

7 New value perspectives in culture-led urban regeneration

Arturo Rodríguez Morató, Victoria Sánchez Belando, Mariano Zamorano, and Matías I. Zarlenga

Introduction

In recent decades, culture has increasingly been mobilized for shaping and promoting places. Some of these efforts have aimed to economically impact decayed territories by attracting upper-middle classes and tourists, provoking gentrification and displacement. There is a substantial body of well-established literature on these processes, particularly in Anglo-Saxon countries (Zukin, 1982; Evans, 2003; Lloyd, 2010). However, artistic and creative activities also preserve and produce multiple values beyond economic value (Grodach, 2016). Often, they help promote participation and inclusion of marginal populations or advance intercultural dialogue and integration of culturally diverse groups (Zapata-Barrero, 2015; Falanga & Nunes, 2021). They also combine physical and civic transformations in many ways (Rodríguez Morató & Zarlenga, 2018) and produce aesthetic and identity values of different kinds.

The predominance of the economic valuation of culture has most clearly shown its limitations and raised harsh criticism in culture-led urban regeneration processes (Oakley, 2015; Paddison & Miles, 2020). It is also here that the tensions between instrumental and intrinsic valuations of culture and the practical difficulties of reconciling them have become more apparent, notable in a long tradition of critical research on culture-led urban regeneration initiatives that focuses on the evaluation of their effects (García, 2004a, 2004b; Lees & Melhuish, 2015; Campbell et al., 2017). While denouncing the numerous flaws and rhetorical function of the standard evaluation practices, mainly consisting of economic impact measurements, this tradition still conceives these effects in terms of outcomes that go beyond the field of culture, that is, in terms of instrumental values only.

From a critical perspective, the UNCHARTED Project has addressed the plurality of cultural values in cultural practices associated with culture-driven urban transformations. Instead of evaluating outcomes and impacts, we have looked into values and evaluations within urban regeneration programmes, and instead of considering culture-led urban regeneration initiatives that are driven by external interests, we have focused on cultural institutions or programmes directly linked to cultural demands and objectives that additionally aim to impinge on the urban setting. In relation to large-scale cultural policy initiatives, like cultural mega-events,

which can also have urban regeneration objectives, UNCHARTED has addressed them as instances of cultural strategic planning. That work is covered in Chapter 6, so we do not consider this type of case here.

Our work aimed to throw light on a neglected kind of evaluation of urban cultural regeneration practice and to show its relevance in outlining an alternative sense of organic regeneration, far from the neoliberal parameters. Furthermore, it also sought to identify some fundamental challenges that urban cultural regeneration confronts and to make some recommendations in this regard. In this way, we hoped to help define a new paradigm of culture-led urban regeneration and contribute to improving the management of these types of processes.

In this regard, we have mainly focused on examining the case of the *Fàbriques de Creació* (Creation Factories) programme in Barcelona, a programme that has involved the rehabilitation of industrial and historical heritage buildings owned by the municipality to set spaces for innovation and artistic experimentation since 2007. These are spaces run by various associations and foundations, in addition to the city council, under a shared governance umbrella. We have considered this case in the context of the trajectory of culture-led regeneration initiatives carried out in Barcelona over the last 40 years, a very prominent trajectory which has made the city become an exemplary reference for this type of process. Moreover, we have considered this case in contrast with two other cases, one in Budapest (urban cultural regeneration initiatives carried out in the 8th district in recent years) and another in Porto (examining two contrasting cultural institutions: a flagship cultural facility, Casa da Música, and a grassroots, informally organized cultural space housed in a condominium, STOP). Finally, we have developed a co-creative experiment on the evaluation methodology implemented by the Barcelona City Council in the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme. This chapter reports on all the work done and concludes with the assessments of some leading experts in the field who provided feedback on this work.

Analytical perspective

Our analytical strategy was, first, to examine the sociohistorical parameters shaping culture-led urban regeneration organizational frameworks within the Barcelona context. Subsequently, employing a relational and pragmatic sociological approach, we identified cultural values endorsed and advanced by the local administration spearheading urban regeneration initiatives. Our analysis examined the consequential effects on the actors and institutions involved by emphasizing the micro-level but rejecting a strict micro-macro dichotomy where structures emerge through practices and institutions (Hermant & Latour, 1998). Through this exploration, we scrutinized uses and values of culture as integral components of contemporary urban development strategies, addressing associated dynamics and contradictions. Furthermore, we considered shifts in the appreciation of culture within the context of the increasing diversity characterizing contemporary societies. Three dimensions crossed the analytical strategy: the first one concerned cultural policy governance dynamics; the second one paid attention to the plurality of

values in urban cultural policy; and the third one addressed the territorial embeddedness of culture-led urban regeneration concrete interventions.

Methodologically, once the sociohistorical context of our investigation on culture-led regeneration in Barcelona had been defined, our reflection involved three working phases focused on the city council-led evaluation methodology for the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme performance: (1) a meta-analysis of the evaluation experience of the programme; (2) an independent and co-creative exploration of the valuative and evaluative experiences of the actors directly or indirectly linked to the programme; and (3) the assembling and contrasting of three kinds of evaluations: the process evaluations carried out by the Institute of Culture of Barcelona (ICUB) (phase 1), other evaluations and assessments (phase 2), and Porto and Budapest experiences of urban cultural regeneration.

During the first document-based phase of the research on the *Fàbriques* case, we developed a co-analysis of the programme evaluation methodology implemented by the ICUB in collaboration with the officials of the institution. The second phase of the research process involved fieldwork (including interviews, focus groups, and participatory observation) and collaborative fieldwork with neighbours, space managers, artists, and journalists. Furthermore, the approach aimed to co-assess and co-configure an efficient methodological strategy for better aligning the *Fàbriques* evaluation methodology with its represented plurality of values, adapted to different stakeholders' characteristics, needs, and interests. Finally, the last phase of the co-created evaluative process aimed to contrast and assemble results from the initial analysis with lessons learned in the validation process.

This main case was examined in contrast with similar cases in Budapest and Porto. The Budapest case¹ focused on a cultural regeneration programme in 8th District. In this instance, the participatory and cultural practices of the local municipality and its various cultural institutions (such as museums, community centres, and youth centres) correspond to a district characterized by social stigmatization and segregation on multiple levels (spatial, social, cultural, and educational). The principles of extending cultural rights, enhancing social inclusion, and strengthening local democracy were combined in the policies and activities of the municipality under evaluation. The second case examined the dynamics of interaction between urban heritage preservation and gentrification within the context of the touristification process underway in the city of Porto.² This examination involved interviewing various stakeholders from Casa da Música and a Commercial Centre (STOP), delving into their discourses and perspectives on these processes, and analysing urban policies designed to address the challenges encountered by the arts and culture sector in the city.

This comparative scrutiny aimed to extract insights and lessons with broader applicability beyond the central case study under consideration. Building on this comparative approach, we aimed to formulate refined methodological guidelines for evaluation that address identified limitations in evaluative processes. The general guidelines produced, amalgamating theoretical principles with practical experiences and attuned to the intricacies of cultural regeneration, are expected to serve as a valuable resource for urban planners, policymakers, and practitioners involved in similar initiatives.

The Barcelona model of urban cultural regeneration: configuration and recent transformations

Culture was key in the development of the city throughout the democratic period. It was central during the first stage, fully integrated into the urban transformation of the city, and then also, in a different way, in a stage after the 1992 Olympics, articulated to the post-industrial and tourist development of the city and associated with a set of changes in local cultural policy in terms of discourses, objectives, intervention approach, and alliances for management (Rodríguez Morató, 2005). During the 1980s and part of the 1990s, within the framework of the social democratic agenda of Mayor Pasqual Maragall (1982–1997), especially in the years of the Olympic transformation (1986–1992), the relationship between culture and urban planning sought, to begin with, a balance between actions aimed at local well-being from a proximity approach (involving the adaptation of industrial heritage to create sociocultural facilities in neighbourhoods, such as civic centres) and interventions aimed at improving the infrastructure of professional cultural sectors, which in turn contributed to the international promotion of the city (i.e., high-culture facilities and emblematic buildings designed by internationally renowned architects).

However, what was most characteristic of all these actions was that they were not developed independently and in isolation but rather articulated within a general urban plan. This holistic planning of actions was conceived from architectural assessment criteria by teams of architects with significant decision-making capacity. It was planning based on previously established citizen consensus and characterized by three main features: (1) its polycentric character, in that the actions proposed the promotion of a set of new urban centralities and affected all corners of the city; (2) the integration of public–private collaborations of various types under clear public leadership; and (3) a strong aestheticist and culturalist content, although not spectacular or one-dimensional (Rodríguez Morató, 2005). This content formula is exemplified in the urban design and architecture promoted, which combined concern for design and function, as well as in the integration of first-class contemporary art in the periphery, which de-centred attention and avoided the production of scenographic arrangements. But above all, it is exemplified in the recovery and renewal of pre-existing urban heritage, whether specific elements of urban memory or the facades of the residential buildings of the historic centre. All these elements and features defined the Barcelona model of urban cultural regeneration in its phase of greatest influence, a model that would later be strongly transformed, although it would continue to gravitate and partially re-emerge over the years.

Since the mid-1990s, cultural interventions (such as large facilities and large events) were promoted in the context of a strategy more oriented towards urban branding and the global circulation of the Barcelona brand. In parallel, the plans for entrepreneurial restructuring of cultural policy and the focus on the structuring of the cultural sector promoted by the local government materialized in the creation of the ICUB in 1996, a public agency aimed at promoting the cultural sector following a strategic planning approach. This administrative reorganization was linked

to a growing alignment of local cultural policies with the agenda of creative cities and urban revitalization based on culture, as advocated by Landry and Bianchini (1995) in the British context. In the 2000s, this approach would lead to a growing economic valorization of culture and creativity, inspired by other experts, such as the internationally renowned Richard Florida.

In this evolution, the initial model breaks down. The Universal Forum of Cultures, a cultural mega-event promoted by the city council in 2004 represented a turning point in the urban cultural regeneration trajectory of Barcelona. In that case, the poor social legitimacy and the loss of public leadership in the face of market objectives generated political tensions and various disaffiliations that displaced the aspirations for cultural and social inclusion, as well as those for the participation of the local community and social movements, which had initially been promoted as founding elements of that great event. The continuity with the Olympic model was only apparent since, in this case, a good part of the characteristic elements of that model were absent. The ambition to use a cultural mega-event as a lever to promote urban transformation and, at the same time, gain international exposure for the city was similar. However, the initiative was concentrated in a specific and marginal space of the city, a space lacking identity, so it was not possible to propose any articulation with pre-existing urban heritage. Furthermore, as already indicated, public leadership was much lower and the voice of the cultural professionals involved was much less influential than the private promoters. Under these conditions, the urban plan that was developed was not nearly as integrated, either between the architecture of public promotion and that of private promotion or with respect to the rest of the city.

Following the 2008 crisis, during the period 2011–2015, an austerity agenda was implemented in local policies, which meant an intensification of the economic approach to culture in a context of strong cuts to well-being (Sánchez Belando, 2017). Faced with this, in 2011 cultural activism not only questioned the role of culture in the local development model, the precariousness of creative work, and the limits to citizen participation in urban cultural life, but also began to imagine alternatives in a political key, which to a certain extent would make up the cultural programme of the left-wing coalition Barcelona en Comú (BeC).

In 2015, the victory of BeC in the Barcelona City Council implied a rethinking of cultural policy in terms of rights (Zamorano, 2023). Regarding the role of culture in the territory, these changes pointed to forms of urban revitalization through culture that involved intensifying the sociocultural use of pre-existing spaces or enabling spaces and infrastructures intended for other purposes or in disuse for these purposes. This movement of change in the relationship between culture and territory, which had begun under conditions of austerity as a temporary policy, was then institutionalized as a central policy in the new administration, inspiring a diversity of decentralized cultural initiatives guided by objectives of participation, social cohesion, and environmental sustainability. The “Patrimoni ciutadà” (Citizen Heritage) programme is an example of this type of action in the planning of city uses.

The Fàbriques de Creació programme: main characteristics

The creation of the Fàbriques de Creació programme is the institutional result of the sustained demand of the cultural sector and the city's cultural movements to obtain spaces for creativity and artistic innovation. The programme was proposed to foster artistic creation at the local level and promote the decentralization of culture and creativity to diverse neighbourhood contexts as well as an urban revitalization intervention through the rehabilitation and innovative architectural adaptation of disused industrial and architectural heritage, to provide spaces and resources for artistic creation and to promote interaction between the artistic community and the local community.

Currently, the programme includes 11 rehabilitated facilities located in six different neighbourhoods, each one specializing in a specific artistic field (from circus to dramaturgy). All buildings are publicly owned and most are managed by private non-profit organizations (e.g., foundations, associations), except Fabra i Coats, which is under direct municipal management. The design of the programme allows each centre to operate with significant autonomy, within a shared governance framework.

The programme was implemented in 2007 within the framework of the Strategic Culture Plan *New Accents* of 2006. In line with the approach of this plan, the programme is part of a change in the strategy of the local cultural administration that is aimed at supporting cultural associations and community culture after a period in which the focus had been on companies and large industries of the cultural sector. Taking cultural regeneration interventions as a model on a European scale, such as the Friche la Belle de Mai in Marseille or the Cable Factory in Helsinki, the programme aims to promote the Factories as spaces open to the surrounding community, offering services that promote social cohesion and coexistence in neighbourhoods.

From the start, the ICUB has been working on the configuration of a public-private governance network and on the coordination of facilities, which are diverse in terms of activities, resources, form of organization, and work dynamics, as well as in relation to socio-historical, institutional, and socio-territorial factors that have made them possible. While some of these initiatives are the result of the promotion of consolidated artistic collectives, others are the result of citizen mobilization; and, in other cases, the leadership is mainly from cultural administration. In most cases, the new uses of these spaces were defined with the direct participation of organizations and groups related to creators and their needs.

The Fàbriques de Creació programme replicates many of the Barcelona model's characteristics in its original version on a different scale. It is, thus, essentially polycentric. It articulates heritage and creation through innovative architectural renovations, and it operates from public leadership but based on collaboration with private agents. However, this programme also involves significant changes with respect to that model. To begin with, it aims to have a regenerative impact on a territory of restricted scope, even if distributed, instead of an impact of a general, wide-scale scope. At the same time, it responded to an artistic-sectoral demand

from community sectors, while the Olympic programme was the result of the exclusive will of the administration. The basis of legitimation of the action is, in this sense, different. In the Olympic times, the administrative will that drove the action responded to a basic democratic consensus on the needs of the city, forged within the framework of an anti-Franco opposition movement, so the Olympic project relied on a general citizen consensus. On the contrary, in the case of the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme, the legitimacy base was more precarious and was limited to specific professional or community sectors.

In correspondence with the above, the logic of the cultural regeneration initiatives developed is also different. In the Olympic regeneration, culture was mobilized to organically transform the urban fabric and dynamics, while the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme aims to serve as a basis for the promotion of cultural creation and, at the same time, by itself or through it, to produce regenerative effects in the territory. The organicity of the transformation is more tentative and less assured in this case. Furthermore, in line with the above, the administration is much less assertive in its relationship with the other actors with which it deals and is more receptive to change. In short, the initiative of the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme corresponds to a stage in which, having lost the basic legitimacy of public cultural action, the idea predominates that the recovery of the regenerative effectiveness of the original model involves re-establishing connections with cultural actors and with various sectors of citizens through the development of participatory, decentralized, and flexible governance.

A co-creation experiment

In collaboration with the city council cultural administration, we examined the methodologies that have been developed and implemented over the last decade to evaluate the different dimensions of the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme in relation to the artistic and cultural creation and dissemination activities that take place in the facilities themselves as creation spaces and in relation to the neighbourhood space in which they operate.

The work involved cooperation between researchers (the University of Barcelona team) and local cultural administration civil servants (ICUB), as well as on-site visits and interviews in the facilities. The cooperation consisted of a systematic exchange with the ICUB to review administrative documents and receive feedback on the research progress. These actions took place between March and November 2023, following a strategy that promoted the articulation of conceptual and practical administrative perspectives in order to achieve a nuanced and holistic understanding of the programme's evaluative framework and the processes leading to it. The primary outcome of this process was a co-created corpus of insights and analytical contributions to better understand and improve the evaluative framework of the programme. This was framed as a "meta-analysis" of the strategies driven by the ICUB to develop this methodology between 2012 and 2022, which included ICUB peer review and comments on the meta-analysis report and involved ICUB representatives' participation in several working meetings

and a workshop in Barcelona. The outcomes of these efforts were later validated through semi-structured interviews with six directors, neighbours, and Slash construction discouraged of three Arts Factories (Fabra i Coats, Ateneu Nou Barris, and Hangar). Through direct engagement with the operational context, we elucidated the intricate processes, objectives, and impact assessment criteria embedded in the *Fàbriques de Creació* initiative. This methodological synthesis positions the analysis within a scholarly framework while leveraging academic and administrative stakeholders' expertise to build avenues for improvement in the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme evaluation system.

Fàbriques de Creació evaluation methodology: development and model

One challenge of the ICUB has been developing a centralized methodology for evaluating all Factories under the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme with common goals. This inconclusive process has occurred in parallel to the setting up of the spaces' network and has taken more than a decade. The overall development of the evaluation system for the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme can be divided into three main moments:

- *Phase 1:* The process started with a quantitative model for the evaluation of *Fàbriques de Creació* that was generated between 2012 and 2013. It was led by the ICUB and supported by the external consulting company Artimetria.
- *Phase 2:* A second moment is characterized by a proposal for qualitative evaluation of the Factories in 2015, an idea that materialized coinciding with the arrival of the Barcelona en Comú Redundant, city government. The development of this tool was directed by the external consulting company Sócol.
- *Phase 3:* Finally, this development closes with the attempt to rework and consolidate the 2015–2016 qualitative system. First in 2018, under the direction of external academic researchers Alba Colombo and Tere Badia. And secondly, with its subsequent refinement by Alba Colombo and Martí Font (2020). This process was based on a study conducted by the Open University of Catalonia external experts.

Studies have been developed by the ICUB's technical team and external contracting, starting with Artimetria in 2013 and followed by Sócol in 2015. These informed the development of a set of proposals that helped identify parameters and dimensions that are shared by the different Factories. On the one hand, an extensive list of indicators was drawn up that is very useful for measuring the quantitative effects of the projects (2012–2014). On the other hand, the first proposals of what could be understood as qualitative parameters illustrated a complex reality (2015–2020).

In April 2017, a debate process began on the Art Factories Government Measure with all the entities involved, leading to the new *Mesura de Govern* (edict) seeking to establish a holistic mixed methodology. This was later translated into a new study (Colombo & Font, 2020) externally led by the Open University of

Catalonia with additional participatory methods aimed at developing and agreeing upon a qualitative/quantitative methodology (2018–2020), which has not been fully implemented as of 2025.

These three frameworks can be seen as supplementary and as an attempt to gradually grasp specific qualitative evaluation variables associated with creation and community involvement. The initial evaluation framework provided core assessment dimensions for creation hubs and networks, including innovation, quality, excellence, and promotion. However, it also considered social components of urban regeneration by including factors such as social inscription. The latter aspects were further addressed in the Sòcol model, which, while providing a procedural understanding of valuation, offers a new approach to social relations revolving around the Factory activity. Finally, the last model entails a more apparent alignment of these components with “extra artistic” (in a traditional definition) goals and values by adding layers such as workers’ and residents’ rights.

Today, the evaluation methodologies of *Fàbriques de Creació* policies display a medium-high level of informality. In this programme, the ICUB evaluates each facility’s performance as part of a reporting process using quantitative standards and methods. The current quantitative system’s level of abstraction is considered too high, making it challenging to propose clear measures for improvement. Therefore, evaluation primarily relies on annual reports submitted by each Factory, detailing activities, budget structure, audience numbers, and resident artists, but systematic feedback from the administration to facilities managers is lacking. Negotiations are ongoing to introduce qualitative indicators for overall performance analysis.

Based on our analysis of the ICUB evaluation system, the following aspects summarize these issues from the perspective of tensions between values embedded in the different methodologies and actor manifestations, representing such tensions:

- *Autonomy* (each Factory’s trajectory, goals, and orientation) vs. *Convergence* (integration into the programme’s common identity and goals): This tension affects governance, programming, relations with the territory, and the distribution of ICUB public resources. In this regard, the lack of specific resource allocation for carrying out evaluation tasks by both ICUB and specific Factories has been indicated as a key issue by stakeholders.
- *Qualitative* vs. *Quantitative*-driven valuation practices: Disputes arise between procedural and outcomes-based reporting approaches, influencing the ways of measuring the performance of the Factories. This tension between qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods is exemplified by certain Factory managers and actors who argue that quantitative indicators are not suitable for reporting on artistic processes.
- *Social value* (proximity task of facilities) vs. *Aesthetic value* (artistic interest): This tension reflects differences in the cultural and artistic consumption associated with expert and general public audiences as well as the diverse aesthetic and artistic repertoires managed by each Factory.

- *Research-oriented* (more experimental and procedural spaces) vs. *Production-oriented Factories* (focused on concrete outcomes in the market/field): This tension relates to the evaluation of results (prioritizing processes or products).

Control cases: culture-led urban regeneration in Budapest and Porto

The control cases (Porto and Budapest) were used to differentiate the general and idiosyncratic aspects of the relationship between the administrative evaluation and the dynamics of evaluative co-creation, focusing on comprehensiveness and value integration capacity and the diversity of contexts and traditions of intervention and participation (i.e., national policy models, social demands, etc.). In this sense, they allowed us to identify the general conditions and applicable principles for improving the evaluation methodologies in a pluralistic and participatory sense.

Control case 1: Culture-led urban regeneration in the 8th district of Budapest

In contrast with Western European cities, where culture-led urban regeneration has been gradually gaining ground over three to four decades, in Hungary, it only became widespread over the last few years—especially as a consequence of Hungarian cities’ application for the European Capital of Culture call in 2010. Moreover, goals of urban regeneration and socioeconomic cohesion of deprived neighbourhoods have been only formulated after the democratic turn in 1989. And the first programmes during the 1990s perceived urban regeneration as a field for attracting investors exclusively and did not take into consideration the values of social integration or sustainable social and cultural development.

Instead of stressing social cohesion, these policies hindered sustainable urban development and jeopardized historical and cultural heritage and cultural diversity in most of these urban areas. The redevelopment projects that started around 2000 consisted mainly of high-end housing and commercial property projects, with an entrepreneurial logic that has been an integral aspect of the adoption of neoliberal principles in policies that aim to encourage private capital accumulation. Thus, in 2005, the launch of Magdolna Quarter Programme (MQP), Hungary’s first truly integrated socially sensitive urban regeneration programme in the 8th district of Budapest was a real shift from the previous principles. It took place in one of the most deprived areas in Budapest and it aimed to strengthen local society as well as improve housing and living conditions.

The new local government has put great emphasis on community participation and self-governance, aiming to create a participatory municipality that can ensure wide accessibility to public life and politics, including citizens with various ages, genders, identities, social status, religions, or mental or physical conditions. Since 2020, an Office of Community Participation has been part of the Mayor’s Cabinet, dedicated to the development of the culture of participation in the district, stressing the strengthening of the communities in Józsefváros and engaging local residents

in common decisions. Besides the Office, several other aspects and initiatives for engaging local participation exist.

Governance and participation (top–down and bottom–up developments)

The 8th district is home to many cultural institutions of national (the Hungarian National Museum, Hungarian Natural History Museum, and Erkel Theatre) and city-level importance (Metropolitan Ervin Szabó Library). Nevertheless, there is very little communication and cooperation between these levels of governance. Following a change of municipality leadership in 2019, cultural initiatives proliferated in the district, with the municipality taking the initiative and accompanying and supporting NGOs and grassroots initiatives with reduced space rental, financial instruments (such as periodic and targeted grants for civil organizations), and other supports. In addition to the reorganization of institutions and the creation of new ones, the municipality has also expanded its cultural offer with a number of programmes and events that also mobilize the principles of social inclusion, diversity, and equality. Given the highly diverse socio-cultural landscape of the district, the question of where to locate cultural institutions and activities is a central issue, a dilemma for the municipality leadership, and therefore a matter of value principles.

The relative representation of value plurality and territorial inscription (proximity and participation dynamics, etc.)

The municipality sees the introduction and institutionalization of participatory mechanisms as a “culture change,” a long-term process over many years. Therefore, the emphasis is placed on the gradual development of a more participatory approach. On the one hand, this means “from inside-out” implementation: starting with the city council and the mayor’s office and then extending to the municipal institutions and companies. On the other hand, this follows a bottom–up approach, that is, from the minimum objective of information to a more advanced level of power-sharing, to partnership. For the municipality, the biggest dilemma is how to combine high and mass culture, so to address who is potentially “excluded” from one event or another. Experience shows that these events mobilize a wider range of socio-cultural groups than originally thought. Although the Roma community is a priority target of the municipality’s community and cultural strategy, there are many other minorities, immigrants, and newcomers living in the 8th District. The community participation office pays special attention to these communities with various training and cultural programmes that appeal to their specific needs.

Control case 2: Urban regeneration and cultural values in the city of Porto

The two cases examined in Porto come from top–down and bottom–up dynamics. The first case is the internationally renowned opera hall Casa da Música, a high-culture institution promoted by the public sector and managed by the

private sector. The second case is the experience of self-organized musicians seeking to foster Porto's music scene through an intervention of the creative adaptive reuse of the old Commercial Centre, STOP, which is located in a low-middle income neighbourhood in the metropolitan area of the city. The exploration of both cases involved interviewing different agents from Casa da Música and STOP and examining their discourses and views on those processes, including the urban policy designed to tackle the challenges faced by the arts and culture field in the city.

Governance and participation

Today Casa da Música has a highly hierarchical and bureaucratized internal structure. Furthermore, precarious labour conditions prevail among the employees, which has led to a small number of workers accumulating functions. These characteristics result from the growing weight of private institutions in the management of the Casa da Música, which has led to both a lack of transparency in many processes and the overvaluing of their interests rather than those of the different communities in the city and of Casa da Música's workers.

In contrast, the governance situation at STOP is marked by various challenges stemming from a lack of effective internal organization. While STOP is a space frequently utilized by musicians and artists, both ideologically and practically, there is a noticeable disorganization. This lack of cohesion has given rise to the formation of multiple associations within STOP, resulting in a dearth of shared goals and a less than clear understanding of the overarching vision.

Representation of value plurality

The values of inclusion and integration guide the work of Casa da Música and involve developing a sense of belonging. In this sense, it favours music creation from scratch with the communities, with themes, texts, and music chosen and/or created by them. The idea that the stage is the ultimate space for inclusion prevails. However, an apparent mismatch is identified between the values followed by the educational service and those that are favoured within the institution as a whole, where little attention is paid to dimensions such as inclusion and representativeness within the workforce.

The plurality of values within STOP is palpable from the outset, manifesting in different approaches to work. While some musicians engage in collaborative efforts, the majority operate in an entirely individualized manner. This diversity significantly impacts internal organization, collective decision-making, and the establishment of priorities for collective goals, and it suggests the absence of a cohesive community. The inherent discrepancy between the values that underpin STOP, including ideals of freedom, autonomy, self-management, and art for art's sake, contrasts with the cultural policy pursued by local authorities, which prioritizes mainstream culture, major events, and offers occasional, non-sustained support for the arts, with a heavy emphasis on tourism.

Territorial inscription

One of Casa da Música's primary missions is its presence in the territory and the involvement of different populations, with the educational service being the main structure dedicated to this axis. Working with communities and creating projects with them on selected topics contributes to developing a sense of belonging to their neighbourhoods and city. The educational service works in a network with numerous institutions in the city and metropolitan area. However, beyond this, there had been no strong connection between Casa da Música and the citizenry as a whole. First and foremost, this is because of the absence of a logic of networking in the territory, the relative lack of contact with other smaller structures, and the inability to create partnerships.

STOP plays a pivotal role in the cultural landscape of Porto, often referred to as a "factory of culture" with unique characteristics that set it apart from similar spaces around the world. STOP stands as a linchpin in Porto's cultural dynamics, fostering autonomy, self-management, and organic relationships among musicians. Its potential closure, a recurrent fear in the music sector, would not only disperse musicians but also hinder the city's ability to easily share resources and foster musical collaborations. Moreover, STOP is part of a broader cultural movement in the Bonfim area, contributing to the emergence of artists' studios and other cultural spaces that collectively enrich the area's cultural and artistic diversity.

Methodological reflections: towards a new methodology for evaluating urban cultural regeneration processes

Culture has acquired strategic value for cities in recent times because culture has value for people, which means that people recognize in it a plurality of values. This is the basis of the possible benefits it can provide to individuals, groups, and societies. Culture-led urban regeneration has often been conceived through the exclusive lens of economics and practiced with only its external effects in mind. From an alternative perspective that pays attention to the plurality of cultural values, we have focused on cultural institutions or programmes that adopt this same plural vision and we have investigated the values and valuations that are present in their practices. The cases and processes we have considered allow us to identify three crucial dimensions that define urban cultural regeneration programmes while showing how they relate with different values of culture: cultural contents, territorial inscription, and participation and governance.

Cultural contents

Culture-led urban regeneration programmes are defined, to begin with, by their material content: the cultural repertoires mobilized, the built environment that is recycled, the new creation produced, and the various types of cultural expressions that are included (e.g., professional artworks, amateur practices, and traditional ethnic expressions). This content can be more or less plural. The *Fàbriques de Creació* programme in Barcelona, which involves very diverse arts

and cultural expressions and different types of renovated architectural heritage, offers an example of plurality, while the Casa da Música in Porto, a case that combines an iconic new building by Rem Koolhaas with a series of classical music ensembles (in addition to an educational service that slightly compensates for this musical monoculture) represents a less diverse urban regeneration initiative.

These contents are connected with different types of values, not only with aesthetic and identity values but also with others. They can connect with specific social groups, for example, thus producing inclusion (or exclusion) effects. The efforts to include diverse cultural content in the activities programmed in the 8th district of Budapest respond to the desire to promote social inclusion in a very diverse neighbourhood. These efforts also aim to promote participation more generally. To the extent that citizens participate in these activities, get involved in them, or simply positively appreciate the renovated spaces and buildings and visit them, there is now an increase in individual and collective well-being. Furthermore, people's positive appraisals are easily transformed into economic value. The Olympic transformation of Barcelona was very successful in terms of citizen participation and appreciation and gave way to an exponential increase in tourism in the following years, which very well exemplified this conversion of the previous values generated into economic value.

To the extent that contents are associated with values, their connections become important. Contents and their associated values can be incompatible, for example, and may so deactivate each other. The Forum 2004 in Barcelona provides a good example of this, a case in which the values inspiring the cultural discourse of the event collided with the economic goal of the parallel urban planning operation, with the result being the discredited and symbolic failure of the event. Another possibility is that contents are simply added without significant connections being developed between them, as occurs in the case of STOP in Porto, where a multiplicity of very disparate musicians coexist without much practical relationship between them and, above all, without generating any common aesthetic or ideological identity. In this case, the connection between them in the cultural space they share hardly adds value. But cultural contents can also articulate in combinations that are meaningful and create new value: aesthetic values, identity, or authenticity. This is the intention when combining heritage and creation through innovative architectural renovations in the case of the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme in Barcelona.

Territorial inscription

A second fundamental coordinate that defines urban cultural regeneration initiatives is their territorial inscription. These initiatives can be concentrated or dispersed and can also be located at central positions, in the periphery, following a polycentric scheme, or in specific places. The effects of the spatial arrangement of cultural regeneration initiatives in the city are multiple, and the various options are also linked to different values.

The concentration of actions in central positions of the city, even if they are run-down areas, is an option that favours the generation of economic value but at the same time also an increase in urban inequality and gentrification of the intervened area. Dispersion in peripheral points promotes, on the contrary, cultural equality. Without excluding some possible positive economic effects, the polycentric option implies a better distribution of benefits and a greater range of values promoted. The Olympic regeneration of Barcelona offers a clear example of this. In that case, the transformation was conceived according to a characteristic polycentric scheme, with the intention of affecting the entire perimeter of the city. This decision made the regenerative transformation operate in a plurality of areas, which all saw their identity reinforced with the whole gaining, at the same time, in cohesion and well-being.

Finally, there is another option, which is the strategic dispersion of interventions, when they are located in specific points of deprived areas where it is desirable to influence or in places where the intervention seems more convenient for different reasons. In the 8th district of Budapest, for example, the location of regenerative actions is the result of strategic approaches that seek to produce specific effects with respect to discriminated social groups and in their relationship with the rest of the population.

In the case of Budapest, moreover, the contents appear predetermined, associated with the territory and its inhabitants. The link between territory and content revealed here points to another important defining feature of urban cultural regeneration initiatives: the greater or lesser connection that may exist between these two dimensions—content and territory—when defining projects of regeneration. These projects, in fact, can be articulated or modelled in accordance with pre-existing cultural values in the territory, capitalizing on the heritage accumulated there or based on cultural and citizen initiatives already underway. This is what happens in some cases within the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme and also in some of the regenerative actions undertaken in Budapest, as mentioned. But these projects can also be conceived, on the contrary, in a manner completely alien to the pre-existing realities in the territory. This seems to be what happened in the case of *Casa da Música* in Porto.

Participation and governance

This dimension, which has to do with the presence and role of people in regenerative actions, is increasingly central in the definition of those same actions, for different reasons. Participation appears as a fundamental value within the most general local cultural policy, as the basis of its own legitimacy. But in urban cultural regeneration initiatives this value is reinforced even more because the regenerative action is based precisely on the engagement of the people. Furthermore, as a defining dimension of regenerative action, participation is intertwined with the other two dimensions previously discussed (contents and territorial inscription), conditioning them, and sometimes even determining them. This is the case for the initiatives in the 8th district in Budapest, where the ultimate stated objective

of these policies is social inclusion through participation. This leads, on the one hand, to locating the actions in certain places whose inhabitants are intended to be attracted and affected and, on the other hand, to incorporating the contents that are closer to them. Even in the cases furthest from this social logic of inclusion, such as that of the Casa da Música in Porto, primarily oriented towards artistic excellence, the gravitation of the value of participation translates into the existence of a powerful educational service, whose guidelines for action include projecting itself outside the institution to connect with diverse audiences in other places and assuming all types of musical repertoires for the same reason.

The modalities of cultural participation are multiple and can entail very different degrees of involvement. Its promotion thus involves a diversity of mechanisms and dynamics. Regeneration initiatives can be limited to promoting the expansion of audiences, which implies a merely passive participation of the individuals involved. At a higher level, participation can entail contributing to decision-making, opening the way to governance dynamics. At the highest level of involvement, the relationship becomes one of cooperation or partnership. Both the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme in Barcelona and the initiatives promoted in the 8th district of Budapest include examples of this type of collaboration. These are the modalities of regenerative action in which the organization of participation most strongly determines both its location and its content. And for the rest, these are also the programmes that favour the greatest plurality of values.

Challenges and recommendations

On the basis of the analytical and co-creative elaborations carried out, some main challenges were identified to improve urban cultural regeneration initiatives, and we have deduced some concrete recommendations from them. These are organized into five categories: cultural contents, place, participation, governance, and evaluation.

Cultural contents

Challenge: The main issue concerning cultural content is to ensure their *appropriate combination*, which involves the existence of a plurality of contents, different values and functions, links to relevant issues and opportunities on the territory, and that they are productively articulated to the pre-existing heritage.

Associated recommendations

- **Define regeneration programmes through strategic planning.** Consider the structure of objectives and the existing opportunities on the territory regarding pre-existing heritage and ongoing cultural initiatives. Successful regeneration initiatives are site-specific—they should not be replicated. Reflect on the values linked to the contents of the programme and adjust them to its objectives.

- **Favour plural contents.** Include plural content capable of connecting with the diverse population living and working in the territory.
- **Look for synergetic combinations of contents.** Seek combinations that can fit and have the potential to create additional value.

Place

Challenge: Regarding the *place* to locate these initiatives, the fundamental challenge lies in their *adequate distribution in the territory*, ensuring that the selected places allow for establishing the right connections between contents.

Associated recommendations

- **Avoid concentration.** Urban cultural regeneration initiatives should avoid concentration and locating in areas that are already rich in cultural institutions and activities.
- **Develop well-balanced schemes.** Locate the regeneration initiatives on the urban territory in a way that ensures a well-balanced scheme of polycentric developments.
- **Favour strategic placement.** Consider particular issues and challenges of the territory in planning specific locations for the initiatives.

Participation

Challenge: The challenge is how to ensure *diverse participation*, involving marginalized groups, enhancing *stakeholder engagement* across various levels, and fostering co-creation processes and interdisciplinary collaboration for cultural policy development in urban regeneration.

Associated recommendations

- **Foster inclusive representation.** Ensure diverse representation by actively involving individuals from various ethnic, gender, and artistic (etc.) backgrounds, including those historically marginalized in all kinds of cultural practices and cultural policy decisions, to foster pluralistic perspectives and challenge existing socio-cultural hierarchies. Meaningful inclusion of protected groups requires anti-tokenism strategies to be considered in this process.
- **Enhance stakeholder engagement strategies.** Develop a comprehensive policy plan to engage stakeholders at multiple levels, acknowledging the different forms of participation. This includes strategies for exchanging information, consultation, decision-making authority, and fostering co-production, ensuring a holistic approach to participation.
- **Foster cross-sector collaboration.** Encourage collaboration not only within the cultural sector but also across other sectors involved in urban regeneration, such as educational agents or environmental movements.

Governance

Challenge: The challenge of *good governance* in urban cultural regeneration processes is to develop adaptable structures that allow for continuous and productive dialogue in which artistic freedom and the autonomy of cultural professionals combine with greater participation of citizens in decision-making, while guaranteeing effective and legitimate public leadership.

Associated recommendations

- **Build adaptive governance structures.** Establish flexible and adaptive governance structures that can accommodate evolving dynamics. This includes mechanisms for continuous dialogue, feedback loops, and the capacity to adjust policies based on the changing needs and aspirations of the cultural professionals, the urban community, and the administration, fostering a more responsive and sustainable organizational framework.
- **Facilitate bottom-up initiatives.** Encourage and support bottom-up initiatives at the legal, economic, and policy levels, responding to the specific needs and demands of local artistic sectors. These initiatives can serve as models for public-private collaboration and decentralized reuse of abandoned spaces, promoting cultural regeneration aligned with community needs. Still, top-down intervention should be managed in a timely manner to gain efficiency in this process.
- **Address power dynamics.** Explicitly address power dynamics within co-creation processes, acknowledging and mitigating imbalances. This involves creating mechanisms to ensure the meaningful participation of all stakeholders, irrespective of educational background, and actively addressing power differentials between institutional and artistic actors.

Evaluation

Challenge: The challenge addressed is the need for effective evaluation of culture-led urban regeneration processes. This involves establishing clear metrics, incorporating qualitative measures, and transitioning to procedural evaluation models that actively engage communities for a more dynamic and collaborative assessment.

Associated recommendations

- **Establish clear policy evaluation metrics.** Develop and standardize policy evaluation metrics that assess the effectiveness of cultural regeneration processes. This includes incorporating qualitative measures to capture the impact on institutional and artistic developments, as well as overall social-oriented cultural regeneration policy aims.
- **Integrate procedural evaluation models.** Transition towards procedural evaluation models based on co-creation, involving not only public administrations

and institutional agents but also actively engaging surrounding communities. This ensures a more dynamic and collaborative approach to evaluating the impact and success of regeneration processes.

- **Develop reports on values.** As part of the evaluation procedure of cultural regeneration initiatives, integrate reflections on the plurality of values generated within the reports of the managers involved.

Debating the UNCHARTED perspective on culture-led urban regeneration

In this section, we present the main reflections and comments made by a group of experts in relation to the work carried out by UNCHARTED on values and evaluation in urban cultural regeneration processes. The exercise of obtaining and discussing feedback from the group of experts took place in a policy seminar held in Barcelona on January 25, 2024, and in subsequent conversations. At the Barcelona meeting, following an initial debate focused on our analysis of the evaluation processes of the *Fàbriques de Creació* programme, in which the technical staff of the ICUB who are responsible for this programme, the director of one of the Factories, and a local researcher on urban cultural policy participated. A broader discussion then opened up on various aspects of the analytical model we have elaborated on the general phenomenon of culture-led urban regeneration, the challenges we have identified in this respect, and the recommendations we have deduced from our analysis. The experts who participated in the discussion on these issues were Dave O'Brien, from the University of Manchester; Beatriz García, from the University of Liverpool; and the Coordinator of the Committee on Culture of the United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) global network, Jordi Pascual.

The main challenges concerning culture-led urban regeneration initiatives

First, the invited experts gave their views on which of the previously identified challenges to improving urban cultural regeneration initiatives—the content of the initiatives, their location, participation and governance patterns, and the evaluation methodology used—are the most important. While acknowledging that all the factors mentioned are relevant, the three experts agreed on the particular importance of governance. In this regard, Jordi Pascual highlighted the dimension of power in relation to governance as the most decisive element in the development of these dynamics, an element that, however, both cultural analysts and cultural actors themselves tend to overlook, he said, because they find it uncomfortable. Dave O'Brien agreed with this diagnosis, but also pointed out that power dynamics become a crucial challenge, especially in the context of participation:

power in terms of who produces culture, the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in the cultural workforce, . . . but also in relation with audience representation. . . . Who is allowed to participate? Who is expected to be a consumer? We observe uneven take-up dynamics even in participatory approaches that

often are quite top-down. . . . I think there is a tendency to neglect talking about these kinds of inequalities.

Beatriz García, while acknowledging the importance of all the challenges identified, particularly governance, drew attention to the fact that the relative importance of some challenges varies over time. In this regard, she pointed out that currently “the one about evaluation methodologies, about how we define value, is particularly critical and has not been interrogated sufficiently. . . . It requires more attention.” In this regard, she added that

the conversation is getting more sophisticated. . . . We are finally admitting that we have simplified too much, with the predominant focus on the econometrics . . . and there is a need to define more properly how we capture symbolic value, how we capture the intangibles, how we capture contradictions, and how we understand legacy—and for how long we need to interrogate a cultural-led regeneration intervention in order to understand what has been successful and what has been a failure.

Leadership and participation as keys to the success of culture-driven urban regeneration initiatives

Both leadership and participation are essential factors for the success of culture-driven urban regeneration initiatives, acknowledged Jordi Pascual. He recalled Barcelona’s successful experience in the 1980s, when the generation that took power in the city council after the Franco regime channelled the energy of social movements that embodied the aspirations of citizens. The Barcelona leaders of the time embraced the urban strategies outlined by these movements, making citizens feel at the centre of their political action and gaining legitimacy. Participation and leadership went hand in hand and reinforced each other. Dave O’Brien then broadened the perspective to similar European cases and pointed out the risk that in different political contexts, where citizen participation is not so prevalent and the regenerative perspective has become more narrowly economic, reliance on leadership may prove misguided and counterproductive. In this regard, evoking the experience of Liverpool, he drew attention to how the emphasis on charismatic leadership in cultural policy, which had been effective there for a certain period owing to the prominence of certain individuals, deteriorated when they were replaced by less prominent and more problematic figures.

Beatriz García’s view on the balance between leadership and participation in urban cultural regeneration initiatives provided a different insight. Considering the issue from a perspective focused on the practical challenges posed by such initiatives today, she questioned the excessive naivety that leads to participation being seen as a panacea at present:

We have now that keyword: co-creation. It is like everyone needs to be part of all processes. . . . I think it is certainly an aspiration that it is worth keeping in

mind. But it can also be dangerous, because ultimately you also need to know who is held responsible, who is accountable for what when decisions have to be made. . . . I do not think it is possible to completely remove or flatten up decision making . . . but there is an issue as well of scale: it depends on the type of intervention . . . and also on the time to deliver. . . . Participatory models still require a lot of testing. A lot of them are still aspirational and many of them are not working very well. Even though there are some debates on how to develop alternative organizational charts or how to do things without a director, I do not think we are there yet completely, in terms of having models of participation truly open and horizontal. . . . We are starting at the neighbourhood level . . . in certain areas, yes [this is possible] . . . but I think we need to be careful and maybe adapt the level of expectations . . . and give it time.

Do different logics of urban cultural regeneration operate in large-scale projects and smaller interventions?

Looking at this question from the perspective of evaluation, Beatriz García acknowledged the existence of two logics, related, on the one hand, to large-scale projects and, on the other hand, to smaller interventions:

That is why at times it is unfair when we want to undermine the value of an intervention. . . . We might want to deny the value of a mega-event judging it through the logic of the small intervention, and also the opposite, we do not give enough credit to what a small intervention is trying to do because we are looking at it through the logic of the mega-event. . . . Concerning mega-event and large-scale interventions, a lot of what is left behind is on the iconic level. It is about making statements. And you might decide how much should be invested into something that ultimately is a lot about generating narrative, perception, and change in terms of levels of confidence. It is just generating a comment and generating a lot of attention, not concentrating attention on something. In order then to make it possible to achieve or to trigger other things that may have been blocked for a long time . . . it operates at that level.

In contrast, she noted that

the small-scale interventions can be much more complex . . . , involving different communities at different times. . . . The capacity to concentrate the attention and to get this moment of the collective is lower. So, you will be able to reach out and engage in a deeper way, but with a smaller group or a much more specialized one . . . , a niche area. . . . I think it is really important to recognize those differences, so that we can judge the merits and the challenges of each type of intervention through its own framework or definition of value.

Dave O'Brien, however, looking to the opposition between these two kinds of projects, one supposedly focused on economic outcomes and the other on social and

cultural ones, from the perspective of the practice of those involved in them, tended to see it as a false dichotomy:

Because increasingly if you want a European Capital of Culture, if you want an Olympics, there is an element of expectation that you will do outreach work, you will do engagement, you will do involvement . . . or your bid will be marked down . . . [On the other hand, in the case of] smaller, place-based regeneration projects, often there is the assumption that the only thing that counts is participation or cultural transformation. But actually . . . artists need to be paid . . . so, there is an economic logic to even these small projects. . . . Artists, even if they are explicitly against the art market or explicitly participatory or co-productive artists, . . . they still have a sense of an artistic career, they still have a sense of doing good practice, they still have a sense of wanting progress in terms of things like artistic status but also in terms of the economic value of their works. . . . So maybe there is a false tension between the big economic transformation and the small micro projects.

On the generalization in the analysis of urban regeneration processes driven by culture: from specific cases to general recommendations

“It is important to strive towards identifying patterns, but this does not mean that we should believe that a formula is possible . . . that is very reductive,” said Beatriz García. Instead, she elaborated,

It is more useful to think of frameworks and models. . . . This is also something we have to debate: what do we mean when we talk about a model, like the Barcelona model? But in order to advance, to learn, also to be able to commit to knowledge transfer . . ., and not to constantly be repeating the same mistakes, it should be possible to identify certain commonalities. . . . What I am very much in favour is of testing modelling and frameworks. . . . It should be possible to develop some element that could be replicable. At the same time, you need to be open to interrogating and revising it . . . and it is really useful to think of types of exercises, . . . for instance, you have the idea of principles, setting up principles for operations. . . . If you talk about cultural strategies, you can consider that in order to define the cultural strategy of your city, these are basic principles you could apply. . . . We can talk of an appropriate level of generality.

In this respect, Jordi Pascual, speaking about the elaboration contained in the preceding pages, said:

I think you have found a very good and outstanding level of generality. . . . In my experience, the five boxes and the recommendations that unfold those challenges can be read almost all over the world with interest. . . . I cannot avoid pointing out that in our work, in the UCLG Committee of Culture, we work in a similar way. . . . The key difficulty, the challenge, the virtue also, of

these processes of generalization and providing a mirror for peers to improve local policies is engagement, the involvement of those who are going to use a toolkit in its elaboration. . . . Otherwise, it is not useful. . . . Doing things together, these exercises of induction, analyzing realities from different places and finding a common ground . . ., offering the results, in continuous evaluation, but offering a conjunctural frame for us to discuss, this is hugely important. So, I believe that you have done a great work specifically in the field of cultural and urban regeneration.

Dave O'Brien looked at the question from a different angle:

Rather than to think, "Is this a proper framework?" "Will it be useful?," I say we are in a context where these culture-led regeneration projects will happen anyway, whether they offer participation, offer to the citizens a sense of control, whether they offer cultural rights or not, they will happen anyway. And I think what is striking with this particular work that UNCHARTED has done is the Barcelona concepts. . . . Nearly 30 years ago there was this discussion around about a Barcelona model, and models are really important, not just to the academic literature but to the imagination of policymakers. . . . The crucial thing here is to give a sense that the Barcelona model is not something that stopped in 1992, it is not something of "if you have an Olympics and a good kind of a tourist brand, then you can use culture to transform your place." It is to say that the Barcelona model has a long-term history, it has had several iterations, and the current evolution is one that provides this framework that offers much more participation, much more transparency, and it is designed to have effects that are not just economic, or the economic rewards do not just aggregate to one or two large institutions or large actors. So, my answer to the question is much more the sense of the opportunity to reframe the Barcelona model, because policymakers will still say things like "Look what happened to Barcelona, would not be great to copy Barcelona?," and . . . [this provides the opportunity] to say . . . "that language of doing Barcelona means something very different than an Olympics and a tourist brand" . . .; it is a chance to say, "there is a different Barcelona model." And if we call it the UNCHARTED Barcelona model, we can say it is very positive.

Notes

- 1 Eszter György and Gábor Oláh from ELTE carried out the Budapest case study.
- 2 Natália Azevedo, Lígia Ferro, Inês Maia, José Ricardo, and João Teixeira Lopes from the University of Porto were involved in the analysis of the Porto case.

References

- Campbell, P., Cox, T., & O'Brien, D. (2017). The social life of measurement: How methods have shaped the idea of culture in urban regeneration. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 10(1), 49–62.

- Colombo, A., & Font, M. (2020). *Fàbriques de Creació. Objectius comuns i indicadors per al diagnòstic de la realitat d'acció*. Ajuntament de Barcelona.
- Evans, G. (2003). Hard-branding the cultural city—from Prado to Prada. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(2), 417–440.
- Falanga, R., & Nunes, M. C. (2021). Tackling urban disparities through participatory culture-led urban regeneration: Insights from Lisbon. *Land Use Policy*, 108, 105478.
- García, B. (2004a). Cultural policy and urban regeneration in Western European cities: Lessons from experience, prospects for the future. *Local Economy*, 19(4), 312–326.
- García, B. (2004b). Urban regeneration, arts programming and major events: Glasgow 1990, Sydney 2000 and Barcelona 2004. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), 103–118.
- Grodach, C. (2016). Arts, gentrification, and planning for creativity. *Carolina Planning Journal*, 41, 22–29.
- Hermant, E., & Latour, B. (1998). *Paris, ville invisible*. Les empêcheurs de penser en rond—La Découverte.
- Landry, C., & Bianchini, F. (1995). *The creative city*. Demos.
- Lees, L., & Melhuish, C. (2015). Arts-led regeneration in the UK: The rhetoric and the evidence on urban social inclusion. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 22(3), 242–260.
- Lloyd, R. (2010). *Neo-Bohemia: Art and commerce in the postindustrial city*. Routledge.
- Oakley, K. (2015). *Creating space: A re-evaluation of the role of culture in regeneration*. Research Report.
- Paddison, R., & Miles, R. S. (Eds.). (2020). *Culture-led urban regeneration*. Routledge.
- Rodríguez Morató, A. (2005). La reinvencción de la política cultural a escala local: el caso de Barcelona. *Sociedade e Estado*, 20, 351–376.
- Rodríguez Morató, A., & Zarlenga, M. I. (2018). Culture-led urban regeneration policies in the Ibero-American space. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 24(5), 628–646.
- Sánchez Belando, V. (2017). Building alternatives to the creative turn in Barcelona: The case of the socio-cultural centre Can Batlló. *City, Culture and Society*, 8, 35–42.
- Zamorano, M. M. (2023). Cultural policies in Madrid and Barcelona during the “governments of change” (2015–2019): Toward a post-creative city? In C. Mathieu & V. Visanich (Eds.), *Accomplishing cultural policy in Europe* (pp. 19–34). Routledge.
- Zapata-Barrero, R. (Ed.). (2015). *Interculturalism in cities: Concept, policy and implementation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Zukin, S. (1982). *Loft living: Culture and capital in urban change*. Johns Hopkins University Press.