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Starting point
Boedapest (2014)
Heritage

“Features belonging to the cultures of a particular society, such as traditions, languages, or buildings, that were created in the past and still have historical importance.”

- Buildings
- Nationally listed monuments
Vacancy

- Around 2,000,000 m² vacant heritage in NL
- Actual vacancy level is unknown
- Negative consequences
Problem field

Negative consequences
vacancy

- (anti) squatters
- vandalism
- premature deterioration
- loss of values
Adaptive re-use is needed to maintain and preserve these buildings in a feasible and sustainable way

(Douglas, 2006)
Many heritage buildings stay vacant for years...
Heritage re-use processes are perceived as highly complex
Problem field
Complexity

- Complex decision-making process
- Value trade-offs
- Less room for interventions, more needed
- Long term projects
- Challenges
- Successes are not easily replicated
Challenges

- Feasibility issues
- Current regulation
- Technical problems
- Collaboration
Collaboration

- Suspicious stakeholders
- Changing roles
- Unclear roles and responsibilities
“Unclear role and responsibility divisions can lead to bottlenecks in the collaboration and add to the complexity of heritage re-use processes”.

(Schönau & De Bruijne, 2008; Van der Kuij, 2014)
Complexity is seen as the main bottleneck to start heritage re-use processes in practice

(Kurul, 2007)
Research aim

- Decrease complexity in heritage re-use processes
- Increase insight in the collaboration
- Stimulate initiatives to re-use vacant heritage buildings
Problem field

Conceptual model
“How can a clear overview on role and responsibility divisions contribute to a reduction of the complexity of heritage re-use processes?”
Methodology
Methodology

**subquestions**

- What does a heritage re-use process look like?
- Which roles have to be fulfilled?
- Which challenges can be identified?
Methodology

subquestions

- What does a heritage re-use process look like?
  - Which steps have to be taken?
  - Which stakeholders are involved?
  - What are their tasks and responsibilities?
Methodology

subquestions

- What does a heritage re-use process look like?
- Which roles have to be fulfilled?
  - Which stakeholders are fulfilling these roles and why?
  - Which roles are not fulfilled?
  - Which roles are executed by multiple stakeholders?
Methodology

subquestions

- What does a heritage re-use process look like?
- Which roles have to be fulfilled?
- Which challenges can be identified?
  - Which risks and challenges can be identified?
  - What are possible solutions to these challenges?
Methodology

Methods and approach

- Literature study
- Case study research
- Cross-case analysis
- Focus group
Methodology

Research model
Methodology

Case studies

- 4 case studies
- 2 included semi-structured interviews
- Based on extensive amount of literature
- Interview outcomes previous researchers
CHV Veghel

Former food factory
Industrial heritage
Listed silo’s
Initiative in 2007
In use since 2015
Still in progress
De Ploeg Bergeijk

Former weaving mill
Industrial heritage
Listed building & park
Initiative in 2007
Completed Dec 2016

(Bruns, 2016)
De Hallen
Amsterdam

Former tram remise
Industrial heritage
Listed complex
First initiative in 1994
Completed 2015

(Knaack, 2015)
BK-City Delft

Former science faculty & laboratory
Listed building & interior
Initiative in May 2008
First part completed in September 2008

(Braaksma & Roos, 2015)
Methodology

Models

- Timeline
- Process description
- Relation structure
- Collaboration framework
- Complexity assessment framework
Findings
Findings

Steps and activities

◆ Similar to contemporary adaptive re-use processes

◆ Heritage specific
  ◆ Value assessment building(complex)
  ◆ Defining the story of the building
  ◆ Specific solutions for design challenges

|43|
Findings

Involved stakeholders

- Similar to new-built and contemporary adaptive re-use processes

- Heritage specific
  - Cultural Heritage Agency
  - Monument committee (provincial / monumental)
  - Independent monument committees
    e.g. Bond Heemschot; Het Cuypergarten; etc.
Findings

Roles

- Initiator
- Owner
- Producer
- Regulator
- Financier
- User

Advisor
Findings

Responsibilities

- Responsible
- Accountable
- Supportive
- Consulted
- Informed

(Van Nieuwenhuis, 2003-2010)
Findings

Collaboration framework
### Findings

#### Collaboration framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process steps and activities</th>
<th>Roles and responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing current building state</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value assessment building / complex: cultural, historical, architectonic</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary assessing adaptation potential</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining extension possibilities</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential users</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing financial expenses and resources in combination with risks and uncertainties</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on best form for development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract financier</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire building complex</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea forming</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering involved parties</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financier</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Cross-case analysis

- Steps and activities are similar
- Sequence of the steps and activities differs
- Role division differs with every project
- Responsibility divisions differ
- Roles and responsibilities changed within the processes of the particular projects as well
Conclusion
Complexity of heritage re-use processes cannot be reduced with a clear overview on role and responsibility divisions
Heritage re-use processes are unique

A general overview on role and responsibility divisions cannot be made

Divisions differ within every project

Changes occur during the process
Stakeholders cannot anticipate with certainty on changes as the dynamics are unknown at the start and they differ extremely per project.
It might however be possible to steer on aspects that increase the level of complexity within the collaboration, or to deal with the complexity in a different manner.
Additional findings
Additional findings

CHV, Veghel

- Long timescale
- Many different involved stakeholders
- Different aims and perspectives
- Many constraints due to the location and type of use
- Interdependencies with other projects
Findings

CHV, Veghel

- Persistent initiator
- Experienced team
- Organic growing approach
- Change of culture within the municipality
  - Entrepreneurial aldermen
  - Looser procedures / integral approach
Additional findings

De Ploeg, Bergeijk

- Long timescale vs. short time scale
- Lack of knowledge and experience vs. experienced team
- Mistrust neighbourhood vs. support base
- Lack of decision making vs. decisive owner
- High level vs. lower level of uncertainty/novelty
Additional findings

De Ploeg, Bergeijk

- High commitment key stakeholders
- Shared understanding of project aims
- Clear communication in the project team
- Leadership
Additional findings

De Hallen, Amsterdam

- Long timescale
- Many different involved stakeholders
- Different aims and perspectives
- Lack of a support base within neighbourhood
- Many interdependencies with other projects
- Lack of clear (governmental) decision making
De Hallen, Amsterdam

Additional findings

- Active neighbourhood foundation
- Active initiating architect
- Experienced project team
- Large support base
- Decisive government
- Shared understanding of project aims
Additional findings

BK-City, Delft

- Very short timescale
- Many involved stakeholders
- Experienced project team
- Shared understanding of project aims
- Support base
- Decisive leadership
Cross-case analysis

Additional findings

- Difference in complexity levels
  - Timescale
  - Number of constraints
  - Interdependencies and interactions with other projects
  - Changing participating organisations
  - Governmental decision making
  - Collaboration between stakeholders
Additional findings

Cross-case analysis

- Possibly decrease complexity
  - Limited timescale
  - Limit interdependencies and interactions with other projects
  - Limiting number of stakeholders involved
Additional findings
Cross-case analysis

- Deal with complexity
  - Organic growing / step-by-step approach
  - Prioritising (first) needs
  - Clear government strategies
  - Set up experienced project team
  - Early involvement of residents (and users)
  - Continuous alignment of project stakeholders
Recommendations
Recommendations

Further research

- Stop trying to fit these processes into blueprints
- Research possibilities of aspects that help reduce or deal with complexity for practical impact
Recommendations

Practice
Recommendations

For initiators in practice

- Possible to reduce complexity? [NO]
  - Yes
    - Diminish complexity increasing aspects
  - No
    - Possible to deal with complexity? [NO]
      - Yes
        - E.g., step-by-step approach
      - No
        - Wait
      - Or
        - Temporary use
any questions?

Thank you for your attention
References


Images


