\\_culture\\_cultural\\_heritage\\_v2.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/system/files/ged/master_final_action_plan_culture_cultural_heritage_v2.pdf)> [accessed 26 June 2022].

— (2021a). 'Urban Agenda for the EU: Multi-level governance in action.' Brussels. Available online at: <[https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/brochure/urban\\_agenda\\_eu\\_2021update\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/brochure/urban_agenda_eu_2021update_en.pdf)> [accessed 29 June 2022].

— (2021b). 'Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the energy performance of buildings (recast).' (COM(2021) 802 final) (2021/0426 (COD)).

European Committee of the Regions (EcoR). (2015). 'Opinion of the European Committee of the Regions — Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe.' (OJ C 195, 12.6.2015).

European Council (Eco). (2017). 'European Council Meeting (14 December 2017) — Conclusions.' (EUCO 19/1/17 REV 1.)

European Economic and Social Committee (EESC). (2018). 'The contribution of Europe's rural areas to the 2018 Year of Cultural Heritage ensuring sustainability and urban/rural cohesion.' Available online at: <<https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/contribution-europes-rural-areas-2018-year-cultural-heritage-ensuring-sustainability-and-urbanrural-cohesion-own>> [accessed 9 May 2022].

European Parliament (EP). (2015). 'European Parliament Resolution of 8 September 2015: Towards an Integrated Approach to Cultural Heritage for Europe.' (2014/2149(INI)). (OJ C 316, 22.9.2017).

European Union, European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). (2018). 'REFILL: A Journey Through Temporary Use.' Available online at: <[https://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/media/refill\\_final\\_publication.pdf](https://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/media/refill_final_publication.pdf)> [accessed 9 May 2022].

European Union, Technical Expert Group on Sustainable Finance Taxonomy (2020). 'Final Report of the Technical Expert Group on Sustainable Finance.' Brussels.

Fava, F. (2022). 'Ongoing adaptive reuse: patterns of heritage resilience before and after COVID-19.' *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, ahead-of-print. <<https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-06-2021-0116>>.

Fouseki, K., and Nicolau, M. (2018). 'Urban Heritage Dynamics in "Heritage-Led Regeneration": Towards a Sustainable Lifestyles Approach.' *The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice*, 9.3-4: 229-48.

Garzillo, C., Balenciaga, I., Izulain, A., Rangil-Escribano, T., and Wildman, A. CLIC. (2020). 'Adaptive Reuse of Cultural Heritage: An Examination of Circular Governance Models from 16 International Case Studies — Synthesis Report.' Available online at: <<https://www.clicproject.eu/files/D3-4.pdf>> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Girard, L. F. (2019). 'Implementing the circular economy: the role of cultural heritage as the entry point. Which evaluation approaches?' *BDC University of Naples Federico II*, 19.2: 245-79. Available online at: <<http://www.tema.unina.it/index.php/bdc/article/view/7269/8161>> [accessed 24 April 2022].

Gravagnuolo A., Lupu, A., and Palomba, C. (2021). 'D6.24 — Final report of the Task Force on circular models for cultural heritage adaptive reuse in cities and regions.' CLIC (Circular models Leveraging Investments in Cultural heritage adaptive reuse). Available online at: <<https://www.clicproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/D6.24-Final-report-of-the-Task-Force-on-Circular-models-for-cultural-heritage-adaptive-reuse-in-cities-and-regions.pdf>> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Harrison, R. (2018). 'Critical heritage studies beyond epistemic populism.' *Antiquity*, 92: 365, 1-3. <<https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2018.223>>.

Hughes, P. and Luksetich, W. (2004). 'Nonprofit arts organisations: Do funding sources influence spending patterns?' *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33.2: 203-20.

Iaione, C. (2016). 'The CO-City: Sharing, Collaborating, Cooperating, and Commoning in the City.' *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 75.2: 415-55.

ICOMOS. (2020.) 'European Quality Principles for EU funded Interventions with potential impact upon Cultural Heritage – Revised edition November 2020.' Available online at: <<https://www.icomos.org/en/about-icomos/committees/regional-activities-europe/58799-european-quality-principles-for-eu-funded-interventions-with-potential-impact-upon-cultural-heritage>> [accessed 24 April 2022].

Interreg. (2022). 'Interreg Europe 2021-2027: Programme Manual.' Available online at: <[https://www.interregeurope.eu/sites/default/files/2022-05/IR-E\\_programme\\_manual\\_annexes\\_0.pdf](https://www.interregeurope.eu/sites/default/files/2022-05/IR-E_programme_manual_annexes_0.pdf)> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Izulain, A., Garzillo, C., and Wildman, A. (2021). 'Local Action Guide: Collaborative Approaches to Adaptive Reuse of Cultural Heritage.' CLIC. Available online at: <[https://www.clicproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/CLIC-D5.2-Local-Action-Guide\\_ICLEI\\_Final.pdf](https://www.clicproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/CLIC-D5.2-Local-Action-Guide_ICLEI_Final.pdf)> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Juricic, B. B., Galic, M., Marenjak, S. (2021). 'Review of the Construction Labour Demand and Shortages in the EU.' *Buildings*, 11:1, n.p. <<https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11010017>> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Kaplan, R. S. and Grossman, A. S. (2010). 'The emerging capital market for nonprofits.' *Harvard business review* 88.10: 110–18.

Katzy, B., and Mensik, W. (2007). 'Living labs. Implications for the public innovation agenda.' Paper presented at the e-Challenges e-2007 Conference. The Hague, October 24–26.

Kaya, A. (2020). *Populism and Heritage in Europe: Lost in Diversity and Unity*. London: Routledge.

KEA. (2017). 'Culture for Cities and Regions — Future creative cities: Why culture is a smart investment in cities.' Available online at: <<https://keanet.eu/wp-content/uploads/Future-creative-cities-01122017-KEA.pdf>> [accessed 14 May 2022].

Kickul, J. and Lyons, T. S. (2020). *Understanding social entrepreneurship: The relentless pursuit of mission in an ever-changing world*. London: Routledge.

Kip, M., and Amacher, D. (eds.) (2021). 'Keywords for Adaptive Heritage Reuse: The Adaptive Heritage Reuse Glossary Project'. OpenHeritage. Available online at: <<https://openheritage.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Keywords-for-Adaptive-Heritage-Reuse-Glossary.pdf>> [accessed 9 May 2022].

Kip, M., and Oevermann, H. (2022). 'Neighbourhood Revitalisation and Heritage Conservation through Adaptive Reuse: Assessing Instruments for Commoning.' *The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice*. [Online]. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2022.2068255>>.

Knippenberg, K. V., and Gils, H. V. (2021). 'Immaterial Heritage.' In 'Keywords for Adaptive Heritage Reuse: The Adaptive Heritage Reuse Glossary Project.' Ed. by Kip, M., and Amacher, D. (OpenHeritage), p. 44. Available online at: <<https://openheritage.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Keywords-for-Adaptive-Heritage-Reuse-Glossary.pdf>> [accessed 29 June 2022]. Also available online at: <<https://openheritage.eu/immaterial-heritage/>> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Labadi, S., Giliberto, F., Rosetti, I., Shetabi, L., Yildirim, E. (2021). 'Heritage and the Sustainable Development Goals: Policy Guidance for Heritage and Development Actors.' Paris: ICOMOS. Available online at:

[https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2453/1/ICOMOS SDGs Policy Guidance 2021.pdf](https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2453/1/ICOMOS_SDGs_Policy_Guidance_2021.pdf)> [accessed 9 May 2022].

Legnér, M. (2018). 'Post-conflict reconstruction and the heritage process.' *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 24: 2, 78–90.

Mérai, D., Veldpaus, L., Kip, M., Kulikov, V., and Pendlebury, J. (2020). 'Typology of current adaptive heritage re-use policies.' OpenHeritage: Deliverable 1.3 (Report).

Murovec, N., and Kavaš, D. Interreg. (2021). 'Public-Private Cooperation in Cultural Heritage Revitalisation.' Available online at: <https://www.interreg-central.eu/Content.Node/D.T1.2.3-PPC.pdf>> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Office fédérale de la culture (OFC). (2018). 'Davos Declaration.' Available online at: [https://davosdeclaration2018.ch/media/Brochure Declaration-de-Davos-2018 WEB 2.pdf](https://davosdeclaration2018.ch/media/Brochure_Declaration-de-Davos-2018_WEB_2.pdf)> [accessed 28 June 2022].

Open Method of Coordination (OMC) Working Group of EU Member States' experts on better access to and wider participation in culture. (2012). 'A report on policies and good practices in the public arts and in cultural institutions to promote better access to and wider participation in culture'. Available online at: [https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/policy/strategic-framework/documents/omc-report-access-to-culture\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/policy/strategic-framework/documents/omc-report-access-to-culture_en.pdf)> [accessed 9 May 2022].

— (2018). 'Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage. Report of the OMC working group of Member States' experts.' Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Patti, D. and Polyák, L. Eds. (2017). *Funding the Cooperative City: Community Finance and the Economy of Civic Spaces*. Cooperative City Books.

Pendlebury, J., Wang, Y.-W., and Law, A. (2018). 'Re-using "uncomfortable heritage": the case of the 1933 building, Shanghai.' *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 24.3: 211–29.

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

Potts, A. (Lead Author). (2021). 'European Cultural Heritage Green Paper.' Europa Nostra, The Hague and Brussels. Available online at: [https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2552/1/2021 European%20Heritage%20Green%20Paper\\_full%20paper.pdf](https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2552/1/2021_European%20Heritage%20Green%20Paper_full%20paper.pdf)> [accessed 9 May 2022].

Ross, S. M. (2020). 'Re-Evaluating Heritage Waste: Sustaining Material Values through Deconstruction and Reuse.' *The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice*, 11.2–3: 382–408.

Sani, M., Lynch, B., Visser, J., and Gariboldi, A. (2015). 'Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work plan for Culture 2015–2018).' Commissioned by the European Commission from the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC).

Stanojev, J. (2019). 'Progression Analytics and Establishing Continuum of Participatory Governance in Cultural Heritage.' *SCIRES-IT: SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY*, 9.1: 79–90.

UNESCO. (2016). 'Culture: urban future: global report on culture for sustainable urban development.' Paris, France: UNESCO.

United Nations (UN). (2015). 'Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.' Available online at: <<https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/publications/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>> [accessed 9 May 2021].

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2021). '2021 Global Status Report for Buildings and Construction: Towards a Zero-emission, Efficient and Resilient Buildings and Construction Sector.' Global Alliance for Buildings and Construction. Nairobi. Available online at: <[https://globalabc.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/GABC\\_Buildings-GSR-2021\\_BOOK.pdf](https://globalabc.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/GABC_Buildings-GSR-2021_BOOK.pdf)> [accessed 29 June 2022].

Vehbi, B. O., Yüceer, H., and Hürol, Y. (2019). 'New uses for traditional buildings: The olive oil mills of the Karpas Peninsula, Cyprus.' *The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice*, 10.1: 58–82.

Veldpaus, L., Fava, F., and Brodowicz, D. (2019). 'Mapping of current heritage re-use policies and regulations in Europe: Complex policy overview of adaptive heritage re-use.' OpenHeritage: Deliverable 1.2.

Veldpaus, L., Krajewska, O., Miah, J., and Szemző, H. (2020). 'Adaptive heritage reuse: Learning from policy and governance frameworks across Europe.' OpenHeritage: Policy Brief 1. ICLEI Europe.

Voytenko, Y., McCormick, K., Evans, J., and Schliwa, G. (2015). 'Urban Living Labs for Sustainability and Low Carbon Cities in Europe: Towards a Research Agenda.' *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 123: 45–54. <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.053>>.

Watson, M. (2012). 'Adaptive reuse and embodied energy.' In *Industrial Heritage Re-Tooled: The TICCIH Guide to Industrial Heritage Conservation*, ed. by Douet, J., pp. 136–41. Lancaster: Carnegie Publishing Ltd.

Wilkinson, S.J., Remøy, H., and Langston, C. (2014). *Sustainable Building Adaptation: Innovations in Decision-Making*. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Wollentz, G., May, S., Holtorf, C., and Högberg, A. (2020). 'Toxic heritage: Uncertain and unsafe.' In *Heritage Futures: Comparative Approaches to Natural and Cultural Heritage Practices*, ed. by R. Harrison et al., pp. 294–312. London: UCL Press.

Wong, L. (2016). *Adaptive Reuse: Extending the Lives of Buildings*. Basel: Birkhäuser.