



FP7-SCIENCE-IN-SOCIETY-2011-1
Grant Agreement No. 289076

European workshop programme:

Workshop 10: Cultural Heritage and Creative City / Regional Development

Budapest, Hungary, 16 September 2014

Summary and documentation

Guntram Geser and Hannes Selhofer, Salzburg Research



The CreativeCH project is funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of content

Page | 2

1	WORKSHOP BRIEF, AGENDA AND PARTICIPANTS	4
1.1	Workshop brief.....	4
1.2	Programme	5
1.3	List of participants.....	6
2	PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION RESULTS.....	7
2.1	Workshop presentations	7
2.2	Discussion	16
2.3	Key results.....	17
3	WORKSHOP RELATED LINKS AND ONLINE MATERIAL	19
3.1	Organisations and projects	19
3.2	Related publications	20
3.3	Workshop material online	21
4	CREATIVECH SERIES OF WORKSHOPS.....	22
4.1	Workshop objectives.....	22
4.2	Overview of the 10 CreativeCH workshops	23



ACRONYMS OF THE PROJECT PARTNERS:

MFG	MFG Baden-Württemberg, Germany
mNACTEC	Museu de la Ciència i de la Tècnica de Catalunya, Spain
PIN	PIN - Servizi didattici e scientifici per l'università de Firenze, Italy
SRFG	Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft m.b.H., Austria
UoC	Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal
UVT	Universitatea de Vest Din Timisoara, Romania

DISCLAIMER:

The CreativeCH project is funded with support of the European Commission. This document reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

TERMS OF USE:

This work is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License. The license also applies to the included CreativeCH images and figures.

1 Workshop brief, agenda and participants

1.1 Workshop brief

Workshop focus: The workshop addressed city and regional development strategies that are focused on cultural heritage assets and creative industries. A specific focus was on the sustainability of such development.

Workshop questions:

- How can cultural heritage contribute to city/regional development and creative “place making” vs. formulas that lead to cultural uniformity and sterility?
- How to go beyond shallow “cultural branding” and combine historic depth and creative vitality to create truly attractive places for investing, living and working?

Workshop context: The workshop has been organised in collaboration with the Institute for Social and European Studies (ISES), Köszeg, Hungary. The Institute since 2011 holds the UNESCO Chair in Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainability, and offers a post-graduate programme that provides an interdisciplinary specialization in cultural heritage and sustainable development. The workshop was held at the Petofi Irodalmi Múzeum, Budapest, Hungary (<http://www.pim.hu>) on the 16th of September 2014.

Workshop participants: The workshop brought together experts from Hungary and other countries, including from Creative SpIN (Spillovers of Innovation), a network of European cities funded under the URBACT programme. Creative SpIN defines and tests tools and methods to best connect cultural and creative industries with other sectors of the economy, to stimulate “creative spillovers” that contribute to innovation. Furthermore senior and young researchers and project managers of CreativeCH partners participated.

Thematic lead & workshop organisation: The thematic lead of the workshop was Salzburg Research who organised it with support from MFG Baden-Württemberg.

1.2 Programme

13:00 – 13:15	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Guntram GESER, CreativeCH, Salzburg Research, Austria Tamás FEJÉRDY, ISES, Honorary Member of ICOMOS International, Hungary</p>
13:15 – 14:45	<p>Session 1: Creative Spin</p> <p>Creative Spillovers for Innovation Denise BARRETT, Creative SpIN project manager, Business Development & Innovation, Birmingham City Council, United Kingdom</p> <p>Creativity between the walls – new tendencies in the urban development of Budapest Tamás EGEDY, Metropolitan and Urbanisation Research Group, Institute of Geography, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary</p> <p>Embodied creativity: cultural heritage and creative city development Tamás FEJÉRDY, Honorary Member of ICOMOS International, Budapest, Hungary</p> <p>Discussion <i>Cultural heritage and creativity for sustainable development</i></p>
14:45 – 15:15	<p>Coffee break</p>
15:15 – 17:00	<p>Session 2: Creative Transformation</p> <p>Cultural heritage neighbourhoods in urban transformation - citizens' perspectives Ági PAP, PhD, University of Szeged, Department of Economic and Social Geography, Szeged, Hungary</p> <p>Outsized expectations, partial results – The ECoC Pécs 2010 experience András TRÓCSÁNYI and Gábor PIRISI, Institute of Geography, Department of Human Geography and Urban Studies, University of Pécs, Hungary</p> <p>Cultural and Creative Industries in Košice Marián MATUSÁK, project manager, Košice - European Capital of Culture 2013, Slovakia</p> <p>Discussion <i>Creative “place making” – the role of cultural heritage and cultural businesses</i></p> <p>Workshop summary / key takeaways Guntram GESER, CreativeCH, Salzburg Research, Austria</p>

5



1.3 List of participants

Name	Affiliation	Country
Dóra Balint	Institute of Geography, University of Pécs	Hungary
Denise Barrett	Creative SpIN Programme Manager, Business Development & Innovation, Birmingham City Council	United Kingdom
Julia Eder	Salzburg Research, Salzburg	Austria
Tamás Egedy	Metropolitan and Urbanisation Research Group, Institute of Geography, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest	Hungary
Tamás Fejérdy	Architect, Honorary Member of ICOMOS International, Budapest	Hungary
Guntram Geser	Salzburg Research, Salzburg	Austria
Gisela Gonzalo	Museu de la Ciència i de la Tècnica de Catalunya, Terrassa	Spain
Ion Imbrescu	Universitatea de Vest Din Timisoara	Romania
Cinzia Luddi	PIN - Servizi didattici e scientifici per l'università de Firenze, Prato	Italy
Andrea Mati	Institute of Geography, University of Pécs	Hungary
Marián Matusák	Project manager, Košice - European Capital of Culture 2013, Košice	Slovakia
Dorel Micle	Universitatea de Vest Din Timisoara	Romania
Ági Pap	PhD, Department of Economic and Social Geography, University of Szeged	Hungary
Corina Popa	Universitatea de Vest Din Timisoara	Romania
Eliána Popevi	Universitatea de Vest Din Timisoara	Romania
Carme Prats	Museu de la Ciència i de la Tècnica de Catalunya, Terrassa	Spain
Paola Ronzino	PIN - Servizi didattici e scientifici per l'università de Firenze, Prato	Italy
Stefano Sbarbati	MFG Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart	Germany
Patric Tátsai	Institute of Geography, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest	Hungary
András Trócsányi	Head of the Department of Human Geography and Urban Studies, Institute of Geography, University of Pécs	Hungary

2 Presentations and discussion results

The participants were welcomed by Ágnes Füle of the workshop host Petöfi Irodalmi Múzeum, Guntram Geser of Salzburg Research on behalf of the CreativeCH project, and Tamás Fejérdy who represented the Institute for Social and European Studies (ISES). The workshop was organised in collaboration with ISES that since 2011 holds the UNESCO Chair in Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainability.

Tamás Fejérdy, Honorary Member of ICOMOS International, highlighted the role of cultural heritage as historical environment of cities and major factor of local cultural identity. He also emphasised the importance of education and professional specialisation in cultural heritage and sustainable development as offered by the ISES post-graduate programme. Guntram Geser briefly introduced the participants to the context of CreativeCH as a project in the Science and Society programme of the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme and the overall theme of the workshop: Cultural Heritage and Creative City / Regional Development.

Presentations on cities in Hungary (Budapest and Pécs), Slovakia (Košice) and the United Kingdom (Birmingham) provided a set of examples for discussing the role of cultural and creative industries in the development of cities and regions. Furthermore issues in releasing the creativity embodied in cultural heritage and citizen's perspectives of the value of cultural heritage / historic environment were addressed.

2.1 Workshop presentations

Cultural and Creative Industries

Denise Barrett (Birmingham City Council, UK) in her presentation "Creative Spillovers for Innovation" explained how methods developed and tested in the Creative SpIN project can help cities to connect cultural and creative industries with other sectors of the economy. The aim is to stimulate "creative spillovers" that contribute to innovation, in public and social services, for instance. Creative SpIN is a project funded under the European URBACT programme and involves nine partner cities: Birmingham (UK), Bologna (Italy), Essen

(Germany), Kortrijk and Mons (Belgium), Košice (Slovakia), Óbidos (Portugal), Rotterdam (Netherlands) and Tallinn (Estonia). Each partner city has identified a key sector for innovation, established an URBACT local support group, and implements a local action plan.

Birmingham is the largest local authority in Europe that governs and provides services to a diverse population of over 1 million people. In recent years the city has carried out major regeneration projects and established city-wide initiatives (e.g. creative city initiative, health and well-being board). In the Creative SpIN project Birmingham has chosen the health sector to develop cross-sector collaborations and promote creative spillovers. There is a critical need to develop new ways of working, collaboration and business models to enable the city fulfill the public health function despite shrinking public funds. On the other hand, the city is home to world class arts and cultural organisations (e.g. the Birmingham Museum & Art Gallery, Royal Ballet and others) and a growing cultural and creative sector, which is perceived as a key factor of economic growth.

Responding to the challenges posed by changes in the health sector and social deprivation in some districts, the city is testing the potential of creative spillovers in the Ladywood district. The district has some of the most deprived areas in the country, including high unemployment among the young population and the worst health outcomes in the city. The local action plan includes co-locating health and community services, connecting the services to cultural and creative industries clusters in the district, and promoting stakeholder engagement to improve employability and health outcomes. Among the practical methods is a smart guide enabling collaboration between stakeholders or the Royal Ballet offering a program of physical activities for children and elderly people.

The presentation of Denise Barrett made clear that cultural and creative industries should not only be seen as a driver of economic growth but also as vital for cross-sector innovations. The example of services for health and well-being was very useful to make the case.

Tamás Egedy of the Institute of Geography, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest in his presentation “Creativity between the walls” addressed the success factors of creative and knowledge-intensive industries. Instead of Richard Florida’s 3T’s (Talent, Technology, Tolerance) he emphasized a set of factors that were identified in the ACRE project (EU, FP6 project, 10/2006-09/2010). The factors are the 3P’s – Pathways, Place, Personal Networks (Musterd *et al.* 2010); in brief:

- Pathways are the historical development paths city-regions have followed and generated specific infrastructures and conditions (political, economic, social, cultural, physical) which they can build upon;
- Place relates to unique characteristics of city-regions which may offer special economic, environmental or other opportunities, including benefiting from cultural heritage assets;
- Personal Networks mean the presence, strength and functioning of family ties and social networks which are important in attracting and retaining different types of people.

Contrary to Florida's emphasis on diversity and tolerance, the ACRE project identified personal trajectories, networks, and job opportunities as keys to understand the development of the creative economy. Concerning "living in the city" – in the case of ACRE: Amsterdam, Barcelona, Birmingham, Budapest, Dublin, Helsinki, Leipzig, Milan, Munich, Poznan, Riga, Sofia and Toulouse – the project found that personal trajectories are definitely the main motivators. "Hard" factors are decisive for attracting and settling down creatives, while "soft" factors are important to retain creatives in the long run. The hard factors include size of city, transport links, employment opportunities, etc.; soft factors include openness, cultural diversity, leisure & entertainment and environmental conditions (e.g. historic / heritage elements, proximity to natural environment).

Tamás Egedy also presented interesting figures for the Creative Economy (creative industries + knowledge-intensive industries) in Hungary and the Budapest metropolitan region, e.g. locations, number of enterprises, employees and revenues. Furthermore he gave an overview of major urban regeneration projects as well as industrial clustering (e.g. the Mobility and Multimedia Cluster) in Budapest.

Tamás Egedy thought that regarding the creative economy Central and Eastern European (CEE) cities do not lag behind their Western European counterparts – especially not concerning the economically more relevant part of knowledge-intensive industries. The keys to success of cities – the 3P's – are mostly the same everywhere, and the overall goals are a strong position in the country and internationally, recognition as a center of creativity and technology, and positive social and environmental conditions. As strong impediments are to be noted a lack of clear strategies, high level of bureaucracy, missing cooperation between local/regional authorities and actors, a weak civil society, and outflow of talent.

European Capitals of Culture – Pécs 2010 vs. Košice 2013

The workshop provided an opportunity to compare the experiences of two European Capitals of Culture (ECoC), Pécs (Hungary) in 2010 and Košice (Slovakia) in 2013. It turned out that the approaches and results of these cities indeed were very different.

András Trócsanyi of the Institute of Geography, University of Pécs, Hungary in his presentation “Outsized expectations, partial results” noted that from the 19th century Pécs was an important mining town and trade centre, but after the fall of the post-war Socialist regime faced massive and rapid deindustrialization, decreasing incomes, unemployment and various legacies of the Socialist era (poor infrastructure, extensive brownfields, etc.). As a response to the continuous loss of economic position the medium-size city (about 157,000 inhabitants) identified the value of its historic heritage for a new self-definition (the Early Christian Necropolis of Pécs was inscribed in the World Heritage List in 2000) and developed a pole program of economic restructuring which included cultural, health and environment industries as new key factors. The ECoC 2010 call provided the opportunity to plan large investments in new cultural infrastructure under the slogan “The borderless city”, with goals such as erasing inner and outer borders, revitalizing and expanding the downtown eastwards (based on cultural functions), giving a long-term advantage to the city via new cultural facilities, and making the city more attractive (e.g. revival of public spaces and parks).

András Trócsanyi’s evaluation of Pécs ECoC 2010 includes:

- Pécs implemented an infrastructure-heavy program, with capital investments of € 140 million, and operating expenditures of € 35 million for the event itself.
- The capital investment was mostly spent on 5 key projects: Zsolnay Cultural Quarter (the largest among several projects focused on the rehabilitation of public spaces); Pécs Conference and Concert Centre, South Transdanubian Regional Library and Knowledge Centre, and Grand Exhibition Space. None of them were ready by January 2010; the Zsolnay Quarter finished only in April 2012.
- The focus on cultural infrastructure was appropriate as the main existing elements were built or renovated in the 1970-80s and there was not a single large-scale investment in the public sphere between 1990 and 2005. Also the M6/60 motorway was completed as a side-effect of the ECoC.

- Cultural projects and events: The program of 650 cultural projects and 4,675 individual events in 2010 (12 each day) was overdone and lacked clearly defined goals. The program was hardly perceived beyond the regional/national level (e.g. there were no “blockbuster” events), and it seems unlikely that the target of one million visitors was reached.
- Tourism impact: Pécs is a secondary center in Hungarian Tourism, which in its peak year in 2003 only received 1.5% of all overnight stays in Hungary (decreased to 0.97% in 2012). In the ECoC year there was a significant 19% growth in the number of overnight visitors; like most other ECoCs Pécs experienced the typical post-event drop in visitors. The goal of mobilizing private investments for more accommodation capacity was not fulfilled (only one larger new hotel opened).
- Image building: The goal of “putting the city on the map” as a prospering and attractive city has not been achieved (in part due to the shadow of the much larger 2010 ECoCs Ruhrgebiet and Istanbul).
- Cultural and creative economy: No breakthrough was achieved and the fundamentals are still weak.
- What has been achieved however is: The new elements of cultural infrastructure provided a major enhancement in available cultural spaces and services; the revitalized public spaces represent a substantial „face-lifting” of the inner city, and Pécs has become a much more liveable and popular city than before ... “a more European city for the average people”.

The Pécs ECoC 2010 certainly suffered from the economic crisis. There was a lack of private investments and no extra national public funds were mobilized (the same amount of funds were allocated for development without ECoC to other Hungarian regional centres as well). There will be long term financial problems raising questions of sustainability of the cultural infrastructures.

Marián Matusák, painted a very different picture of the Košice ECoC 2013 in Slovakia and the sustainability of the activities. He is a project manager of the non-profit organization Košice 2013 (currently 6 full-time and 3 part-time employees) that was established by the city to manage the ECoC project and ensure its impact beyond 2013. Indeed, the city wanted to exploit the Košice ECoC 2013 as an exceptional chance to promote and cluster cultural and

creative industries. This was part of a broader strategy aimed at transforming the city from a post-industrial (steel industry) to a creative economy center, building on new technologies (especially ICT), culture and creativity.

Marián Matusák summarized the ECoC as follows:

- Infrastructure: The building of cultural infrastructure was not the primary goal, although 20 investment projects were realized, including the Kasárne/Kulturpark (former barracks from the 19th century), Kunsthalle / The Hall of Arts (a former indoor swimming pool), and seven SPOTS (centres in the city quarters connecting social and cultural activities).
- Projects and events: There were 600 cultural projects and about 2500 events, including 100 festivals, 470 visual arts exhibitions and performances, 270 theatre and dance performances, 250 multi-genre events, 270 conferences, seminars, lectures, 770 workshops.
- Creative industries program 2010-2013: This program included 60 artistic residencies (K.A.I.R. project), 40 residencies were sent out to other countries (Creative Industries Toolkit), 24 supported artists & creatives (ESCALATOR project), 73 supporting events, trainings, seminars, workshops, and larger conferences such as “Shaping the Future” (2010), “Policies for Social Era” (2011) and “Place!” (2013).

The overall goal of transforming the steel city into a creative city by 2010 has been elaborated into a Creative Economy Master Plan that aims to involve a wide range of stakeholders and implement an action plan of 40 projects. Several of the projects for the period 2013-2015 have been started within the ECoC.

Among the stakeholders that are firmly on board are the IT Valley Košice (established in 2007 and aiming to increase the number of IT jobs from 6000 to 10,000 in 2018), Visit Košice (in charge of re-branding Košice to a “creative city”), the Coalition 2013+ (U.S. Steel Košice and T-Systems Slovakia), the Pavol Jozef Šafárik University and the Technical University Košice. Furthermore international partnerships have been established through the European Creative Business Network (ECBN), the Network for Innovations in Culture and Creativity in Europe (N.I.C.E.), and the Creative SpIN project. On the local level the Creative SpIN project allows Košice training and potentially retaining talented people through cross-sectorial activities.

According to Marián Matusák the main requirements for success of Košice's cultural and creative industries strategy are a fit-for-purpose learning and skills offer, an excellent arts and cultural sector, appropriate workspace and high-speed broadband, access to markets, business support, access to finance and a supportive legal framework.

Concerning the legacy of the Košice ECoC after 2013, Marián Matusák noted the K13 - Košice Cultural Centres (i.e. the local cultural hubs Kulturpark, Kunsthalle, SPOTS, Amphitheatre and others), and the Košice 2013 Cultural and Creative Industries development agency. He characterized them as being "in transition", but their core activities are expected to be sustained.

In summary, a comparison of the Pécs and Košice ECoCs shows considerable differences in terms of implementation and results. Pécs 2010 was mostly focused on building cultural infrastructure and revitalizing public spaces. This was needed and made Pécs a more liveable city for the local population. Intended other effects such as "putting the city on the map" (e.g. tourism) and stimulating the cultural and creative economy were hardly achieved. In contrast, the Košice 2013 ECoC was used strategically to promote and cluster cultural and creative industries; a particular focus was on training and professionalization. Infrastructure investment was focused on centers of art and media production and consumption; the creative industries program supported the work and networking of artists and creatives. Important regional actors (e.g. IT industry, universities, public agencies) became active stakeholders in the Creative Economy Master Plan. If all requirements for long-term success can be fulfilled (e.g. access to finance and markets) remains to be seen, but keeping the momentum and sustaining the support for professionalization and business development will be crucial.

Cultural heritage as "embodied creativity" and citizen's perspectives

Cultural heritage was referred to as one of the soft factors in the presentation by Tamás Egedy, i.e. under "Place" of the 3P's identified in the ACRE project. Among the two European Capitals of Culture, Pécs had a strong focus on cultural heritage through developing of cultural tourism attractions beyond the World Heritage label, in particular, the Zsolnay Cultural Quarter which was established on the site of a former world renowned ceramics factory of the Zsolnay family. Two further presentations brought cultural heritage more centre stage.

Tamás Fejérdy, Honorary Member of ICOMOS International, introduced the workshop participants to the concept of cultural heritage as “embodied creativity”. Basically the concept understands cultural heritage as creative expressions, embodied in historic architecture and moveable cultural objects as held by museums and galleries. Tamás Fejérdy emphasized that conservation of cultural heritage and creativity are not opposites, if re-use of and additions to existing built heritage are truly creative. Criteria for such creativity include

- that the creative intervention should be rooted in and appropriate to the particular heritage site, i.e. corresponding to the cultural identity of the place – not a fashionable, “forced creativity” intervention;
- if contrasts between existing and new elements are used they should not diminish but highlight the existing heritage values (i.e. keeping and reinforcing the historically authentic aspects),
- the new / added value of the creative intervention should be tangible and beneficial.

Consequently, interventions in heritage environments pose specific challenges for creativity to generate solutions that ensure at the same time preservation of heritage values and meeting new needs of social life and economic activities. Tamás Fejérdy emphasized that in the historical evolution of cities such “creative answers” often formed a rich, multi-layered heritage, expressing the continuity and cultural identity of the community. He added that truly creative cities should have the resilience and capacity to renew themselves without losing their cultural heritage and identity.

Ági Pap presented results of her recently completed PhD thesis at the University of Szeged (Department of Economic and Social Geography). The empirical work focused on three cultural heritage neighbourhoods in Budapest: the Castle District at the Buda side of the city (2,400 residents; the most important touristic area); the Inner-Erzsébetváros (17,800 residents), the part of the 7th city district that was the centre of Jewish life in Budapest before World War II; and the Wekerle Estate in the 19th city district that is a unique, garden-city-like residential area with more than thousand houses built in the Hungarian art nouveau style (10,900 residents).

Ági Pap’s research questions focused on how the residents of the different areas perceive the heritage character of their living environment, including attitudes towards existing regulations of heritage protection; whether the cultural heritage strengthens the local identity

and the attachment of the residents, and if there are conflicts between the residents and the various actors involved in the urban development (e.g. public administration, monument protection, investors / developers, local businesses, tourists).

Briefly summarizing some of the results of the questionnaire survey with 893 residents:

- Advantage of living in a cultural heritage neighborhood: This was most strongly felt by residents of the Castle District, e.g. nice place, historical environment, specific atmosphere. In the other two areas such values ranged much further down on the list. In the Inner-Erzsébetváros the residents mostly valued the location (central, everything is close, good transportation). Good community / friendly residents were recognized in the Castle District and Wekerle Estate, but did not show up on the list of residents of Inner-Erzsébetváros. Only the Wekerle Estate was perceived as a family/kid-friendly area.
- Disadvantages of the area: Lots of tourists in the Castle District; dirt, unpleasant smells and noise in the Inner-Erzsébetváros (vivid night-life scene); regulations imposed by monument protection in the Wekerle Estate, where the buildings/flats are mostly owned by the residents.
- Feeling at home: Residents of the Castle District and the Wekerle Estate felt at home while in the Inner-Erzsébetváros many agreed only somewhat or were undecided. Heritage buildings as part of the residential environment added to feeling at home in all three areas, but less so in the Inner-Erzsébetváros.
- Conflicting situations: In the Castle District between residents and tourism providers and local government; in the Wekerle Estate between residents and monument protection and local government; and in the inner-Erzsébetváros many conflicts between different actors because of intensive developments in the area.

In general the results demonstrate that cultural heritage elements that are in bad conditions do not strengthen the local identity and feeling at home. Public or private ownership of heritage buildings and regulations for monument protection play an important role. The more intensively an area can and is “developed”, the more lines of conflicts there are between different actors.

2.2 Discussion

In the discussion of the workshop theme and presentations no participant questioned the role of cultural and creative industries as important drivers of city and regional development. However, the examples of the Pécs and Košice ECoCs showed that different strategies (and certainly lack of a clear strategy) can result in very different outcomes.

Culture and cultural heritage are important local/regional values (e.g. for a liveable city) but as such may not be drivers of economic growth and job creation. Hence setting a strategic priority in this sector and investing in cultural infrastructure must be well considered. Re-use of historic buildings and structures, e.g. for cultural and creative facilities, will be beneficial in many cases, however requires appropriate creative interventions.

There was a strong agreement among the workshop participants that attracting, training and retaining talented people is one of the key factors of success of creative cities. The issue of “brain drain” towards the capital / metropolitan areas was addressed by several participants.

Participants also thought that mobilizing stakeholders across the board is crucial for successful creative city / regional development. With regard to cultural and creative industries it was also considered that universities should be subsumed under this category and urged to offer appropriate curricula that provide fit-for-purpose learning and skills development.

The framework of the 3P's – Pathways, Place, Personal Networks – was recognized as highly relevant for thinking about required conditions of creative city / regional development. Also the importance of cross-sector innovations through knowledge and skills of cultural and creative businesses and organisations was acknowledged. Public and social services may be one of the prime targets of such “creative spillovers”.

The role of clearly targeted policies was seen as vital, however some participants felt that lack of openness of local/regional authorities to new approaches (“bureaucracy”) still is a major impediment to creative development of cities and regions. One participant even asked “what can be done about uncreative politicians”?

2.3 Key results

[1] Creative city / regional development policies and strategies: Cities and regions aim for a strong position in the country and internationally, recognition as centers of creativity and technology, and positive social and environmental conditions. The role of cultural and creative industries (CCIs) as important drivers of city and regional development are recognized. However, different strategies (and certainly lack of a clear strategy) of CCI promotion can result in very different outcomes.

[2] Involving stakeholders across the board: Mobilizing all relevant stakeholders is crucial for successful creative city / regional development. Development initiatives often face conflicts among parties with different interests (e.g. investors / developers, monument protection, local businesses and citizens). Governance of the public sector (e.g. municipality, regional government) has an important role to play in the resolution of such conflicts.

[3] Cultural and creative industries “spillovers”: Cultural and creative industries (CCIs) should not only be seen as a driver of economic growth but also as vital for cross-sector innovations. Such innovations may be achieved through promoting “spillovers” of CCI knowledge and skills into other sectors. Public and social services may be one of the prime targets of such “creative spillovers”.

[4] The 3P’s – Pathways, Place, Personal Networks: The 3P’s (developed in the ACRE project) may provide a more useful framework for thinking about required conditions for creative city / regional development than the 3T’s (Talent, Technology, Tolerance) and similar schemes.

[5] Requirements for success: Among the main requirements of success of creative city / regional development are attraction and promotion of creative businesses and talented people, access to finance and markets, and a supportive legal framework. Bureaucratic mindsets, missing cooperation between local / regional authorities and other actors, and a weak civil society can be strong impediments for creative city / regional development.

[6] Providing fit-for-purpose curricula, training and professionalization: The development of the necessary local / regional base of knowledge and skills for cultural and creative businesses requires that universities offer appropriate curricula that provide fit-for-purpose learning and skills development. Furthermore opportunities for vocational training

and professionalization as well as support for creative work (e.g. residencies and commissioned work), networking and business development support will be necessary.

[7] Brain drain: Attracting and retaining talented people is one of the key factors of success of creative cities and regions. The “brain drain” towards the capital / metropolitan areas is a major issue for medium-size and small towns.

[8] “Hard” and “soft” location factors: Differences between these factors should be recognized. “Hard” factors are decisive for attracting and settling down creative people; they include e.g. size of city, employment opportunities, transport links, etc. “Soft” factors are important to retain creatives in the long run, including cultural diversity and tolerance, leisure & entertainment, and environmental conditions (e.g. historic / heritage elements, proximity to natural environment).

[9] Culture as a priority area of development?: Culture will not necessarily range high on the political agenda, which typically is more concerned about economic development and job generation, social security, public health, etc. Culture and cultural heritage are important local / regional values (i.e. for a liveable city) but as such may not be drivers of economic growth and job creation. Therefore the cultural sector has to demonstrate relevance for city and regional development.

[10] Heritage / historic environment and cultural infrastructures: Heritage / historic environment can strengthen the local identity and contribute to citizens’ pride of place. It can also offer opportunities for re-using historic buildings for cultural and creative facilities / infrastructures. However, preserving heritage values and enabling appropriate new uses requires truly creative interventions.

3 Workshop related links and online material

3.1 Organisations and projects

ACRE - Accommodating Creative Knowledge: Competitiveness of European Metropolitan Regions within the Enlarged EU (FP6 project, 10/2006-09/2010), <http://acre.socsci.uva.nl>

Birmingham Museum & Art Gallery, <http://www.bmag.org.uk>

Birmingham Royal Ballet, <http://www.brb.org.uk>

Budapest Mobility and Multimedia Cluster, <http://mmklaszter.com/en>

Coalition 2013+ (Košice), <http://www.koalicia2013.eu>

Creative Industry (Slovakia), <http://www.creativeindustry.sk>

Creative SpIN - Spillovers of Innovation (URBACT project),
<http://urbact.eu/en/projects/innovation-creativity/creativespin/homepage/>

ECBN - European Creative Business Network, <http://ecbnetwork.eu>

ICOMOS International, <http://www.icomos.org/en/>

Institute for Social and European Studies (ISES), Kőszeg, Hungary – UNESCO Chair in Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainability, <http://www.ises.hu>

IT Valley Košice, <http://www.kosiceitvalley.sk/en>

K.A.I.R. - Košice Artist in Residence, <http://www.kair.sk>

K13 - Košice Cultural Centres, <http://www.k13.sk>

Kasárne/Kulturpark (Košice) on Facebook, [https://sk-
facebook.com/KASARNEKULTURPARK](https://sk-facebook.com/KASARNEKULTURPARK)

Košice 2013 - European Capital of Culture, <http://www.kosice2013.sk>



N.I.C.E. - Network for Innovations in Culture and Creativity in Europe, <http://www.e-c-c-e.de/index.php?id=241&L=1>

Pécs 2010 - European Capital of Culture, <http://www.pecs2010.hu/en>

Place! International Conference 2013 in Košice, <http://www.creativeeconomy.sk>

SPOTS (Košice), <http://www.spots.sk>

URBACT programme, <http://urbact.eu>

Visit Košice, <http://www.visitkosice.eu/en>

The Role of Cultural Economy in the Structural Revival of Hungarian Cities” (04/2008-10/2012), <http://nyilvanos.otka-palyazat.hu/index.php?menuid=930&lang=EN&num=73739>

Zsolnay Cultural Quarter (Pécs), <http://www.zsolnaynegyed.hu>

3.2 Related publications

Egedy, Tamás and Kovács, Zoltan (2010): Budapest: A great place for creative industry development? in: Urbani izziv, vol. 21, no. 2, 2010, <http://urbani-izziv.uirs.si/Portals/uizziv/papers/urbani-izziv-en-2010-21-02-006.pdf>

Egedy T., Redmond D. & Ehrlich K. (2013): Urban regeneration and housing as potential tools for enhancing the creative economy, in: Musterd S. & Kovács Z. (eds.): Place-making and policies for competitive cities. Wiley-Blackwell, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781118554579.fmatter/pdf>

Fejérdy, Tamás (2009): Approaching 40 years old: World Heritage now and its possible future. In: Stanley-Price, Nicholas and King, Joseph (eds.): Conserving the authentic. Essays in honour of Jukka Jokilehto. ICCROM Conservation Studies 10. Rome: ICCROM 2009, http://www.iccrom.org/ifrcdn/pdf/ICCROM_IC10_JukkaFestchrift_en.pdf

Fejérdy, Tamás (2013): Conservation and changes: continuity – creativity – contrasts in Historic Cities. Discussion paper. V4 Conference: Creative Cities: The Future of Urban Life, ISES, Kőszeg, 25-26 June 2013, http://www.ises.hu/webimages/files/fejerdy_tamas.pdf



Florida, Richard (2002): *The rise of the creative class: And how it is transforming work, leisure, community, and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books

Musterd S., Brown J., Lutz J. *et al.* (2010): *Making creative-knowledge cities. A guide for policy makers*. Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research, <http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/Creative-KnowledgeCities-v3-lowres.pdf>

Pap, Ági (2013): *Residential attitudes towards urban heritage in Budapest – through the example of the Wekerle quarter*”, in: *Geographica Timisiensis*, vol. XXII, nr. 1, 2013: 17-32, <http://www.geografie.uvt.ro/old/cercetare/publicatii/geographica/abstracte/Geographica2013-1/2%20PAP%20REF.pdf>

Pap, Ági (2014): *The relationship between the built cultural heritage and the local identity – actor-centred geographical analysis based on Budapest case studies*. Theses of the PhD dissertation. University of Szeged, Department of Economic and Social Geography, Szeged, http://doktori.bibl.u-szeged.hu/2243/13/Pap_Agi_t%C3%A9zisf%C3%BCzet%20%28angol%29.pdf

Stefán, Klára J. and Trócsányi, András (2012): *Geographic aspects and spread of the cultural economy in Hungary*. In: Trócsányi, A. and Pirisi, G. (eds.): *The role of the cultural economy and tourism in the renewal of cities*. Pécs: Publikon Kiadó, http://old.foldrajz.ttk.pte.hu/tarsadalom/otka/pdf/cultural_economy_geographicap.pdf

Trócsányi, András and Pirisi, Gábor (eds.): *The role of the cultural economy and tourism in the renewal of cities*. Pécs: Publikon Kiadó

3.3 Workshop material online

The presentation slides, information about the speakers, a workshop video and other material are available on the workshop page on the project website:

<http://www.creative-heritage.eu/workshopbudapest.html>



4 CreativeCH series of workshops

4.1 Workshop objectives

The overall aim of CreativeCH is enabling cities and regions across Europe to benefit from Cultural Heritage assets through innovative approaches, products and services that are developed and promoted in creative cooperation of Cultural Heritage (CH) organisations, Science & Technology (S&T) centres and Cultural & Creative Industry (CCI) businesses.

The CreativeCH workshop programme consists of 10 workshops that are organised to share, discuss and consolidate the current experiences in CH – S&T – CCI Cooperation. The project aims at creating a rich and inspiring knowledge base on such cooperation. Therefore the workshops cover a wide range of issues and opportunities in such cooperation.

The workshops foster an open and productive exchange of experiences among the participants. The formats are flexible, chosen according to the particular topic and the type and context of the event at which a workshop is held.

The typical setup that has been used in the workshops already held includes short “show & tell” presentations, demonstrations of innovative digital products and services, and moderated discussion rounds. The duration of such a workshop is about 3-4 hours.

4.2 Overview of the 10 CreativeCH workshops

The table below gives an overview of the topics, schedule & locations, and lead partners of the 10 CreativeCH workshops:

Date	Topic	Location	Lead partner
2012-04-18	Creative clusters	MFG, Stuttgart, <u>Germany</u>	SRFG
2012-05-17	Cultural heritage and ICT in the experience economy	INVTUR 2012 Conference, Aveiro, <u>Portugal</u>	UoC
2012-11-21	Citizen cultural participation	VAST2012 Symposium, Brighton, <u>UK</u>	UVT
2013-05-10	Cultural tourism	Fiera Modernista, Terrassa, <u>Spain</u>	mNACTEC
2013-05-16	Internationalisation and localization of heritage content	PIN, Prato, <u>Italy</u> (as part of the EVA Florence Conference)	PIN
2013-09-17	Business models for creative cooperation	Culture Factory Week, Pilsen, <u>Czech Republic</u> (in the context of the preparation of Pilsen 2015 – European Capital of Culture)	mNACTEC
2013-12-02	New skills and professionalization	DISH - Digital Strategies for Heritage Conference, Rotterdam, <u>Netherlands</u>	PIN
2014-02-18	IPR and management of rights	MWF2014 – Museums and the Web Conference, Florence, <u>Italy</u>	UoC
2014-04-10/11	Creative industries & citizen cultural participation in rural multi-cultural communities	West University of Timisoara and Banat villages, <u>Romania</u>	UVT
2014-09-16	Cultural heritage and creative city / regional development	Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum, Budapest, <u>Hungary</u>	SRFG