Participatory approaches in the adaptive reuse of two Dutch private-led cultural heritage projects
role of the local communities

Chen, Y.

Publication date
2022

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Proceedings of REAL CORP 2022, 27th International Conference on Urban Planning and Regional Development in the Information Society

Citation (APA)
Chen, Y. (2022). Participatory approaches in the adaptive reuse of two Dutch private-led cultural heritage projects: role of the local communities. In M. Schrenk, V. Popovich, P. Zeile, & E. al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of REAL CORP 2022, 27th International Conference on Urban Planning and Regional Development in the Information Society* (pp. 553-561). Real Corp.

🏆 *reviewed paper*

Participatory Approaches in the Adaptive Reuse of two Dutch Private-Led Cultural Heritage Projects

Yawei Chen

(PhD Assistant Professor Yawei Chen, Department of Management in the Built Environment, Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology, Julianalaan 134, 2628 BL Delft, the Netherlands, y.chen@tudelft.nl)

1 ABSTRACT

There is increasing debate concerning citizen participation in the reuse and transformation of heritage sites. However, the question of why and how participatory approaches are explored in private-led heritage adaptive reuse receives limited attention. The paper shows why the communities should play an essential role in the adaptive reuse of heritage sites in the two Dutch cases. The article is theoretically based on debates on social sustainability and community participation in the adaptive reuse of heritage sites. The qualitative investigation consisted of interviews with different actors. The study shows that the adaptive reuse ambitions of the two Dutch heritage sites face difficulty in receiving the support of the local communities. The findings show interest, expectations, and needs gaps between the private heritage and local communities. The investigation indicates that the participation of the local community is lacking, and the mutual understanding between the two is problematic, which has led to the stagnation of the adaptive reuse process of the heritage sites. The paper suggests that the multi-stakeholder processes can identify the key stakeholders and address how to activate key stakeholders to collaborate with available means on shared goals and interests.

Keywords: Heritage, adaptive reuse, participatory approaches, private-led, Community

2 INTRODUCTION

An essential goal of the urban transformation process is to transform a dilapidated urban environment with improved spatial quality and added value to both land and property. However, there is widespread debate about what to do with the existing properties, especially those with historical significance and monumental status. This is not only because the built environments are considered highly durable but also because, for sustainable urban transformation, there is a need to address how resources and materials brought from the past – histories, artefacts and places (Lillevold and Haarstad 2019) are to be reused. Studies have identified the role of heritage in urban development, such as historical significance and symbolic value (Lipe 1984, ICOMOS Burra Charter 2013). They are authenticity that motivates heritage tourism (Waitt 2000; Park et al. 2019), economic rewards (Bullen & Love 2011), and environmental value (Macmillan 2006). In recent years, various studies stressed the social values that "encompass the significance of the historic environment to the contemporary community" (Jones 2017). This concern reflects the local community's understanding of the historical, cultural and social value and the impacts of their adaptive reuse on the heritage sites and the historical environment around them. On various occasions, opposition from the community initiatives led to stagnation in the adaptive reuse of heritage sites.

This paper aims to look into the role of the community in the reuse and transformation of heritage sites when adaptive reuse is involved in private-led heritage projects. This topic has yet to receive sufficient attention from academia. The question is whether the community should play a role in transforming private-owned heritage sites. And if so, how can the community /cities play their part in facilitating the transformation of heritage sites to contribute to a sustainable outcome? This research investigates two heritage sites in the Netherlands undergoing adaptive reuse transformation. It explores the role of the communities within the heritage transformation process and the stagnation stakeholders encounter. The paper is structured as follows: the next section discusses how social sustainability, social value and community are addressed in the governance of heritage transformation, as well as the role of the community and the tension involved in the multi-stakeholder process in the heritage transformation. Section 3 discusses the adaptive reuse of two private-owned heritage in the Netherlands and the uncertainties involved in the multi-stakeholder process. The wishes of different stakeholders are mapped in both cases, and the community's input is highlighted and compared in both cases. Section 4 concludes what role the community plays in the adaptive reuse of private-owned heritage sites and how to incorporate community input into transforming private-own heritage sites to achieve social sustainability.

3 THEORY DEBATE: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN THE ADAPTIVE REUSE OF HERITAGE SITES

The role of the community in the urban development process is essential in realising social sustainability. Community is traditionally defined as "groups of people with a common background, interest or identity" (Bray 2006). It is "where one lives and consequently where one finds meaningful community interaction and social relations" (Bradshaw 2008). In urban development, the community can be considered an integral component of the governing process and "a form of organisation through which ordinary people can mobilise their interests in opposition to those of the state, or larger global forces" (Bray 2006). Researchers explored various tangible and intangible values in the adaptive use of heritage sites, among which the social value connects buildings, environments and people. In this section, we first examine why community participation is essential for the sustainable transformation of heritage sites before discussing how social value and participation can be incorporated in the adaptive reuse of heritage to address the role of the community and the tensions within the process related to participation.

3.1 The debate on the role of community in sustainable urban development

Different theoretical perspectives drive the discussion of community involvement in urban development. The first perspective can be related to the right to the city movement, a term Lefebvre coined in 1968 (Lefebvre, 1968; 1996). The right to the city responds to neoliberal urbanism and social injustice (Aalbers and Gibb 2014). While private property is fundamentally about the ability to exclude others from its use (Aalbers & Christophers 2014; Davies 2007), the right to the city is both a critique of and a moral claim against the privatisation and commodification of housing and urban space. The abstract dimension is the right to belong to and co-produce the urban areas. The rights to space is not defined through property rights or expropriation but through use and appropriation. Or, in other words: "the right not to be alienated from the spaces of everyday life" (Mitchell & Villanueva, 2010: 667). Cities should address user value over exchange value, as cities are meant for people, not profit. The right to the city ensures justice and equity through which inhabitants have a right to full participation in urban life as equals (Fincher & Iveson 2008: 9; James 2013). Harvey (2008) also stated that the right to the city is far more than a right of individual access to the resources but rather a collective right that exercises power over urbanisation processes. The right to the city thus projects a concrete claim to integrated social, political and economic rights, the right to education, work, health, leisure and accommodation in an urban context that contributes to developing a healthier relationship between people and space.

The second perspective concerns the significant role of the local community in sustainable urban development, especially the social dimension in the urban sustainability discourse. In area-based urban regeneration, the local community can bring place-based knowledge to the planning process and be incorporated into strategic solutions that are better tailored than top-down intervention (Deakin and Allwinkle 2007; Chen and Qu 2019). Residents feel more connected with their local neighbourhood by getting involved in the locality. Their involvement in local affairs facilitated them in developing skills and social capital to find solutions to enhance local social welfare. Community participation contributes to the goal of social sustainability, which emphasises the "development (and/or growth) that is compatible with harmonious evolution of civil society, fostering an environment conducive to the compatible cohabitation of culturally and socially diverse groups, while at the same time encouraging social integration, with improvements in the quality of life for all segments of the population" (Polese and Stren 2000: 15-16). When linking social sustainability to urban space, it is vital to address, for example, the human dimension in the interaction between residents and the city and the social facets of cities (Caprotti, F; Gong, Z,2017).

The third perspective is related to the intent for social inclusion and the social values created in the multi-stakeholder governance perspective. Some research may connect the community's involvement with the goal of social sustainability, which means contributing to the internal and external stakeholders' development and growth by achieving several objectives such as equity, well-being, social cohesion and inclusion, the opportunity for learning and self-development (Chiu 2003). Swyngedouw (2005) addressed the necessity of citizen involvement in entitlement, status, representation, accountability and legitimacy and the danger of being excluded in upscaling or downscaling or in the governance order. More studies under the multi-actor perspective discussed the shifting power relationships between different types of actors and the (dis)empowerment dynamics (Avelino & Wittmayer 2016). As the essence of the community is solidarity,

common identity and sets of shared norms and values, the governance discourse includes various propositions that attempt to develop the sense of belonging in the communities and bond people together, such as community addressed through networks and partnership, the opening up of decision-making to greater participation, enhancing social capital and community cohesion, engaging citizens in community issues (Taylor 2007; Bradshaw 2008).

The above debates recognise the significance of involving the community in achieving sustainable urban development from different perspectives. While social sustainability addresses the satisfaction of basic human needs and the subsequent continuation for future generations (Littig and Griessler 2005), community involvement provides the opportunity for the local population to participate voluntarily in community politics. It helps develop a more place-based, inclusive, and justice solution for transforming urban areas. Such debates also apply to heritage studies, which identify the close linkage of the adaptive reuse of heritage sites with the social dimension of sustainability (Conejos et al., 2016). Although it was only in the second half of the twentieth century that the social value of heritage became an explicit component of conservation policy and practice, the linkage between heritage sites and the local communities is considered an essential part of community identity. Heritages have symbolic value and spiritual associations for the location and thus help communities create an attachment to the place. However, what is less well known is whether and how community participation occurs in practice. This concerns the governance of the heritage transformation process from the multi-stakeholder perspective and engaging the community.

3.2 The governance of adaptive reuse of heritage sites: stakeholder inclusion and community participation

The adaptive reuse of heritage is a process that changes a disused or ineffective item into a new one that can be used for a different purpose or any work to a building over and above maintenance to change its capacity, function or performance (Douglas 2006:1). A successful adaptive reuse process is about negotiating the transition from the past to the future to secure the historical transfer of heritage assets while also meeting the needs of the contemporary world. Just like the debate on sustainable urban development, academic discussions concerning adaptive reuse consider various political, economic, social and environmental implications of heritage transformation and, consequently, how the balance between preservation, reuse, value capturing, sustainability, and social experiments is achieved and enforced (Li et al. 2021). Some challenges are identified in the studies on the adaptive reuse of heritage that hinder a smooth process of heritage transformation, like policy ambiguity on heritage buildings/sites or contradiction in the planning and heritage system towards heritages. But what influence may hinder the process significantly often arises from the different intentions, interests or imbalanced power and resources among the stakeholders.

In the process of heritage transformation, several stakeholders are critical to the success of a heritage transformation project. The stakeholders appreciate the cultural and historical value of heritages and see the potential economic value heritages buildings can contribute. In particular, the public sector includes the local authorities and their agencies using legal and policy instruments to address the historical, social and economic value in the process of heritage transformation, e.g. how the heritage projects fit into the principles of heritage preservation and planning vision, or achieve economic development and job creation or attract tourism. Property/land owners, real estate developers and financial investors belong to the private sector. They use their financial instruments or ownership as bargaining tools to create economic values via adaptive reuse of heritage projects (Ruijgrok 2006). Besides, architects, planning practices and construction companies play a part in addressing the architecture, authenticity and sustainability values.

In contrast, the discussion of involving the community is a more recent phenomenon. Local communities increasingly recognise that future generations may benefit from protecting specific places and areas but may suffer from inappropriate new functions in adaptive reuse and even get excluded. This initiative from the community also coincides with increasing attention to broader, non-expert perceptions of heritage and the communal values associated with these focuses. Besides place-based bottom-up initiatives, researchers and policymakers are convinced that involving communities may create opportunities to achieve social sustainability goals such as equity, well-being, social cohesion and inclusion.

While the belief that individuals should be given a voice appeals to democratic thinking, there is little agreement regarding the best way to achieve meaningful involvement (Callahan, 2007). Social sustainability requires an organisational commitment toward the stakeholders that should be brought together in new forms

ISBN 978-3-9504945-1-8. Editors: M. SCHRENK, V. V: POPOVICH, P. ZEILE, P. ELISEI, C.BEYER, J. RYSER

of transparent and participative management, communication and decision-making (Hemmati, 2002). While participation emphasises how "stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives, decisions and resources (World Bank 1996, xi), there are different levels of how participation can be organised and integrated into the decision-making process. The levels of participation described in the ladder of citizen participation by Arnstein (1969) varies in the participant's power in the end-product and relation to the public authorities. Whether the key stakeholders choose to inform the public, listen to the public, engage the public in problem-solving or co-develop agreement depends on the legal framework and institutional setting and the wills of the administrators (Creighton 2005). Galuppo et al. (2014) suggest two steps to set up a more socially sustainable multi-stakeholder process: a) "engaging multiple stakeholders in collaborate settings" to identify and activate stakeholders; b) "activating cycles of inquiry and action" to exchange views and promote the circulation of different values.

In the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings and sites, the communities often have neither the advantage of owning the heritage nor contributing to the financial mechanism. This adds extra barriers for local communities to get involved and voice their concerns at an early stage. Successful adaptive reuse projects require both good design for the building and planning that carefully considers the surrounding environment and the community's concerns about the future of the heritage sites (Macmillan 2006). Therefore, it is crucial to understand each stakeholder's diverse needs and concerns through surveys and interviews and later address these needs and possible solutions that address these needs and concerns through collaborative workshops (Galuppo et al. 2014).

4 METHOD AND TWO CASES ON THE ADAPTIVE USE OF HERITAGE SITES

4.1 Methodology and the case selection

Following the literature review, this paper examines two private-led adaptive reuse projects in the Netherlands - the adaptive reuse of the industrial heritage Soda Factory in the middle of a residential neighbourhood and the transformation of the UNESCO heritage Fort Kudelstaart at the edge of a city. The two selected projects have been used in various education programs that aim to help students investigate the complexity of the regeneration of the existing urban environment, with a focus on understanding the stakeholder's involvement and the role of the community in the process of the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings and sites. They help understand why the local community should play a role in the adaptive reuse of private-owned heritage sites about results and process. Face-to-face interviews and document analysis have been used to collect information for stakeholder analysis and the wishes and interests of stakeholders related to the community's role. The interviewed stakeholders include various public authorities (e.g., planning department, tourism department, monument preservation agencies), private sector (e.g., real estate developer, property owner) and local community representatives (neighbourhood community organisations, inhabitants, visitors, local business communities and passengers). Interview protocols have been prepared beforehand to address specific interviewees and ethical considerations. In the case of Fort Kudelstaart, workshops were organised to better understand the stakeholders' wishes, including the inhabitants and (mis)communication.

4.2 Two cases: the adaptive reuse of the Soda Factory and the Fort Kudelstaart

The Dutch cases - the Soda Factory and the Fort Kudelstaart are both ongoing heritage projects for adaptive reuse. The Soda Factory is a two-warehouse building (Lijfland and Coerlandt with a total floor area of 2188 m2) located in a residential neighbourhood at the Buitenhaven in the centre of Schiedam, a city adjacent to the famous Dutch port city Rotterdam. It is a former industrial property used to produce soda in the 19th century. It has been vacant since 1975 and was in a dire state. A local initiative prevented this building from demolition before the municipality sold the warehouses for the symbolic sum of one euro.

The current owner – a retired architect Peter van Velzen acquired the building in 2012 and started restoration. The intention was to give the building a new social function in the city of Schiedam and become a breeding space for various entrepreneurs and initiatives. In December 2015, the Soda Factory was included in the municipal monument list. With the help of the new fund-raising mechanism like crowdfunding, the transformation of the Soda Factory started. The owner wanted to follow an organic development strategy. Some temporary functions like a café, escape room and photo shooting space have been added, but that has so far resulted in inadequate development and has not been financially sufficient on an annual basis. The

City vision 2030 of the Municipality of Schiedam has adopted new functions such as the leisure economy. Specific government organisations support the reuse of the Soda Factory, but in comparison with similar heritage projects, governmental support is lacking. Besides, little information has been communicated with stakeholders and the inhabitants. Despite the social intention of the owner, no direct community involvement and participation have been incorporated into the project development process. On the other hand, concerns and opposition were expressed from the neighbourhood inhabitants and organisations on the noise and chaos caused by the visitors.

Fig. 1: Image of the Soda Factory (Above) and Fort Kudelstaart (Below)

In the second project, the Kudelstaart - an old military defence fort constructed in 1906 as part of the "Defence Line of Amsterdam" - became a UNESCO World Heritage in 1996. As a result of budget cuts, the Dutch government asked the municipality of Aalsmeer to buy Fort Kudelstaart. After researching the feasibility of the purchase of the defence fort, the city of Aalsmeer purchased the fort in 2014 and decided "to make the fort an icon for the water sports in Aalsmeer" (Municipality of Aalsmeer, 2020). In the same period, the village council and immediate residents proposed to make the fort more accessible to the public. Aalsmeer town council approved a change of its local zoning plan, paving the way for the transformation of 'Fort bij Kudelstaart' into a vibrant and pioneering venue for water sports. The municipality selected a property developer Martijn de Liefde via a European tendering process to collaborate on the Fort Kudelstaart project based on a ground lease contract. The proposal by developer Martijn de Liefde envisages the transformation of the 60,000 m2 site into a high-quality nautical centre. The definite master plan drawn up by Serge Schoemaker Architects for Kudelstaart Sailing Fort foresees the change of the 60,000 m2 site into a

ISBN 978-3-9504945-1-8. Editors: M. SCHRENK, V. V: POPOVICH, P. ZEILE, P. ELISEI, C.BEYER, J. RYSER

high-quality maritime centre with additional mooring spots and harbour amenities, hotel rooms, spa/wellness facilities and meeting spaces. The design vision includes a restaurant, café, small museum and viewing platform. In early 2021, the redevelopment started with soil and roof preparation.

The redevelopment plan and the preparation activities received opposition from the local inhabitants and community organisations. The worries include the possible negative impact of the commercial function on the cultural-historical value of the fort and the surrounding environment. To voice these concerns, the residents established an organisation called Sticht Werkgroep Fort Kudelstaart (SWFK). They defined their task as preserving and improving the living environment of residents in the vicinity of Fort Kudelstaart. They filed an appeal to the state against the newly established zoning plan to stop the redevelopment. The council ruled to suspend the zoning plan and put the redevelopment plan on hold until further decision.

4.3 Role of the local communities

The two investigated heritage projects are both private-led heritage projects. The Soda Factory case is an industrial heritage located in a dense residential neighbourhood in the city centre of Schiedam. In contrast, the Fort Kudelstaart case is situated in the peripheral of the city Aalsmeer along the lake Westeiderplassen. Both projects were initiated because of the historical and cultural value of the heritage. In the Soda Factory case, the whole development is privately owned. The owner describes the current development as an organic development that can maintain the roughness of the industrial characteristics of the Soda factory. Even though the current owner hoped to create a space for the community and crowdfunding was used to mobilise societal force for investment, little has been done to communicate the owner's idea to the neighbourhood or consult the inhabitants about their wishes. The municipality of Schiedam expects the Soda factory to play a role in the area within the boundaries of the master plan but remains ambiguous about the development trajection. From the interviews of key stakeholders, it is clear that the adjacent inhabitants and community organisations have an expectation that the Soda Factory can be a natural meeting place for the neighbourhood, but also want to avoid the disturbance from the public function which the Soda Factory may bring to the quiet neighbourhood as Plantagebuurt where the Soda Factory is located.

In the Fort Kudelstaart case, the property developer leased the fort from the Municipality of Aalsmeer for adaptive reuse, focusing on creating economic value with a new recreation function. The municipality of Aalsmeer addressed the historical and economic value of the heritage and the catalyst effect the redevelopment can bring to local tourism, the business sector and the job market. The monument-related organisation hoped to bring the fort to life; facilitating local tourism was their primary focus. Interestingly, it differs from what the local community focus of this redevelopment project. From the interview, it is clear that inhabitants and community organisations are worried about both traffic from outside visitors and the crime issues linked to the redevelopment (e.g. attraction of youth hanging out and causing damage to the neighbourhood). Local activist groups like MEERGroen opposed the parking garage and feared the damage to the marina.

In both cases, the developers considered their development a good deed of bringing transformation to the heritage projects and emphasised the positive economic impact they could get. However, (mis)communication appears to have caused conflicts that lead to stagnation. In the Soda Factory case, no actual participation process was organised. Because the ongoing development was organic and slow, the adjacent inhabitants complained directly to the owner. The neighbouring inhabitants mostly complained about the noise directly to the heritage owner when certain group activities were organised at the Soda Factory. The interviews also suggest the community expected the Soda Factory to become a city identity and provide social functions for the community. In the Fort Kuldestaart case, the fraction between the project initiators and the local communities was much more prolonged and deeper. The earliest feasibility study of the project in 2014 did not include any input from the inhabitants. The lack of communication and participation was mentioned in the consultation note of the zoning plan for 2020. Although information evenings and open days were organised at the forts, it seems that the inhabitants' concerns were lost in the process, not well understood by the parties, and consequently not addressed by the redevelopment plan. The uncertainty about whether the developers would address their concerns led to the more aggressive way opposition was chosen by the local communities. It resulted in the stagnancy situation of the project.

Involved key actors	Case Soda Factory		Case Kuldestaart	
Private sector	Owner/developer	Maintain rough characteristics, organic development, feasibility, profit	Property developer	Profit of the fort, regional icon
Public sector	City of Schiedam	Industrial monument cluster; city icon and tourism attraction	Municipality of Aalsmeer	Attract local tourism, facilitate the growth of the business sector and the job market; income
Community				
Community adjacent to the heritage	Neighbourhood Association Plantagebuurt	Avoid disturbance A real meeting place	Inhabitants, SWFK	Oppose to possible traffic and safety due to redevelopment Healthy living environment
Local citizen-initiated organisations & NGOs	Crowdfunding		MEERGroen Place holders marina, visitors	Oppose the current plan of parking garage Attractive Leisure activities
Local business community	Stichting Promotie Schiedam S'DAM	-Schiedam's branding is: authentic, lively and innovative, Soda factory is not yet innovative -Need for more unique and authentic overnight accommodation, but of high quality! -Let the history and story of the soda factory return, without it becoming a museum -S'dam sees opportunities for involving parties such as S'loep and WhaSup NL in water tourism	Local shops, restaurant, cafes, tourist related business	Benefit from the increasing visitors

Table 1: Wishes of key stakeholders in the two heritage projects, Soda Factory and Fort Kudelstaart.

5 CONCLUSION

In this research, the focus is to understand the role of local communities in the adaptive reuse of two heritage projects and to what extent the local communities got involved in the two heritage projects. Documents analysis and interviews were used to understand the wishes and concerns of all involved and potential stakeholders. Discussions with property owners, developers, financial investors, government officials, monument protection agencies, community organisations, inhabitants and visitors were explored to enable people to discuss their interests and wishes. On certain occasions, collaborative working groups were organised to understand the stagnation and where the miscommunications occur, as well as what possible solutions can address the need of the communities.

What is clear is that both heritage projects were initiated by the private sector and supported by the local government because of the historical, cultural, economic and social value of the heritage buildings and the possible impacts that can be created on the surrounding urban environment. However, since the projects were initiated by the private sector (property owner in the Soda Factory case and property developer who won the development right from the Municipality with a lease contract), how to develop an appropriate economic function to realise financial return has been a significant concern. The local governments wanted to support the two heritage projects because their successful adaptive reuse would create new tourism attractions,

ISBN 978-3-9504945-1-8. Editors: M. SCHRENK, V. V: POPOVICH, P. ZEILE, P. ELISEI, C.BEYER, J. RYSER

improve the local business environment and create job opportunities, all of which align with their local development ambition. The role of the community has been mentioned (the aspiration of the property owner in the Soda Factory case) and in various planning documents. However, the local inhabitants and community organisations were hardly involved or consulted in the decision-making process. The development proposals and ideas initiated by the private sector focused on commercial success and financial gain. Even though some information exchange meetings were offered later to inform that certain social functions have been included in the zoning plan, these social thoughts remain window dressing and do not touch upon the real worries of the local communities about disturbance and damage to the environment. What also needs to be noticed is that the private developer in the Fort Kudelstaart case even had the unrealistic view that the task of communication with the community had been carried out. They did not realise that there was no actual candid exchange at the information meetings with the local inhabitants to address community-related problems.

From the interviews with the community representatives, the insights and wishes of the community in both cases are more explicit. For example, in the Sodafrabrik case the neighbourhood organisations see this building as an important location symbol and hope that the Sodafabriek provides space for a neighbourhood gathering. For the adaptive reuse of the heritage building, adjacent inhabitants are worried about the noise, and parking disturbance future visitors to the leisure functions in Sodafabriek may bring. Local artists were interested in the space of this property but did not wish visitors to become a distraction for their work. The same can be said about the Kudelstaart; adjacent communities hope to develop educational functions that benefit local youth but fear disturbances like noise, traffic and crime. Other community organisations hope the heritage can provide leisure functions that the area lacks but are worried about the environmental damage to the marina. Following the mapping of stakeholders and their wishes and concerns, it is apparent that the suggested solutions from the community in both projects are much more social-oriented. For example, the inhabitants in the Plantagebuurt consider the neighbourhood-related function of the Soda Factory more as a community centre, a small workshop for the neighbourhood, and space for local young artists. In the Fort Kudelstaart project, besides reducing noise and traffic, the local community hopes to address local youth's educational function through a museum, education centre and water sports centre.

After investigating the two heritage projects, it can be concluded that communication should be improved to reduce miscommunication between stakeholders, the developers and the communities. The collaborating workshop shared and discussed the visions of different stakeholders. It became the first step in bridging the difference between the private sector and the local communities. By engaging the communities, knowledge can be shared and exchanged. More social values appeared in the discussion, and more place-based, community-based suggestions were documented in the shared vision. Even with private-led adaptive reuse, different stakeholders have started to grow a shared and more social-oriented vision toward the future of the heritage buildings.

6 REFERENCES

AALBERS, M.B. and Gibb, K.: Housing and the right to the city: Introduction to the special issue. In: International Journal of Housing Policy, Vol. 14, Issue 3, pp. 207-213, 2014.

AALBERS, M.B. and Christophers, B.: Centering housing in political economy. In: Housing, Theory and Society, Vol 31, pp. 373-394, 2014.

ARNSTEIN, S.R.: Ladder of citizen participation. In: Journal of American Institute of Planners, Vol. 35, pp. 216-224, 1969.

AVELINO, F. & Wittmayer, J.: Shifting Power Relations in Sustainability Transitions: A Multi-actor Perspective. In: Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, Vol. 18, Issue 5, pp. 628-649, 2016. DOI: 10.1080/1523908X.2015.1112259.

BRADSHAW, T.: The Post-Place Community: Contributions to the Debate about the Definition of Community, In: Journal of the Community Development, Vol. 39, No. I, pp. 5-16. 2009

BRAY, D. Building 'Community': new strategies of governance in urban China. In: Economy and Society, Vol. 35, issue 4, pp. 530-549, 2006.

BULLEN, P.A., & Love, P. E.D. Factors influencing the adaptive re-use of buildings. In: Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology, Vol. 9, Issue 1, pp. 32–46, 2011. doi:10.1108/17260531111121459.

CALLAHAN, K.: Citizen Participation: Models and Methods. In: International Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 30, issue 11, pp. 1179–1196, 2007.

CHAPMAN, A.: Technology as World Building. In: Ethics, Place and Environment, Vol. 7, Issue 1–2, pp. 59–72, 2004.

CHIU, R. L. H.: Social Sustainability, Sustainable Development and Housing Development: The Experience of Hong Kong. In: Forrest R. and Lee J. (Eds), Housing and Social Change: East-West perspectives, Routledge. London, 2003.

CONEJOS, S., Langston, C. Chan, E. and Chew, M. Building Research & Information, Governance of heritage buildings: Australian regulatory barriers to adaptive reuse, In: Building Research & Information, 2016. DOI: 10.1080/09613218.2016.1156951.

CREIGHTON, J. L.: The Public Participation Handbook: Making Better Decisions through Citizen Involvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 2005.
DAVIES, M. Property: Meanings, Histories, Theories. Abingdon: Routledge-Cavendish, 2007. DOUGLAS, J.: Building Adaptation, Butterworth-Heinemann, London, 2006.
DEAKIN, M., and S. Allwinkle.: Urban regeneration and sustainable communities. The role of networks, innovation, and creativity in building successful partnerships. In: Journal of Urban Technology, Vol. 14, Issue 1, pp. 77–91, 2007.
DOI: 10.1080/10630730701260118.
FINCHER, R. & Iveson, K. Planning and diversity in the city: Redistribution, recognition and encounter. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
GALUPPO, L., Gorli, M., Scarratti, G. and Kaneklin, C.: Building social sustainability:
Multi-stakeholder processes and conflict management, in: Social Responsibility Journal, Vol. 10, Issue 4, pp. 685-701, 2014. DOI: 10.1108/SRJ-10-2012-0134.
HARVEY, D.: The right to the city, in New Left Review, Vol. 53, pp. 23–40, 2008.
HEMMATI, M.: Multi-stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability: Beyond Deadlock and Conflict, Earthscan Publications Ltd, London, 2002.
JAMES, S. W.: Rights to the diverse city: Challenges to indigenous participation in urban planning and heritage preservation in Sydney, Australia. Space and Culture, Vol. 16, pp. 274–287. 2013. doi:10.1177/1206331213487052.
ICOMOS Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013.
JONES, S.: Wrestling with the Social Value of Heritage: Problems, Dilemmas and Opportunities. In: Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage, Vol 4, Issue 1, pp. 21-37, 2017. doi:10.1080/20518196.2016.1193996.
LEFEBVRE, H. : Le droit a la Ville [The Right to the City]. Paris: Anthropos, 1968.
LEFEBVRE, H. : Writings on cities. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
LI, Y., Zhao, L., Huang, J. and Law, A. A review of research frameworks, methodologies, and assessment methods concerning the adaptive reuse of architectural heritage. In: Built Heritage, Vol. 5, issue 6, 2021. DOI.
LILLEVOLD, K.& Haarstad, H. The deep city: cultural heritage as a resource for sustainable local transformation. In: Local Environment, Vol. 24, Issue 4, pp. 329-341, 2019. DOI:10.1080/13549839.2019.1567481.
LIPE, William D.: Value and meaning in cultural resources. In: H.Cleere (ed.) Approaches to the archaeological heritage. A comparative study of world cultural resource management systems, pp. 1-11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
LITTIG, B., and Griessler, E. Social sustainability: a catchword between political pragmatism and social theory. In: International Journal of Sustainable Development, Vol. 8, pp. 65–79. 2005.
MACMILLAN, S.: Added value of good design, Building Research & Information, Vol. 34, issue 3, pp. 257-271, 2006. DOI: 10.1080/09613210600590074
MAGIS, K.: Community Resilience: An Indicator of Social Sustainability, In Society and Natural Resources, Vol. 23, issue 5, pp. 401-416, 2010. DOI: 10.1080/08941920903305674
MITCHELL, D., and Villanueva, J.: Right to the city. In: R. Hutchinson, M.B. Aalbers, R.A. Beauregard, & M. Crang (Eds.), Encyclopedia of urban studies, pp. 667-671. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2010.
PARK, E., Choi, B. and Lee, T. The role and dimensions of authenticity in heritage tourism, 99-109, 2019. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2019.03.001
POLESE, M. and Stren, R, (Eds.): Social Sustainability of Cities: Diversity and the. Management of Change, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 2000.
RUIJGROK, E.: The three economic values of cultural heritage: a case study in the Netherlands. In: Journal of Cultural Heritage, Vol. 7, Issue 3, 206-213, 2006.
SWYNGEDOUW, E.: Governance innovation and the citizen: the Janus-face of governance- beyond-the-state, Urban Studies, 42(11), pp. 1991-2006, 2005.
TAYLOR, M.: Community participation in the real world: opportunities and pitfalls in new governance spaces, In Urban Studies, Vol. 44, pp. 297–317, 2007
WAITT, G.: Consuming heritage: perceived historical authenticity. In: Annual of Tourism Research, Vol. 27, Issue 4, pp. 835-862. 2000.
WORLD BANK. The World Bank Participation Sourcebook (First printing ed.). The International Bank. https://agris.fao.org/agrissearch/search.do?recordID=US2012420865, 1996.