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ABSTRACT: This chapter looks at forty years of regeneration schemes in a historic industrial district in the inner city of Norrköping in Sweden. It attempts to place the city within a national context of urban development and regeneration post-World War II. Emphasis is put on policies and practices of historic preservation, and how the restoration and reuse of the built heritage has served the purpose of local economic regeneration. The redesign of the district into an attractive public space combined with a number of flagship projects (partially based on public-private partnerships) are identified as the most important ingredients for the success of urban regeneration. Finally, social and cultural aspects of quarterization and sustainability are reflected upon, pointing to the risks of public investments in entertainment facilities, the challenges of multicultural integration, and issues about the durability and survival of large scale projects. A conclusion is that regeneration, if seen as a process of several decades, to a large extent has been successful.

Historic preservation and urban regeneration
The purpose is to describe and reflect upon mainly cultural and social effects of quarterization and historic preservation on the public management of urban space in Sweden between the 1960s and beyond the
millennium shift. The observations have been made in the historic
district called The Industrial Landscape, which is a designated area in
central Norrköping, a working class town with a population of about
128,000 and located 160 kilometers south of Stockholm.

The chapter begins with a discussion on recent years’ academic
scholarship on issues of urban development in Sweden, followed by
comments on how Norrköping has been perceived by urban schol­
ars in the last 15 years. Then a historical expose follows, describing
and evaluating the efforts made mainly by the city to preserve the
building stock and economically regenerate the area. Four different
phases of development are identified and discussed. The chapter ends
with a discussion of different aspects of regeneration, quarterization
and sustainability in contemporary urban development. The obser­
vations made here build on a post doc project conducted at Culture
Studies, Linköping University, on location in Norrköping in the
years 2006–08.

Swedish scholarship on urban regeneration

One of the most prominent features of Swedish scholarship on urban
planning and regeneration, in comparison with for example British
or U.S. American scholarship, is its stress of a ‘user’s perspective’.
Not only developers’ or planners’ experiences of the urban landscape
should count in redevelopment projects. It is important to integrate
the citizens’ view of a place into redevelopment. Planners and pres­
ervationists alike are usually well aware of the risks of gentrification
in redeveloped neighborhoods. (Legnér 2008)

Recent research has pointed to the problem of integrating citizen
views into the rehabilitation and reuse of former industrial sites.
Speaking of ‘place based strategies’, Öhrström (2004) points out
that brownfields redevelopment tend to give developers a lot of say
because the sites are most often abandoned. This is contrary to the
situation in many residential areas where the stakeholders are much
more active. Redevelopment may become a democratic problem be­
because the new users’ views of the place become completely dominant
if the community is not involved in a dialogue from the beginning.
According to Öhrström, the first question to ask when planning a
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large-scale redevelopment project should be ‘What are the needs of the community?’ rather than ‘What are the needs of the developer?’ (Öhrström 2006)

This is however an ideal and in practice there may be considerable deviations from this interpretation. In recent harbor development projects in Stockholm, Malmö and Göteborg, we have seen rather sterile and homogenous residential areas intended for exclusive high income groups being developed (see also Westin’s contribution in this volume), but we have also seen some of the intentions behind these projects backfire: Hammarby Sjöstad in Stockholm for example, was planned for the needs of middle age empty nesters and seniors, but instead it has become a trendy area for middle class families with small children. (DN 2009)

Quoting Öhrström again, rehabilitation of redundant industrial sites should be planned step by step, listening to a plurality of local interests rather than just seeking to maximize property values: “successful regeneration has to go step by step, fulfilling the needs of local people” (Öhrström 2000, 134). Swedish research has begun to emphasize more the need to take into account a diversity of users – including teenagers, artists, and small entrepreneurs – when planning for redevelopment, playing down the importance of spectacular architecture or very costly flagship projects. (Olshammar 2003, 137)

In two recent doctoral dissertations the “new” meanings of industrial sites and goods are elaborated. In large, they come close to what is the mainstream of international scholarship on rehabilitation of brownfields and the structural changes of economy at large: the vision of a post industrial economy based on media and immaterial values (such as the experience economy) taking over the role of traditional economic sectors such as manufacturing, agriculture or mining (Legnér 2007).

Storm (2008), on the one hand, focuses on the reuse of physical structures and how the approaches to the built environment can be said to represent views on the importance of the cultural heritage of industry and work. What happened to industrial places that lost their original functions? What visions were there and to what degree were they achieved? In this, as well in most other similar studies, the focus
is on industrial areas that have undergone regeneration and not been left abandoned or ruined. In this view, deindustrialized areas tend to represent a significant resource for the post industrial economy (in that they sometimes may be turned into new media hubs, opera houses, museums or such) and this is of course only a part of the truth behind industrialization.

In other perspectives, of course, former industrial areas may represent major problems of contamination, unemployment, crime and physical decay. In this way, it may seem a bit naïve to speak of “how the redundant industrial place became an arena for visions of the future in a local community” (Storm 2008, abstract). And even if we acknowledge the importance of the regenerative focus, we should also ask who is benefited by regeneration projects, and who might have less benefits from them. We can never expect a community to support and benefit from a regeneration project in its whole. In earlier works the author has showed how, on the contrary, many development projects in former industrial areas often polarize communities and sharpen already existing social and political conflicts. Examples can be taken from well known projects such as Baltimore Inner Harbor, South Street Seaport in New York, Canary Wharf or Docklands in London. (Legnér 2009, 13–6) Other enlightening cases of ethnic or social conflicts arising from high-profile urban redevelopment projects can easily be found. (Legnér 2007a; Legnér 2007b)

Willim’s (2008) perspective, on the other hand, traces the birth of a romanticized view of the material heritage of the manufacturing industry. “Industrial cool” is a term used for mapping and explaining a contemporary discourse in which the memory of the industrial era is idealized for purposes of nostalgia and commodification. All of this is in one sense very real today, but in another sense it may also be seen as a somewhat naïve and unrealistic view of how economic and social change actually take place. One could easily argue that “the post industrial turn” of people’s everyday economy is grossly overrated by many scholars. The new economy is largely a thing of the most urbanized areas and Sweden remains highly dependent on both manufacturing and the public sector.

In a contrasting study of an industrial area in Göteborg that is...
described as being in a state of decay but without any regeneration efforts being targeted at it, Olshammar (2003) analyzes the roles of different actors involved in the administration of this “permanent-provisional” space, mapping both planning efforts and the everyday life of people working there. The Gustaf Dalén area is far from one of the fancy, cool places of rusting factory shells being reused for trendy live-work-play purposes, and in that sense it poses a down-to-earth view of what everyday reality looks like in many industrial areas (see also Olsson 2003).

It is crucial to understand that the observations of scholars or any one else is not objective or neutral. Instead, it is the result of a choice (conscious or unconscious) of perspective. Urban environments are experienced in an infinite number of ways, of course, so when authors talk of “the urban experience” or “the attractions of a city” one should be aware of their own perspective or gaze. With whose eyes are they making observations about a city? Who is actually experiencing or feeling the attraction? (Zukin 1995) There may be gross discrepancies between individual citizens’ memories and experiences of a certain space, and how changes in this space are represented and treated by media, politicians, planners or developers (Brusman 2006).

In his study of the Swedish town Visby’s UNESCO world heritage area, Owe Ronström recently posed the important question: “Whose city?” (Ronström 2008, 281, also this volume). He touches upon the relationship between cultural heritage, branding and gentrification. Going more in depth into these issues, Martins Holmberg (2006) discusses how historicization (here simply understood as the appreciation of historical references) takes place in an old neighborhood in Göteborg. Urban space, on a superficial and material level, has in the last decades undergone a process of homogenization, and Martins Holmberg traces this expression of facadism (Legnér 2009, 21–22) in detail.

**Scholarship on the Industrial Landscape**

“The Industrial Landscape” has been an object of documentation since the 1970s, while it has been an object for academic research
since the beginning of the 1990s. One motive for distinguishing between these two groups is their differing focus: those interested in documenting have inventoried buildings and environments, while the academics of more recent years have been interested in describing and analyzing the documentation. Regarding documentation, there are mainly two investigations carried through by the city and published in 1974 and 1981–85 respectively. These two documents constitute expressions of the political interest in gaining practical knowledge about a part of Norrköping’s urban environment which has become more and more important for the development of the inner city. These two surveys were primarily intended to be useful for the policymakers and planners of Norrköping.

Academic research, on the other hand, has been interested in reflecting on and criticizing official views on the industrial heritage of Norrköping. (Alzén 1996; Bergdahl 2001; Beckman 2005; Cederborg et al 2005) Its main purpose has not been to improve policymaking in the field but rather to produce more reflective knowledge of how city planning, heritage and place making work in practice. In his valuable study of how issues of local identity are tied to historical references in urban space, Brusman (2008) investigates how the inner city of Norrköping has been the object of numerous regeneration schemes since the beginning of the twentieth century. The notion of making a museum landscape of the former factory buildings in the form of “the Industrial Landscape” is only one of the most recent of these schemes, building on high-flying visions of urbanity and the dynamics of modern inner city life. Citizens’ everyday experience of and needs for urban space often differ from the technical solutions offered by engineers, planners and architects.

A number of ethnographers have pondered over the meanings of the Industrial Landscape (Bergdahl 2001; Beckman 2005; Cederborg et al 2005), of which Alzén’s (1996) doctoral thesis is the single most important contribution. Alzén studied the early phase of preservation of built heritage in the Industrial Landscape from an ethnographic perspective. Her interest is in making sense of the context and the cultural meanings of preserving this specific environment. The investigation ends in the beginning of the 1980s, i.e. when the
phase of documentation is followed by a more intense phase of spatial planning and early redevelopment. An important contrast between Alzén’s work and the present study is that this one has a focus on policy and practice in urban regeneration schemes, and maps the development all the way from 1970 to 2010.

Figure 1. The Industrial Landscape with its main facilities.
Source: M. Legnér.

Urban development in Norrköping before 1970
The town Norrköping, located 120 miles south of Stockholm, was founded in medieval times, growing out of a mill and fishing village along the falls of Strömmen, by king Albrekt of Mecklenburg. This village developed into an important market and a place for court sessions, also working as a place for crossing the river. The industrial area covered in this report represents the original settlements and thus it contains important archaeological remains. King Johan III settled the first plan of the town, which had been sacked and virtually destroyed by a Danish army in 1567.

In the seventeenth century, the castle Johannisborg was built since this was the place where the duke resided. At about the same time (1620) a Dutch entrepreneur, Louis De Geer, settled in the town which then received additional charters from the king. Norrköping
becomes the mercantile and industrial center in Sweden, manufacturing guns, cannons, ammunition, brass products and textiles. Visitors in the eighteenth century were impressed by the factories and the liveliness of the town, but also by the number of plastered wooden frame houses. (Palmstedt 1927)

The nineteenth century was a period of intense industrial development without any counterpart in Sweden. The great transformation of industry took place after mid-century when first cotton and later wool industry was mechanized. Consequently, a number of huge weaving and spinning mills and warehouses were raised along Strömmen, using the water for power, supplemented by steam engines beginning in the 1860s (Björk 2007). Historians have meant that Norrköping better than any other town in Sweden tells the story of the foundation of the Swedish manufacturing industry. The economic prosperity of the town was manifested by the founding of the great esplanades, just one year after Haussmann’s introduction of the Paris esplanade system. The stone city took shape and became the largest in the country after Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. (Nisser 1974)

It has however often been neglected in the writing of Norrköping’s history that this prosperity only benefited a minority of the population (Sylvan 1974). The mass of laborers in Norrköping lived in poor housing right next to the factories. The labor force of the textile industry, which became massive in the late nineteenth century, was mostly made up of women and children, while men worked as mechanics. Property owners kept up the facades of the large tenements along the main streets, but neglected the interiors.

A workers’ slum developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, giving Norrköping the worst living conditions in northern Europe in the 1940s. Most of these tenements were torn down in the urban renewal efforts of the 1950s and 1960s, creating huge empty spaces in the middle of the city. In this respect, a historic connection was broken between spaces of work and spaces of leisure. The industries – the property of the industrialists – would in time be restored and preserved, while workers’ housing was torn down without any second thoughts. (Schönbeck 1994, 202)
By 1900, Norrköping had begun losing its competitive edge in textile and engineering industry. Competing centers of manufacture were developing in other parts of the country as well. Beginning in 1913, the textile industry was becoming concentrated to a few large companies in Norrköping. The 1940s represented a last, yet temporary surge in textile industry, but in the following decade the crisis was unavoidable. Factories started closing down and workers were laid off. (Nilsson 2000, 160)

Immediately after the war, Norrköping became the target for the new national housing policy. Old tenements located in mixed use neighborhoods were razed and replaced by modern apartment buildings in exclusively residential neighborhoods. A housing survey from 1945 listed Norrköping as one of the cities in Sweden where there was the most urgent need to provide new housing. At about the same time, municipalities became responsible for planning the housing needs of the community. However, at this time (1945–55) industries began closing down in Norrköping and industrial structures located centrally in the town became vacant. As a result there was a surplus of modern, up to date housing for a long time to come. (Schönbeck 1994, 177)

In 1955 a new general plan was established after three years of work, but then nothing happened for some years. The promised subsidies from the state did not come through as planned and there was growing division among the political leadership about which course to take. One party wanted to build more affordable rental apartments, and another party wanted instead to build condos. It is still unclear today how this division affected downtown development, but as a result the future renewal would be hampered and not carried through in a systematical manner.

The demolition of downtown began in 1959. In Norrköping the razing was scrupulously planned. Those who had been children in 1915, when Norrköping had had the worst housing stock in the country, had grown up and wanted to see the old workers’ tenements torn down and replaced. People should not have to live next to workshops, warehouses and stores, they argued, and children should not have to play on streets where there was a lot of traffic.
Apartments in the inner city were demolished and new ones built up just outside the inner city. In the period 1958–71, 7,000 apartments were torn down and historic neighborhoods near the inner city core were struck hard. (Schönbeck, 234–9) Very little was being built downtown, which meant that demolished or partly demolished properties stood vacant and deserted for many years. In 1962 the renowned textile mill Tuppen (The Rooster) ceased production, and the buildings were demolished in 1969. About ten years later housing was built on the property, but for a decade it was just an empty lot. The razing of this prominent riverfront structure gave people an idea of what soon could be happening to other historic mills and workshops in the area, but there was no organized resistance against further demolition. In the eyes of many people in the city, the buildings were useless once they had stopped production. Furthermore, they were associated with memories of poverty and hard and often dangerous work. The historic value was rated very low locally. Downtown remained a desolate, partly demolished landscape for many years due to lack of planning and investment. The city core became a slum and was to a great degree abandoned for many years to come.

The industrial landscape: development post-1970

Phase 1: Direct government, 1970–1982

In the early 1970s a form of direct government was implemented to make a first inventory of historically valuable environments in the inner city of Norrköping, including the industrial area. Through this documentation, the industries along Strömmen became defined (1974) as one of five remarkable environments in the inner city. The inventory laid grounds for the coming regulation of the area.

The most important law was the Landmark Code, Byggnadsminneslagen, from 1960. The code was not applied to churches, archaeological sites or state property. These were already protected by other means. A property could be designated without owner consent, but the legislators stressed that gaining consent was crucial. The code did not protect entire environments, just the properties, and in cases where the protection was conditioned by financial circumstances,
the economic support would have to be settled before the protection was enabled.

Another important law was the Building Code, *Byggnadslagen* (1947), supplemented by the Building Regulation, *Byggnadsstadgan* (1959). The Building Code made it possible to give an overall protection to certain blocks or complete neighborhoods, such as the Old Town of Stockholm which was covered in a paragraph added in 1963.

There were some, however comparatively restricted, possibilities of receiving state funding for renovating historic building. The main sources were threefold, implying direct government interventions:

1. The Swedish state lottery, granting a maximum of 20 percent of the costs,
2. The National Heritage Board’s funds, which were mortgaged a long time in advance,
3. Labor market grants (AMS), which meant putting unemployed construction workers into work on a project basis; this was possible if housing was not included in the buildings to be renovated.

The lack of government support in historic preservation had made it necessary for some municipalities to acquire single properties which otherwise would have been torn down. Before 1970, this had especially been done in the municipality of Ystad. Buying properties was a very costly way for municipalities to preserve buildings, and could hardly be applied to whole environments. Starting in 1974, another municipal tool of regulation could be used to temporarily stop the demolition of a building, but only for a maximum of five years. A third tool for municipalities was to economically support the renovation of remarkable facades.

In May 1969 a bill was passed on the preservation and management of historically interesting environments in the city. Five years had gone since historic environments were debated the last time, but still no commission had been appointed to investigate the need of preservation. Now, for the first time, attention was being paid to the industrial area along Strömmen. As a growing part of the industry in the center of town was closing down, it was gradually becoming valued as a his-
historical environment. The Building Board meant that it was becoming necessary to obtain an overview of the characteristics of the industrial environment in Norrköping. Buildings should not only be inventoried, but also the economic aspects of historic preservation and adaptive reuse should be considered. In 1970 it was decided that a committee, Kulturmiljökommittén (Committee for historical environments) would be appointed with the mission to investigate the preservation of historically valuable environments, and not just individual buildings. Traditionally, the needs of preservation had been discussed for each building, downplaying the values of an intact environment, but now the intention was to gain an overall view of the building stock.

There were basically three motives for appointing the committee:

1. The razing of the urban renewal programs of Swedish cities in the 1950s and 1960s had demolished no less than 15 blocks in the inner city. There had been a need to clear unsanitary housing, but the clearing had had devastating effects on the city image.
2. Around 1970 there was a need to plan the inner city again, not least from a traffic perspective. New bridges over Strömmen were discussed, which would change the image of the city.
3. Finally there was a growing interest among property owners to reuse older buildings that could be renovated at affordable costs. The sources of funding had improved.

At this time several cities in Sweden were inventorying their architecture, but they were all going about in different manners. In Lund 1963, all buildings facing a street had been documented but nothing of the inside of the blocks. In Uppsala 1964, every building in the inner city had been documented. Karlskrona, on its part, had in 1970 shown a very restrictive attitude, excluding all buildings that could not present a remarkable historic value. In short, even though a committee had been appointed in Norrköping to document valuable environments, nothing was given regarding the method to choose.

Having this in mind, it becomes interesting to examine what method the committee adopted. The directives were pretty clear, stressing what was called the “psychosocial motives” for preservation. The
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argument here was simply that urban populations were feeling a growing discomfort and alienation toward the new, sterile environments of suburbs and inner cities. There was evidently an articulated critique of the consequences of rational planning already in 1970. Historic traditions, manifested through architecture and design, invoked the imagination and made people more creative and happy. The city was seen as a living organism, and it was compared with the annual rings of trees. New buildings were added to the old, resulting in an organically produced environment. It is interesting that aspects of identity and sense of belonging were stressed already at this point in time, considering the proposed novelty of the discourse on the importance of creativity and culture in cities today. In Swedish local politics, the notion of the influence of the built environment on people’s minds has been around for a long time.

A classification consisting of three tiers of preservation was used to designate buildings:

A. Historically remarkable building. Protected by the law of 1960, *Byggnadsminneslagen* (Landmark Code)
B. Historically valuable building, which might become protected.
C. Building of some historic or environmental value, which should be preserved. If demolished, it should first be investigated.

Environments were protected according to two tiers:

A. Historically remarkable environment
B. Historically valuable environment

The actual work of the committee is not of interest to describe here since only a part of it concerned the industrial area, which became one of five delineated districts of historic interest. Instead, we will advance directly to the values ascribed to “the industries along Ström­men including adjacent neighborhoods”. The committee was obviously influenced heavily by architectural professor Göran Lindahl, who in 1970 published an article arguing for the preservation of the factories. Lindahl had then become known as one of the most articu-
lated advocates for the preservation of urban historic structures. A passage in Lindahl’s article (1970) was quoted by the commission:

Norrköping’s structure of old vacant industrial buildings, collected in the center of the city, amasses one of the most complicated planning problems that any Swedish town has had to face. What will happen to this area, still growing, when the Holmen paper mill in a near future breaks up from its jam packed property? [...] What kind of ruined landscape can Norrköping expect to get? Or is there any possibility of reuse in this, from several aspects, technically genuine mass of structures. The problem is worth contemplation also from a standpoint of cultural history: even in the old English mill towns should it be difficult to find such a concentrated and well preserved environment stemming from the breakthrough period of industrialism. (Author’s transl.)

What approach did the committee take on the environment, then? The making of the industrial area into a public space that people would like to cross through and spend time in became important. The beautiful views of the flowing water, and the possibilities of improving communication alongside Strömmen and through the still closed off area were stressed. Nothing was said about the possible future functions of the buildings, or how they might be adapted.

It is however important to keep in mind that this was, still in the 1970s, a very active industrial district with a large paper mill, Holmens bruk (or Holmen), dominating the neighborhood and sealing it off from public use. It was not yet considered a public space or even a place you would visit if not for work. The entrances of the mill were closed off by guarded iron gates and by the water. Imagining alternative functions for the buildings must have been hard as they were still being used as workshops, warehouses and premises for small associations.

The committee wished that, once the traditional industries were closed, thoroughfares for bicyclers and pedestrians were established. Furthermore, the views of Strömmen were deemed remarkable (tier A) and would be preserved. Curiously, very few buildings were suggested for designation. Within the property of the mill only two of
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the oldest buildings, Strykjärnet (The Iron) from 1917 and Holmentornet (The Holmen Tower) from 1750, were considered tier A buildings. Obviously, the industrial activity and the uncertainty about the future uses of the large mill property hampered further designations. Outside the mill, another four buildings were considered tier A. As we shall see, the discussions about how to preserve
the Holmen paper mill would return in the 1980s and early 1990s as no decisions were made on this area in the 1970s.

**Phase 2: Regulation, 1983–1988**
In the beginning of the 1980s, 27 percent of the working population in Norrköping was employed in manufacturing. Commerce and service represented 60 percent. (Cederborg et al 2005, 27) Technically
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speaking, the city had already made the transition from an industrial economy to a knowledge economy. Conceptually, however, people seem to have been mentally stuck in the industrial age. The industrial area along Strömmen was not yet seen as a potential source for urban regeneration, but rather as a “major planning problem” (SOU 1982, 100, author’s transl.).

This was a time of renewed efforts to document and prepare the ground for preserving the most important buildings. The Committee for historic environments had in the 1970s established the principles of historic preservation in Norrköping. In 1976, the city council declared that the industrial area along Strömmen constituted a historically remarkable environment. In the general plan of the inner city from 1982, large spaces were designated as “areas of investigation”, expressing a wish to preserve parts of them, but without having the knowledge of what future development would look like (PACTE 1997). This was to a large extent an issue of real estate economics: without development there would be no preservation, since the funding would be lacking.

In 1979 the city council appointed a new committee to produce a more thorough documentation of the Industrial Landscape. The investigation would include proposals for reuse, showcases of successful reuse, proposals for land marking, and a proposed district plan. The committee consisted of politicians, civil servants (among them the city architect and head of the city museum) and a representative of Holmens Bruk. The city council was looking for measures that would give the city possibilities to “guide development” (Norrköping 1981). In the end, few proposals for reuse were presented.

A first volume of the investigation was published in 1981, covering the western part of the Industrial Landscape. In the same year the city museum moved to its new premises within the area. This was a typical way of the city exercising direct government in the area, attempting to spearhead urban development and show the real estate companies that this environment was possible to adapt and reuse for new, post-industrial functions.

In the 1981 survey, the only suggestion for reuse concerned a single
building complex called Drags. One proposal was to turn the former factories of this site into offices, but it was based on an engineering student’s paper produced ten years before. The offices were intended for the Swedish Maritime Administration (Sjöfartsverket) based in Stockholm, but the department refused to be relocated to a vacant factory and warehouse, choosing instead to have new offices erected in another part of Norrköping. (Industrilandskapet 1981)

This lack of novel ideas in 1981 shows us two things: 1) the committee saw as its main task to document existing buildings in order to prepare grounds for preservation, not primarily for re-use, 2) the committee was poorly equipped to work as a kind of creative think-tank for the development of the area, despite that it was composed of a heterogeneous group of actors, although mostly made up of public officials from different departments. Except for a representative from Holmens Bruk – a company quickly moving out of the area – there were no real estate or business interests involved in the committee. The consequence was that the area was primarily defined as a planning problem, rather than as an area ripe for new forms of entrepreneurialism and businesses.

The survey of the eastern-most part of the area, including Holmens Bruk, was finished in 1985. It concluded that the district, not surprisingly, was too large to become a museum in itself. (Industrilandskapet 1985) Further expansion of the city museum was not realistic. However, together with national labor organizations the city planned to create a Museum of Work inside Strykjärnet, a unique building drawn by architect Folke Bensow and erected in 1917. The very first plans had been made already in 1977. A foundation consisting of four national non-profit organizations was founded in 1983, and the first exhibition was opened in 1991 after major restoration works on the building and adjacent structures. Informants have witnessed of the importance of the restoration of Strykjärnet in showing the public and potential investors that the industrial buildings could indeed be restored and adapted.

It would become necessary to preserve buildings along the water, clear some interior buildings of less historic value, and to make compatible infill. Interestingly, when the committee summarized...
its views on future development, direct government action was not seen as an effective alternative, despite the move of the city museum and efforts being made to establish the Museum of Work. In 1983 Strykjärnet and the neighboring building Strykbrädan (The Ironing Board) had been purchased by the city from Holmens Bruk, but no further accessions were planned. The city did not have the means to buy even smaller parts of the area, and government support was lacking. Still in 1985, there were no plans from the government or Linköping University, (located in the neighboring city) to expand higher education in Norrköping. Redevelopment of the building stock would have to rely solely on local and regional economic resources. (Industrilandskapet 1985)

At this time a heated debate about the conservation of Strömmen broke out. The owner of the paper mill planned to cut the flow of water to a minimum in order to maximize the outlet of power. A giant underground pipe would be constructed, diverting almost all of the water. An expert commissioned by the Water Court (Vattendomstolen) came to the conclusion that the proposed cut in the flow of water would severely damage the image and visual experience of the inner city. (Sachs 1985) Local and regional authorities were also very skeptical towards this plan. One of the local newspapers, Folkbladet, started a campaign called “Save Strömmen”. A list of more than 5,000 protestors’ names was handed over to the mill early in 1984. (Alzén 1996) In 1986 it was finally ruled that the seasonal flows would be preserved. The mill would still construct the pipe but would have to cut down the volume of water planned to go through it. The reasons were environmental as well as aesthetic as the river was becoming an increasingly important part of the city image. The story of Strömmen is not of primary concern here, but it is interesting to note that the fate of the river stirred strong feelings among the people of Norrköping, while the built environment has not mobilized the same kind of emotion.

In order to initiate a public discourse on the future of the buildings, the second local paper Norrköpings Tidningar proposed a contest in order to put pressure on the paper mill to plan for future re-development:
This industrial landscape is unique in Europe. But what will happen with the area in the future? The question will become critical the day Holmens Bruk abandons the paper factory at Strömmen. (NT 1983, author’s transl.)
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The company had gradually been moving to new premises outside town since 1977. In Spring 1986 the old mill finally closed and the property, 6.5 hectares in size and comprising twelve historically significant buildings, became vacant even though Holmen remained as the property owner for two more years. Public knowledge of the area was, however, very limited compared to the information authorities had collected about other parts of the district. The western part of the district, where property owners were many and small, had been scrutinized in a much more thorough way.

The committee appointed by the city council in 1979 had not included the mill property in its survey, and thus the city was poorly informed about the needs of preservation and the possibilities of adaptive reuse in the area. The only building that had been suggested for protection was Holmentornet, which was a historic gate and tower of the mill property. (Industrilandskapet 1985) This lack of information, combined with a hesitation to make regulatory decisions, would a few years later result in open conflicts between the developer, the architects and the authorities regarding the need for preservation and new additions. It is tempting to draw the conclusion that the city government did not want to disturb the business of one of the largest property owners and employers in town.

Obviously, the issue of historic preservation in the Industrial Landscape was not – contrary to what Alzén (1996) suggests – in any way determined by the late 1980s. Among buildings not protected was the power plant in a classicist style, nowadays called VärmeKyran (The Heating Church), built in 1927–30 after drawings by architect Ivar Tengbom who designed several prominent buildings on the property. Today this is one of the feature landmarks of the Industrial Landscape but, surprisingly, the city’s committee considered it disposable in 1984. Attraction and utility would in time determine the views on several buildings. But the Industrial Landscape had not, except for a limited group of preservationists, become an “attractive” (Alzén 1996, 132) place by this time. Attraction, if defined as values useful in place marketing, did not occur until a few years into the 1990s, after the Museum of Work and the combined symphony and conference hall Louis De Geer had opened their doors to the public.
In 1986 Holmens Bruk was negotiating with the largest development company in town, AB LE Lundbergs. Evidently, the mill was not interested in developing the property itself but rather wished to sell it off as quickly as possible. Following informal negotiations between the owners of the mill and city government, there was however an agreement made that a Scandinavian architectural contest (Allmän Nordisk Arkitekttävling) would be held. The jury was constituted by representatives of the company, architects and officials from city government. According to the program of the contest, a wide range of economic activities were planned for the area: office, crafts, light manufacturing, housing, services, culture, and leisure. (Holmens Bruk 1986) Officially, Holmens Bruk said the company would need roughly one third (6,000 sqm) of the planned office space in the area. Since the company instead moved its headquarter into a modernist concrete building in another part of town, it seems rather as if the leadership was not ready to commit itself to the prospect of staying inside the district.

It seems as if Holmens Bruk more or less had been forced by the city to arrange the contest, when it really just wanted to sell the property. (Rosenqvist 2007) At the time of the architectural contest the property was not yet open to the public, but the competitors were given a guided, historically focused tour through the premises. Already here the reasons for future conflicts over development could be discerned. The County Board of Administration and the City Museum stated that the built landscape along Strömmen was of national interest, “riksintresse”, and that there were also archaeological remains that should be excavated before redevelopment. Holmens Bruk, on the other hand, meant that development needed a “sound balance between culture and economy” (NT 1986a, author’s transl.). “Culture”, in this case identified as the need for historic preservation, was pitted against “economy”, representing the interests of developers and real estate owners. Realizing the risk of an entrenched conflict between authorities and owners, the city government soon decided to downplay the risk in a statement made to one of the papers. (NT 1986b)

It is not hard to see that the identification of conflicting interests
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and the pitting of them against each other benefited the paper mill that still owned the property. Neither the city government nor the County Board of Administration wished to see a conflict. From a policy perspective, historic preservation and development may go hand in hand. They do not have to come in conflict. At this time, however, the property owner obviously saw an apparent risk of being tied up by legislation restricting the reuse or razing of buildings. In time, the conflict would escalate, demonstrating the conflicting future scenarios for the area.

The contest produced ideas mainly on how to develop public spaces, give the area an overall design and some suggestions for reusing the existing building stock. (Holmens Bruk 1987). The development of public spaces was regarded as a great concern for the city, since the area had never been accessible to pedestrians. Without proper and safe thoroughfares, the area would never become attractive. Three winners were appointed, of which the first prize winner suggested a fairly cautious reconstruction of the Holmen area. Reuse by way of historic preservation had been one of the outsets of the contest, meaning that some of the previous water surfaces would be restored and that facades facing Strömmen and the main streets surrounding the Holmen area would be restored.

Later in 1987, vital parts of the Holmen area were designated as a historic national interest by the National Heritage Board through new legislation on the protection of natural resources (Code of Natural Resources). This meant that the industrial character of the district, with its narrow streets and tall, yellow plastered facades from the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century would be restored. Nothing was to be demolished until future uses had been decided. (Tarschys 1991)

Before redevelopment began the industrial district had to be re­zoned by the city. A master plan was developed together with a new planning tool called area directions introduced in the national Code of Planning and Building (PBL) in 1987. One intention with PBL was to strengthen citizens’ involvement in planning. (Khakee 2000) In fact, PBL acknowledged the plurality of interests and actors involved in planning issues. In the case of the Holmen dis-
trict, however, networks and groups within the nonprofit sector do not seem to have been consulted to any noticeable extent, with the exception of the symphony orchestra. There was a "consulting exhibition" in Fall 1989, ending with a public hearing (samråd). A number of parties made statements on the exhibition, mainly local and regional authorities and property companies, but only a few NGOs. Apparently, the city did not make use of its wider network of organizations but mainly viewed the issue as a process of negotiation between city government and the largest property owners. (Norrköping 1989)

There were limits put on the development of public space. Playgrounds and parks would not be placed here, since the character of industrial heritage and stone architecture was to be preserved. A proposed playground and park next to a residential area was moved away after first having been located to the center of the district. Instead a plaza called Holmentorget was placed in the center with two of the giant rolls previously used in the paper mill placed in a raised position. A single tree was also planted. (Södergren 1991) Normally, this plaza is used very little except for large gatherings such as concerts or other entertainment events in summer. An interview with the city architect at that time has confirmed the author’s suspicion that the plaza, as is sometimes the case when public spaces are invented, was a result of “creative drought”. (Hagberg 2007)

The architectural contest offered the city and Holmens Bruk a multitude of ideas on how to reconcile historic preservation with needs for renewal. A great challenge was how to integrate an area which had been used for a single purpose (the production of the mill) with the public spaces of the inner city. There was also the goal of creating a mixed use area. The proposed integration of housing would be a troubling issue. People did of course not want to live in an industry-looking area, and with housing certain additional requirements on urban design would be added, such as car parking, green areas and playgrounds. In the end, housing would only be placed on the fringes of the Industrial Landscape, while the interior of the district would be marked for the museum, offices, education and entertainment.
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Around the year 1990 there was still no large establishment inside the Industrial Landscape. The Museum of Work opened in 1991, and there were plans for building a symphony and conference hall. At the time of the architectural contest back in 1986, there had been great uncertainty about the possibilities of financing such a project. In the late 1980s, the situation for the Norrköping symphony orchestra became more desperate: its hall from 1913 had become under dimensioned, since it only took an audience of 400, and there were no spaces for rehearsal. (Åhlén 1987) The city was considering a combination of a new premise that could house both the internationally merited symphony orchestra and the publicly owned conference facility, which was still located outside of the inner city. In order to make the new facility economically feasible, concerts would have to take turns with other kinds of cultural events such as exhibits, expos, conferences and happenings. (Granehed 1990)

The first sketch for a new symphony hall had been made by a Norwegian architect, Bjarn Thorup, by direction of the Norrköping orchestra society’s manager Björn Holmvik, who argued that the main building of the paper mill had the ideal dimensions of a symphony hall. The “ideal” in this case was the halls of Vienna and Berlin. (NT 1986c) At first, they had the idea of encapsulating the old paper mill in glass and steel, not considering the fact that the exterior of the building would be protected by law.

In 1988 the Holmens Bruk property was finally acquired by two real estate companies, AB LE Lundbergs and SIAB, which were given development rights by the city. Together these two real estate companies formed a development company, Holmenbyggarna, to build on the site. A culture and conference center requiring an investment of 630 million Swedish Kronor (in the monetary value of 2009) planned to be placed inside the former paper mill, funded through a government sponsored enterprise. Initially, a partnership between the city and the Church of Sion had been negotiated, with the goal of developing a combined church and symphony hall. The negotiations ended early in 1989, officially with the explanation that
the proposed development had grown in such a way that the church could not join the partnership. (Sion 1989) Late in 1988 plans for the hall still included a large part destined to become a chapel, but the sacred function was then excluded.

In 1990 Holmenbyggarna presented its plans for the property. The company wanted a privately owned conference center complete with a hotel to be called “Holmen Expo”. The first prize winner of the architectural contest, Finnish Kai Wartiainen, was hired to design the development. Wartiainen’s firm in Helsinki joined forces with the Stockholm based firm AOS, which was a firm with experience from major preservation and development projects in the capital. Wartiainen and AOS declared that they wished to reuse as much as possible of the existing building stock. In a city run by Social Democrats, the development company found it wise to appeal to the public with a broad range of cultural and leisure activities and not just conferences and concerts, which naturally would attract more visitors than inhabitants. The project leader Peter Whass told a local magazine that

[…] it is not intended only for those who live and work here or visit the culture and conference center. It is going to be accessible to all of Norrköping’s population. As you know, “Holmens” has previously been a sealed off area. But in the future everyone will be able to walk here, and approach the water and the environment. (ÖA 1990, 40)

Finally, in 1991 a limited company – “Norrköpings Kultur och Kongress KB” – was formed between the city, owning a fourth of the shares, and five major developers (AB LE Lundbergs being one of them), in order to finance the new center inside the paper mill, drawn by Ivar Tengbom in the 1920s. (Bergström 2001; Eriksson 2001, 284) When communicating the development project to the community, however, the development project was called a ”culture and conference center”, giving it a broader definition and thereby making it less controversial. (Krantz 2007)

By owning a substantial share in the property company, the public was guaranteed a substantial influence in the building process. The
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county administration imposed its regulation over the development, forcing the developer to follow landmark regulations. The development was however delayed due to conflicts over preservation issues. At first the developer, who had no experience with preservation issues, went against these directions and began tearing down buildings. Holmenbyggarna was even forced to rebuild a large landmark structure which had been demolished without permission. The County Antiquary expressed its legal power over national interest, thereby forcing Holmenbyggarna to follow landmark regulations. A conflict between the County Administrative Board, the city and the developer followed which was unraveled through lengthy negotiations.

For this purpose, a committee with delegates from the City, the County Administrative Board, the National Heritage Board and the developer met continuously for two years in order to deal with design and preservation issues. The committee was considered so successful that it is still in use, guiding development in this historic district. Subsequently it even became a model for public-private governance studied by national authorities such as the National Heritage Board. Through the Holmen committee, especially the city planner and the county antiquarian were able to influence the developer’s representative in an informal way and make him more receptive to the historic preservation of the environment. (Häger 2007) The Holmen committee proved to be a tool for managing urban development that efficiently defused the previous battle between the developer and the authorities.

When finished in 1994, the city bought the other shares and became the sole owner of the hall. In 1995, the city received the prestigious award of the Swedish Urban Environment Council for preserving the Holmen district. (Lundström & Nyström 2001) This was one evidence of that the redevelopment of the Holmen district had finally been a successful encounter between development and historic preservation, even though substantial parts of this industrial site remained to be redeveloped at that time. Today, the hall is a cultural icon in Norrköping and is used for symphonies, conferences, festivals and other cultural attractions, run by a company owned by the city.
Especially three parts of the urban regeneration scheme of the late 1980s and early 1990s opened up for further development in the Industrial Landscape. First, it was the creation of public spaces, mainly thoroughfares intersecting this previously sealed-off area, thereby making it possible for people to, so to say, discover the place. More importantly, two development projects stand out. The first one, Museum of Work (opened in 1991), was mainly NGO-based and meant that a flagship institution, based within an aesthetically unique and restored textile factory, was established. This project showed the city, and especially its developers, that restoration and reuse was in fact possible to carry through. It also made apparent for people that important changes were coming about in this otherwise redundant area. The second project was another flagship: the private-public partnership of the symphony and conference hall (opened in 1994), in which the city and the major developers joined forces to build a facility that would strengthen the cultural amenities of the inner city, and begin to develop a tourist economy by attracting visitors to symphonies, conferences and events. At about the same time, the city began to realize the potential of using the running water and the built heritage of the Industrial Landscape to attract visitors and students to the city.

A few years later, the two flagships projects of the Museum of Work and Louis De Geer were overshadowed by the establishment of Linköping University’s new campus (1997) in the northwestern part of the historic district. (Cederborg et al 2005) In ten years time, this campus went through a rapid development of both growth and shrinkage. Rising costs for rent have forced Swedish universities to use space as efficiently as possibly, while new buildings designed exclusively for the universities’ purposes have been erected instead. The university with its students has radically altered the image and uses of the Industrial Landscape, and it has without doubt speeded up the pace of rising real estate values and gentrification in the area. There is however still surprisingly little activity in the inner parts of the district after working hours, since restaurants, bars and shops are exclusively located in the fringes. The movement of people through the Industrial Landscape after 6 PM is generally very modest.
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Phase 4: Developing the fringe areas, 1998–present
The presence of the university has not only speeded up gentrification but also the economic development and entrepreneurialism of the district. There is a science park with a hub adapted for new small firms within the creative industries. Norrköping Visualization Center, a project in which the city, the science park and the university are partners, will open the largest center for visualization in Northern Europe in 2010. (Economou 2008) The center will include a dome theatre for projecting 3D animations (called “visualizations”), exhibitions and a conference facility. (Andersson & Yunnerman 2006) Interestingly, it is to be located in a redundant water power plant and an adjacent tower built to store water for extinguishing fire accidents in the factories. The project has roots going back to the beginning of the 1990s, when a science center called Himmel och Hav (Sky and
Sea) was planned to be housed inside a former power plant. Plans had proceeded far by 1995 and a number of partners were involved, among them Holmenbyggarna, the City of Norrköping, Linköping University, the national weather forecast service SMHI, and the government-led air navigation enterprise LFV. (Himmel och Hav 1995) Funding for this project failed, however, but the idea of creating a combined education-entertainment center that could attract visitors coming from the whole region has lived on in a new shape. (Andersson 2008; Johansson 2008) The finalization of the project has however been delayed, since it was first projected to open in Fall 2009.

An interesting development in the eastern-most part of the Industrial Landscape is the restoration and reuse of the block called Knäppingsborg. These low, plastered buildings were erected in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and housed a snuff mill (opened

Figure 6. The power plant and the tower destined for the Norrköping Visualization Center. Photo: M. Legnér.
in 1761) and other light industrial facilities. Famous Swedish snuff brands such as Röda lacket and Rappé were developed here. The area was derelict for many years, mainly known for housing a popular jazz bar, before one of the major developers in town, Ståhls, invested in the property and began to work to make it into a mixed use space housing offices, restaurants and small stores. It is a Swedish adaptation of the American festival marketplace (Bloom 2004) where authentic goods are sold in a casual, local atmosphere, also offering events and entertainment. Knäppingsborg, which is now a brand, opened in 2007. (Karlström 2008) This kind of development offers some economic development in the form of cultural consumption, but it is also a sign of homogenization and gentrification of urban space in the Industrial Landscape. There is now much less of affordable, bohemian and creative spaces in this area than there still was ten years ago. Rising real estate values and the presence of the university have pushed out economically weaker actors such as NGOs, sweatshops and small independent stores.

Regeneration, quarterization, sustainability
This chapter has examined the interrelationship between historic preservation and urban development within a Swedish context in the last three decades of the twentieth century. Focus has been on how sensitive issues of preservation have been possible to solve within a major urban regeneration scheme in the city of Norrköping. Four distinct phases can be identified in the development of the area.

Firstly, between 1970 and c. 1982 the city government focused on surveying the building stock of the still very active industrial district. The Industrial Landscape was defined as a “great planning problem” rather than as a zone for small-scale entrepreneurialism.

Secondly, from c. 1983 to 1988 the phase of surveying was followed by a phase of public regulation and initial development. There was a rezoning of the industrial district, public spaces were planned and both Strömmen and the built environment came under the protection of new legislation.

Thirdly, from 1989 to 1997 there was a period of government sponsored enterprises. This was the time for three flagship projects:
Museum of Work, Louis De Geer and the new university campus. Curiously enough, this third phase coincided with a crisis in the real estate market in the early 1990s. In 1986, the plan had been that the Holmen area would be fully redeveloped by the turn of the millennium, but the financial collapse slowed the development pace considerably. (Whass 2006)

Finally, from 1998 and on, the previously underdeveloped fringes of the Industrial Landscape have been redeveloped with privately owned housing, mainly in the Drags area where housing was proposed already in the early 1970s, and amenities for cultural consumption. A fourth flagship in the form of an edutainment center is under way with location in the middle of the Industrial Landscape and is scheduled to open in Spring 2010.

After forty years of planning and development the Industrial Landscape is about to enter a more mature state and as a result of that, the pace of development will most probably slow down a bit. There are however still some parts of this vast urban space that are largely untouched since the 1970s, mainly in the southwest (where the science park is located), but with the establishment of the Norrköping Visualization Center this area will also become regenerated and occupied.

Several question marks regarding the sustainability of recent development projects should be raised. Funding of the center has been shaky with the city investing a large sum, while the university has been reluctant to invest. The other partners in the project are very small. The city is taking a fairly large risk when investing in such an adventurous project. Will the center be able to survive on its own, on revenues from visitors, research and conferences, when the city is grappling with fiscal problems? Will it be shut down, alternatively scaled down, if it does not manage to attract a large number of visitors in a couple of years? If that is the case, the southwestern part of the Industrial Landscape will again become a largely vacant and redundant area. Another risk in sustaining regeneration effects in the area is posed by the university’s development. In the last years, the Norrköping campus has been forced to minimize its premises in order to keep rents down, and this development is not expected
to turn around. One possible scenario is the university retreating to the northwestern part of the Industrial Landscape, and also outside of the area, when the consequences of gentrification kick in more seriously (with rapidly rising real estate values). This development is evident already today. The positive regeneration effects of having the university present in the district, with thousands of students passing in and out every day and keeping up occupancy in the buildings, will diminish if the campus is gradually repositioned at the fringe of the landscape area.

A final reflection on sustainability raises the issue for whom the Industrial Landscape exists. Is it meant to be used by the citizens of Norrköping, of the region or by visitors from farther away? Evidently, Norrköping, as most other cities, wishes to strongly increase

Figure 7. Entrance to the redeveloped block Knäppingsborg.
Photo: M. Legnér.
its number of visitors, and for that to happen competitive entertainment facilities and popular events are needed. In time, the Industrial Landscape may become a disneyfied tourist ghetto, where history provides the facades and the insides of buildings offer instant entertainment.

Finally, there is the issue of quarterization: does the different regeneration projects described above give the Industrial Landscape the characteristics of a cultural quarter? Evidently, the idea of using cultural attractions, to a large part funded by public and other non profit actors, is not new in Norrköping. Already in the early 1980s the Museum of Work was planned to function as an engine for further development in the area. The economic regeneration of the area was in the 1980s and 1990s largely based on cultural consumption such as
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the museums, the symphony orchestra, conferences, entertainment events, and later also some shopping (concentrated to one block). Soon cultural consumption will be even further enhanced with the opening of the dome theatre in 2010. But with the establishment of a university campus and the science park, there is nowadays also a considerable and growing production within the sector of cultural industries. A recent survey showed, not surprisingly, that the cultural industries of Norrköping is spatially concentrated to the inner city and the campus area. (Östham 2006)

Connecting to recent scholarship on Swedish urban development, there are not only economic aspects of quarterization but also cultural and social ones. In its general plan for the area, the city wishes the Industrial Landscape to become a meeting place for a multitude (“mångfald”) of cultural expressions. This is a common goal in Swedish town planning of today. Exactly what this goal means, if the wish is seriously felt, and how it is supposed to be achieved is still unclear, to say the least. If the focus is on ethnic integration and multicultural expressions, the city is obviously not closing in.

Reflecting upon Zukin’s (1995) idea of “domestication through cappuccino”, the parameters of the Industrial Landscape function in a homogenizing way and keep different groups of local community apart. Just south of the landscape there is a housing area with a large population of immigrants. A survey would probably show that almost none of them ever move into the Industrial Landscape, despite that it is just around the corner. The answer is probably that they simply have no reason to go there. Instead, those who generally enter into the Industrial Landscape are students, school pupils and well educated middle class office workers and academics. Quarterization, then, may intentionally or unintentionally exclude and isolate people, and maybe this is the price of economic regeneration by way of cultural consumption. A quarter such as the Industrial Landscape will not attract those groups of the community that don’t have the means to consume or an interest in the goods and services being offered. Issues of exclusion, accessibility and homogenization need to be taken seriously, even though we understand that all problems of urban regeneration can’t be fixed at once.
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