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PREFACE

Since the start in 2002 the Department of Culture Studies (Tema Kultur och samhälle, Tema Q) has been a site for broad interdisciplinary cultural research and today a leading research environment within this expanding field. The essays by Mattias Legnér tie together under the title *Historic Rehabilitation of Industrial Cities: Cases from North American and Swedish Cities* in this volume tackle vital aspects of urban planning and cultural heritage, with emphasis on the preservation and reshaping of the industrial cultural heritage. Today, this heritage is a prime rallying point for cultural policy and urban planning, where those who plan or develop urban spaces have no prescience of cultural dynamics or aspects. It is, among other things, this that is highlighted in the present volume.

Gathered in the way they are in this volume the essays display a comparative approach to questions on urban planning and cultural policy, comparing strategies of rehabilitation of industrial cities especially in Sweden and the United States. In this way, the rehabilitation of the industrial city of Norrköping is contrasted to equivalent processes in Baltimore Maryland and Durham in North Carolina, in the north and south of the United States respectively. As these cases show, heritage is not simply inherited, but constantly constructed and renewed. Thus, the preservation of heritage is always part of the production of something new. Besides, historic restoration and cultural conservation leave their own marks and traces on the sites of heritage. Another question concerns the attempt to convert life into heritage, or as in the cases explored in this volume: how to make places of industrial heritage into “living” places. In this sense, the understanding of history is confronted with the contemporary use of places and buildings. As shown in this volume, the outcome of this dialectic is commonly the result of local policies and dynamics. In this way, the dialectic between national cultural policies and local practices in the reconstruction of places...
and buildings, as well as cultural values, is also displayed in the volume.

The questions dealt with in this gathering of essays will probably become more and more relevant with the growth of what might be designated as a heritage-inflected economy and urban planning. The Department of Culture Studies (Tema Q) will continue to explore these questions and they are also highlighted in other research projects at the department. This continuation will be possible thanks to a grant from the foundation Forskning och framtid, edified in collaboration between Linköping university, the municipality of Norrköping and the local business world. And this grant has also been a prerequisite for the publication of the present volume.

Norrköping December 2008

Erling Bjurström

Head of Department of Culture Studies

**INTRODUCTION**

This paper is the result of a fellowship at Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies, co-funded by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond in Sweden, allowing the author to compare policies and practices of historic preservation in the U.S. and Sweden. A second co-funder was Culture Studies (Tema Q) at Linköping University.

One purpose with the fellowship was to compare the preservation and rehabilitation of an industrial district in the city of Norrköping with interesting counterparts located in the U.S. It was natural to pick one case from Baltimore, Maryland, with its traumatizing experiences of deindustrialization and disinvestment, covering the time period from the 1950s and well into the 1990s. Secondly, Baltimore could also represent historic preservation in northern USA. Another case, being of a comparative character, would be picked in order to represent southern USA. The choice fell on Durham, North Carolina, a considerably smaller town than Baltimore but of a size and character that was comparable to Norrköping. Except for looking at these cities, I also visited Raleigh, Richmond, Wilmington, Philadelphia, New York, Washington D.C., and Providence, not only studying what was happening in derelict urban environments but also speaking to local developers, planners and preservationists.

Surveying and comparing national policies is one part of the purpose but not the sole one. That could easily have been done without visiting the U.S. Instead, one idea with the paper is that national policy only influences rehabilitation projects to a certain degree. Are the local practices of city and state governors, planners and developers perhaps more important for the end results and the consequences of urban redevelopment than policies? I would like to suggest this to begin with. One could easily become an expert on national policymaking without ever gaining a deeper understanding of why rehabilitation projects turn out the way they do. Rehabilitation of the built environment in cities has to be studied at the local level in order to be more fully understood. This means that we have to take into consideration not only government policies on
planning and preservation, but also a more fine-grained knowledge about the history and physical development of places. How, for example, do we explain cities such as Baltimore and Durham have met the experiences of disinvestment quite differently, despite having had access to much the same (although not identical) policy frameworks?

To begin with, I should emphasize that I approach rehabilitation as a cultural phenomenon, instead of seeing it exclusively or even mainly as an economic or technical phenomenon. This means that the very concepts of rehabilitation, reuse, preservation and heritage are looked at, but also they way in which these concepts acquire meaning through public discourse. The perceptions of adaptive reuse are not universal: their origins are national and they have thus been shaped by national cultures. Practices, on the other hand, have found national, regional as well as local expressions.

The re-evaluation of a built environment is taking place not just as a consequence of economic factors but also within a cultural process. Previously vacant industrial buildings do not just become attractive again without any reason: in order to understand why developers find it meaningful to reuse old brick buildings, I would argue that we could just as well address issues of taste and material culture (by studying the growing appreciation of worn brick facades, the discourse on environmentalism and energy conservation etc.), as we could address the economic or political aspects which is usually the most common perspective among scholars. This means that physical structures are actively attributed new meanings through redevelopment.

Blighted properties are today becoming symbols of culture, creativity and regeneration through the actions of property owners, developers and politicians. One conclusion to be drawn from this argument is that the built environment is consciously interpreted and manipulated by these agents in order to make buildings and their surroundings attractive to investment from real estate dealers and private property owners, but often also to a visitor economy. The social and economic needs of the neighborhood are often given a lower priority because of their relative lack of capital and political influence. This is not surprising in itself, but it should be emphasized in the beginning of a paper such as this.

The paper is divided into six chapters. These chapters stand relatively free from one another, but they follow a structure beginning in theory and academic traditions of writing about urban environments, ending in three empirical case studies. "Historic design and urban redevelopment" is largely a discussion of Anglo-Saxon research on urban design and historic preservation carried out since the 1980s. The Marxist rhetoric of urban studies of the 1980s and 1990s is scrutinized. American preservation policies and views on reuse are treated in "U.S. policies on rehabilitation", highlighting the use of historic districts in Baltimore City as a way of attracting investment into declining neighborhoods with an abundance of historically valuable, redundant buildings. The historic shift from emphasizing new construction to preserving urban fabrics is traced and explained through an empirical study of the long-lasting, touring exhibition "Buildings Reborn".

In the chapters "The historic rehabilitation of Clipper Mill, Baltimore" and "The American Tobacco Historic District" two case studies of how industrial sites from the nineteenth century were reused in the beginning of the twenty-first century are examined and discussed. The impact of historic preservation policies is treated in particular. Emphasis is on the interpretation of the site's history and how it affects the reuse. The American cases are followed by the Swedish case of Norrköping, which is carried out more in detail and traces historically the impact of historic preservation policy from the 1970s to the early 1990s. In the final chapter, "Concluding reflections", the empirical results of the case studies are discussed in the light of the arguments in this introduction.

HISTORIC DESIGN AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

The re-imaging of cities

The Marxist approach to inner city development in the late twentieth century has enjoyed a great influence on the British literature of human geography and urban studies. Two of the most prominent representatives of this “school” are David Harvey and Sharon Zukin. Let me first introduce the thinking of Harvey: With the move from the industrial, managerial city to the post industrial, entrepreneurial city, city governors have become more focused on channeling capital flows than on redistribution of income and of maintaining a high level of welfare. This has been the conclusion not only of Harvey but also of Logan and Molotch in their highly influential work Urban Fortunes.2

All of these authors wrote against the Thatcher and Reagan governments in the 1980s. They, together with other authors such as Hall and Hubbard, suggested that the entrepreneurial shift had characterized urban development both in North American and West European cities, even though the processes have had significant local differences. One notable difference was that U.S. cities had been forced to create so called growth coalitions with business leaders due to fiscal weakness, while in the U.K. and other European countries the local state had not been “captured” by coalitions of private capital.3

At the same time as this critical view developed on how cities (much like companies) were becoming managed rather than governed, the authors also recognized that the urban landscape had

---

become much more important to manage than before the 1980s. Simply put, it was deemed of crucial importance by many governors how a city was perceived by “outsiders” such as tourists, creative professionals and business leaders. This was especially the case in industrial cities wishing to make the transition to a postindustrial economy.

Following these academic and highly critical works on urban development in the 1980s, a number of subsequent studies in the U.S. focused on how cities in practice attempted to adapt to the changing political and financial landscape. Whites, Lammers, Strom and others studied factors that were said to have great influence on large companies relocating to other cities. The lifestyle and leisure of managers and business people was examined, beginning in the late 1980s. These writings were of little relevance to the Marxist tradition of Harvey and Zukin, other than merely confirming their observations. Authors accepted rather than criticized these circumstances, stating over and over again how important it had become for cities with an economy in a transitional state to develop its cultural identity.

Culture and heritage, widely defined in a way so that both high and low culture are included, can be seen as the core of the “urban experience”, at least if those who experience belong to the middle and upper classes of society. It is important to stress that the observations of scholars or anyone else is not objective or neutral. Instead, it is the result of a choice (conscious or unconscious) of perspective. Urban environments are experienced in an infinite number of ways, of course, so when authors talk of “the urban experience” or “the attractions of a city” one should be aware of their own perspective or gaze. With whose eyes are they making observations about a city?

Who is actually experiencing or feeling the attraction? Historically, artists and culture have thrived in larger cities, but they have seldom been supported by city government. In later years, however, culture has become a growing sector which authorities and associations seek to manage, guide and exploit. Coalitions between arts associations, business and civic leaders have become piecemeal in larger cities. Culture, some authors tell us, is at the heart of the future of cities in the post industrial age when services have become a more important sector of the economy than manufacturing. Cities which used to have an industrial character have made great strides to instead become known as cultural and cosmopolitan centers if not the whole world, then at least a good part of it.

DOWNTOWN BALTIMORE

This change from an industrial to a cultural “profile” has been accompanied by extensive downtown development projects. Instead of just marketing the image of a city, urban leaders are increasingly trying to create environments which will attract tourists and by itself give the city a “rep” among visitors. Marketing through logos and brochures are relatively cheap, but is often not seen as enough when cities are facing escalating regional and global competition. In Baltimore there was the Inner Harbor project begun in 1962, dominating downtown development in the 1970s and 1980s. David Harvey points to 1978 as a transition-point in Baltimore development, when public-private partnership policies became
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6 Whitt, pp. 18-19.

7 A few examples of such cities in Western Europe are Glasgow, Manchester, Barcelona and Baltimore.
accepted with a decision to build Harborplace. Baltimore politicians and developers wanted not just to market but actually build from scratch a new, attractive downtown.

In Baltimore there was a growth coalition between developers and the city where the goal was to make the inner city attractive for living and consumption again, following serious race riots in the late 1960s that accelerated the white middle class exodus to the suburbs. This emigration of the middle class was reinforced by blockbusting activities as black workers increasingly moved in from the South, causing a long term housing shortage in the inner parts of the city.

Since then, Baltimore has deindustrialized to a great extent while tourism has risen to become the third largest industry in the city. "Civic pride", as defined by a small urban elite, is reinforced through flagship regeneration projects such as the Inner Harbor project in Baltimore, or the downtown renaissance in Providence. This kind of spectacular, large-scale and high-risk projects, such as London's Docklands, Canary Wharf or Spitalfields Market, or South Street Seaport in New York, was heavily criticized by radical scholars of the early 1990s for "deflecting debates surrounding the actual desirability of redevelopment". Urban design was intimately associated with the politics of place-marketing and actively used to make entrepreneurial forms of governance appear more legitimate to the public.

According to Harvey, one purpose of the trend from uniform architectural styles to eclectic and unique postmodern styles of urban design is an attempt by city governors to assert an individual identity needed to fight competition from other, similar cities. This new landscape of consumption represents both a revitalized economy and increased civic pride, reducing the local people's feelings of alienation and exclusion caused by globalization. Harvey, of course, is seriously critical to what he thinks is a game of mind-warping manipulation by city governors desperate for investment.

Well before Harvey commented on development in downtown Baltimore, however, Levine wrote a critical piece on the dualism caused by partnerships between the city and developers:

Baltimore has become “two cities”: a city of developers, suburban professionals, and “back-to-the-city” gentry who have ridden the downtown revival to handsome profits, good jobs, and conspicuous consumption; and a city of impoverished blacks and displaced manufacturing workers, who continue to suffer from shrinking economic opportunities, declining public services, and neighborhood distress. This dualism — caused by uneven development in many American cities — was somewhat later described by Mollenkopf and Castells, who explored the effects of increased polarization and a deepening
of the dual nature of urban labor market. A growing number of people are employed for catering low-paid services to an elite of high-paid people engaged in the creative economy of postindustrial cities.

One could, however, ponder over the possible alternative developments for these cities. They were indeed experiencing serious economic and social problems long before Levine, Mollenkopf or Castells wrote about them, and the proclaimed dualism of Baltimore with its racial segregation and high crime levels was a fact even before the 1980s redevelopment of the Inner Harbor. It is hardly fair to put all the blame for the negative consequences of economic development on governors who attempt to attract investors into the city, or on the investors who actually pump capital into the city, thereby creating new jobs and raising property values (which is an important source of revenues for cities in the U.S., and nowadays also in Sweden).

Heritage, Culture and Marketing in the Contemporary City

Closely attached to the remaking of the urban economy is the remodeling of the imagined urban landscape. Scholars, just as well as (or much more than) politicians, often work with the city as it may be imagined, rather than experienced. Concepts such as the move from an "industrial to a post industrial economy" has become such a buzz word that it has in practice been emptied of all meaning. I will not just use that terminology but instead only refer to it as other scholars have used it. One author who wrote about the conceptual transition "from an industrial to a service economy" in the 1990s, said that cities must reimage themselves and provide themselves with a new iconography displaying messages of attractiveness and success. What this actually means, and who is doing it, is of course much harder to say. The people of a city doesn't simply "reimage" themselves or think about how the "iconography" of their city may be improved. It is rather the mindwork of consultants, politicians and other members of an urban elite.

In this respect, authors at the end of the twentieth century spoke about "new cultural intermediaries", meaning that the idea that culture and the arts were important for the image of the city was increasingly promoted by artists, media professionals and intellectuals. An urban historian such as Ward, looking at the development of city marketing throughout the twentieth century, said at this time that the transformation of place into a commodity where money is being spent on experiences had become central to the management of cities:

The place is packaged and sold as commodity. Its multiple social and cultural meanings are selectively appropriated and repackaged to create a more attractive place image in which any problems are played down.

This is a way of criticizing the new cultural policies of cities by using a Marxist perspective. But do city governors really control the image making of a city? The counter argument that the influence of public governance over marketing is limited, could easily be made. Taking the argument a bit further, it would be possible to say that this - the loss of public influence and tools to manage local economic development - is an important part of the commodification

of urban space. In reality, place-making and place-marketing campaigns will often be ignored, resisted or re-interpreted in other ways than anticipated by consultants, civil servants and politicians.

The resistance against city imaging and marketing ploys actually constitutes a field ripe for academic exploration today. This paper will try to show how images of redevelopment may become challenged and reinterpreted by interests which do not necessarily share the same views of development as politicians and developers do.

At this point I should make a quick stop to reflect on the dominant views of prior research on place-making. The dominating view in Anglo-Saxon social and cultural studies has been the Marxist, in which city governors and developers often are seen as manipulating the mind of the public in order to make unnecessary development immune to criticism. Belonging to this view, broadly speaking, are both Harvey's already mentioned critique of the entrepreneurialist mode, and Zukin's view that culture functions as a tool by which capitalist social and economic relations are recreated. In her ground breaking work *Loft Living* (1982) on gentrification in New York City, Zukin has stated that the rebuilding of "the inner city in a theatrical image of the urban past demands both a reduction and a romanticising of the city's industrial workforce". Developers and governors are thus seen as forming coalitions with the intention of making an urban milieu of private or semi-private spaces made for easy consumption.

Boyer, an architectural historian, aligned herself with Zukin when she later (1992) stated that the aim with recreating historical environments in cities is "theatrical". This was controversial statement, since few people think they live in a theatre. Boyer, as a materialist historian, implies that an historically authentic representation of the environment could have been produced. Determining authenticity (if seen as an "historically correct representation"), however, in conservation projects is a problem without an easy solution. As Muños Vías recently has argued, a contemporary conservationist often "stresses the relevance of subjective, personal tastes, biases and needs when it comes to conservation decision-making". Examining why and how certain design solutions were decided upon would thus be more relevant than attempting to pin down the level of authenticity in an urban environment.

Boyer later (1994) argued for a "postmodern return to history" that became important when trying to explain why historic images were co-opted by politicians in European and American cities in the 1970s and 1980s. She suggested that political leaders in the United States were more or less traumatized by suffering experiences of the civil rights movement, the Vietnam War and the dissolution of family values. Modernism became the target for different kinds of accusations, not least for rejecting the stability and traditions of the past:

A past connected to the present across the gaping maw of modernism, visual memories sweetened and mystified by the haze of time and codified as fashionable styles and images – these could be manipulated to release the tensions that social change and political protests, uneven economic and urban development had wrought, and instead these styles and images could be used to
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19 Conversation with Professor Ronan Paddison, Department of Human Geography, University of Glasgow, during an international symposium on urban "cultural quarters" organized by M. Légère, Visby, Sweden, 10-12 September 2008.


recapture a mood of grandeur, importance, heroism, and action that appeared to have been lost forever.24

One problem with seeing culture as something that detracts attention from the social problems of cities, however, is that culture is viewed not as a dynamic force shaping society, but solely as a way of consuming experiences. In Boyer’s perspective, historical urban design is only intended for the “pleasure and spectacle” of passing visitors.25 But cities are not just sitting and waiting to be used as toys for amusement. Urban landscapes are functional, working and dynamic environments which do not easily lend themselves to be used for theatrical purposes.

Seeing historical architecture in cities as mere “theater” is to disqualify the potential of the viewer to make his or her own interpretations. Recent Swedish research has stressed the need to take into account the views of groups often given a marginal importance in urban development politics, such as youth or ethnic minorities. In an ethnographic study of the Industrial Landscape in Norrköping, the graffiti painting activities of teenagers within this space were studied, showing that spaces officially intended for leisure and consumption are used in ways not anticipated by planners and developers.26 A more recent example is Marianne Råberg’s study of the politics of the management of Stockholm’s built heritage through the twentieth century.27

Facadism – Tidying up the Mess of History?

The 1980s and 1990s views in which cultural representations of development are seen as entirely driven by capital and profit interest can be said to have dominated research on urban redevelopment, regardless whether we look to American, British or Australian academic works. In Australia, a scholar such as Wendy Shaw has been critical of the postmodern architectural trend called “facadism”, meaning that the historical context of a building or site is consciously obliterated, leaving just a “prettied up” place suitable for instant gentrification.28 Also other Australian scholars on gentrification have promoted the notion that only those kinds of heritage which can easily be consumed will survive. Alternative stories from the artifactual past tend to become lost.29

According to Shaw’s view, developers focus on the products previously manufactured at the site when manipulating its images, downplaying the fact that this used to be a place of labor and other human relations. Examples of this can be found in Baltimore: an ongoing redevelopment on Eastern Avenue where luxury condos costing at least $400,000 are proposed, goes under the name “The Shoe Factory”, and a complex of former brewery buildings redeveloped a couple of years is called “Brewers Hill” and marketed with the help of the logo of a renowned but long gone beer brand, National Bohemian.

A similar dystopian view is evident in cultural studies of redevelopment in British cities30, even though the opposite – an

inherently positive and uncritical view of redevelopment – has also been evident in the U.K. From the later perspective, the reconstruction of a site is viewed solely as a practical problem – how to make it feasible – and not one of conflicting representations or interests. The overall critical stance towards issues of authenticity, however, is something I sympathize with and will elaborate below.

One constructive way of finding alternative ways of interpreting the multiple meanings of industrial heritage, as Cathy Stanton previously has shown in her study of Lowell, Massachusetts, has been to use anthropological method.

**EXAMPLES OF RECENT SWEDISH SCHOLARSHIP**

Even though it had a profound influence on urban studies in the 1980s and even the 1990s, the Marxist structuralist approach is today a too deterministic way of interpreting how cultural policies work in contemporary cities. Culture, defined broadly, should not be seen as just exploited by capital in order to maximize profit, but instead we should perceive culture and cultural policy as a dynamic force actively manipulated by different agents such as developers, city governors or neighborhood associations.

This is a way of acknowledging that not only the developers’ or planners’ experiences of the urban landscape should count in redevelopment projects. As Bo Öhrström has pointed out, brownfields redevelopment tends to give developers a lot of say because the sites most often are abandoned, as opposed to residential areas where the stakeholders are much more apparent. This is a democratic problem because the new users’ views of the place become dominant if the community is not involved in a dialogue from the beginning.35 This is also illustrated through cases of industrial heritage development in Anna Storm’s thesis Hope and Rust from 2008.36

Swedish research has begun to emphasize more the need to take into account a diversity of users – such as youth, artists, small entrepreneurs – when planning for redevelopment, playing down the importance of spectacular architecture or very costly flagship projects.37 Quoting Öhrström again, rehabilitation of industrial sites should be planned step by step, listening to a plurality of local interests rather than just seeking to maximize property values: “successful regeneration has to go step by step, fulfilling the needs of local people”.

**AUTHENTICITY IN HISTORIC REHABILITATION**

Instead of seeing the past of a place as something objectively existing, waiting to be unveiled and discovered, we should see interpretations of the past as a process of negotiation. Contrary to what Shaw says about the hegemonic power of capitalism and consumerism to determine the way we look at the past, it would be preferable to say that interpretations of a place’s past are not determined by a collection of artifacts. Instead the past is interpreted

---

36 Anna Storm, Hope and Rust. Reinterpreting the industrial place in the late 20th century, KTH, Stockholm 2008.
through an ongoing discourse between participants with differing intentions and perspectives. It is necessary to go beyond the view "that culture is for élites, or that cities are now only places for consumption instead of production". Culture should not be seen as a theatre or a facade with the sole purpose of cloaking the intentions of urban development and for increasing luxury consumption. Urban culture should rather be interpreted as a contextual framework influencing decisions made by developers, architects, planners and investors on issues of architectural representations, such as how historical authenticity should be handled in specific projects. Dealing with pasts in a redevelopment is a process of uneven negotiations between officials, developers and property owners.

This choice does not mean just selecting agency over structure when looking for a theoretical perspective. Rather, much like Anthony Giddens I want to assign the "ideas and values people hold about what they should build" the same importance as economic resources available for development or the politico-judicial rules limiting development.

**U.S. POLICIES OF REHABILITATION**

**The Terminology**
Adaptive reuse has been defined as "the process of converting a building to a use other than that for which it was designed". Reuse can be problematic from a number of perspectives. It can be seen from a developer’s point of view, an architect’s or a city planner’s, just to name the most obvious actors involved in reuse and rehabilitation. From an intellectual point of view, the term "reuse" itself is actually not very helpful if one wants to gain a deeper understanding for what happens when an old structure is adapted and given new functions.

Neither does the term "rehabilitation", as used by the National Park Service, help us much in efforts to gain a deeper understanding. It is defined as "the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural or architectural values". The difference from the definition of "reuse" above is basically that the new use is also supposed to be "compatible" with the old one.

**Problems of Reuse**
Despite this brief description of the concepts of reuse and rehabilitation, we have still not delved very deeply into the needs of reuse or its consequences. Has not reuse always been around? Why has reuse increasingly come into focus for preservationists? Reuse as a phenomenon described in the definition given above is an old practice, and lacks novelty. Ever since the industrial revolution,
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industrial buildings have been reused for other purposes than they were built. 45 Developers are furthermore interested in making profit, and preserving a building may not always seem economically feasible. Historically, developers have often been pitted against preservationists because of differing views of development and new construction. This is an uneven fight since developers are financially strong while preservationists often are represented by nonprofit organizations with very limited resources. Preservationists have traditionally had to rely on advocacy and legislation to reach their goal of nourishing a social climate where preservation of the built environment is valued highly. The biggest fights between developers and preservationist have been fought over downtown development project where plans call for historic buildings to be replaced by highrise buildings or highways.

In textbooks students of preservationism may be asked to take a cynical stance toward development instead of trying to find common ground. 46 In reality, however, planning departments and state historic preservation officers are most grateful for developers who wish to take on development in blighted neighborhoods. 47 Industrial areas with vacant warehouses and factories, perhaps located in the geographical periphery of a city, might be a much more attractive site for developers than an old office building or theatre downtown, where costs are much higher and resistance from preservationists is likely to be strong.

Today developers can make use of different government programs when redeveloping brownfields. Brownfields are "unused or abandoned properties that are either polluted or perceived to be polluted as a result of past commercial or industrial use and are not attractive to the current real estate market." 48 If the buildings have been marked as historically interesting, there might be funding for preserving exterior or interior parts of them. There might also be funding for cleaning up pollution.

**Restoring Brownfields**

The rehabilitation of these often very unattractive and low valued sites, called "brownfields", has become an important task for U.S. environmental policy. As a result of global economic transformation, the number of vacant industrial sites is growing all the time. The Environmental Protection Agency has estimated the number of brownfield sites in the United States to more than 450,000. 49 This number is not yet decreasing. Industrial society has thus created, and continues to contribute, with heavily polluted and unusable locations often located inside or close to larger cities where population density is very high and where land use needs to become more efficient.

This is why rehabilitating historic brownfield sites in urban areas is becoming an increasingly important task for postindustrial society. A basic problem is that these sites are no longer, or rarely, useful for industrial purposes. As the economy in most parts of the Western world transforms from manufacturing to services, these buildings need to be transformed, and that is where the task becomes difficult. This is not a problem unique to the United States in any way but is a growing issue in Sweden and elsewhere. Most often, governments do not have the funding to finance the adaptation and reuse of brownfields. Instead all or at least most of the investment has to come from the for-profit sector, but in order to make these sites attractive for investors, governments often need to provide incentives and support in different forms.
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A brownfield can be restored in a number of ways. First the site is cleaned of contamination according to zoning requirements, and this is often very costly for the property owner. In many cases it is not possible to evaluate the needed investment for cleaning before the work has started. If the site is to become a residential area, requirements are higher than if it is going to be used for other purposes. The reason is that children are going to play there and therefore it should not be dangerous to consume the soil. Office, retail or light manufacturing naturally puts lower requirements on cleaning.

There are basically three purposes with restoring a brownfield, but only one of them will be dealt with here. That is the purpose of reusing the existing structures for new functions in order to raise property values and make the site economically feasible once again. Sometimes this means adding some new construction as well, and tearing down some of the existing. This is also the purpose generally associated with adaptive reuse.50

A second purpose can be to fund the preservation of the building, for example by turning it into a house museum. This is quite an exclusive purpose and only a few structures are so historically interesting that they can be turned into museums. The third purpose is to clean the land in order to make it possible for development again, thereby razing existing structures and raising completely new ones. This paper is concerned with historic preservation issues and will not deal with this third purpose.

Literature on historic preservation and rehabilitation rarely, if ever, discusses the new functions of adapted sites or their consequences for environment and society. Preservationists generally first become interested in a site when it has become the target of redevelopment, and their interest diminishes quickly when the building has been treated in compliance with preservation standards. Most often they are concerned only with the architectural qualities of the building, sometimes even only the qualities of exteriors, leaving the interior to be designed according to the developer's wishes. Sometimes the compatibility of the new function can pose a problem for rehabilitation, especially when industrial buildings are turned into apartments and the developer wants to add exterior details that will increase the attractions of the building, such as balconies or walkways.

One problem that never is discussed in books on preservation is the fact that industrial buildings rarely are interesting from an architectural point of view. Historic preservation on the other hand is obsessed with the idea of historical epochs of architecture. Only a few industrial buildings have been drawn by prominent architects or can be identified as belonging to an epoch recognized by architectural historians. How an old industrial building can be evaluated as an historic object is a preservation issue, but finding ways of adapting it in a compatible way might be even harder. Warehouses, workshops and factories often have in common with churches and theatres very large interior spaces that are not easily reused. Achieving continuity in the use of a building is often complicated,52 since developers rarely want to use industrial buildings for industrial production or storage.

**Attitudes toward adaptive reuse**

The practice of reuse was not discussed publicly in the United States before the 1960s when urban planning was increasingly criticized and the American economy was going through profound transformations. Even though reuse had been carried out for a long time, it had not been identified and analyzed as a specific form of development earlier. A discourse on adaptive reuse was born through the “discovery” of a number of successful development projects in the 1960s and 1970s. In preservationist discourse, the success story
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50 Olshammar, pp. 104–105.
52 Murtagh, p. 120.
which has been retold most often is probably the reuse of two 19th
century market places in Boston during the 1970s, Faneuil Hall and
Quincy Market, and Baltimore’s Inner Harbor which was
redeveloped beginning in 1962. Neither Boston, Baltimore nor
Ghirardelli Square in San Francisco were remarkable as projects of
historic preservation, but were instead inscribed as great successes in
the history of redevelopment and reuse because of the economic
“wonders” they created.

CHANGING VIEWS IN THE 1970s

Attitudes to reuse changed in government departments and in public
discourse during the 1970s. One reason was that flagship projects in
several cities had proven to be commercial successes, increasing
cultural tourism and general interest for the city. In 1979 the director
of the Chicago Department of Planning declared that:

Attitudes toward the importance of adaptive reuse have made a
180-degree turn. Government clearly feels an obligation to protect
the historic heritage of people by preserving historic buildings
[...].

That same year Smithsonian opened a large travelling exhibition
called “Buildings Reborn: new uses, old places” which told the story of
buildings in cities finding new uses that were of benefit to the public. The architectural historian Barbaralee Diamonstein published
a book with the same title and she was also the one who designed the
exhibition. It was basically a list of good examples of reuse found
throughout the country, with pictures and descriptions of the history
and reuse of the sites.

The exhibit “Buildings Reborn” was from the beginning planned
to be exhibited in 22 cities during a three-year period, visiting cities
like New York City, Providence, Washington, D.C. and Chicago
(where it first opened), but the last exhibit in the U.S. ended as late
as October 1985. Then the exhibit apparently went abroad to
Canada. Judging by the records kept in the Smithsonian Institution
Archives, then, the exhibition must be said to have been a huge
success. It is reasonable to assume that the exhibit must have had at
least some impact on the public discourse on adaptive reuse in the
United States. At the least, the exhibit reflected an increased public
interest in adaptive reuse.

Besides the fact that it was shown in cities throughout the country,
the exhibit was accompanied by programs of guided city walks,
public seminars and symposiums. An example of this was an all-day
symposium organized by the Smithsonian Resident Associate
Program in Washington, D.C. on April 5, 1979, the same day that the
exhibit was opened in the Renwick Gallery. Panels and lectures
were held by prominent officials and politicians on topics like “The
Economics of Reuse”, “Public Policy on Adaptive Reuse” and
“Aesthetic Attitudes toward Reuse”. Symposiums like this one show
that the exhibit was not only intended to be a celebration of
adaptive reuse, but also to spur serious debate about this
phenomenon.

Pamphlets with maps showing successful examples of adaptive
reuse in at least the cities of New York, Chicago and Washington,
D.C. were handed out to visitors. The exhibit toured to no less than
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21 sites only in New York State. The exhibit was also advertised and reviewed in a large number of newspapers and journals, and, as already mentioned, a book by a well known architectural historian was published simultaneously.

The book, published during the Carter administration when new efforts were made to formulate efficient environmental policies, was prefaced by the prominent Democratic legislator John Brademas, who defined this book as a support for Carter’s politics on historic preservation and environment.

Exactly what was new with the reuse of historic buildings according to Diamonstein? As mentioned above, the history of adaptive reuse in one way goes all the way back to the Industrial Revolution. None the less it was seen as a novelty by writers in the United States of the 1970s. Why was that? To begin with, Diamonstein said that as recently as the early 1960s “preservation was an esoteric concern, the subject of low-key letter-writing campaigns, polite protest meetings, and little more.”

Diamonstein went on to describe how the preservation movement grew in the following years, coming to the conclusion that “preservation has increased nationally in large measure by way of recycling - a practical means of preservation available to the smallest town, the most modest commercial enterprise”. Reuse did not just have consequences for architecture and preservation but represented a part of a “widespread social revolution occurring”. One new side of adaptive reuse, then, was its sheer quantity - that it quickly was becoming more common and was done on more conscious grounds. But there were also other novelties with reuse.

One important aspect was without doubt the rejection of modernism. Diamonstein had interviewed urban designer Jonathan Barnett, later the author of a number of books on planning and design, who said that the movement of adaptive reuse could be interpreted as a way of architectural criticism. Rejecting modern design in favor of historical ones represented a change in popular tastes, a trend that soon would become known as postmodernism.

More and more, people seem to prefer what the past had to offer in the way of handcrafts, custom design of hardware and moldings, attention to details (newness still prevails, though, when it comes to choosing appliances.)

As the author implies in this quote, the rejection of modern design only applied to architecture, and mostly only the exteriors, and not to the inventories and appliances in buildings. On the outside, reused buildings would reflect the past, but on the inside they were preferred to be very modern in order to make life for its inhabitants as convenient as possible. The rejection of modernist design, then, was only partial.

When Diamonstein tried to explain why adaptive reuse had evolved into a movement, she stressed six factors. Interestingly, they were all reactions to prior developments in the 1950s and 60s, which means that adaptive reuse largely was defined as a way of rejecting and resisting a course that society had taken after World War II. One of these factors was of course the urban renewal programs that razed many inner cities in the United States, often ignoring the historic values of buildings. Urban renewal represented white flight, decaying downtowns, growing crime and alienation but also a loss of sense of place and neighborhood character. Urban renewal was soon resisted in many cities by activists who fought for the preservation of their neighborhood or for the environment.

Remarkably but perhaps symptomatically, Diamonstein never mentioned the New York activist Jane Jacobs once in her
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introduction. In a European book on the same subject, Jacob’s bestseller *Death and Life of Great American Cities* from 1961 would surely have been cited at least once. Diamonstein’s reluctance to grant Jacobs any importance might be seen as support for a statement that has been suggested earlier, meaning that Jacobs’ standing in the United States was very low. Her unofficial biographer Alexiou Alice Sparberg said that Jacobs, going against influential urban planners without having any formal higher education, was criticized for being a feminist radical defying American housewife virtues. By the time Diamonstein wrote her book, Jacobs was long gone from New York and the United States, having emigrated and settled in Toronto.

A third factor was that Americans were becoming more educated and had started to travel more. The knowledge society was giving its members new awareness of their history. Two other factors were the skittish economy of the 1960s and the early 1970s with rising unemployment rates, followed by the energy crisis beginning in 1973. Historic preservation was reconsidered as a way of giving new employment in the construction sector, lowering building cost and saving energy. The last factor was the decline of modernist architecture and the rise of postmodernism, although Diamonstein did not mention this explicitly.

Both the book and the exhibit put focus most on the architecture and aesthetics of reused buildings, rather than discussing their history or economics or the policies of reuse. This might in part be explained by Diamonstein’s professional background as an architectural historian. Among other things she discussed the risks of making the preserved environments too pretty. Gentrification was another issue she discussed in her introduction but exclusively from an aesthetic point of view, for example the overuse of exposed brick which she pointed out was not historically authentic. The wider implications of reused buildings – such as local economy or neighborhood change – were left out.

The “Buildings Reborn” exhibition.

Adaptive reuse as a symptom of social change

“Buildings Reborn” can be seen as a first attempt to write a history of a growing cultural activity in the United States, establishing a historical origin of this activity and trying to make sense of it by pointing to greater changes in contemporary society: the texts accompanying the before and after pictures of rehabilitated buildings told stories of deindustrialization, the coming of the knowledge society and the rise of postmodernism. An origin of the reuse phenomenon was placed in the mid-1960s, describing how the old Ghirardelli chocolate factory in San Francisco was saved from demolition in 1962, or how Faneuil Hall Marketplace was saved in
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1973 after "supermarkets and trucks had dated the market" by the 1950s. Before and after pictures were efficient aesthetic tools for showing the values of reuse: who could be critical of adaptive reuse when seeing how a run-down, previously attractive building was again turned into something beautiful and useful?

The main text panel introducing the exhibit explained the wider phenomenon of reuse that could not be explained by a single one of the 53 cases exhibited:

Adaptive re-use can only be explained as part of a more general social re-valuation occurring in the United States. This includes an awareness of our historic past, a realization that new need not mean better, a reconsideration of the meaning of progress, a respect for conservation, an appreciation of the handmade object, a susceptibility to nostalgia, the political and economic sophistication to make these values into forces of reform in many aspects of our lives.

The exhibit obviously managed to revitalize the public discourse on the subject of adaptive reuse. A number of articles from the late 1970s have been found that discussed the subject. Apparently, staff at the Smithsonian collected paper clippings from a collection of journals and magazines that published articles on the subject. Probably only a part of all relevant articles has been traced, but the selection might be seen as representative of the discourse at the time of the exhibit. Most publications just reproduced slightly edited versions of the press release, but a few went further and published their own pieces on the exhibit. These articles reinforced the message of the exhibit when saying that recent years had shown that old buildings did not have to be either destroyed or turned into landmarks, but that there was a third option — adaptive reuse — that could revitalize whole neighborhoods.

Diamonstein’s ultimate goal with her book and the exhibit — to lay the foundations for a national policy on the recycling of old buildings — was at least in part reached with the initiation of the Main Street Program in 1980. Perhaps more important was the fact that the preservation movement experienced a serious backlash during the Reagan administration of the 1980s.

**Policies of Reuse since 1976**

By the late 1970s adaptive reuse, then, had been widely accepted both by authorities and by developers in the United States. One important reason was the creation of a federal historic tax credit program in 1976 as part of the Tax Reform Act, and strengthened in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. Owners of historically designated buildings could apply for up to 25 percent rehabilitation tax credit depending on the building’s age and listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Preservation policy subsequently suffered during the Reagan administration, when the tax credit was cut to 20 percent in 1986, and a couple of other limits were put on the amount available. A cap allowing only $7,000 of credits to be used per year gutted the credit incentive considerably, and development in cities evidently decreased as a result of these limitations.

State and local governments have tried to compensate for the changes in the federal tax credit from 1986. In 1992, there were 37 states that offered some kind of tax relief to owners of historic properties. According to Maya Morris, there are three types of property tax relief of which one is the tax credit. The two others are
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property tax abatement that decreases or delays the property tax for a given time, and a property tax freeze which holds the property value at the prerehabilitation level. Of these, the tax credit seems to be the most common and important one.

Since 1986, state and city governments have evaluated their historic tax credit programs. In the 1980s and early 1990s critical voices meant that preservation was not economically sound and that it was of less public benefit than new construction. Nowadays there is however a broad agreement that the benefits outweigh the costs. Beginning in the 1990s, evaluations from places like Philadelphia (1991), Rhode Island (1994), New Jersey (1998) and New York City (2003) have shown that local historic districts raised property values. In 1998, a report from the Fannie May Foundation showed that preservation has advantageous multiplier effects, meaning that money spent on preservation rebounded through the local and state economy. Similar results come from Florida where a survey states that every dollar generated in preservation grants returned two dollars in direct revenues. A study from Maryland (2003) said one dollar of investment returned $1.30-5.02 during the years 2000-2001.

The Maryland program, however, was soon exposed to criticism due to its generosity, and a cap was put on the use of credits for commercial properties. From 1997 to 2001, Baltimore City properties received between 85 and 99 percent of applied credits for commercial properties. In 2002, that number drastically decreased to 55 percent due not only to the cap on the amount available for commercial projects ($3,000,000 per project) but also to a geographical cap limiting Baltimore City of using more than 50 percent of a year’s credits (Figure 1). Naturally, these two caps have had a cooling effect on historic rehabilitation in Baltimore city since 2002.

Historic rehabilitation credits have been seen as a temporary experiment in Maryland and was about to end in 2004. Due to successful lobbying from the nonprofit preservation organization on state level, however, it will survive at least until 2009.

In other states where the historic tax credit programs have not been as generous as in Maryland, such as in North Carolina or Rhode Island, there is no cap for commercial projects. The state of North Carolina, for example, divides a project’s tax credits over 5 or 10 years in order to decrease negative fiscal effects. It seems as if Maryland’s initial willingness to use preservation policy as a development tool struck back on itself, “the state basically gave away money to developers for rehabilitating historic structures”, causing the legislative assembly to retreat on this issue, and since 2002 no further changes have been made to the policy.

Historic preservation as a tool for urban development

In the last three decades the adaptive reuse of former industrial buildings has become a recognized way of revitalizing industrial cities in economic and social crisis in the United States. Alexander J. Reichl says that the potential of historic preservation as a strategy for commercial revitalization became apparent in the course of the
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Studies done by the federal government stimulated the use of preservation policy as a strategy for raising property values in inner cities and thereby increasing the local tax base. Using historic preservation for “cloaking” urban development was also seen as a way of decreasing the risk of political conflicts and creating consensus around downtown development, even if cultural development projects themselves might appear illegitimate in some cases. Preservation laws led to the introduction of a new commodity: transferable development rights, allowing owners of landmarks to sell unused development rights to owners of adjacent lots, making it possible for them to construct higher buildings.

Reuse has become not just a way of renewing local economy but also a way for crucial parts of the urban historic fabric to be preserved from demolition. Adaptation of industrial buildings is as old as the Industrial Revolution itself, but the discourse on adaptive reuse has taken a different turn since the 1960s. Contemporary discourse of reuse rests on the assumption that buildings are turned from industrial to postindustrial uses. The purpose is no longer just to create new jobs and to increase property values but also to enhance aesthetic qualities of the urban fabric.

Within this context the enhanced importance of historic preservation activities carried out in many American cities in recent years becomes understandable. Preservation policies can serve the need of the postindustrial city to create unique locations and boost the sense of place. They have been consciously utilized by city governors to fight disinvestment in inner city areas and to produce more attractive environments through restoration and rehabilitation. According to Wansborough and Mageean, this is actually the essence of postmodernism: it is all about concern for the continuity of traditions and “a sense of place, the local and particular”.

Reuse has become not just a way of renewing local economy but also a way for crucial parts of the urban historic fabric to be preserved from demolition. Adaptation of industrial buildings is as old as the Industrial Revolution itself, but the discourse on adaptive reuse has taken a different turn since the 1960s. Contemporary discourse of reuse rests on the assumption that buildings are turned from industrial to postindustrial uses. The purpose is no longer just to create new jobs and to increase property values but also to enhance aesthetic qualities of the urban fabric.

Within this context the enhanced importance of historic preservation activities carried out in many American cities in recent years becomes understandable. Preservation policies can serve the need of the postindustrial city to create unique locations and boost the sense of place. They have been consciously utilized by city governors to fight disinvestment in inner city areas and to produce more attractive environments through restoration and rehabilitation. According to Wansborough and Mageean, this is actually the essence


The most obvious expression in urban planning of this trend is the creation of cultural quarters or districts in cities, such as Temple Bar in Dublin or the Northern Quarter in Manchester. Cultural quarters tend to grow in historically preserved districts or neighborhoods, where gentrification has not yet kicked in. None the less, cultural quarters need careful planning and support in order to flourish. In the U.K., this way of nurturing the planning of cultural districts a bit at a time has sometimes been called urban stewardship, which is a “process of looking after and respecting a place, and helping it to
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help itself". In the U.S., however, this kind of integrated cultural planning is expressed in other ways and is usually weaker.

Developers have realized that brownfields, abandoned or underdeveloped ex-industrial sites, represent economic and cultural values. At the same time, local and state governments have initiated a large number of different incentive programs to support reuse of different kinds. The rise of environmental politics has further encouraged the cleaning and restoration of polluted sites, allowing them to be reused in new ways. From an environmental or green perspective, reuse is a way to hamper urban sprawl, decrease pollution from traffic, save open spaces, decrease demolition masses, and also to preserve historic urban cores and thus increase the quality of life in cities.

Today developers can make use of various government programs when redeveloping brownfields. If the buildings have been marked as historically interesting, there might be funding for preserving exterior or interior parts of them. There might also be funding for cleaning up pollution. In the state of Maryland, there is a voluntary clean-up program which protects a participating property owner from future federal and state litigations. In this way, redevelopment can be interpreted as a way of making cities greener (by supporting sustainability through cleaning up pollution and reducing transportation) and more "liveable" by preserving important heritage and at the same time making attractive residential and commercial space. New jobs are created within city limits and in time tax revenues hopefully will increase.

Public discontent is another risk connected to redevelopment. When the city engages in the cofunding of a project, there might not be a limit set from the beginning of how much the city will invest. A project that fails to attract tenants and investors might become a burden to the city. Furthermore, critics say that the public benefits that come out of these redevelopments (new jobs, more taxes, attractive and accessible public spaces) do not justify the often huge investments made.

There might also be other concerns to take into consideration when redeveloping. It seems that these projects often aggravate local residents and merchants. There can be several reasons for such local resistance against redevelopment projects. People might be concerned over increased traffic, that the constitution of the population will change (i.e. rich people will be moving in and less well-to-do locals will have to move out) – a process called gentrification – that the environment will be damaged, or that the history and heritage of the place will be lost. This resistance is to be taken seriously and not belittled.

However, there do not have to be conflicts between developers and the community. Development can, at least potentially, be seen as bringing values of different kinds to the local community: increased security and safety, improved infrastructure, more jobs and commercial facilities, but also the preservation of a threatened and perhaps even dangerous heritage, such as decaying buildings. Both developer and community have great responsibilities in creating dialogue and an atmosphere of cooperation.

In this way, values can be said to represent identities and collective memories. Locals may be attached to a place because of nostalgic memories and stories which are told about it, public officials and developers might instead see a bright future of prosperity in it, designers and architects want to express their genius and at the same time respect the integrity of the building, and so forth.
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SAVING THE PAST, REVITALIZING THE ECONOMY: CONFLICTING GOALS?

Historic preservation and rehabilitation have increasingly become tools for urban revitalization, instruments to boost the economy in areas hit hard by deindustrialization and social crisis. Since preservation is part of several incentive programs on the federal, state and city level, it might be justified to ask how it might contribute to not just saving jobs and raising property values but also the character and qualities of a community? Are historic preservation policies only a cover-up for subsidizing construction and renovation? This has to do with how the past of a place is used in development.

To begin with, the past is subjected to interpretations - at a certain point in time it is not given how the past of a building will be interpreted. We need only to look at the history of adaptive reuse to understand that buildings that at one moment were considered useless and destined for demolition, not much later would be reevaluated as having value by way of their history. A reinterpretation of their past suddenly prolonged their life and gave them a future.

It is important to ask questions of how this reevaluation of buildings occurs. How does a building go from being seen as a blight on the neighborhood to instead being seen as a cultural and economic resource? This is a question seldom, if ever, asked by preservationists or developers in the United States. “What is the relationship between economic development and historic preservation?”, as the editors of a recent anthology on historic preservation in the United States ask.²³

Preservation of the built environment has traditionally been a task for the private sector in the United States. Among important early preservation activities initiated privately are most often mentioned George Washington’s birthplace Mount Vernon in Virginia, and Independence Hall in Philadelphia. Before 1966, the federal authority National Park Service (NPS) only looked to the preservation of natural environments. NPS was established in 1916 to administer areas too large to be preserved privately, but it was not until after World War II with the federal programs for urban renewal that the government began to perceive it as a responsibility to preserve buildings and whole districts, first through the establishment of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1949.²⁴

²⁴ Tyler, p. 42.
LOCAL POWER OVER PRESERVATION

It is important to remember that federal government has very little regulatory power over properties in the U.S.. The real power over preservation issues has stayed on the local level, which has primary responsibility for land use regulation. The federal role has primarily been to fund activities, set out an overall superstructure for these and to ensure that the states approach preservation in a consistent way.

On federal level, several acts have had a major influence on historic preservation in American cities since the 1960s. In 1966 the National Historic Preservation Act formalized relationships between levels of government and provided incentives for local governments to form commissions protecting historic resources. The first preservation ordinance in the United States was adopted by the city of Charleston in 1931. With the act of 1966, state governments became more active. Earlier state policies had typically included operation of state-administered museums, historic sites and infrastructural programs. In many states, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) were established in order to make federal funding available in the state. In Maryland the SHPO is the Maryland Historical Trust. SHPOs process nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, they administer grants, they advise and assist local agencies but without a mandate to regulate. States can vest local governments with so called "enabling power", but these agencies do not necessarily have to accept these powers. It is their freedom not to get involved in preservation issues. The SHPO also reviews applications for federal historic tax credits and makes recommendations to the NPS.

Baltimore’s Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation (CHAP) dates back to 1964, two years before the national preservation act. Local commissions like CHAP are following an ordinance which regulates the review process and the possibilities of protecting structures. CHAP was granted the authority to designate landmarks in 1967 (Ord. 67-939). In recent years the commission has been integrated with the Department of Planning, giving it closer ties to the city planning process but also subjugating it to the power of the Planning Commission.

Non-profit organizations working with public awareness and increase of knowledge about preservation issues is Baltimore Heritage that mainly works with advocacy and grant administration, Jubilee Baltimore that gives technical advice and training to homeowners, and Preservation Maryland which is the state advocacy group for historic preservation. A fourth non-profit organization, Downtown Partnership, is also involved in advocacy of historic preservation but exclusively in the downtown area.

Beginning in 1980, it became possible for local governments to become certified by the state to make them eligible for federal and state funding. Certification can be given if the government has established a historic preservation commission with the power to review, if its system of surveying historic properties is tied to SHPO procedures, and if it accepts and is able to exercise state and local preservation ordinances. In other words, through certification the local level becomes more tied to the state government.

As mentioned above, preservation in the United States is absolutely most important on a local level. That is where the real power is vested. Processes of designating structures and districts are initiated on the local level, where approvals or disapprovals of changes to structures also are given. Historic preservation has traditionally been and continues to some extent to be a grassroots movement in the United States. It is however safe to say that property owners, initially because of the federal tax credits, have become more important in the designation of new objects.
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Very little, next to nothing, can be done without the consent of affected property owners. If preservation policies are to succeed they have to appear legitimate and just, not to neighborhoods or developers in the first place, but to the individual property owners. Accordingly, if preservation policies seriously conflict with property rights, they are most likely to fail. Preservation officers often have to walk a tightrope when trying to spread their message and carry out policies on the local level, while advocates in the private sector have the opportunity to be more polemic and less balanced in their views.

FROM LANDMARKING TO DISTRICTING

There were not only changes in the legislation in the 1960s. The understanding and meanings of historic preservation also changed. There was a move from aged national landmarks towards giving more attention to whole environments or districts. More recent buildings were recognized as historically important, and there was also a shift from a museum view of environment to a view that would allow buildings to be used in new ways. As already mentioned, in the 1970s adaptive reuse and rehabilitation became important ways of preserving structures that enabled them to continue having an economically vital function. Former schools, hospitals, police stations, warehouses and factories were increasingly converted into new uses but with the historic exteriors more or less kept intact.

The largest federal program of adaptive reuse has been The Main Street Program, established in 1980. Preservation through reuse and rehabilitation became an important way of renewing blighted downtowns by bringing back some of their retail.\(^\text{69}\) This corresponded well with Barbaralee Diamonstein's goals for a coordinated national policy on reuse. The Main Street program represented a policy move from basically maintaining museum functions towards preservation having a role of economic revitalization, thereby paving the way for making government support for historic preservation more legitimate. Another change that took place was that the environmental movement of the late 1960s joined forces with the growing preservation movement. Preservation was a more "green" and environmentally sound way of building than new construction.

THE CASE OF BALTIMORE CITY

One expression of preservation strategies in cities has been the creation of a distinct cultural or historic district in downtown. In Baltimore the official cultural district since the 1970s is Mount Vernon with its cultural institutions such as the main public library, a large arts museum (and another one nearby) and the nation's oldest basilica. More gentrified historic districts can however be found around the Inner Harbor, such as Federal Hill, Fells Point and Canton in which preservation policies have been used most extensively by developers and homeowners.

---
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In more recent years, the city has tried to make use of these policies in more distressed neighborhoods as well. New historic districts have been established in blighted neighborhoods through mitigations with developers wanting to raze buildings in these places. These districts are located outside of the downtown area. CHAP cooperates with several local non-profit organizations to increase public awareness about economic incentives available for homeowners. One result can be seen in Figure 2, which implies that historic preservation was given a new role in development at the end of the 1990s. In the 5-year period of 1999–2003, almost as many local historic districts were designated as in the preceding 15 years.

Figure 2. Designation of local historic districts within Baltimore city 1964–2003.


This development becomes even clearer when looking at the designation of national historic districts in Baltimore city, as shown in Figure 3. The first years of the new millennium experienced a sharp rise in the use of this kind of districting, that does not protect the buildings (except from federally funded building projects) but makes them eligible for historic tax credits. About as many (26) national districts were designated in the 5 years of 2001–2005 as in the 35 years before that (28). The purpose is to spur redevelopment in large areas of the city. This development becomes even clearer when looking at the designation of national historic districts in Baltimore city, as shown in Figure 3. The first years of the new millennium experienced a sharp rise in the use of this kind of districting, that does not protect the buildings (except from federally funded building projects).
projects) but makes them eligible for historic tax credits. About as many (26) national districts were designating in the consisting of residential neighborhoods with high concentrations of vacant properties.

Figure 3. Designation of national historic districts in Baltimore city 1966–2005.

A prime example of this new development-driven preservation policy is the Old West Baltimore district which was designated in 2004, "primarily a row house neighborhood of approximately 175 city blocks directly northwest of downtown Baltimore". From a preservationist view this is an enormous area to monitor. The single purpose with it is to give incentives for new homeowners to buy a property in the district and use tax credits to renovate it:

The West Side is thriving, historic buildings have new life, current and committed projects exceed $1 billion, and Baltimore can boast the largest redevelopment effort of its kind in the nation.

Another example is Baltimore East, an economically depressed neighborhood designated in 2002, consisting of approximately 110 blocks of "low-scale two and three-story rowhouses". This rise in designation of national districts was caused by the Historic Communities Investment Fund, which was a partnership between the nonprofit preservation organization on state level - Preservation Maryland, the SHPO Maryland Historical Trust and The Abell Foundation. Grants of $176,105 went to neighborhoods in Baltimore city, resulting in 16 new national districts. Nonprofit organizations and state government has with the consent of city government played a large role in the new preservation strategies of Baltimore.

Local landmarking in Baltimore is not used primarily as a tool for development but for protecting individual buildings that are deemed important from an architectural or historical perspective. The designation of landmarks practically stopped in 1987 after a breakdown in communications between CHAP and downtown developers, who mistrusted the preservationist intentions. In the year before, CHAP had landmarked a large number of buildings without the owners' consent. Some owners protested and their properties were taken off the list.
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After this incident, no landmarking was done in Baltimore city without owner consent, which became much harder to get because of the icy relationship between CHAP and downtown developers. A consequence of this conflict was that only 3 buildings were landmarked in the period 1988–1997 (Figure 4). In more recent years CHAP has again become more proactive in landmarking, even if focus has been on designating new districts in order to attract investments into blighted neighborhoods.

Figure 4. Designation of local landmarks in Baltimore city 1964–2003.


THE HISTORIC REHABILITATION OF CLIPPER MILL, BALTIMORE

CLIPPER MILL IN BALTIMORE: THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In the part of the Jones Falls Valley that runs into Baltimore city, there are many old mills, workshops and plants along the stream. In the late 19th century, 80 per cent of all cotton duck in the United States was manufactured here. Parts of the valley, such as the neighborhood of Woodberry in Baltimore city, became company towns where workers lived in housing owned or at least built by the company. In these towns workshops, mills, warehouses and housing were mixed and located right next to each other.

The textile mills took their last breath, more or less, during World War II when war production temporarily increased demand and cotton duck was shipped in for dyeing and waterproofing. After the war synthetic materials revolutionized the textile industry and much of the production moved to the southern states where labor was more flexible and cheaper. The last of the remaining mills, Meadow Mill, ceased its textile production in 1956.

Originally called the Poole and Hunt Foundry and Machine Shops and located in Woodberry, the development site discussed here was first built in 1853 to hold a machine-manufacturing and metal-casting plant. Besides furnishing nearby cotton mills with machinery, the shops also manufactured railroad cars. Robert Poole
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pioneered in the design and manufacture of looms for weaving cotton duck and of machinery for textile, gist, flour and saw mills. German Hunt was the one handling the firm's financial affairs. Around the foundry, workers lived in company housing, or housing associated with the mill owners, in a paternalistic relationship to the company management.

This was originally a complex of fieldstone and brick buildings, periodically enlarged as the need arose. There is no record of an architect or exact building dates. The shops are mostly known for making the iron columns supporting the dome of the Capitol in Washington, D.C., a historical anecdote that is reproduced in the exhibitions at the Baltimore Museum of Industry and which also was quoted by the developer when first commenting on the acquisition of the site in early 2003. There are in fact similar iron columns left in place at the site today.

By the 1890s, the village of Woodberry had become one of the characteristic company towns characteristic of New England where the plant and the housing together formed a social community and an architectural whole. Woodberry remained socially homogenous for a long time, even after the last mills closed in the aftermath of World War II. The architectural design of the area has not changed much since the 1940s, with the exception of a local TV-station established there in the 1950s, and later a low-rise apartment building.

---

100 Jamie Steinh, "Mill slated to become a home for artists; Struever aims to rebuild site destroyed in fatal fire", Baltimore Sun January 30, 2003. The original reference to the columns is given in the nomination form of the National Register of Historic Places, B-1007 (Poole and Hunt Company Buildings).

In a description of the Poole and Hunt Foundry from 1980, it says that "much of the plant is abandoned". Some buildings were used as storage by a bottling company but most of it seems to have been abandoned: "Plans for the future use of the entire property are unknown." In the early 1990s the buildings hosted a number of artists who appreciated the open spaces and low rent. There was also a rock climbing gym and a furniture repair shop.

---


**THE REDEVELOPMENT**

In 1995 parts of the site were ravaged by fire. For a few years, the charred remains of 17-acre Clipper Mill attracted film crews...
“seeking a picturesque backdrop”.103 One reason why redevelopment of the site did not take place initially was suspicion that the ground might be contaminated, a common problem connected with brownfields in the United States. Responsibility for cleaning up pollution would have fallen on the property owner.104 In late 2002, Struever Bros, Eccles & Rouse bought the premises and proposed a $50 million project (currently increased to $70 million) that would turn the Poole and Hunt Foundry into “a residential community and a cooperative hub for Baltimore artists”.105 Two years earlier, the development company had redeveloped another factory downstream along the Jones Falls – the Stieff Silver building, which formerly made fine silverware, is now office space but has kept its old name. Earlier, in the mid-80s he had also acquired and redeveloped a mill complex nearby now called the Mill Center, housing artists and other small entrepreneurs.106

In August 2003 the city provided Tax Increment Funding (TIF) for $7.8 million in bonds for publicly owned road, sewer and water pipe construction in the Clapper Mill area.107 Underground phone and broadband lines, however, are not covered by TIFs in Maryland because they are owned by the phone companies. The TIF bonds were to be repaid through increased real estate tax collections on the property. Later that fall the TIF, which pledged expected additional property tax revenues from the project to pay off the debt, was lowered to $5.5 million. This was actually a new and innovative way for the city to subsidize development, introduced by the state of Maryland in 2001. If the project would fail, the TIF would be financed through an extra tax on property owners in the district.108

Further, the Poole and Hunt property began its journey through the Maryland voluntary cleanup program, a brownfields program which basically limits the property owner’s future liability. After having been certified, the property cannot be litigated by federal or state government for previous contamination. This is a way for the state to make brownfields more attractive for redevelopment.109 Like many brownfields, the site proved to be contaminated with oil in the soil and lead paint in the interiors, and there had also been illegal dumping in later years. The costs for remediating this contamination has been estimated to $1,200,000. All but c. $160,000 of that was covered by three different grants from the brownfields program.110

More important for the developer than the brownfields program was the historic tax credits available on the federal and state level. The property is planned to receive the maximum of $3,000,000 in state credits (thereby reaching the state cap) and is currently up to $9,000,000 in federal credits. The developer can also utilize a reduction of the property taxes from the city, after having proved through a statement from the former property owner that at least 75 percent of the site had been vacant for at least three years.111 In return the developer must follow the standards for historic rehabilitation set by the National Parks Service (NPS). For this purpose Struever Bros., Eccles and Rouse – a developer reknown for its niche in historical rehabilitations – frequently hires historic advisors to find appropriate solutions for preservation issues. In this case two advisors were recruited, both working out of Washington,

103 Timothy B. Wheeler, "Brownfields help sought in Annapolis; Fenced-off sites could be useful if not contaminated; A look at Clapper Mill", Baltimore Sun February 20, 2000.
105 Jamie Stehm, "Mill slated to become a home for artists; Struever aims to rebuild site destroyed in fatal fire", Baltimore Sun January 30, 2003.
109 Maryland Department of the Environment, Voluntary Cleanup and Brownfields Program (fact sheet collected in March 2007).
111 Email to the author from Brigitte Fessenden, Baltimore City Department of Planning, January 26, 2007.
D.C.: Betty Bird & Assoc. and Macrostie Historic Advisors, both of them very experienced in commercial rehabilitation projects.

Betty Bird was given the task of preparing the necessary documentation of the site in the fall of 2002, including photographs and descriptions. Macrostie was then contacted to prepare a proposed historic rehabilitation which was presented to NPS and Maryland Historical Trust (MHT). In all of these negotiations the role of the architect is very much subordinate. The advisor was only in contact with the developer, who then gave directions to the architect firm Cho Benn Holback.\textsuperscript{112} Therefore it is not necessary to view the architect as an influential actor in this “game of preservation”.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{clipper_mill.jpg}
\caption{The 1956 office building. Photo: Author (2006).}
\end{figure}

By using the documentation found in the historic tax credit application file kept by MHT, it becomes possible to follow the negotiation process between the developer/advisor and the preservation officers. The NPS official has said that this was the most complicated case she has ever worked with, which caused the file to become extremely extensive. What made this a complicated case was the sheer size of the site – a 20-acre complex with an array of buildings – and the severe damage done to it by fire, fueled by decades of oil leakages.\textsuperscript{113}

Due to the fire one large building (where the Millrace building now stands) had been completely destroyed and an adjacent one (now called the Assembly building, erected 1890) had been seriously damaged. A third building called the Tractor building (1916), connected to the Assembly, was undamaged by the fire but in serious need of repair. Another large building, the Foundry which was erected in 1870, was in relatively good shape. There is also a stable in fieldstone from 1890, an office building from 1905 and a newer one from 1956, the most recent addition to the complex. Rail tracks ran between the main buildings, but were torn up in the beginning of the redevelopment. There is also a millrace running along the south side of the site that was cleaned up.

The developer wanted to use historic tax credits to fund the rehabilitation of the historic structures, but he also wanted to erect new structures in the yards. Two problems arose here. First, since the new construction would be within the historic site as described in the National Register of Historic Places, the developer would have to find a solution that would not diminish the integrity of the historic part. Second, the industrial character of the rehabilitated buildings would have to be kept despite the fact that they would be turned into new uses.

\textsuperscript{112} Interview with Jennifer Hembree, Macrostie Historic Advisors LLC, March 1, 2007.

\textsuperscript{113} Interview with Jo Ellen Hensley, National Park Services, March 1, 2007.
“Industrial character” however is not easy to define, and can be interpreted in different ways. Keeping the industrial character in a rehabilitation is not so much about preserving the actual historic appearance of the building but more about maintaining an idea of industrial design, giving the observer a sense that manufacturing and industrial production was once going on here. Architecturally it can be about preserving open spaces where that is possible, not lowering the ceiling or covering vents. Rough, less finished materials should be chosen and exterior ornamentation avoided. In line with these thoughts, the NPS minimized or abolished the use of corrugated steel siding, wooden decks, balconies, railings, and demanded the reuse of window frames, doors, shutters and other details. The interpretation of the site’s historical authenticity can be seen as a discourse in which different interests are negotiated and played out. The preservationist has a set of norms to follow but the developer will at times suggest and argue for other solutions.

The developer wanted to adapt the Clipper Mill site into a mixed use space where condos, rental apartments, office space and artist studios would be combined. The new Millrace building was planned for apartments and the partially ruined Assembly building for condos and office. The previous office buildings would remain offices. The lofty Tractor building was planned for parking and some apartments. The Foundry would be turned mainly into space for artists. The intact stable building was originally thought suitable for residential units, but that was soon changed to office space. To be constructed was also a number of duplex and single family homes.

THE NOSTALGIA OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

There is a discrepancy in the way the developer described the project before the actual development began, and how it is described when trying to promote the location. The following description was given in the form for applying for historic tax credits from the city (May 2003) when asked how the project would “revitalize the neighborhood”:

The project site is a blight on the communities. The redevelopment will save 5 historical blgs integral to the historic character of Woodberry. Portions of Woodberry adjacent to the site suffer from drug use and crime. This redevelopment will help to negate these factors, strengthen the neighborhood, and stabilize or improve property values. The project will construct a portion of the Jones Falls Valley greenway through the property and if funding is sufficient, all the way through Druid Hill Park. Environmental contamination on the site will be cleaned up, thus improving the overall environmental health of the community. The stream bisecting the property will be improved through the removal of a suspended sanitary line which runs in the stream and is known to leak.

Obviously, there is no hint of romance or pastoral idyll in this document which was only intended for communication between city officials and the development company. Blight, drugs, crime and environmental hazards are mentioned. When publicly marketing this development, however, a completely different rhetoric is used by the developer. Struver Bros., Eccles & Rouse makes use of the historic aesthetic when marketing the site. An advertisement hints at the place’s industrial history but without giving any contextual information, mobilizing the romantic potential that ruins in the right place carries:

The Assembly Apartments at Clipper Mill are between Hampden & Woodberry, right next to the [Druid Hill] park. You’re also close to fun shops & restaurants, your favorite hangouts, Light

114 Interview with Jo Ellyn Hensley, NPS, March 1, 2007.
Rail & I-83. Walk inside and you'd never know this place used to make large machinery ("Assembly", get it?). Picture 2-story lofts with arched windows and lots of natural light. There's a pool that flows through some stone ruins. And yes, even a stream running through the basement.¹¹⁶

Blight and crime are gone here, and the stream which was described as a source of pollution has now become a cool feature. It is the aesthetics rather than the history of the Assembly Building that is used in advertising the apartments. Advertisements feature the exposed brick, balconies, lofts, large windows looking out over woods, and the pool. In the beginning of the twenty first century, the architecture of late nineteenth century mills is considered highly attractive not only as housing and office space, but also as studios for artists and craftsmen.¹¹⁷

The Authenticity of Industrial Character

The developer and the preservation officials had different views of what constituted “industrial character” to begin with. Inside the burnt shell of the Assembly, a new apartment building would be erected. Beginning in late winter 2003 there was an abundance of correspondence between the historic advisor and the NPS, in which the preservation official denied a number of proposals from the developer.¹¹⁸ Despite these continuing adjustments and repeated conflicts over authenticity issues, the preservation side and the developer seem to have shared a spirit of cooperation and dialogue, even though the project manager repeatedly challenged the NPS regarding choice of materials and methods. It is the project manager’s task to keep costs down and to find more affordable constructions methods.¹¹⁹ The preservationist’s task, on the other hand, has very little to do with costs and everything to do with the choice of authentic materials and architectural styles.

After summer 2003 the development moved forward more swiftly. The main issues proved not to be about the historical part of the property, since the standards were more or less clear on what alterations were compatible with the historic structure. The most difficult question regarding the historic part was what to do with the Tractor building, which in itself was intact but with huge windows that needed repair. This building was still in March 2007 largely unrepaired and only used as a garage.

Instead the lingering issues centered on the compatibility of new constructions adjacent to the historic buildings, and in spring 2007 some of them were still unresolved. One troubling issue at the outset was the duplex homes, which the developer soon abandoned and sold the development rights to Ryland Homes, a company known for suburban homes built using affordable methods. This type of house became common in Maryland suburbs in the 1990s. The final solution was considered compatible because of the choice of brick and formstone (which has a look similar to the fieldstone used in the historic buildings). This solution was criticized by a neighborhood association for being too dense, bringing too much people and traffic into an area where access was very limited.

¹¹⁶ Ahh, the peace and quiet of city life, advertisement produced for Assembly Apartments, collected in November 2006. See also their website www.assemblyapartments.com. The real estate company is owned by the developer.
¹¹⁹ As the project manager explained in an interview, they would continually be pushing the limits, suggesting cheaper materials than the ones suggested by NPS. One successful example is the slated roof that finally was put on the stable; Tim Pula, December 1, 2006.
The reuse of design – the shape of objects found at the site was used when decorating the redeveloped area. Photo: Author (2006).

Another issue was the height of the Millrace building, which neighbors on the overlooking Brick Hill resisted. This building is much higher than the original building, blocking the earlier view from the houses on the hill. A small part of the destroyed workshop that stood there before the fire has been preserved as a symbolic gate to the campus area, a ruin carrying the sign “Clipper Mill”.

A more troubling issue was the landscaping and construction of a wooded area just south of the stable, Tractor and Assembly buildings. The area is wedged between the old shops and the Druid Hill Park which is a wooded recreational area. The wood on the spot was razed and two new streets built for single family homes with a postmodern look, using glass and steel. These homes were not considered compatible, but the developer did not adjust his proposal in a significant manner. By spring 2007 Struever Bros., Eccles and Rouse was already marketing these new homes without having resolved the issue with NPS. When marketing these houses, the importance of life style was added to the role of location: “It’s not just about where you live. It’s about how you live.” The environmental or “green” aspects of these homes are stressed in this advertisement.

120 Interview with Dan Sams, Maryland Historical Trust, October 2006.
121 A full page advertisement in Urbanite. For Baltimore’s Curious, January 2007.
This idea was also utilized when transforming part of the basement of the Tractor building into a pool surrounded by steel columns and a couple of ruined walls. The columns are in the same place as before the development, but have been refinished and turned into torches. At night the burners glow and cast light over the pool. In night pictures of this environment, young people – all Caucasian – are gathered around a romantic fire on the roof of the Foundry building. This is a magical and romantic but also safe place – there is no issue of mixed races here despite the fact that 70 percent of the population in Baltimore is Afro-American.  

The developer looks at Clipper Mill as a “campus”. It is going to be “a new community” (according to a January 2007 advertisement), with parties and other social occasions which naturally will exclude other existing Woodberry residents. The pool area is fenced in and designated only for residents in the Assembly and Millrace buildings, although residents in Woodberry earlier had been promised that they would be able to gain access to it. The developer does not seem to have a plan for integrating the campus into the already existing community. Instead he chooses to make a new one which he can “re-image” when necessary. Security guards are patrolling the premises during dark hours, protecting residents and businesses within the limits of the site.

**Who is attracted to Clipper Mill?**

In March 2007 there were 30 tenants at Clipper Mill. Their composition was completely different from the American Tobacco Historic District, even though the emphasis on creative economy was even stronger here. Twelve of the tenants described themselves as artists, seven fell into the category of design, landscaping, landscaping, landscaping.

---

architecture and development, and then there were a number of miscellaneous businesses: two in publishing, two in marketing, two in health, and finally one museum/gallery, one restaurant, one law firm, one high-tech company and also one within financing. Interestingly, the editorial board of the city magazine *Urbanite* in which the development has been advertised is located here.

The idea of Clipper Mill working as a hub for artists and designers seems more focused than the community of American Tobacco, where focus is on high technology, law and financing but also on entertainment. At Clipper Mill there was but one restaurant, and that had not even opened in April 2007. None the less, the intentions of the developers in both of these cases are to create so called “24/7 communities”, but their methods differ.

What are the benefits for artists to live and work in this environment? Most of them were already active at this site before the redevelopment. Some of them may have been squatting, others had leases. Their rents were lower, so what have they gained from the development? A project manager working with the adaptation of a plant into an artist hub in Providence, said that development made the site safer and more secure but also that the studios were updated with modern amenities. One could further argue that more security and amenities makes the location attractive for art consumers to visit, making it possible for artists to combine their studios with shops and galleries. Right next to the Clipper Mill property, however, there is a large factory building which houses affordable studio space. Close by there are also other vacant mill and warehouse buildings which could be turned into affordable studios or galleries. To conclude: From an artist's perspective Clipper Mill was hardly wanted or needed, but the developer had a vision of a mixed working and living community that he chose to fulfill.

123 Based on a list given at http://www.clippermill.net/tenants.html
125 Interview with local photographer Tracey Brown, December 18, 2006.

---

**THE AMERICAN TOBACCO HISTORIC DISTRICT IN DURHAM**

*The future looks bright for downtown Durham, where old tobacco warehouses are being converted into apartments, offices, specialty shops and restaurants.*

**BACKGROUND: STATE POLICY AND HISTORY**

Durham, with a population of 187,000 in year 2000, used to be a town dominated by the tobacco industry. The memories of this industry still live among its older inhabitants, and many of its structures are still standing. Today Durham is part of the "Research Triangle", the other two points of the triangle being Raleigh and Chapel Hill. Local economy is dominated by the presence of Duke University (23,000 employees in 1999), once founded with capital accumulated in the tobacco industry. The second largest employer in 1999 was IBM with 14,000 employees.

The expansion of the university and the attraction of new companies within creative economy - paired with large economic incentives - obviously makes rehabilitation of the centrally located tobacco buildings interesting. The buildings of the old tobacco industries have been rehabilitated since the early 1980s, when Brightleaf Square was opened featuring upscale retail and restaurants. Brightleaf Square was recently (2004) renovated as a "Main Street" kind of response to the growing malls outside of town.

The state of North Carolina is currently experimenting with a mill rehabilitation tax credit for the reuse of former industrial buildings.

127 Herget & Mancuso, p. 77.
In July 2006, the “mills bill” as it is commonly called was prompted by the closure of many textile, tobacco and furniture plants in the past decade. It is a tiered credit, meaning that the credit will vary depending on which county a mill is redeveloped in (there are five tiers). This is quite a sophisticated way for the state authorities to direct redevelopment to the areas that are most distressed and need most investment. The mill credit has also been adapted to the regional character of industry, meaning that not only former tobacco manufacturing plants are eligible for the credit but also the warehouses in which raw tobacco used to be sold (these would otherwise be seen as agricultural buildings).

The primary purpose here, as in other places, is not to save historically interesting buildings but to incentivize development. However, in order to receive the credit a developer must follow the same standards as when performing any other historic rehabilitation.128 A large number of mills have so far been turned into office or residential space in North Carolina, recently the Edenton Peanut Mill (office), the Piedmont Leaf Lofts and the Edenton Cotton Mill Condominiums (both luxury residential), and even more rehabilitation is expected following the introduction of the “mills bill”.129

**Using the Historic Identity of the Tobacco Industry**

In the former industrial town Durham there is a tobacco manufacturing plant that nowadays is called The American Tobacco Historic District. Since 2005 it has housed offices and restaurants, and in the future there will be residential units, the latter a project handled by the Baltimore developer Struever Bros., Eccles & Rouse. There are also plans for a performing arts center which will reinforce the presence of culture and entertainment in the area. The developer says this will become a mixed “live-work-play” area,130 but currently it is mostly “work”. Since 2005, less central parts of Durham have also become interesting for redevelopment. Early in 2007 a local developer commented on the redevelopment: “Investors who have come in [...] have seen the phenomenal success of American Tobacco [...] and realized that [this] is an area that has really lain fallow.”131

The facades of the American Tobacco Historic District have been restored to look much as they did newly constructed at the end of the 19th century. An old water tank rising over the roofs carries the name “Lucky Strike” and functions as a beacon, drawing attention and giving identity to the district together with a damaged smokestack that was repaired. Obviously, developers working with rehabilitation are interested in making use of the historical identity that ties a building to the rest of the community. In a newsletter designed for the property, the developer described the meaning of this rehabilitation as an act of American boosterism, strengthening local pride and identity:

> [...] an historic landmark was saved from a soon to be final hour and revived to an icon of local vibrancy. In a few months, the Lucky Strike Smokestack will stand proudly above Downtown Durham showing everyone, once and for all, that the great City of Durham has arrived!132

---

128 For general information about the credit see North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office, “State Mill Rehabilitation Tax Credits” (brochure collected in March 2007). For the “mills bill” see General Assembly of North Carolina, Session 2005, Session Law 2006-40, House Bill 474, “An act to provide a tax credit for revitalization of historic mill facilities…”


131 Jim Wise, “Investors buy into neighborhood, hope to hit home run; Lots of land changing hands in ballpark district as neighbors postulate on what will become of area”, *The Durham News*, February 3, 2007.

132 The newsletter is found at [http://www.americantobaccohistoricdistrict.com/](http://www.americantobaccohistoricdistrict.com/)
Inside the complex a mix of historic and postmodern design features can be seen. Among the most eyecatching attributes is a canal constructed by the developer, Capitol Broadcasting Company, running through the whole complex and forming a pool around the water tank. The canal was built in 2004 to create an aura of attraction that the industrial buildings themselves were not believed to carry. The developer has put a lot of effort into making the stream look historic. The concrete of the sides of the canal have been chipped and sand blasted to give it a worn-down look, which does not correspond to the preservation norms of National Park Service which say that additions must not be made to look old.

If one follows the water upstream, however, the observer soon reaches the source: a large fountain splashing water in front of one of the original brick buildings. The long yard between the two rows of buildings has thus been completely landscaped and redone (with the exception of the water tower, now located on a tiny island), even with lawns planted but with the intention of giving the viewer a feeling of history and authenticity. Why this mixed message of old industrial buildings in a postindustrial landscape?

By using the past of the site the developer has attempted to create a kind of community of tenants at this campus. An expression of these efforts is the work of local writer and photographer Ben Casey, who was given the task of documenting the development process from 2003 to 2005. Obviously, a lot of these photos were not meant primarily for documentation exclusively but also to be seen as art. Is this history or is it art? Casey’s photos have been hung on the walls inside the common areas of the buildings. During this time, his images and stories were continually published on the development’s website, contributing to a mix of contemporary art (many of his photos are more art than documents) and historical features.

Going into the Strickland building, the visitor is greeted by glass walls, marble stairs and bright lights, but also by exposed brick. An array of features giving the message that this after all is an historic site is given through old black and white photographs, an old shoe shining chair, wooden beams and tobacco stains in the floor. But exactly what is so historic about this, and why was it deemed important not to make this building look entirely new? And exactly what features from the industrial days are stressed: is it the actual labor, is it the products, or just the design itself?

For photos of the construction work in see http://www.americantobachistoricdistrict.com/
Moving through the American Tobacco Historic District with these spectacles on, one soon gets the feeling of moving in a borderland where nothing is what it first appeared. The common areas are actually packed with art, much of it in the form of photographs of old blueprints and from before the rehabilitation. In fact, the images shown prove to be a highly selective choice. These photographs actually act as peepholes into three distinct transition periods in the history of the place: (1) the time when the plant was planned and built around the turn of the 20th century, (2) the glorious heyday of the tobacco industry of Durham in the 1930-40s, and (3) the time immediately preceding the redevelopment in the beginning of the 21st century. Missing from this "documentation" is the latter half of the 20th century, the period of accelerating decay and deindustrialization in Durham.

It could be said that these images give a nostalgic view of the tobacco industry and its surroundings, highlighting the success of the cigarette brands Lucky Strike and Durham Bull, but also reveling in the romantic ruins of industrialization. Nowhere in the photographic documentation is there any mention of the crippling health effects of smoking discovered in the last decades. Neither are the legal processes against the tobacco industry, nor their outcome, mentioned in any way. Here the famous cigarette brands still carry an aura of distinction and success, not least since they laid the foundations for the community (Duke University was founded with tobacco money).

Within the American Tobacco Historic District is also the DBAP, Durham Ball Athletic Park, a city owned 10,000-seat baseball
stadium hosting the immensely popular minor league team Durham Bulls since 1994. The park represents important parts of local identity but is in need of renovation. In the most recent years the renovation plans have been the subject of some heated debate. The neighborhood has feared that the DAP will be privatized and cease its youth activities. There are close historical connections between the DAP and the tobacco industry, not least through the name and symbol of Durham Bull, which originated as a tobacco brand. In Spring 2007, the city had invested c. $4 million in order to get the park renovated.

WHO IS ATTRACTION TO AMERICAN TOBACCO?

Who are the tenants attracted to a development such as American Tobacco? In spring 2007 there were 38 tenants. Ten of the tenants can be categorized as high-tech, biotech or medicine, nine as working within law or financing, six are restaurants, four are to be found in publishing or broadcasting, four within design and marketing, three within higher education (all related to Duke University), and two are nonprofit organizations. Almost all of the tenants are active within what is usually called “the creative economy”. In fact, only the restaurants and one non-profit organization (YMCA) can be counted out, and both directly serve the “creative class”.

This last observation just hints that there is a connection between this kind of urban design and creative economy. It would carry too far to suggest that the tenants moved here just because of design solutions, and it has been outside the scope of this study to closer analyze the motives of the tenants for locating their business to the DAP district. For future studies, however, it could be interesting to look closer at the design preferences of the creative class.

136 Based on a map of tenants at the project website: http://www.americantobaccohistoricdistrict.com/
don’t want that to happen to us.”137 The poor neighborhoods lying next to the athletic park will most certainly not get a boost from the development. Instead, in the next few years displacement and further development is to be expected in this area.

Interior of the main building. Photo: Author (2007).

THE HOLMEN DISTRICT IN NORRKÖPING

NORRKÖPING: A BRIEF HISTORY OF PLANNING BEFORE 1970

The town Norrköping, located 120 miles south of Stockholm, was founded in medieval times, growing out of a mill and fishing village along the falls of Strömman, by king Albrekt of Mecklenburg. This village developed into an important market and a place for court sessions, also working as a place for crossing the river. The oldest charters granted by the king are from 1384. The industrial area covered in this report represents the original settlements and thus it contains important archaeological remains. King Johan III settled the first plan of the town, which had been sacked and virtually destroyed by a Danish army in 1567. The medieval streets and foundations of buildings were reused when the town was settled again. However, a new part of town north of the medieval settlement was also added and given a typical renaissance plan with straight streets.

In the seventeenth century, the castle Johannisborg was built since this was the place where the duke resided. At about the same time (1620) a Dutch entrepreneur, Louis De Geer, settled in the town which then received additional charters from the king. Norrköping becomes the mercantile and industrial center in Sweden, manufacturing guns, cannons, ammunition, brass products and textiles. At the end of the seventeenth century, Norrköping has a population of c. 6,000. As was common in early modern towns, Norrköping was partly destroyed in devastating fires in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. A plague striking in 1710-11 killed 2,135 people, and when Russians invaded the town in 1719 it was as good as wiped out. The town, however, seems to have

recuperated quite quickly, surely owing to the strategic position of the place. Visitors in the eighteenth century were impressed by the factories and the liveliness of the town, but also by the number of plastered wooden frame houses.  

A bird's eye view of Norrköping from the late nineteenth century.

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

It has however often been neglected in the writing of Norrköping's history that this prosperity only benefited a minority of the population. The mass of labourers in Norrköping lived in poor housing right next to the factories. The labour force of the textile industry, which became massive in the late nineteenth century, was mostly made up of women and children, while men worked as mechanics. Property owners kept up the facades of the large tenements along the main streets, but neglected the interiors. A workers' slum developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, giving Norrköping the worst living conditions in northern Europe in the 1940s. Most of these tenements were torn down in the urban renewal efforts of the 1950s and 1960s, creating huge empty spaces in the middle of the city. In this respect, a historic connection was broken between spaces of work and spaces of leisure. The industries – the property of the industrialists – would in time be restored and preserved, while workers' housing was torn down without any second thoughts.

By 1900, Norrköping had begun losing its competitive edge in textile and engineering industry. Competing centres of manufacture were developing in other parts of the country as well. Beginning in 1913, the textile industry was becoming concentrated to a few large companies in Norrköping. The 1940s represented a last, yet temporary surge in textile industry, but in the following decade the
crisis was unavoidable. Factories started closing down and workers were laid off.\(^{141}\)

Immediately after the war, Norrköping became the target for the new national housing policy which replaced old tenements in mixed use neighborhoods with modern apartment buildings in exclusively residential neighborhoods. (Johansson 1997) A housing survey from 1945 listed Norrköping as one of the cities in Sweden where there was the most urgent need to provide new housing. Only about 20 percent of all households in Norrköping had individual water closets, and this was a very low share compared to other municipalities. Fifty-seven percent of the households shared a toilet with three or more households, and that was exceptional for Swedish standards. There was also a very high share of small apartments. (Schönbeck 1994, 198) At about the same time as it became the responsibility of the municipalities to plan for their housing, industries began closing in Norrköping and industrial structures located centrally in the town became vacant. (Schönbeck 1994, 174)

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

The demolition of downtown began in 1959. In Norrköping the razing was scrupulously planned. Those who had been children in 1915, when Norrköping had had the worst housing stock in the country, had grown up and wanted to see the old workers' tenements torn down and replaced. People should not have to live next to workshops, warehouses and stores, they argued, and children should not have to play on streets where there was a lot of traffic.

Apartments in the inner city were demolished and new ones built up just outside the inner city. In the period 1958–71, 7,000 apartments were torn down and historic neighborhoods near the inner city core were struck hard.\(^{142}\) Very little was being built downtown, which meant that demolished or partly demolished properties stood vacant and deserted for many years. In 1962 the renowned textile mill Tuppen (The Rooster) ceased production, and the buildings were demolished in 1969. About ten years later housing was built on the property, but for a decade it was just an empty lot. The razing of this prominent riverfront structure gave people an idea of what soon could be happening to other historic mills and workshops in the area, but there was no organized resistance against further demolition. In the eyes of many people in the city, the buildings were useless once they had stopped production. Furthermore, they were associated with memories of poverty and hard and often dangerous work. The historic value was rated very low locally. Downtown remained a desolate, partly demolished landscape for many years due to lack of planning and investment. The city core became a slum and was to a great degree abandoned for many years to come.

**Scholarship on the Industrial Landscape**

The Industrial Landscape in Norrköping has been the object of documentation and academic research. One motive for distinguishing between these two groups is their differing focuses: those interested in documenting have inventoried buildings and environments, while the academics of more recent years have been interested in describing and analyzing the documentation. Regarding documentation, there are mainly two investigations carried through

---


by the city and published in 1974 and 1981–85 respectively. These two documents constitute expressions the political interest in gaining practical knowledge about an important part of the urban environment. The knowledge was intended to be useful for policymakers.

Academic research, on the other hand, has been interested in problematizing official views on the heritage of the industry. Its main purpose has not been to be useful in policymaking but rather in a deeper knowledge of how city planning, heritage and placemaking work. A number of ethnographers have pondered over the meanings of the Industrial Landscape, of which Annika Alzén’s doctoral thesis is the absolutely most important contribution.143 Alzén has investigated the preservation of the Industrial Landscape, but without the policy perspective. Her interest was instead in making sense of the cultural meanings of preserving the environment. The investigation ends in the beginning of the 1980s, i.e. when the phase of documentation ends to be followed by a phase of spatial planning and early redevelopment. An important contrast between Alzén’s work and this contribution is that the latter concentrates on policy issues and maps the development up until the early 2000s.


DIRECT GOVERNMENT OF THE 1970S

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

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

Another important law was the Building Code, Byggnadsregeln (1947), supplemented by the Building Regulation, Byggnadsbetalgan (1959). The Building Code made it possible to give an overall protection to certain blocks or complete neighborhoods, such as the Old Town of Stockholm which was covered in a paragraph added in 1963. There were some, however comparatively restricted, possibilities of receiving state funding for renovating historic building. The main sources were threefold, implying direct government interventions:

1) the state lottery granting a maximum of 20 percent of the costs,
2) the National Heritage Board’s funds, which were mortgaged a long time in advance,
3) AMS-bidrag, which meant putting unemployed construction workers into work on a project basis; this was possible if housing was not included in the buildings to be renovated.
The lack of government support in preservation had made it necessary for some municipalities to buy up single properties which otherwise would have been torn down. Before 1970, this had especially been done in Ystad. This was evidently a very costly way for communities to preserve buildings, and it could hardly be applied to whole environments. Starting in 1974, another municipal tool of regulation could be used to temporarily stop the demolition of a building, but only for a maximum of five years. A third tool for municipalities was to economically support the renovation of remarkable facades.

The Committee for Historical Environments, 1970–1974

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

There were basically three motives for appointing the committee:

1) The razing of the urban renewal programs of Swedish cities in the 1950s and 1960s had demolished no less than 15 blocks in the inner city. There had been a need to clear unsanitary housing, but the clearing had devastating effects on the city image.
2) Around 1970 there was a need to plan the inner city again, not least from a traffic perspective. New bridges over Strömmen were discussed, which would change the image of the city.

3) Finally there was now a growing interest among property owners to reuse older buildings that could be renovated at affordable costs. The sources of funding had improved.

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

Having this in mind, it becomes interesting to examine what method the committee adopted. The directives were pretty clear, stressing what was called the psychosocial motives for preservation. The argument here was simply that urban populations were feeling a growing discomfort and alienation toward the new, sterile environments of suburbs and inner cities. Historic traditions, manifested through architecture and design, invoked the imagination and made people more creative and happy. The city was seen as a living organism, and it was compared with the annual rings of trees. New buildings are added to the old, resulting in an organically produced environment. It is interesting that aspects of identity and sense of belonging were stressed already at this point in time, considering the (proposedly novel) discourse of the importance of creativity and culture to the survival of cities today.

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

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

Environments were protected according to two tiers:

A) Historically remarkable environment
B) Historically valuable environment

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

Norrköping’s structure of old vacant industrial buildings, collected in the center of the city, amasses one of the most complicated planning problems that any Swedish town has had to face. What will happen to this area, still growing, when the Holmen paper mill in a near future breaks up from its jam packed property? [...] What kind of ruined landscape can Norrköping expect to get? Or is there any possibility of reuse in this, from several aspects, technically genuine mass of structures. The problem is worth contemplation also from a standpoint of cultural history: even in the old English mill towns should it be difficult to find such a concentrated and well preserved environment from the breakthrough period of industrialism.144

A charming description was given of the image of this industrial area, quite alien to the dirty and laborsome work that had been going on there for some three centuries. Then again nothing was said about the economic functions of the buildings. Instead the committee stressed the views of the flowing water, and the possibilities of

144 Lindahl, G. ”Industrilandskapet i Norrköping.” Arkitektur 1970.
improving communication alongside Strömmen and through the still closed off area. It is important to keep in mind that this was, still in the 1970s, a very active industrial district with a large paper mill, Holmens bruk, dominating the neighbourhood and sealing it off from public use. It was not yet considered a public space or even a place you would have a reason to visit if you did not work here. The entrances of the mill were closed off by guarded iron gates and by the water.

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

VIEWS OF THE INDUSTRIAL LANDSCAPE

There is in Norrköping a widespread belief that without a profound change in the view of the historic industrial buildings, they would have been torn down. This is not necessarily true, or at least not the only truth. Already in the late 1960s did antiquaries and architectural historians argue for the preservation of some of the buildings. Preservationists, then, were already convinced of their values, and they still are. In this respect, little has happened since the 1960s. But in time, as development has regenerated this area, the general opinions have been gradually influenced. The population of Norrköping is today much more positive towards the Industrial Landscape than it was, say, twenty years ago.

This shift in opinion makes it hard to imagine a time before development had begun, the area still not publicly accessible, and interest in the place extremely low among the people of Norrköping. Several eyewitness informants have expressed the mentality of the 1970s and 1980s: "tear it down", was a common view regarding the future of the Industrial Landscape. It was hard to be proud of a place of deserted buildings, and certainly still at the end of the 1980s hard to believe that the district in ten years would be populated with a state university, a concert and congress hall, a science park, and a number of educational facilities. In one sense, then, development has proceeded rather quickly, but the general notion seems to be that it has taken a long time.

In the marketing material produced by the city nowadays, the history of the Industrial Landscape is presented in a non-problematic way. There has been a wish by politicians and marketing people to look beyond, or possibly to ignore, the challenges caused by preservation and reuse, and dream of a city filled with cultural industries. In a brochure produced by the city in 1998, the Industrial Landscape was described as "a melting pot for creative ideas". In the same year, the city architect described this area as "a most attractive" environment, despite the fact that the cell phone manufacturer Ericsson just had closed a large factory in the Industrial Landscape. But in fact, the same kind of predetermined and simplistic messages were produced by the city already in 1992:


---

When, in the sixties and the seventies, other cities were gripped by demolition fever, Norrköping made a decision about its future. The Industrial Landscape would not be demolished. Instead it would be filled with life.\textsuperscript{149}

Of course there wasn’t one decision, and ultimately the decision wasn’t Norrköping’s but developers’ and the national government’s. The marketing ploys used by the city makes it hard to go beyond the often reproduced success story of this place. In a 2006 marketing brochure directed to prospective university students, the Industrial Landscape was described as the hub of Norrköping’s culture and student life. The Louis De Geer concert and congress hall is employed for its events, concerts and TV shows. Knowledge, regardless of its uses or contexts, has become a keyword in place marketing: “The most palpable element in the renewal can be defined in one word. Knowledge.”\textsuperscript{150} The Industrial Landscape has truly become a \textit{grand projet}, a flagship development, in Norrköping’s efforts to compete in the image making of cities.\textsuperscript{151}

This very simplistic view on the identity and character of the Industrial Landscape breaks of course up into complexity and contradictions when challenged by the stories of informants active in city government or development. From the point of view of knowledge generation, this is a necessary process to go through, moving from simplicity to complexity. In order for us to learn anything about the preservation of the Industrial Landscape, or any other place, we have first to distance ourselves from the myths of marketing and placemaking. Unfortunately though, the language and images of marketing may find its way into academic scholarship as well, blurring the supposed delineation between politics and scholarship. Consider the following quote taken from an official history of Norrköping, produced by academic historians describing recent development in the city:

Norrköping is now changing its identity. That process is today the result of a planned strategy. The city by the stream is today a place where the university, hi-tech industry and cultural institutions of different sorts meet.¹²²

The task of academic scholarship should of course be to distance itself from and criticize the official views of the city, rather than adopting the political discourse, thereby giving it a certificate of being the one and only truth.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL REGULATION IN THE 1980S

In the beginning of the 1980s 28 percent of the working population in Norrköping was employed in manufacturing. Commerce and service represented 60 percent.¹³³ Technically speaking, the city had already made the transition from an industrial economy to a knowledge economy. Conceptually, however, people seems to have been mentally stuck in the industrial age. The industrial area along Strömmen was not yet seen as potential source for urban regeneration, but rather as a "great planning problem" (SOU 1982, 100; Olshammar 2002).

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

In 1979 the city council appointed a new committee to make a deeper documentation of the Industrial Landscape. The investigation would include proposals for reuse, showcases of successful reuse, proposals for land marking, and a proposed area plan. The committee consisted of politicians, civil servants (among them the city architect and head of the city museum) and a representative of Holmens Bruk. The city council wanted measures that would give the city possibilities to "guide development".¹³⁴ In the end, few proposals for reuse were presented.


A first volume of the investigation was published in 1981, covering the western part of the Industrial Landscape. In the same year the city museum moved to its new premises on the northern side of Strömmen. This was a typical way of the city exercising direct government in the area, trying to spearhead real estate development and show that the buildings were possible to adapt and reuse for entirely new functions.

In the 1981 survey, the only suggestion for reuse concerned a single building complex, the Drag’s Factories, and one of the proposals for this site — turning the factories into offices — was based on an engineering student’s paper produced ten years earlier. The offices were intended for the Swedish Maritime Administration, but the department refused to be relocated to a vacant factory and warehouse, choosing instead to have new offices erected in another part of Norrköping. This lack of ideas showed basically two things: 1) the committee saw as its main task to document existing buildings in order to prepare grounds for preservation, 2) it was poorly suited to work as a kind of creative think-tank for the development of the area, despite that it was a heterogeneous gathering of actors, although mostly made up of public officials from different departments. Except for a representative from Holmens Bruk — a company quickly moving out of the area — there were no real estate or business interests involved in the committee.

The eastern part, including Holmens Bruk, would not be presented until 1985. More importantly, the survey concluded that the district was too large to become a museum in itself. Further expansion of the city museum was not realistic. However, together with national labour organizations the city planned to create a Museum of Labour (first planned to be named Museum of the Labour Movement) in “The Iron” building, drawn by the architect Folke Bensow and finished in 1917. The very first plans were made already in 1977. A foundation consisting of four national non-profit organizations was founded in 1983, but the museum in The Iron did not actually open until 1991. Informants, however, have witnessed about the importance of the renovation of The Iron for the image and credibility of redevelopment in the Industrial Landscape. It would become necessary to preserve buildings along the water, clear some other, interior buildings that was of less historic value, and to make compatible infill. Interestingly, when the committee summarized its views on future development, direct government action was not seen as an effective alternative. In 1983 two buildings, The Iron and the neighboring Ironing Board, had been
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purchased by the city from Holmens Bruk, but no further purchases were planned. The city did not have the means to buy even smaller parts of the area, and government support was lacking. Still in 1985, there were no plans from the government or Linköping University to expand higher education in Norrköping. Redevelopment of the building stock would have to rely on local and regional economic resources.138

At this time there was also a heated debate about the conservation of Strömman. Holmens Bruk planned to cut the flow of water to an absolute minimum in order to maximize the outlet of power through the construction of an underground tunnel. An expert commissioned by the Water Court came to the conclusion that the proposed cut in the flow of water would severely damage the image of central Norrköping.139 Local and regional authorities were also very sceptical towards this plan. One of the local newspapers, Folkbladet, started a campaign called “Save the river”. A list of more than 5,000 names was handed over to Holmens Bruk early in 1984.160 In 1986 it was finally ruled that the seasonal flows would be preserved. The reasons were environmental as well as aesthetic as the river was becoming an increasingly important image in the city. The story of the river is not of primary concern here, but it is interesting to note that the fate of the river stirred strong feelings among the people of Norrköping, while the buildings of the Industrial Landscape did not, at least not at this point in time.

At about the same time (1983), the other local paper, Norrköpings Tidningar, had proposed a contest in order to put pressure on Holmens Bruk to plan for future development:

This industrial landscape is unique in Europe. But what will happen with the area in the future? The question will become critical the day Holmens Bruk abandons the paper factory at Strömman.161

The company had gradually been moving out since 1977 when a new site for manufacturing paper products had opened just outside town. In Spring 1986 the mill finally closed and the property, 6.5 hectares in size and comprising twelve historically significant buildings, became vacant even though Holmens Bruk remained as the property owner well into 1988. Knowledge of the area was, however, very limited compared to the information authorities had collected about the rest of the Industrial Landscape. The western half of the district, where property owners were many and small, had been scrutinized in a much more thorough way.

The committee appointed by the city council in 1979 had not included the mill property in its survey, and thus the city was poorly informed about the needs of preservation and the possibilities of adaptive reuse in the area. The only building that had been suggested for protection was the Holmen Tower from 1751, the historic gate of the mill property.162 This lack of information, combined with a hesitation to make regulatory decisions, would a few years later result in open conflicts between the developer, the architects and the authorities regarding the needs for preservation and compatible infill. It is not hard to come to the conclusion that city government did not want to disturb the business of one of the largest property owners and employers in town.

Obviously, the issue of historic preservation in the Industrial Landscape was not — contrary to what Alzén (1996) suggests — in any way determined by the late 1980s. Among buildings not protected was the classicist, church-looking Power Plant (nowadays called the Heating Church), built in 1927-30 after drawings by architect Ivar Tengbom, who designed several prominent buildings.

---
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on the property. Today this is one of the feature landmarks of the Industrial Landscape but, surprisingly, the city’s committee considered it disposable in 1984. Attraction and utility would in time determine the views on several buildings. But the Industrial Landscape had not, except for a limited group of preservationists, become an “attractive” place by this time. Attraction, if defined as values useful in place marketing, did not occur until a few years into the 1990s, after the Museum of Labour and the concert and congress hall Louis De Geer had opened their doors to the public.

According to a Social Democratic politician active at the time, Holmens Bruk was in 1986 negotiating with the largest developer in town, Lundbergs AB. Evidently, Holmens Bruk was not interested in developing the property itself but rather wished to sell it off as quickly as possible. Following informal negotiations between Holmens Bruk and city government, there was however an agreement made that a Scandinavian architectural contest (Allmän Nordisk Arkitektävling) would be held. The jury was constituted by representatives of the company, architects and officials from city government. According to the program of the contest, a wide range of economic activities were planned for the area: office, crafts, light manufacturing, housing, services, culture, and leisure. Officially, Holmens Bruk said the company would need roughly one third (6,000 sqm) of the planned office space in the area, but the company moved its headquarters to another part of town and does not seem to have been seriously interested in the prospect.

According to a Social Democratic politician active at the time, Holmens Bruk was in 1986 negotiating with the largest developer in town, Lundbergs AB. Evidently, Holmens Bruk was not interested in developing the property itself but rather wished to sell it off as quickly as possible. Following informal negotiations between Holmens Bruk and city government, there was however an agreement made that a Scandinavian architectural contest (Allmän Nordisk Arkitektävling) would be held. The jury was constituted by representatives of the company, architects and officials from city government. According to the program of the contest, a wide range of economic activities were planned for the area: office, crafts, light manufacturing, housing, services, culture, and leisure. Officially, Holmens Bruk said the company would need roughly one third (6,000 sqm) of the planned office space in the area, but the company moved its headquarters to another part of town and does not seem to have been seriously interested in the prospect.
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The mill as seen from the north in the beginning of the 1900s, where the symphony hall would be developed in the late 1980s.

At the time of the contest the property was not yet open to the public, but the competitors were given a guided, historically focused tour through the premises. Already here the reasons for future conflicts could be discerned. The County Board of Administration and the City Museum stated that this landscape constituted a national interest, riksintresse, and that there were also archaeological remains here that should be excavated. Holmens Bruk, on the other hand, meant that the development needed a “sound balance between culture and economy”. “Culture”, here seen as the needs for historic preservation, was pitted against “economy”, which represented the interests of developers and real estate owners. A few days later, the city government obviously had decided to downplay
the risk of a conflict when it made a statement for the largest newspaper.\textsuperscript{167}

Identifying two conflicting interests and pitting them against each other was a method used by the property owner in order to mobilize forces for the defence of his ownership. Neither the city government nor the County Board of Administration wished to see a conflict, and from a policy perspective, historic preservation and development may go hand in hand. They do not have to come in conflict. At this time, however, the property owner obviously saw an apparent risk of getting tied up by legislation restricting the reuse, or tearing down, of the buildings. In time, the conflict would escalate, demonstrating the power relations between developer and authority. It seems as if Holmens Bruk more or less had been forced by the city to arrange the contest, when it really just wanted to sell the property.\textsuperscript{168}

The contest produced ideas mainly on how to develop public spaces, give the area an overall design and some suggestions for reusing the existing building stock.\textsuperscript{169} Developing public spaces were regarded as a great concern for the city, since the area had never been accessible for pedestrians. Without proper and safe thoroughfares, the area would never become attractive. Three winners were appointed, of which the first prize winner suggested a fairly cautious renewal of the buildings. Reuse through historic preservation had been one of the absolutely most important outcomes of the contest, which meant that some of the previous surfaces of water could be restored and that facades facing Strömmen and the main streets surrounding the Holmen district would be preserved.

\textsuperscript{167} Stated by Rune Rosenqvist in Norrköpings Tidningar, May 23, 1986.
\textsuperscript{168} Interview with Rune Rosenqvist, November 15, 2007.

Later in 1987, vital parts of the Holmen District were designated as a historic national interest by the National Heritage Board through the new legislation on the protection of natural resources (Code of Natural Resources). This meant that the industrial character of the district, with its narrow streets and tall, plastered facades from the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century had to be preserved. Nothing was to be demolished until future uses had been decided upon.\textsuperscript{170}

DEVELOPING PUBLIC SPACES

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

There were however limits put on the development of public space. Playgrounds and parks would not be placed here, since the character of industrial heritage and stone architecture was to be preserved. A proposed playground and park was moved away after first having been located to the center of the district. Instead a plaza called Holmentorget - completely deserted on an ordinary day - was placed in the center with two of the giant rolls previously used in the paper mill placed in a raised position. A single tree was also planted.

The architectural contest gave the city and Holmens Bruk access to a bank of ideas on how to reconcile requirements of preservation with needs of renewal. A great challenge was how to integrate an area which historically had had a single, isolated purpose with the city center, without renouncing the character of the built industrial heritage. The proposed integration of housing would be a troubling issue. People did not want to live in an industry-looking area, and with housing certain additional requirements on urban design would be added, such as car parking, green areas and playgrounds. In the end, housing would only be placed on the fringes of the Industrial Landscape, giving precedence to the preservation of the industrial architecture.

BUILDING THE SYMPHONY AND CONFERENCE HALL

Around the year 1990 there was still no large establishment in the Industrial Landscape. The Museum of Labour opened in 1991, and plans for building a symphony and conference hall. At the time of the architectural contest back in 1986, there had been great uncertainty about the possibilities of financing such a project. In the late 1980s, the situation for the Norrköping symphony orchestra became more desperate: its hall (“Hörsalen”) from 1913 had become under dimensioned, since it only took an audience of 400, and there were no spaces for rehearsal. The city was now considering the combination of a new premise that could house both the orchestra and the publically owned conference center, which was located right outside the city. The orchestra would not get a new hall to use on its own. In order to make the establishment feasible, concerts would have to take turns with events such as exhibits, expos, conferences and cultural happenings.

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

In 1988 the Holmens Bruk property was bought by two real estate companies, L E Lundbergs AB and SIAB, which were given development rights by the city. Together these two real estate companies formed a development company, Holmenbyggarna, to build on the site. A culture and conference center requiring an investment of SEK 370 million was planned to be placed inside the former paper mill, financed through a government sponsored enterprise. Initially, a partnership between the city and a free church (Sion) had been negotiated, with the goal of developing a combined church and symphony hall. The negotiations ended early in 1989, officially with the explanation that the proposed development had grown in such a way that the church could not join the partnership. Still late in 1988, however, plans for the hall included a large part destined to become a chapel.

In 1990 Holmenbyggarna presented its plans for the property. The company wanted to a privately owned conference center complete with a hotel, which was to called “Holmen Expo”. The first prize winner of the architectural contest, Finnish Kai Wartiainen, was hired to design the development. Wartiainen’s firm in Helsinki joined forces with the Stockholm based firm ADS, which was a firm with experience from major preservation and development projects in the capital. Wartiainen and ADS declared that they wished to reuse as much as possible of the existing building stock. (Häger 2007)

In a city run by the Social Democrats, the development company found it wise to appeal to the public with a broad range of cultural and leisure activities and not just conferences and concerts, which naturally would attract more visitors than inhabitants. The project leader Peter Whass told a local magazine that

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

---

176 Norrköpings Tidningar, April 22, 1986.
177 Letter from Sion to Norrköping city council, January 5, 1989.
Finally, in 1991 a limited company - “Norrköpings Kultur och Kongress KB” – was formed between the city, with a fourth of the shares, and five major developers (L.E. Lundbergs being one of them), in order to finance the new center inside the paper mill, drawn by Ivar Tengbom and built in the 1920s.179 When communicating the development project to the community, however, the development project was called a “culture and conference center”, giving it a broader definition and thereby making it less controversial.180

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

For this purpose, a committee with delegates from the City, the County Administrative Board, the National Heritage Board and the developer met continuously for two years in order to deal continuously with design and preservation issues. The committee was considered so successful that it is still in use, guiding development in this historic district. Subsequently it became a model for public-private governance studied by national authorities.

When finished in 1994, the city bought the other shares and became the sole owner of the hall. Today, the hall is a cultural icon in Norrköping and is used for symphonies, conferences, festivals and other cultural attractions. It is run by a company owned by the city.

Through the Holmen committee, especially the city planner and the county antiquarian were able to influence the developer’s representative in an informal way and make him more receptive to the historic preservation of the environment. In 1996 the County Administrative Board was able to support the preservation of a coal conveyor with a grant of 700,000 SEK, and another building (The Hangar, later renamed The Wing) was preserved with the help of the county labour board. The developer has explained that only through the building of mutual trust between the group’s members, the conflict was possible to solve.181 Even though the individual stories of the members differ somewhat, the conclusion can be made that the Holmen group proved to be a way of direct government that efficiently defused the previous battle between the developer and the preservation authorities.

CONCLUSION

In 1995, the city received the prestigious award of the Swedish Urban Environment Council for preserving the Holmen district.182 This was one evidence for that the redevelopment of the Holmen district had finally been a successful encounter between development and historic preservation, even though substantial parts of this industrial site remained to be redeveloped at that time. Through national land marking, the character of the district was protected. In order to make redevelopment possible and to guide it, a government sponsored enterprise was then created. When a conflict occurred, preservation authorities effectively used their regulative power and

180 Interview with Kaj Krantz, October 4, 2007.
182 Lundström, M. & L. Nystöm (eds.) Industrilandskapet.
cooperated with the developer in a constructive way to find a solution acceptable to both parties. Negotiations that not only solved current problems but also attended to long-term issues in the district were crucial in order for the development to progress.

Looking back, we can see that Norrköping has used the Industrial Landscape along the Motala River to break away from a situation of economic stagnation and social degradation, facing a brighter future of small business entrepreneurship, higher education facilities and knowledge-based industry. As a way of regulation, however, historic preservation did not make a direct contribution to regeneration but acted more as a way of guiding the pace and architectural qualities of the development.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

One of the purposes with this report was the surveying and comparing of national policies of historic preservation in Sweden and USA. There are obvious differences and similarities which become evident in a comparison. It is often said that Swedish preservation movement has its roots in state policies from the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, there are great similarities in the more recent developments. Until the 1950s and 60s, the Swedish preservation was to a large extent a locally based grassroots movement, much as it was in USA. In more recent years, the field of historic preservation has become a target for consciously developed policies, resulting from professionalization and a changing political environment (such as the growth of green politics) within which preservation has a much stronger legitimacy than before.

Besides surveying and comparing policies, I have made the argument that national policy only influences rehabilitation projects to a certain degree. A question asked in the introductory chapter was: “Are the local practices of city and state governors, planners and developers perhaps more important for the end results and the consequences of urban redevelopment than policies?” Bearing in mind that three case studies, two from USA and one from Sweden, could not give a comprehensive answer to the question, I would still suggest that rehabilitation of the built environment has to be studied at the local level in order to be clearly understood. Local political traditions, for example, should be scrutinized.

A second argument in this report has been that physical structures are actively attributed new meanings through urban redevelopment. I have shown this by studying how issues of authenticity and the preservation of “industrial character” have been addressed in the three cases. I do not argue that there is one authentic interpretation of industrial heritage. That is impossible since all interpretations of the past are made from a contemporary view which is influenced by the issues of our own time, not the ones of yesterday. Blighted properties are today becoming symbols of culture, creativity and regeneration through the actions of property owners, developers and politicians.
This is why taste and aesthetics become important factors when deciding what an authentic, reused industrial building should be used and how it should look.

The built environment is actively interpreted and manipulated by in order to make buildings and their surroundings attractive to capital investment. The social and economic needs of the neighborhood are often given a lower priority because of their relative lack of capital and political influence. This became evident not least in the cases of Baltimore and Durham. The social and cultural needs of the neighborhoods were played down in favour of large real estate companies.

This report is the result of research carried out at Tema Q, Linköping University, from summer 2006 to the beginning of 2008. The research was funded by the Norrköping-based science foundation Forskning och Framtid. I would like to thank the foundation for generously funding my work in Norrköping/Linköping during the mentioned time period. At the outset, the ambition was to compare urban regeneration and historic preservation in Sweden and the U.S., exemplified by the cities of Norrköping and Baltimore. In the end, a comparative case in Italy was also included.

I had the fortune to spend eight months as a Riksbankens Jubileumsfond “Senior Urban Fellow” at the Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies in Baltimore, from October 2006 to May 2007. Some results of this project have recently been published in a report by Centrum för kommunstrategiska studier (CKS) in Norrköping: Industriav och kulturmiljöpolicy i stadsförnyelseprocesser: Norrköping, Baltimore och Milano (2008).

A international conference on this theme was organized in Visby 10-12 September 2008 (The Sustainable Development of Cultural Quarters: International Perspectives), and an anthology with papers from the meeting is expected to be published in 2009.
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