

Preface

This book was preceded by a conference held at Gotland University, Visby, in September 2008. The title of the symposium was “The Sustainability and Development of Cultural Quarters: International Perspectives”. The idea for the conference was born during Mattias Legnér’s postdoctoral stays first at Johns Hopkins University (USA), then at Linköping University (Sweden) in 2006–2008.

We would like to thank both the incoming participants of that conference and colleagues who took the time to comment the presented papers: Petra Eriksson, Tom Mels, Ann-Marie Rosenqvist, Nils Blomkvist, Lars Wängdahl, Erik Tängerstad, Ulrika Mebus and Krister Olsson. Also we would like to thank Jill D. Friedman for her precious linguistic advice.

The publication of this volume, and parts of the conference, were generously funded by *Marcus Wallenbergs stiftelse för internationellt vetenskapligt samarbete*. A significant part of the conference was funded by *Vetenskapsrådet*.

Introduction

Mattias Legnér and Davide Ponzini

Although cities have been centers of culture and creative entrepreneurialism for ages, the emergence of urban cultural policy in the late 20th century probably reflects the clearest recognition of culture as a factor influencing urban and economic development (Cochrane 2007). For example, it is safe to say that culture has become a field of policy used for regenerating cities struck by the economic and social consequences of deindustrialization (Zukin 1995; Evans 2001; Scott 2000). In this sense, not only states and regions develop cultural policy or “the conscious and deliberate manipulation of culture” (Kearns & Philo 1993, 3), but also cities try to impact their future development through cultural policies. Lately, this idea of utilizing culture, including heritage of different kinds, in order to regenerate urban areas has become part of a new orthodoxy in which cities and regions strive to improve their competitiveness. In the English-speaking world this phenomenon has sometimes been called “culture-led urban regeneration” (Miles & Paddison 2005). It is striking how quickly this recognition of the economic and social forces of culture has spread throughout the Western world, and today it is even influencing Asian ‘instant cities’ that have not previously been ravaged by deindustrialization, such as Riyadh, Abu Dhabi and Singapore (Chang 2000; Bagaeen 2007).

According to Evans and Shaw (2004), cultural venues can be integrated to different degrees in urban regeneration schemes. In so called culture-led regeneration, “culture is more catalytic and critical” (Paddison this volume) than in previous schemes of ‘city marketing’, ‘place making’ or ‘hard-branding’ in cities such as Baltimore, Bilbao, Glasgow or Barcelona (Garcia 2005; Plaza 2005; Ward 2006). A city such as Baltimore has experienced long-lasting and profound problems of drug abuse, mass unemployment and shortage of low income housing which hardly have been countered by downtown

regeneration projects (Legnér 2007a). Large and medium size cities have nevertheless attempted to copycat the 'success story' of these cities, neglecting to take into account the crucial urban contexts of these projects (Evans 2003). The Millennium Dome in London is one case of a large scale culture-led regeneration project with a disastrous outcome (McGuigan & Gilmore 2002). As becomes evident in Porter and Shaw (2008), regeneration strategies often backfire and result in displacement and extreme gentrification.

Although moderate success in regeneration and tourist attraction may be achieved in some cases, the unrealistic expectations of increased competitiveness articulated by policymakers are often not met (Beauregard & Pierre 2000). In other cases culture-led processes could not even start because of public-private governance problems, or they did not have any impact at all (Sudjic 2005). Cooke (2008) has recently posed questions about what is included and excluded in the term 'culture' in local and regional policy today, and how the cultural images of cities have become central in marketing and competition. These questions also become crucial in the contributions of the present volume:

Who and what is cultural development of cities for? ... What role should a city's cultural strategy play regarding its social or cultural hinterlands? ... To what extent is the city's built form now a key conveyor of the cultural image a city professes to hold dear? (Cooke 2008, 29, 45)

The use of cultural policy for urban and regional economic development gave rise to dilemmas such as those between cultural provision in the city centre and in disadvantaged neighborhoods, and between consumption-oriented strategies and support for local cultural resources (Bianchini & Parkinson 1993). One example is the European Capital of Culture. In Glasgow and later in Stockholm most resources were focused on creating activities and development projects in the inner city, close to visitors but far away from a majority of less well-to-do inhabitants (Boyle & Hughes 1991). The establishing of cultural quarters and districts in cities has also led to gentrification,

the displacement of residents and facilities, and has increased the cost of living (Bianchini 1999).

Cities of today use arts and heritage to strengthen their 'identity' and to make their own places more visible and marketable. 'Culture' has been, and is, mobilized with the political purpose of boosting cities and regions, making them more attractive for investment and living (Ward 1998; Bell & Jayne 2004a). The place and its historical context are being inscribed with new meanings in the era of globalization, and perhaps ironically, 'place' seems to become all the more important as globalization progresses. In Sweden, as in many other countries, regional NGOs are beginning to develop policy programs for the arts and creative industries (Aronsson et al 2007). The arts and economic development become mixed in a political sphere in which 'culture' runs the risk of becoming looked upon solely as a market-driven mechanism where results are easily quantified and measured. Stevenson (2004) further argues that today's policy interventions tend to blur the boundaries of public culture, making cultural and economic development synonymous and giving priority to social control and place management rather than engaging in issues of empowerment or social justice. There is a risk with culture-led regeneration that local arts and culture, following a greater market orientation, become socially exclusive rather than inclusive, thereby neglecting the profound needs of a community. For example, Stoke-on-Trent is still dominated by working-class values and traditions, which do not easily come together with the values of a 'creative class' that the city governors wish to attract. A clash between cultural investments and the local environment raised questions regarding the distinction between cultural consumers and citizens (Jayne 2004).

In many Western countries, heritage and the arts have been approaching different challenges of privatization (Ponzini, forthcoming). The built heritage of urban environments has been used consciously to market cities and to improve their images in the eyes of tourists and companies (Evans 2001 & 2004; Smith 2007). In the USA, historic preservation has been combined with urban regeneration schemes at least since the 1970s (Mason & Page 2003; Legnér 2009). The interest in experimenting with historic preservation policies in

order to boost the real estate market increased in the beginning of the 1990s, when more and more states developed incentive programs for property owners buying and restoring historic buildings (Legnér 2008). Examples of cities where the built heritage during certain phases has been given the role of supporting local economy with incentive policies are Boston, Philadelphia and New York (Mason 2005).

To a large extent, these redevelopment projects have required large-scale investments in restoring and regenerating urban environments. These projects may be seen as identity-based projects in which heritage, tradition and culture are used as conceptual links between the past and the future of a city or region. To what extent the economic or cultural outcomes have been positive is debatable and in many cases not easy to evaluate after only a few years. Evans (2003) argues that Glasgow's scheme of commercializing the architectural heritage of MacIntosh is a shortsighted and non-sustainable brand. Liverpool, furthermore, has declared itself the birthplace of The Beatles (Cohen 2007), and Dublin has mobilized the ghost of James Joyce to attract foreign visitors (Rains 2004). In the long run, hard-branding may prove to be a non-sustainable way of developing local economy, even though it might be effective in the short run. It may be non-sustainable both from an economic perspective, and also from a cultural perspective: the expressions used for commercial exploitation seldom, if ever, manage to represent the cultural and ethnic diversity of a community (Bell & Jayne 2004a). Cultural investments raise issues of long-term sustainability and evaluation too. Johnson and Thomas (2001) suggest using a cultural measure, describing how cultural amenities are experienced and received by population and visitors instead of evaluating culture along an economic scale. Yet, the basic difficulties of evaluating cultural investments remain (Evans 2005; Quinn 2005) and it seems difficult to envision evaluation solving similar citizenship dilemmas.

In the wake of increasing privatization and marketing of arts and heritage, international research on cultural policy is facing a range of issues to explore. For a number of years Swedish research on cultural heritage centered on the issue of 'Whose heritage?' (Aronsson & Alzén 2006), focusing on questions of representation and selec-

tion of heritage, rather than asking how cultural heritage was actually used for commercial purposes, or what the outcome was. A number of projects, largely based on case studies, have resulted in conclusions about the representations and ownerships of material heritage in urban environments (Ashworth & Tunbridge 1990; Walsh 1992; Lowenthal 1998; Ashworth et al 2000), but what is less known are the positive as well as negative effects of commercializing heritage.

Much of this research was carried out with a rising skepticism towards the intentions and goals of national cultural policy. Most, if not all, communities in Europe have become more multicultural post-1989, and this development has without doubt caused significant 'cracks' in the cultural policies of nations (Harding 2007). What is national culture today, and is it at all relevant to speak of homogeneous ethnic communities in the 21st century? (Ashworth et al 2007) In many EU countries, the goals of cultural policy have become more blurred in later years as society has made the gradual transition into the 'information age' (Alzén & Burell 2005; Storm 2008) By the millennium shift, the question of what cultural heritage should represent had become much more complicated than what it had been only twenty years earlier.

At the same time as national cultural policy has become questioned in many countries, the built heritage seems instead to be facing a sort of renaissance. Historic preservation may be on its way to entering a 'second generation' of policies where it is looked upon as an engine for economic and cultural development. Where the first generation was focused on forced measures, bans, public funding and the following stigmatization of historic buildings (for being more difficult to manage than new constructions), second generation policies are directed towards voluntary protection, public-private partnerships, and cultural heritage being used as a tool for individual experiences and place making.

As the material heritage of our cities become more and more voluminous, there will be an increasing demand for alternative sources of funding and more innovative ways of preservation. A good example of this is the Knäppingsborg quarter (Legnér in this volume) in the Swedish city of Norrköping, where the property owner identified

commercial values in a block of redundant historic buildings and carefully restored them in order to make the block into a 'festival marketplace'. Sweden is an interesting example of how 'second generation' property owners are attributing historic buildings higher real estate values, despite the absence of tax reductions or other incentives (Johansson 2002). In later years historic blocks in urban areas have often spearheaded processes of gentrification. The fact that preservation tended to fail where gentrification did not occur makes this typical urban tradeoff even more evident (Olshammar 2003; Martins Holmberg 2006).

In this sense, the ways cultural production and consumption are organized in space seem crucial in order to understand the contemporary city and relevant physical, functional and semiotic urban transformations. For these reasons and because of the emerging problems mentioned above, it seems important to question and understand how the spatial organization of cultural production and consumption interacts with the urban and regional environment and how it is interpreted in urban and economic development policies.

Spatial frames for cultural economies

The economic logic describing the spatial organization of cultural institutions and producers is generally drawn from urban and productive milieus (Santagata 2006). Cultural firms and institutions cooperate together at a local level to be more competitive in the global market in order to strengthen their relationships in terms of tacit knowledge, reciprocity, trust and social capital. In this sense, the spatial organization explains important economic advantages and the production of localized common goods that are needed by cultural activities, such as physical infrastructures, care of the urban environment, urban marketing, attraction of human and creative capitals (Scott 2004).

There is a multitude of descriptions of the spatial organization of cultural institutions and producers in literature related to cultural production in Europe and the USA. The labels of such models are not particularly useful in classifying the differences among so called cultural clusters, districts or quarters, since they are adopted and

oftentimes interchanged to describe similar phenomena which are not distinct one from another in terms of production, dimension or scale (Cooke 2005). Nonetheless, they provide interesting insights into the spatial organization of cultural institutions and producers, making more evident certain links between cultural policy and urban transformations (Ponzini 2009).

The concentration of small and medium size cooperating cultural producers may constitute a cultural cluster. The cluster generally induces efficiency advantages, proximity relationships and economies of scale and scope, such as human capital development, knowledge spillovers, and the creation of localized common goods (Cooke & Lazzaretti 2008). The cultural cluster concept has been applied to almost every type of cultural production, such as media, fashion, design and the arts (Molotch 1996). Even if this concept is rooted in the industrial approach to cultural production, the policy implications and translations are less often the traditional incentives to industries and more likely specific programs and measures for cultural organizations in a given urban environment. Although a number of studies have discussed the typical roles of key actors in high-tech clusters, little has been done to analyze the strategies of creative clusters and the role of actors such as universities and higher educational institutions.

The term district is also frequent in the description of spatial conformation of cultural production and consumption. Generally this term may range from a simple portion of space including a certain number of cultural activities to a more complex insight in the way culture, creativity and entertainment organize in urban and regional environments. The localization model of the district was studied by Alfred Marshall (1920) and further developed by European scholars (Bagnasco 1977; Beccatini 2003). Only recently it was transferred to the production of cultural goods and services. Santagata's (2002) definition of the cultural district (CD) is articulated and it draws attention to the spatial advantage of being able to internalize parts of the rich externalities of the cultural production, including different ranges and scales of cultural and complementary activities, such as fine arts, media, museums and entertainment urban complexes (Scott 2000).

Martias Legnér and Davide Ponzini

Goods & services	Industrial CD	Institutional CD	Museum CD	Metropolitan CD
	Design-based, fashion, audio-visual, movies	Wine & food shows, festivals	Networks of museums	Theatres, cinemas, art, restaurants
The model	Historic-evolutionist	Property rights	Public policy	Urban policy

Table 1. Cultural districts according to Santagata. Source: Santagata 2002.

The economic model of the cultural district does a good job of explaining the spatial organization of cultural institutions, but, despite what Sacco and Tavano Blessi (2005) proposed as an “advanced” CD model, the urban policy implications of this model are not direct. It is now widely accepted that it is not proper to consider CDs as explicit policy instruments for local economies (Santagata 2002). Sometimes these sorts of agglomerations are artificially assembled on maps expecting to induce effects on the real economy or the urban environment. In other cases, when the interpretation of districts is simply related to the subdivision of space in distinct portions, the implications may be reduced to the traditional redistribution of resources in cultural policy financing. The concept of the CD needs to be reconsidered in order to be relevant to urban policymaking, and in particular in order to understand why and how cultural production and consumption can play a role in urban revitalization and regeneration.

Although there is no consensus on the exact characteristics of cultural quarters in the international debate, we can point out criteria relevant to their definition. Evans (this volume) considers different rationales adopted in promoting cultural quarters, in terms of economic, social and cultural goals. The term “cultural quarter” (CQ) actually stems from the Anglo-Saxon language and is used both in the UK and the USA. Roodhouse (2006, 22) states that:

A cultural quarter is a geographical area of a large town or city which acts as a focus for cultural and artistic activities through the presence of a group of buildings devoted to housing a range of such activities, and purpose designed or adapted spaces to create a sense of identity, providing an environment to facilitate and encourage the provision of cultural and artistic services and activities.

Roodhouse furthermore distinguishes between CQs and cultural industries quarters. The first category is used to identify an area in which cultural activity is encouraged to locate. The second type of designation is used for purposes of business development within the creative and cultural industries. More simply, Montgomery (2004, 293) points out that cultural quarter initiatives are not a novelty and assume a variety of names and forms:

Cultural Quarters are often seen as part of a larger strategy integrating cultural and economic development. This is usually linked to the redevelopment or regeneration of a selected urban area, in which mixed use urban development is to be encouraged, and the public realm is to be reconfigured. In other words Cultural Quarters tend to combine strategies for greater consumption of the arts and culture with cultural production and urban place making.

In the UK, cultural quarters are developed with references to images and identities, such as Lace Market in Nottingham (Black 2002b), Rope Walks in Liverpool (Gilmore 2004), or Baltic Flour Mills in Newcastle Gateshead (Bailey et al 2004). The purpose has been to attract new visitors and to strengthen consumption in these places (Black 2002a), but also to allow the local population to regain some of its former civic pride (Bell & Jayne 2004). In Sheffield, England, cultural production has been used to diversify and broaden the economic base, to generate more employment and a higher income level, and to attempt the revitalization of urban neighborhoods (Brown et al 2000).

It is however easier to describe the desirable measures (Bell & Jayne 2004b) than it is to implement them. Drawing on the largely unsuccessful case of the Sheffield Cultural Industries Quarter, Moss (2002) shows how the solidity of cultural objectives and political management are crucial ingredients for cultural production and consumption in order to induce urban impacts.

When considering literature related to practices in urban policymaking, it is possible to identify different models describing the spatial organization of cultural institutions. As summarized in Table 2

below, the models of what scholars and policymakers call 'cluster', 'district' or 'quarter' are adopted and often interchanged to describe similar phenomena, not necessary distinct from one to another in terms of type of cultural production, dimension and scale, or spatial-economic implications.

	Type of production	Dimension/scale	Spatial-economic implications	Urban policy implications
Cultural Cluster	Media, high and popular culture products and services	Regional, sub-regional, urban and neighborhood	Agglomeration effects Rich externalities	Mostly spontaneous
Cultural District	Media, high and popular culture products and services	Sub-regional, urban and neighborhood	Agglomeration effects Internalization of positive externalities	Spontaneous and policy induced
Cultural Quarters	High and popular culture products and services	Neighborhood	Agglomeration effects Rich externalities	Spontaneous and policy induced

Table 2. Three different spatial organization models of cultural institutions and producers.

Although these three models evidently overlap, they are widely adopted in urban policies in different forms. The argument often used to support spontaneous or purposely designated spaces assumes that the presence of a district or quarter will induce regeneration and revitalization effects. The argument can easily be found in many European and North American programs (Montgomery 2004; Evans and Shaw 2004; Porter and Barber 2007). What this literature and policy practices do not question are the finalities for which these policies are instrumental: the cultural contents that contribute to shape places and urban life (experienced both by local communities and tourists), and towards what kind of urban development these policies are tacitly contributing in order to drive global and medium-size cities.

The development and management of distinct spatial quarters intended for cultural consumption and production, and the creative industries, generates questions about what 'culture' actually represents in this case, and what the long-term goals of these policies are.

Connecting to the questions already raised about the effects of gentrification and the main target group of cultural quarters, one may wonder whose culture is being promoted when historic buildings are rehabilitated and made attractive again, or when other assets such as museums, concert halls and art galleries are located in inner city quarters or in highly accessible areas. Ultimately, CQs may prove most meaningful to visitors from the outside. In this very critical perspective, quarters may be compared with outdoor museums:

... they seek to speak to visitors, to provide a narrative of place that refuses resistant reading and confirms dominant narratives. Like museum displays, they provide a framework in which difference is contained and exhibited.... In this sense, the inhabitants of quarters are like the 'cast members' acting out the past at heritage sites. (Bell and Jayne 2004c, 252)

Contributions

In order to address the many questions raised above regarding the use of culture in urban policymaking, it seems necessary to examine culture-led urban regeneration from a critical standpoint. Taking into account qualified voices in recent international debate, this book undertakes the difficult task to observe this composite of problems from three different angles. First, cultural and creative production and consumption are discussed in their relation to urban strategies, governance mechanisms and actors. A second section goes on to explore the question of how to preserve heritage while at the same time fostering a sustainable economic, social and cultural evolution in the urban environment. Finally, a close up look at urban and architectural design provides insights into cultural meanings and planning practices of urban space and places. Of course, given the complex layering of the research questions, many issues are recurrent in different chapters and intersect with each other.

Cultural production and urban policies

The description and analysis of urban implications of cultural production policies can shed light on the discussion of global strategies

and their sustainability, of local integration of different governance mechanisms, of local cultural policy networks and of the behavior of relevant policy actors.

Graeme Evans presents an international comparative study of creative spaces and industry strategies adopted by many cities spread over the most urbanized parts of the world. Policy rationales, creative practice and typologies are presented, with examples of cluster based developments and their regimes. Evans also introduces the issue of urban sustainability, advancing the notion that culture may be the 'fourth pillar of sustainability'.

Davide Ponzini argues that in the last decade, policy design and cultural-urban management in Western countries have developed an abundance of public, private and nonprofit instruments. Their composition is a crucial problem for public action when it comes to addressing complex urban and cultural goals. Drawing on the case study of Ferrara in Italy, Ponzini highlights the question regarding multilateralism and integration, contrasts and synergies of different policy tools in the support of cultural quarters and their positive urban effects.

In the following chapter, Roodhouse, Vorley and Mould explain the point of view and potential strategies of a key urban actor in a cultural and creative economy, namely the university. The ideology of the 'ivory tower' is nowadays being replaced with more of an entrepreneurial university vision. But while the marketization of universities continues to develop through third stream activities, the focus of the 'entrepreneurial turn' appears to privilege scientific knowledge over creativity and talent. Most of the university based commercial activity in the UK is associated with high-tech scientific spin-offs and patents. Existing CQs and the links these have with institutions of higher education serve to illustrate the scope of academic creativity and the cultural economy.

Preserving cultural heritage in the city

Historic preservation poses various challenges for public and private actors depending on the urban context in which the preservation processes are situated. This section presents the analysis and inter-

pretation of historic preservation and public space policies in redevelopment projects of historic industrial precincts and downtown areas in Europe.

Urban environments can be dynamic and creative, but they are also a composite of historic layers and the result of the toils of previous generations of the population. Cities need to develop in order to meet the economic, social and cultural demands of their times. However, without keeping their historical contexts intact, urban environments run the risk of becoming homogeneous monocultures that do not foster creativity. Thus there is a need to formulate and implement mid- and long-term urban policies that can balance the needs of development with the ones of preservation.

Randall Mason thus discusses different mechanisms linking economic development, urban culture and the sense of place. His contribution highlights how the economic and cultural value of urban places are closely connected, and how urban places can thrive both economically and culturally, if planned and designed carefully.

Mattias Legnér's chapter presents the case of the long term regeneration of a historic mill district into a CQ in the Swedish city of Norrköping where public and private actors have worked together, not without conflicts but often with a spirit of striving towards common goals of sustainable development through the management of local industrial heritage. Here we see the consequences of four decades of urban redevelopment, showing the discontinuities in planning the urban environment as well as the different 'regimes' governing heritage planning after World War II.

Mia Geijer's contribution highlights how private interests have affected the management of cultural values implied in the restoration of the Vasa-castles in Sweden. The chapter highlights that preservation and public interests are put at risk when the built heritage becomes a commodity where cultural assets are primarily valued in economic terms.

Lennart Runesson considers the redevelopment of Berlin Mitte between the years 1945 and 1990. The former Berliner Stadtschloß was partially demolished at the end of World War II and was finally razed in the 1950s. Several planning proposals were suggested for the

area around the castle and Berlin Mitte, but the plan was not realized until 1976 when the Palast der Republik was erected at the site of the former castle. Immediately after the collapse of the GDR in the early 1990s, a discussion started about who had the power to represent and to recreate the cityscape. What was to be done with the built heritage of the communist era?

Finally Robert Barelkowski refers to the examples of medieval castles in Poland, which today are in diverse conditions: some still stand, while the ruins of others are barely visible. Drawing on the case of the project for the Royal Castle in Poznan, this chapter proposes a methodological structure combining planning, preservation and architectural interventions.

Urban places and their cultural meanings

The chapters in this section show how the proper understanding of the creation, experience and consumption of urban places require an in-depth analysis of cultural and symbolic dimensions involved in the urban environment. The proposed studies of the urban and architectural design and meanings of new projects, of historically layered market squares, of symbolic places and buildings provide a broad exploration in this field.

Ronan Paddison raises issues regarding the publicness and embeddedness of public art in regenerated urban areas. He looks specifically at the integration of public art in recently redeveloped parts of the Gorbles in Glasgow. How public art is received and met by its critics, and what its role may be in policies supporting urban regeneration, are discussed and reflected upon.

Sara Westin considers the fact that an increasing number of city building projects, in the wake of modernist planning, are trying to create an 'urban atmosphere'. However, these planned environments are often simplistically designed, conjuring the urban fantasies of architects rather than the everyday realities of those who come to live there. Westin approaches the problem of designing the contemporary residential area, here exemplified by the Hammarby Sjöstad neighborhood in Stockholm, by alternating between two perspectives called 'the body of the walker' and 'the eye of the architect'.

In order to understand how consumption forms urban environments, it is important to recognize that consumption is a diverse and situated economic and cultural process. In Chapter 11, Lukas Smas explores the formation and rhythms of an urban place – the Hötorget market square in Stockholm – with focus on different configurations of 'commodity transaction spaces'. The place with its entanglement of cultural and economic activities, different historical retail formats and various consumer services, displays both the changes and continuities of how consumption is culturally configured in the city.

Finally, Owe Ronström presents a case of place making in the concluding chapter about heritage and tradition on the Swedish island of Gotland, located in the middle of the Baltic Sea. He focuses on the UNESCO world heritage site of Visby with its medieval origins and argues that conflicting images and identities are displayed depending on who is the sender and who is the receiver of these visual messages. Visitors are being presented with the images of medieval 'heritage', while the local population is instead grounded more in its 'traditions'.

Cultural policy and urban transformations

The three sections deal with a wide array of questions and open new perspectives on the topic of the recognition, use, organization and policymaking of cultural production and consumption in the city. The study of different strategies, mechanisms and actors in complex urban policies show that CQs are spatial frames where sustainable relations of internalization of positive effects may grow. Relating cultural production, consumption and preservation to complementary economic and social sectors and activities is crucial to making CQs work.

The balance between market-oriented and socially-sensitive cultural policies and heritage preservation has been at the center of a long-standing debate. Merely prescriptive measures or the mummification of cultural heritage have proven unsuccessful in economic and social terms, sometimes resulting in failures such as façadism (Legnér 2007). On the contrary, sophisticated real estate appreciation can, in the short term, consume the positive effects of enhanced

aesthetic and cultural values, inducing effects that could be contrary to market-oriented expectations (Ponzini 2008).

In order to pragmatically harness these forces toward sustainable and shared transformation processes, one may suggest an integration of the built heritage, cultural production and consumption as living elements in the urban environment (Rodwell 2007), to preserve and promote them over time by enhancing the capture of relevant externalities in cultural, social and economic terms. To some extent this has been experienced in CQs, but it could be improved substantially. Of course, this is a challenge and a call for thicker cultural and symbolic analyses not only involving economic or social scholars and policymakers but architects and urban planners as well.

References

- Alzén, A. & B. Burell. 2005. *Otydligt. Otydligt. Otaligt. Det industriella kulturarvets utmaningar*. Carlssons: Stockholm.
- Alzén, A. & P. Aronsson (eds.) 2006. *Demokratiskt kulturarv? Nationella institutioner. Universella värden. Lokala praktiker*. Department of Culture Studies, Report 2006:1. Linköping University: Linköping.
- Aronsson, L., J. Bjälvesjö & S. Johansson (eds.) 2007. *Kulturell ekonomi. Skapandet av värden, platser och identiteter i upplevelsesambället*. Studentlitteratur: Lund.
- Ashgate, G., B. Graham & J. Tunbridge. 2000. *A geography of heritage: power, culture and economy*. Arnold: London.
- Ashworth, G. & J. Tunbridge. 1990. *The Tourist-Historic City: Retrospect and Prospect of Managing the Heritage City*. Pergamon: Amsterdam.
- Ashworth, G., B. Graham & J. Tunbridge. 2007. *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. Pluto Press: London.
- Bagacean, S. 2007. Brand Dubai: The Instant City; or the Instantly Recognizable City. *International Planning Studies* 12(2), 173–197.
- Bagnasco, A. 1977. *Tre Italie. La problematica Territoriale dello Sviluppo Economico Italiano*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Bailey, C., S. Miles & P. Stark. 2004. Culture-led urban regeneration and the revitalization of identities in Newcastle, Gateshead and the north east of England. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(1), 47–65.
- Beauregard R. A. & J. Pierre. 2000. "Disputing the global: a sceptical view of locality-based international initiatives" *Policy & Politics*, 28(4), 465–478
- Beccattini, G. 2003. *From Industrial Districts to Local Development: An Itinerary of Research*. Cheltenham UK, and Northampton MA. Edward Elgar.
- Bell, J. & M. Jayne (eds.). 2004a. *City of Quarters. Urban Villages in the Contemporary City*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Bell, J. & M. Jayne. 2004b. Conceptualizing the City of Quarters. In: Bell & Jayne (2004a).
- Bell, J. & M. Jayne. 2004c. Afterword: Thinking in Quarters. In: Bell & Jayne (2004a).
- Bianchini, F. & M. Parkinson (eds.). 1993. *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bianchini, F. 1999. Cultural Planning for Urban Sustainability. In: Nyström (1999a).
- Black, G. 2002a. The Conservation of the Built Environment in the UK. In: Phelps et al (2002).
- Black, G. 2002b. Nottingham Lace Market. In: Phelps et al (2002).
- Boyle, M. & G. Hughes. 1991. The politics of representation of the "real". *Area* vol. 2.
- Brown, A., O'Connor, J. & S. Cohen. 2000. Local music policies within a global music industry: cultural quarters in Manchester and Sheffield. *Geoforum* 31, 437–451.
- Chang, T.C. 2000. Renaissance Revisited: Singapore as a 'Global City for the Arts'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(4), 818–831.
- Cochrane, A. 2007. *Understanding Urban Policy. A Critical Approach*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Cohen, S. 2007. *Decline, Renewal and the City in Popular Music Culture: Beyond the Beatles*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Cooke, P. & L. Lazeretti (eds.) 2008. *Creative Cities, Cultural Clusters and Local Economic Development*. Cheltenham: Edward Edgar.
- Cooke, P. 2005. Culture, clusters, districts and quarters: some reflections on the scale question. *Sviluppo locale*, 26, 7–30.

Mattias Legnér and Davide Ponzini

- Cooke, P. 2008. Culture, clusters, districts and quarters: some reflections on the scale question. In: Cooke & Lazzarretti (2008).
- Evans, G. 2001. *Cultural Planning. An Urban Renaissance?* London: Routledge.
- Evans, G. 2003. From Prado to Prada. Hard-Branding the Cultural City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Policy* 27(2), 417–440.
- Evans, G. 2005. Measure for measure: evaluating the evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration. *Journal of Urban Studies* 42, 959–983.
- Evans, G., & P. Shaw. 2004. *The Contribution of Culture to Regeneration in the UK: A Review of Evidence*. Report to the DCMS. London: Met: London.
- Garcia, B. 2005. Deconstructing the City of Culture: The Long-term Cultural Legacies of Glasgow 1990. *Urban studies* 42(5–6), 841–868.
- Gilmore, A. 2004. Popular Music, Urban Regeneration and Cultural Quarters: The Case of the Rope Walks, Liverpool. In: Bell & Jayne (2004a).
- Ginsburgh, V.A. & D. Throsby (eds.) 2006. *Handbook of the economics of art and culture*. Elsevier North-Holland: Amsterdam.
- Harding, T. 2007. *Nationalising culture: the reorganisation of national culture in Swedish cultural policy 1970–2002*. Linköping University: Linköping.
- Jayne, M. 2004. Culture that works? Creative industries development in a working-class city. *Capital & class* 84 (Winter).
- Johansson, B.O.H. 2002. The Conservation of the Built Environment in Sweden. In: Phelps et al (2002).
- Johnson, P. & B. Thomas. 2001. Assessing the economic impact of the Arts. In: Selwood (2001).
- Kearns, G. & C. Philo (eds.) 1993. *Selling Places. The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Legné, M. 2007a. Baltimores poetiska planer delade staden. *Svenska Dagbladet* December 17.
- Legné, M. 2007b. The cultural significance of industrial heritage and urban development: Woodberry in Baltimore, Maryland. In: Nilsson (2007).
- Legné, M. 2008. *Industriarv och kulturmiljöpolicy i stadsförnyelseprocesser: Norrköping, Baltimore och Milano*. Centrum för kommunstrategiska studier: Norrköping.
- Legné, M. 2009. *Historic Rehabilitation of Industrial Sites: Cases from North American and Swedish Cities*. Department of Culture Studies, report 2008:1. Linköping University: Linköping.
- Lowenthal, D. 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Marshall, A. 1920 [1980]. *Principles of Economics*, London, Macmillan.
- Martins Holmberg, I. 2006. *På stadens yta. Om historiseringen av Haga*. Göteborg City Museum: Göteborg.
- Mason, R. & M. Page (eds.) 2003. *Giving preservation a history*. Routledge: New York.
- Mason, R. 2005. *Economics and Historic Preservation. A Guide and Review of the Literature*. Brookings Institution: Washington, D.C.
- McGuigan, J. & A. Gilmore. 2002. The millennium dome: sponsoring, meaning and visiting. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 8:1, 1–20.
- Miles, S. & R. Paddison. 2005. Introduction: The Rise and Rise of Cultured Urban Regeneration. *Urban studies* 42(5–6), 833–839.
- Molotch, H. 1996. LA as Product: How Design Works in a Regional Economy. In: Scott & Soja (1996).
- Monclus, J. & M. Guardia (eds.). 2006. *Culture, urbanism and planning*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Montgomery, J. 2003. Cultural Quarters as Mechanisms for Urban Regeneration. Part 1. Conceptualising Cultural Quarters. *Planning, Practice & Research*, 18(4), 293–306.
- Montgomery, J. 2004. Cultural Quarters as Mechanisms for Urban Regeneration. Part 2: A Review of Four Cultural Quarters in the UK, Ireland and Australia. *Planning, Practice & Research*, 19(1), 3–31.
- Moss, L. 2002. Sheffield's cultural industries quarter 20 years on: what can be learned from a pioneering example? *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 8(2), 211–219.
- Nilsson, L. (ed.) 2007. *Stockholms Lijja. Stadshistoriska studier tillägnade professorn i Stockholms historia Sven Lilja 23 juli 2007*. Swedish Institute of Urban History, Stockholm University: Stockholm.
- Nyström, L. (ed.) 1999a. *City and Culture. Cultural Processes and Urban Sustainability*. Stockholm: Swedish Urban Environment Council.

Mattias Legné and Davide Ponzini

- Nyström, L. 1999b. Introduction: The Importance of Culture to Urban Environment. In: Nyström (1999a).
- Olshammar, G. 2002. *Det permanentade provisoriet. Ett återvänt industriområde i väntan på rivning eller erkännande*. Chalmers: Göteborg.
- Phelps, A., G.J. Ashworth & B.O.H. Johansson. 2002. *The Construction of Built Heritage. A North European Perspective on Policies, Practices and Outcomes*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Ponzini, D. 2008. *Il territorio dei beni culturali. Interpretazioni strategiche del processo di privatizzazione dei beni e delle attività culturali in Italia*. Rome: Carocci.
- Ponzini, D. (forthcoming) The Process of Privatization of Cultural Heritage and the Arts in Italy. Analysis and Perspectives. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*.
- Ponzini, D. (2009) Urban Implications of Cultural Policy Networks. The Case of the Mount Vernon Cultural District in Baltimore. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 27(3), 433–450.
- Porter, L. & A. Barber. 2007. Planning the Cultural Quarter in Birmingham's Eastside. *European Planning Studies*, 15(10), 1327–1348.
- Porter, L. & K. Shaw (eds.). 2008. *Whose Urban Renaissance? An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Quinn, B. 2005. Arts festivals and the city. *Urban Studies* 42(5–6), 927–943.
- Rains, S. 2004. Quarterizing the City? The Spatial Politics of the Joyce Industries in Dublin. In: Bell & Jayne (2004a).
- Rodwell, D. 2007. *Conservation and Sustainability in Historic Cities*. Blackwell: Cambridge.
- Roodhouse, S. 2006. *Cultural Quarters: Principles and Practices*. Intellect: Bristol.
- Sacco, P.L. & G. Tavano Blessi. 2005. Distretti Culturali Evoluti e Valorizzazione del Territorio. *Global and Local Economic Review*, 7(1), 7–42.
- Santagata, W. 2002. Cultural Districts, Property Rights and Sustainable Economic Growth. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(1), 9–23.
- Santagata, W. 2006. Cultural Districts and their Role in Developed and Developing Economies. In: Ginsburgh & Throsby (2006).
- Scott, A.J. & E. Soja (eds.) 1996. *The city: Los Angeles and urban theory at the end of the twentieth century*. University of California Press: Los Angeles.
- Scott, A.J. 2000. *The cultural economy of cities: essays on the geography of image-producing industries*. SAGE: London.
- Scott, A.J. 2004. Cultural-Products Industries And Urban Economic Development Prospects for Growth and Market Contestation in Global Context. *Urban Affairs Review* 39(4), 461–490.
- Selwood, S. (ed.) 2001. *The UK Cultural Sector*. Policy Studies Institute: London.
- Smith, M. K. (ed.) 2007. *Tourism, Culture and Regeneration*. CABI: Cambridge, MA.
- Stevenson, D. 2004. 'Civic gold' rush: cultural planning and the politics of the Third Way. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(1), 119–131.
- Storm, A. 2008. *Hope and Rust. Reinterpreting the industrial place in the late 20th century*. Royal School of Technology: Stockholm.
- Strom, E. 2003. Cultural policy as development policy: evidence from the United States. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9(3), 247–263.
- Sudjic, D. 2005. *The edifice complex: how the rich and powerful shape the world*. Allen Lane, London and New York.
- Walsh, K. 1992. *The representation of the past: museums and heritage in the postmodern world*. Routledge: London.
- Ward, S.V. 1998. *Selling Places. The Marketing and Promotion of Towns and Cities 1850–2000*. E F Spon: London.
- Ward, S.V. 2006. 'Cities are fun!': inventing and spreading the Baltimore model of cultural urbanism. In: Monclus & Guardia (2006).
- Zukin, S. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge: Blackwell.