

Emerging Issues, Opportunities and Threats and How to Deal with Them

Original

Emerging Issues, Opportunities and Threats and How to Deal with Them / Ponzini, D., Jones, Z.M. - In: Mega-events and Heritage: The Experience of Five European CitiesELETTRONICO. - Cracovia : International Cultural Centre, 2020. - ISBN 9788366419056. - pp. 316-343

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/3012694 since: 2026-07-20T10:24:01Z

Publisher:

International Cultural Centre

Published

DOI:

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

MEGA-EVENTS AND HERITAGE:

THE EXPERIENCE OF FIVE EUROPEAN CITIES

Edited by
Davide Ponzini
Franco Bianchini
Julia Georgi-Nerantzia Tzortzi
Joanna Sanetra-Szeliga



JPICH
Heritage in
Changing
Environments

MEGA-EVENTS AND HERITAGE:
THE EXPERIENCE OF FIVE EUROPEAN CITIES
National case study report publication

© Copyright by the authors and
the International Cultural Centre, 2020

REVIEW

Professor Dr. Andreas Joh. Wiesand
(European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research)
Dr. Marco Bianconi
(Mobility In Chain)

LAYOUT AND COVER DESIGN

Evanthia Dova

FRONT COVER

The Ibrahim Khan, Pafos (Evanthia Dova, 2017)

BACK COVER

Genoa, Palazzo Doria Tursi (Zachary Mark Jones, 2019)
Milan, Piazza Duomo (ExpoinCittà, 2014)
Wrocław, 2016 European Capital of Culture (Wrocław Official
Flickr, 2016)
Hull, Maritime Museum (Enrico Tommarchi, 2017)
Pafos, Attikon/Othello Theatre (Evanthia Dova, 2017)

ISBN: 978-83-66419-05-6



INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL CENTRE

Rynek Główny 25, 31-008 Kraków, Poland

Phone: + 48 12 42 42 800, 811

Fax: +48 12 42 17 844

E-mail: sekretariat@mck.krakow.pl

The ICC publications are available at the bookshop located in the
ICC Gallery or can be ordered online:
<https://mck.krakow.pl/publications/list>



Chapter 7

EMERGING ISSUES, OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS AND HOW TO DEAL WITH THEM

by Davide Ponzini and Zachary M. Jones

The introduction argued that there is a lack of reflection regarding the links between mega-event planning and heritage policy, both in literature as well as in public and policy debates. Given the explorative nature of our work across European cities, this concluding chapter must be, first of all, seen in its intent of generating further discussion and research regarding this precise connection. As the HOMEE project works to spark such debates and harness them to develop and promote informed policy making in Europe and beyond, the inevitable limits of the following reflection should be interpreted as a spur to engage with further and better work in this direction, within as well as outside this specific research project.

7.1 Diversified views and common perspectives across Europe

The methodological discussion in the introductory chapter and the concrete evidence of the cases – especially as displayed in the front page and data sets in each – made clear that this research deals with very different places in different quadrants of Europe. The definitions and roles of heritage in the five events vary significantly. The different planning systems and institutional settings where the events took place evidently conformed significant aspects, specifically in terms of what could be done or even envisioned and what could not, in other words the actual opportunities of intervention for mega-events. The essence of the events considered and their variations also differ across cases. The European Capital of Culture program is a highly adaptable format as seen in the analysis and the UK City of Culture and Expo also imply quite different international, national and local dynamics. The interaction between mega-event planning activities and heritage policies also substantially differed across the cases. In some cases, the city used its heritage strengths for building its image and visibility (Genoa 2004), in others it had to face some problematic aspects of it in order to find new meaning and cultural momentum;

Opposite page: Market Square, Wrocław (source: Wrocław Official Flickr, 2017).

for example Hull 2017 allowed for a broader understanding of the somewhat painful fishing past of the city; Wrocław 2016 was the occasion to reinterpret the recent history of a European city that saw its population substituted almost entirely following WWII. In some cases heritage was the core of projects explicitly promoted by the event (Genoa 2004, Pafos 2017). In others, it had to be searched at the margins, as collateral aspects that have emerged ex-post, based on the research we have conducted (ExpoinCittà for Milan 2015).

Perhaps due to the size and economic relevance in their respective city, each process related to mega-event planning, delivering and legacy has clearly different features from the other cases. In all cases, the event was “mega”, at least in terms of its effects in the evolution of the city as it constituted a clear turning point, sometimes for spatial planning beyond the mega-event interventions, in all cases in terms of the transformation of the urban environment, its heritage and perception. The precise labelling and classification of such a varied set of cases is an issue that could be discussed further, yet this relative effect makes the celebration of the event important and worth studying even when in absolute terms we may be dealing with events of a smaller size. Pafos, though a quite small city compared to the others and a relatively contained event in terms of attendance, is a case in point: the city has changed its vision, the role heritage has, and significant elements in its planning and transformation in relationship to the ECoC event.

The following table shows the wide range of situations in term of city population and wealth, event attendance and tourist visits, the costs of the events and the investment in heritage. The distribution of facts and figures here is not intended as a means of simple one-to-one comparison but as way to highlight the differences among the cases and perhaps among the cities of Europe that could plan to host a mega-event in the near future. It is not only a matter to reassert the distance between the usual suspects (small Pafos and big Milan), but also to show that cities like Genoa had an explicit proposition for improving its heritage and earmarked a large budget to do so while others operated in

a similar direction without a single policy label and clear political recognition. Of course, the Expo event features in Milan are of a greater magnitude when considering the overall investments, though some of the problems and solutions are still in dialogue with those facing many cities in Europe. Such considerations and reflections in fact led to the issue of context as one of the main aspects to be discussed, as will be further developed in the following section.

**Selected Range of Facts and Figures
across the Case Studies**

City population	32,892 (Pafos 2017) – 1,365,000 (Milan 2015)
City GDP per capita	€ 18,283 (Wrocław 2016) – € 36,600 (Milan 2015)
Event attendance	207,250 (Pafos 2017) – 11,000,000 (Milan 2015 – ExpoinCittà program)
Total number of events	168 (Pafos 2017) – 46,310 (Milan 2015– ExpoinCittà program)
Total event cost	€ 8,500,000 (Pafos 2017) – € 14,780,000,000 (Milan 2015)
Investment in heritage	N/A (Wrocław 2016 and Pafos 2017) – € 300,000,000 (Genoa 2004)

Tab. 7.1 – Selected range of facts and figures across the five case studies.

All in all, and despite the methodological difficulties and limits, this variety among cases proved to be a quite heuristic and generative feature, besides being a constitutive aspect of the European Union’s context (“in varietate concordia” or “united in diversity” is the EU motto). Jointly reading and analyzing different situations, different sets of more or less relevant heritage policy and regulation changes and adjustments that occurred in relation to the event, investigating the discourses that diverse actors have mobilized to legitimize and even to prioritize heritage in the bid for competing for the title (or that have emerged during implementation or that sustained post-event changes), detecting the effects of these on the city, its built environment, cultural offering and social meaning proved to be complex

but inspiring for the reasoning among the HOMEE research teams and across the case studies. The struggle to develop similar analytical structures to such different processes and places in transformation paid off in terms of allowing our perspectives to converge, at least regarding core issues, and to foster learning across places and situations.

In all the cases, the mega-event worked as an indisputable accelerator and amplifier of various urban processes. In some cases, policy makers and stakeholders had pre-existing objectives and target areas for the city to develop, redevelop, reuse or transform, with the event allowing them to signify, promote and infuse areas with new meaning and image. In some cases, the chances to do so emerged only as the planning for the event unfolded or even the post-event management approached. Resources for new or renewed infrastructure and facilities constituted an important means to fuel the process and the interest paid by different actors. The longitudinal analysis and the in-depth investigation of the official documents from the bid to the implementation and legacy interventions showed, in all cases, that mega-events are quite adaptable in their target areas, spatial arrangements and distribution of benefits, as the early and grand plans inevitably have to adapt to the real political and planning arenas. Mega-events are formidable umbrellas that embrace pre-existing policies, harness their consensus and speed their implementation. Stressing underused or neglected facilities and areas as well as pouring more pressure on the historic city center or places inevitably intersected with heritage policy, which typically has a slower pace and, in all cases, brought more reflectiveness regarding the values of the built environment (in some occasions about the intangible cultural assets and the city image as well) in the process.

These are important opportunities for heritage-rich cities. Relevant ways of innovating heritage policy making and involving cultural policy makers in the mega-event planning went beyond the programming of cultural policy alone. In particular, directing the additional resources towards heritage targets in a sustainable manner proved to be a

complex challenge in all cases but always attempted by the leading actors (despite the fact that this depends on the institutional settings, the actors at play in high-level decision making as well as the political constituency and perception of the role of heritage in the city and its future). The substance of what policy makers expected from heritage policies, as well as from cultural and leisure policies more generally are, at the urban level, in line with the mega-events: promote more growth and attract public attention and more tourists for the event and for the subsequent years as well. This consistent inclination of pro-growth coalitions in Western cities seems a powerful political force to make other policies converge, including culture and heritage policies. However, the potential mega-event frictions and concrete threats for heritage should not be underestimated. A systematic overview of the opportunities and threats identified in the cases highlight issues that are common to different situation in Europe. These links across the cases constitute a first basis for elaborating more general considerations in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

Heritage opportunities from the case studies

Increase in heritage funding and heritage-led urban regeneration schemes	Genoa 2004, Hull 2017
Improved cooperation and innovation in governance and at multiple levels	Genoa 2004, Milan 2015, Hull 2017
Heritage works completed properly (and/or after long delays), leading to a new discourse and promoted image for cultural heritage (including difficult heritage narratives)	Genoa 2004, Milan 2015, Wrocław 2016, Pafos 2017
Event providing incentive for new or improved long-term city strategies	Genoa 2004, Pafos 2017
New uses for heritage sites and venues (ongoing also after the event) along with continued focus on maintenance/regeneration.	Genoa 2004, Milan 2015, Wrocław 2016, Hull 2017
A measurable increase in heritage communication and understanding	Wrocław 2016, Hull 2017
Event providing new approaches and opportunities for public participation in heritage related decision-making	Hull 2017, Pafos 2017
Adaptability of the event to be right-sized to fit differing local contexts and types of heritage	Wrocław 2016, Pafos 2017
Sustained increase in tourist arrivals and visit to heritage sites and cultural venues	Genoa 2004, Milan 2015, Wrocław 2016, Hull 2017

Heritage threats from the case studies

Short-time frame of the event in conflict with heritage decision making processes, leading to frictions and projects delayed or not finished on time	Genoa 2004, Milan 2015
Lack of long-term management and maintenance of restored heritage sites post-event, overpressure by mass tourism, festivalization and erosion of public/diverse uses, particularly in center areas	Genoa 2004, Milan 2015, Wrocław 2016
Loss of institutional knowledge and networks following the event leading to a loss of long-term thinking/legacy for the post-event period	Genoa 2004, Pafos 2017
Available funds can become exclusively funneled towards the mega-event (at the expense of heritage) and also create new cultural entities dependent on public subsidies	Wrocław 2016
Development of a single dominating heritage narrative that overlooks alternative aspects of heritage or different social groups	Wrocław 2016, Hull 2017
No long-term cultural policy mechanisms in place after the event to sustain spatial and social changes brought about by the event	Pafos 2017
Concentration of focus and funding in central areas, overlooking the periphery which excludes some resident groups and increasing inequality	Milan 2015, Hull 2017, Pafos 2017
Smaller scale cities may struggle with obtaining adequate funds and expertise	Pafos 2017

There are common threats across the cases and perhaps across Europe. Creating new infrastructure and facilities, renewing public space and injecting new functions or simply enhancing certain meanings and symbols of historic places for the celebration of one mega-event might constitute opportunities, but in these cases were perceived as a potential problem by heritage policy makers and stakeholders, as well as the local community. In some instances, there could be dissonance between the interpretations of the same heritage by different groups or even explicit attempts at silencing certain aspects or components of one city's history and heritage. Obviously, there are radically different time frames and missions that interest mega-event and heritage actors (delivering within years and months for mega-events, protecting for decades and centuries for heritage) and there are different approaches to the urban realm and event different languages between mega-event professionals and interests and heritage-related actors. Beyond this there are concrete threats that recurred in the cases as the imposing of certain governance modes and underlying goals and narrative (e.g. competition, growth and international tourism), the use and commodification of urban space (and any assets, including heritage and culturally-significant places) in order to meet the objectives in the pro-growth agenda (in particular as seen in Genoa 2004 and Hull 2017).

Given the general care for heritage in the European context, more extreme, radical threats did not surface in any of the case studies and are not considered in depth in this publication. Yet we know that mega-events may bring substantial destruction of historic city fabric and buildings, more or less rapid expulsion of local communities and of users, loss of layered meanings and intangible heritage in place. The case of the Beijing 2008 Olympics is widely known, which led to the loss of several historic Hutong neighborhoods. These concerns should be considered with due attention when transferring our lessons to other contexts and situations where tangible and intangible heritage can be threatened by the fast-track development and urban transformation that mega-events typically imply and which may not have in place such strong and long-standing traditions of preserving and protecting heritage (and this is exactly what given policy makers seek for their city).

One other general consideration must be highlighted before going into the details of specific issues: mega-events are moments for experimentation at the regional and urban levels as well as in terms of governance and management. Formats can improve and reflexive planning and implementation on part of involved policy makers can help doing that as the process unfolds. The case of the innovative ExpoinCittà initiative in Milan shows that even international bodies (in this case the Bureau International des Expositions - BIE) can learn from the bottom up and rethink their available options. As it was discussed in the literature review included in a previous HOMEE publication, the Olympic Agenda 2020 is another, more radical, example of the urge for mega-events to learn and evolve over time in order to meet the aspiration and needs of bidding cities. Along the same line, heritage approaches can change, despite the fact that this occurs (in most cases for very good reasons) quite slowly. In this sense, we have these possibilities for change at all levels in mind and with the HOMEE project we intend to contribute to progressing policy making.

Given the explorative nature of this work one cannot derive generalized propositions from the cases and examples considered. Further research and interaction with policy makers and experts can corroborate these views and expand their relevance to other situations. The following sections present an interpretation of the key issues and statements that can be derived from the conclusions and takeaways from the five case studies and can constitute a common ground for further research and debate. Sections 7.2-7.5 provide a first assembly of the very case-specific issues to define more broadly the ways in which policy makers should perceive of and approach the opportunities and threats for heritage in the bidding for or planning of a mega-event and its legacy. These main issues that the HOMEE Project has identified are: the importance of context for mega-events; the relevance of long-term visioning and spatial planning in relation to the mega-event; the complexities of governance, participation and local capacity building; the connection of heritage, identity and local communities to mega-events. We recognize that our findings could perhaps be organized or presented through

other categorizations and intend them as a provocation to be discussed and debated as the project continues to work towards creating a set of final policy guidelines.

7.2 Context matters for mega-events

There are multiple ways in which the economic, sociocultural, political and urban context emerged in the cases, representing key aspects in the ways that heritage came to interact, or not, with the presence of the mega-event.

Mega-events in heritage-rich cities shall position themselves into broader regional, national and international contexts and trends

Important aspects of a city and region depend on very long-term factors and can be affected by the plans and projects for mega-events only in part. The form and qualities of historic city centers, the size and spatial layout of metropolitan and regional systems, the infrastructural backbone of cities are conditions that cannot be underestimated when planning mega-events. Accessibility of event sites can be improved (in terms of public and private transportation, pedestrian mobility etc.) based on existing conditions, as many of the examples showed, yet there are contextual limits to what planning and investments can do within 5-7 years – especially in resource-scarce and governmentally complex cities of Europe. This means working and finding synergies at multiple scales (from regional connections to the design of public spaces) and considering the fine-grain implications of infrastructure and land-use interventions for heritage places, in order to avoid generating vetoing reactions from institutions in power or antagonistic positions on part of the public opinion. On a more intangible side, international visibility cannot be simply generated in the short term; not all segments of tourism are equal and equally beneficial for the city and its different areas and social groups; climbing

the international tourist rankings in a healthy and stable manner takes much more than a mega-event that makes it to the news.

For example, the accessibility of Hull was quite limited and the city has worked with a clear national goal to change the perception and image of Hull within the UK. Meanwhile, the size and characteristics of Pafos, the conjuncture of planning the event in the wake of a financial crisis inevitably led to limits in the scale of planning and interventions. This allowed nonetheless event planners to generate significant urban changes in terms of the use of public space and the connectivity between the center and peripheries. In different ways, both Genoa and Wrocław deliberately reconsidered the role of the historic city center in terms of cultural and leisure activities. Genoa wanted to bring tourists and regenerate its wide city center. Wrocław, though focusing on increasing the number of tourists and other more general development goals, fostered revitalization of neighborhoods outside its historic city core. Both cases showed a clear understanding of contextual matters and planned accordingly. One can see that the intention of injecting cultural life in multiple areas across neighborhood should be seen in place. Part of what Wrocław experimented with was successful thanks to the attention to the local communities and their mobilization in planning their own contribution to the event.

Heritage-rich cities shall consider thoroughly if and how to bid according to their conditions and potentials, not only with reference to the qualities of their heritage, but also their size and dynamics, infrastructure and accessibility, ...

Descending from the previous point, one can see that not all the cities can reasonably aspire to host mega-events without significant risks for the management and success of the mega-event as well as for the balanced development of the city and region. Mega-event organizers tend to target heritage areas and specific cultural hot spots and intangible values that are functional to the event's image and success; this can be

problematic, according to place and situation as well as to the ability of defining goals and means that are sustainable. In the case of Genoa, the political leadership consistently targeted certain places in the historic city center and the old port's waterfront as deemed for physical regeneration and economic revitalization. The city as a collective organization of social actors and economic interests was not prepared for the great transformation and increase in tourism in the historic city center. This exerted significant pressure and stressed certain places in terms of the built environment, as well as social composition and presence of different dwellers and users.

At the same time, the more intense use and appreciation of historic buildings that was spurred by the ECoC and its deadlines established new ways of programming and performing the maintenance of the heritage built environment. The innovations derived more from the new links drawn among existing culture and urban policy actors more than an entirely new structure. In a different way, the limits in the implementation of the original plans and projects for the infrastructure and accompanying interventions for Milan's Expo suggest that the political leadership dramatically underestimated the complexity of urban-regional governance and the substantial unpreparedness of local actors to cooperate. On the contrary, they could enhance the already existing capacity only at the final stage by allowing unplanned but wide-spread activation of places for minor events during the celebration year. In both cases, a more careful understanding of the context could have granted a better and more feasible proposal.

Cities should know their heritage and think about how to positively involve their actors and stakeholders, how to develop a shared and sustainable local narrative as part of the mega-event and the urban development strategy more generally

Communication regarding mega-events typically requires one single strong narrative or image for the city and program.

This may clash with the multiple interests and perspectives of actors and stakeholders on the transformation of the city in general and it may limit the rich interpretations of heritage and places in particular. Spreading the mega-event spatially and diluting the presence of masses over time (targeting longer stays, expanding the calendar of the events) lowers the pressure on must-see heritage places only and generates a broader understanding and potential appreciation of the city. It is not only a matter of risking overtourism and damage in certain hotspots, but widening the conception of what is interesting and valuable in a city to experience, beyond its most consolidated historical areas and heritage attractions. In terms of the time frame, cultural initiatives with a slow pace give room for adjusting and integrating actions that are relevant to historic places. In the case of Wrocław, the ECoC projects (especially those proposed by the residents and local organizations) proved that there is a need of decentralizing the cultural life of the city not only by creating new attractions but also by allowing the local populace and tourists to rediscover the meaning and value of more ordinary heritage and *genius loci*. Using unusual heritage spaces outside the medieval city core opened up possibilities to drive both visitors and residents to less frequented parts of the city. The mega-event faced difficult matters with reference to a city that has seen an almost entire change in population after World War II and that mixed eventually conflicting heritages or witnesses of unwanted memories. This proved to be a socially creative process that generated further opportunities for appropriation of pieces of heritage, facilities and places on part of different social, ethnic and neighborhood groups.

In the case of Hull, despite the difficulties and painful memories attached to it, rediscovering the maritime heritage of the city became a great opportunity for planning long-term interventions, as well as for mobilizing different strata and groups of the local and regional population. In this sense, expanding the cultural ownership and the possible narratives for the mega-events and the involved heritage can become strategic also for inclusivity. Clearly, the case of Pafos had to face the heritage of the Turkish Cypriot

population, to make sense of the places that historically hosted that community and that became deserted after the 1974 conflict which divided the island's territory. This was part of the core narrative (following the overarching motto of the event: "Linking Continents-Bridging Cultures") and resurfaced in multiple concrete projects as the revitalization of the Mouttallos Turkish-Cypriots neighborhood that was partially abandoned.

7.3 Long-term vision and spatial planning

The presence of heritage and the typical ways in which European experts and policy makers deal with it suggest to envision the planning of mega-events in heritage-rich cities within a long-term time frame. The case studies in this report made clear a less obvious consideration, that the intersection with spatial plans and development strategies of the hosting city are also crucial inasmuch as they involve heritage places and cultural policy.

Mega-events are accelerators and amplifiers of development processes and urban policies; cities can better harness their potentials within a shared vision for the development of the city in the long term, especially when dealing with heritage places and assets

Despite the grand plans and statements, successful mega-events are rooted in the locale and inevitably lever the trends and transformation already under way. Recently, there has been a call for more cautious approaches to mega-event planning for the sake of event legacy and sustainability of the facilities and places over time. Following the IOC Agenda 2020, sport mega-events in particular have begun to require thorough consideration of the reuse of large existing infrastructures and of what is built with the purpose of hosting the celebrations of a given event. The lack of a clear vision, not only for the

management of the facility itself but of its role and functioning in the city, can lead to planning disasters. Large facilities that are needed for only a few months of celebration can easily become a heavy burden for the city to manage in subsequent years, both from the financial and urban points of view. The difficulties that Milan has encountered with the reuse of the Expo site could have been easily anticipated, simply based on what past and even recent experiences with Expos and the Olympics showed (Lisbon Expo 1998, Athens 2004 Olympics, and many others; Thessaloniki 1997 is worth mentioning among the European Capitals of Culture). The exceptions made to land-use regulation and planning procedures in order to build the facilities and infrastructures on time for the event can be seen as problematic, because they bypass institutional veto points and restrictions that are conceived for plans and project to be enriched with multiple political stakes a longer-term rationality. This aspect is key to heritage matters, both in terms of presenting opportunities as well as threats (at the same time one should keep in mind that the problematiques go well beyond the heritage policy sector).

For example, Pafos decided to define a new development vision for the whole city and used the event to start a significant exercise in spatial planning. This was an important opportunity and it indeed positioned the interventions for the ECoC in a consistent framework and, despite severe financial limits, still had diversified effects, especially in most disadvantaged areas in the outskirts. On the contrary, the plans for the Hull UKCoC 2017 favored the central areas and their heritage with limited consideration of the outskirts. Following the city strategies of the 1990s, this was due to the selection of most valuable assets as well as to the easiest choice for building a more appealing image for a stigmatized city. The concentration of investments and renovation made a number of key heritage assets more visible and accessible to the public which were previously underused or in a near state of abandon. More generally, without the due attention and connection to city and regional planning, even positive additions to the cultural and leisure offering of a city can induce congestion, trickle-down neighborhood effects and can generate unwanted consequences at multiple scales.

Spatial integration of multiple policies is crucial to direct different efforts and investments in directions that are shared among different actors and stakeholders

The different ways of performing planning on the part of mega-event agencies and city planning departments mark quite a significant distance among the case studies. Planning systems proved to have quite different functions in terms of land-use planning as well as heritage preservation policy (from the formalized and redundant institutional structure of Italy to the liberal approach in the UK), its set of typical actors, the extent to which binding power is in place and is effective. The position of heritage protection powers in the planning system is also important to see if heritage typically needs to mobilize consensus from the bottom up (e.g. in the case of Hull), or has established systems of intervention from the top down (as is typical in Italy). In both directions we have noticed that it is important to consider how the mega-event and the heritage policy interact with one another, but more broadly nest into a vision for the development of the city and the region that covers other policy sectors, such as infrastructure and mobility, social service provision and others. This is visible in the case of Genoa, where events and urban policies of different size and sort went under the umbrella of a long-term planning strategy. This is due to the ability of the leading actors to involve a quite diverse set of agencies and stakeholders at different stages of the process. With respect to strategic planning, the early activation of the strategic conference allowed the Municipality to harvest ideas and energies in order to direct investments and projects towards shared objectives.

This issue was important for the substance of the interventions, including the ones for the 2004 ECoC in Genoa, but even more so in terms of the political consensus that sustain it and the subsequent operations taking place in the historic city center. This and other cases clearly showed that one event cannot anticipate nor solve all problems for the city and cultural policies, no matter how large and important that event might be. Major crises, regional,

national or global, may affect the quality and even the function of certain spaces. The case of Pafos demonstrates how to manage mega-event planning despite a crippled budget and find synergies across policy sectors. The case of Hull shows that revamping retail and leisure through a stronger presence in public spaces may not have a long-lasting effect as socialization and shopping behavior can change quite rapidly. In this sense, having a reflective approach and strengthening the ability of adjusting policies and interventions on part of the public administration and local society may be as important as having clear plans and projects. All cases witnessed, to very different extents, the injection of new public and private functions in heritage places. The spatial characteristics of what heritage areas target and the connection to other policies affected the success of interventions in all cases. In the case of Genoa, the main historic palaces that were neglected and the old port's waterfront did not require massive infrastructure for pedestrians to reach and enjoy cultural life and attractions. In Milan, the lack of a clear spatial vision mixed with a strong self-interested mobilization of event space providers brought to the concentration of activities to the city center and the overexploitation of certain public spaces on part of tourists during the celebration and in subsequent years. A clever spatial vision led Wrocław to mix places inside and outside of the historic city center and to focus on key physical and symbolic connections (e.g. bridges). In the experience of Pafos, the attempt at reconnecting different neighborhoods to the city center, including the ones with diverse socio-cultural background worked only in part. The small size of the city and the relatively limited budget for the event affected the impact of potential change, especially when considered in the medium to long term.

When dealing with heritage, legacy planning should be multidimensional and reflective

One of the most publicly narrated but practically overlooked item in mega-events planning is the legacy. Legacy does not only mean the infrastructure and facilities that have been built

for the occasion of the mega-event, or simply the programs and initiatives that have been started for it. In the case of Milan the organization that took control of the important real estate asset of the Expo site and the vast public investment that it required began with an uncertain trajectory that led to substantial delays in decision making. At the same time, the organization of the ExpoinCittà program, embedded within the city municipality, readily continued and even expanded its efforts in the years following 2015, rebranding as YES Milano and continuing to host events regularly throughout the city while the main Expo site remains closed. On the opposite end in terms of size, the organization managing the legacy of the Pafos event became problematic because of the uncertain status of the administrative agency that was in charge of following up with ongoing cultural programming. Such uncertainties can present ongoing threats to heritage as spaces that were either renewed or given new uses for the event are not continued over the long term.

The social and political networks that are built or strengthened in order to respond to the requirements and challenges of the event, the capacity among public administrators, non-profit and private organizations are relevant elements that could enrich the governance and development of one city. The image and attractiveness of the city and of certain places in the city, as well, are important components of the intangible legacy of mega-events. Among the case studies, Wrocław seems to have planned continuity for the governance and the organization that successfully managed the 2016 ECoC, yet this implied selecting which cultural programs to prioritize, where to keep the attention high and what to return to a business as usual mode. Also because of its long-term perspective, the Genoa case shows that the conditions may change and the legacy may work within a certain time frame, but lose its relevance when the city faces new challenges (e.g. in that case infrastructure and environmental matters gained the highest priority in the public agenda within a few years after the push for becoming a cultural and tourism destination). The mega-event legacy should not be simply planned once and for all, but have built-in moments of discussion and adjustment over time.

7.4 Governance, participation and local capacity building

In Western countries, where powers are shared and sometimes scattered among different public, nonprofit and private actors, governance issues must be taken seriously. Mega-events are not implemented based on off-the-shelve plans, nor can they be simply enacted in heritage-rich cities where relevant aspects of places are multiple and governed by several actors. In particular, heritage-related actors and agencies may have veto powers that can slow or even stop plans and projects. In recent years local population perception and positive inclination towards hosting a mega-event have become more and more important, in some cases even for the awarding of the event itself (with survey and assessments done by the central bodies). In actual policy terms, the involvement of a broad political consensus and the mobilization from the bottom up seems important both for mega-event planning/implementation and for its connection with heritage preservation.

Mega events and heritage policies can intersect in multiple manners and find generative ways to adapt to each other and promote urban and cultural development

In many cases, mega-event plans work with what is in place, because the time restrictions are key and the key elements are too complex to plan from scratch (e.g. infrastructures). This is especially true when referring to heritage policy and places that typically require time to change and to complete eventual projects. In many cases, the mega-event systematized what had been already planned for certain areas and accelerated it. The case of Milan is prominent in this sense, with the old docks of the Darsena being completed following many years of impasse. The organization and approval of small and medium sized events in heritage facilities and places followed procedures and used networks already in place in a faster and more pragmatic manner in order to keep the

pace with the Expo 2015 and its deadlines. This required the convergence of complex sets of actors and powers and the adaptation of policies and actions. The case of Hull is prominent in terms of generating new heritage coalitions and initiatives out of the mega-event experience, with the Hull: Yorkshire's Maritime City, that includes projects for public spaces in the historic city center, the appreciation of existing cultural facilities and the conversion of historic buildings into cultural and public uses.

Mega-events may induce changes in the governance of heritage and heritage sites for them to be available for the events; these (policy) changes are part of the governance legacy of the mega-event and should be envisioned as such

One can consider that the mega-event can become a turning point for city governance arrangements, in traction with what has been discussed in the previous point. For example in the case of Genoa, the existing cultural organizations joined in a new system of museums that coordinated their communication, ticketing and enhanced the cultural appeal of the city. At the early planning stage, the opening of the strategic conference to multiple actors built an important political momentum and harvested relevant ideas for changing the city of Genoa, in particular in its historic city fabric and functioning. Unfortunately, the governance innovations that touched other levels of planning and programming in Genoa did not survive long after the mega-event. Other cases showed how the morphing of the agency or organization that managed the event is a difficult passage that might disperse the capacity and connections across policy domains and within the public administration. This is very relevant when considering the links with the heritage policy field, where mutual trust and a cooperative attitude are sometimes hard to win. In this sense, the capacity-building that occurs during the preparation and delivery of mega-events should be cared for as a central part of the legacy. In this way Wrocław has been perhaps one of the most successful instances of not just maintaining newly created

governance structures for the event but also continuing to significantly fund the organization and its ongoing cultural activities for several years.

The involvement of heritage actors in the mega-event planning processes and post-event networks is key for building capacity and sharing solutions and outputs

The case of Milan shows that a collateral set of initiatives can generate significant momentum by involving a high number of actors from the bottom up. The providers of sites and buildings for the ExpoinCittà initiative coordinated by the Municipality and the Chamber of Commerce contributed to the success of the mega-event by spreading small and medium sized events within the city fabric, by expanding the cultural and entertainment offerings during the celebration period. This consolidated a strong spatial and economic platform for events in the subsequent years and it has, as well, built consensus and a political constituency for the festivalization of the city and the attraction of more events and tourists to town. In the early 2010s this meant experimenting with digital platforms that in the 2020s are more widespread and readily usable on part of the government and other agencies. However, the technical aspects should always be considered in the light of its long-term urban and political implications. On the contrary, in Hull, the involvement of national heritage actors (such as the HLF) experimented for the first time with the benefits of collaboration, provided knowledge, skills and confidence for intervening on heritage assets and areas in a meaningful manner. In particular, art-based initiatives involving heritage sites allowed Hull to broaden the use of known heritage. This sustained a broader discussion on the role of built and intangible heritage in the city and its economic development. In other cases, the involvement of heritage actors might have been considered as a necessary burden in order to avoid certain solutions to be vetoed by relevant agencies or to build consensus among cultural policy experts and opinion makers. Nonetheless the process enriched the solutions and bettered the outputs with respect to the built and intangible heritage of the city.

Mobilizing people in participation processes before, during and after the event (i.e. participation) without overpromising the power given to citizens

The dynamics of mobilization and participation often imply a surge at the earlier stages and sometimes a dramatic drop when operative decisions must be taken to keep the pace and deliver key elements for the mega-event on time. In Pafos, the small-scale and close-knit community of the city core made it easier to mobilize citizens since the earliest phases. This greatly contributed in building the consensus about the bid, the event and to sustain some of the positive effects on the city. The integration of public participation processes into the bidding and planning stage for the 2017 ECoC managed to spread the ECoC ideas widely, provided a platform for discussion, mobilized various groups within the city and established co-operation. Subsequent stages had far lower involvement and this can be seen in the limits of the volunteering program. The Wrocław case is an interesting instance in experimenting with the use of small and micro grants. The mobilization of small organizations and individuals towards the goals of the ECoC was very effective. Involving neighborhood organizations and the grassroots allowed the city to enhance the meaning and uses of places with cultural, civic and social relevance, activate and even regenerate them in connection with the event and its expected legacy. While Genoa also had a public call for projects through its 'Open Door' policy, quite an innovative approach at that time, neither was it able to continue such practices following the event.

Considering self-reinforcing actions and political lock-ins, carefully selecting which interests/constituencies to empower

As any turning point in the trajectory of a city, mega-events may have relevant political implications for subsequent phases. In the case of Milan, the constituency that supported the Expo 2015 and that prioritized event-driven and leisure-tourism-based approaches had a sustained impact. The

former CEO of Expo was elected as the City Mayor in 2016 and consolidated a set of policies, including the craving for mega events. Under the leadership of the new Mayor, Milan placed a successful bid to host the 2026 Winter Olympics which it is currently planning. The case of Hull clearly shows that mobilizing the residents through cultural events had a positive impact in terms of awareness regarding local history and heritage, building consensus and demand for heritage-related activities and further creative use of historic places. The post-event effects on boosting Hull: Yorkshire's Maritime City are very important and of a significant magnitude for Hull. In Pafos, the conception and completion of a comprehensive strategic urban plan, the motivation to implement it and the pressure to fund it were clear results of the ECoC designation. This has empowered planning actors, at least in part, as crucial players in the decision about the future of the city. Though not a significant factor in these cases, in many instances such events can also have the opposite impact with negative perceptions of event planning or delivery cause for political upheaval and change.

7.5 Heritage, identity and local communities

Cultural assets in general and heritage in particular play an ambivalent role in planning mega-events: they can promote social cohesion but trigger political conflict as well. In most cases, mega-events are focal points in the life of local communities and sometimes can mark a change in the image and identity of one city, sometimes by using its heritage and historic places. Policy makers should be aware of this, well beyond the instrumentalizing of these political and cultural processes for the purpose of competition and growth.

Mega-events can help in disclosing/ developing new heritage narratives and building new identities for the city and its communities

In multiple cases, the mega-event and its implementation were starting points for enhancing cultural heritage and its visibility in the host city. For Genoa, the 2004 ECoC and the more general strategy surrounding it triumphed in the award of the UNESCO World Heritage Site in 2006. In Milan, a massive amount of sites were put to use for events collateral to the main exhibition and events of the Expo 2015, including historic facilities and settings. Because of the unplanned nature of this process, there was not any particular spatial arrangement collectively supported. Several “event weeks” continued up to now within the frame of yearly programming and with the creation of a dedicated agency (the YES Milano agency), both derived from the 2015 experience. The refurbishment of the old docks of the Navigli canal system (the Darsena) was reinterpreted as a joint for nightlife and the setting for leisure activities and minor events. This sustained the use of such places and the consolidation of an image for Milan as a leisure tourism destination. The change seems relevant not only under an economic profile, but as it impacts the identity and reputation of Milan. In Wrocław, the event pushed for reinterpreting the European identity and the potential as a crossroad for diverse populations. A more accurate planning for the UNESCO World Heritage Site of the Centennial Hall and its buffer zone involved the development of a new management plan in the same period as the planning for the ECoC; the mega-event was perceived as an opportunity but not fully considered in its implications for mobility and presence of people and the local identity more generally. The plans for Hull: Yorkshire's Maritime City have been extensively mentioned as a recognition of a problematic and even painful cultural identity, linked to the UKCoC 2017 celebrations. In most cases, this meant in-depth heritage research carried out before and after the event, as well as collective understanding of the implications of its recognition. Yet this could also be, on the contrary, a 'double-edged sword' where mega-events reframe heritage

narratives along trajectories that are not recognized as being in line with local identities from large shares of the local population.

Anticipating potential conflicts that are inherent to the intensified use of heritage places and potentials is key

Modifying the balance and the consolidated uses and meanings attached to heritage may generate frictions and even spark conflicts among different groups benefiting from or losing ground with reference to certain heritage pieces, historic places or the cultural practices and intangible values attached to them. This conflict can be anticipated and dealt with through cultural activities, events and the arts, that can creatively generate new platforms for dialogue. Hull is an important example for this practice. Intercultural initiatives were envisioned since the start, given the relevant presence of migrant workers and their weak recognition within official cultural policy making. In addition, the use of arts and playful events for mobilizing heritage building and activating historic places for building a new and more attractive narrative of the city and community proved to be successful. In Wrocław, the collective processing of a difficult cultural identity and social history was stimulated through recognizing specific heritage buildings and places pertaining to multiple communities of the past and of the present. This was a way not only done to valorize heritage for tourists, but also to input social learning and cultural innovation. All the cases showed that promoting social dialogue about and through heritage is much cheaper and less time consuming than managing conflicts that may derive from a different or more intense use of heritage and historic places.

Developing meaningful places for multiple populations and considering multiple stakeholders are ways of enriching mega-event-related plans and projects as well as avoiding heritage-related conflicts

Mega-events, when successful, induce different uses of the urban space and a different balance in the presence of different populations (locals and tourists, high-income and low-income, ethnic groups, etc.). This does not only reflect the benefit for given stakeholders such as mass-tourism-related businesses, real estate rentiers, the local community or others, but also a different interpretation of place and of urban development. In the case of Pafos the ECoC catalyzed processes that were long dormant and mobilized different groups. The main economic interests that sustained the city and region as a tourism destination allowed the creative contribution of groups with different visions for the city and the role of culture in its development. This had limited impacts but showed the possibility for it to happen. Similarly, the social and political interaction involved by planning mega-events can conciliate contradictory values of heritage. The Polish case study shows that built heritage as well as more intangible assets were actively used for social learning and cultural innovation in a diverse local society. Promoting processes that ease reflectiveness and sense-making regarding place, heritage and the aimed-for future may be perceived as an adding to a solid management plan that is the real driver for delivering the mega-event. All the cases are here to tell that these are not optional features for successful and efficient urban and social processes of change.

7.6 From the specificities of case studies to heritage-conscious mega-event policies

The propositions presented in this chapter are based on the in-depth study of five cases. Given the availability of dozens of other experiences in places and under conditions

that are different, we do not expect these to be exhaustive. The intention is to spark debates with experts and policy makers towards the definition of more accurate and useful principles and guidelines for mega-events in heritage-rich cities in Europe and beyond. Likewise, we do not expect all the issues discussed here to be limited solely to 'heritage-rich' cities or historic spaces. These four key areas of focus are important aspects for any city hosting a mega-event to take into consideration and plan for. This chapter and the book as a whole has worked to demonstrate the particular effects such mega-events have on heritage spaces, as well as how the presence of heritage comes to impact the planning and locating of events, the trajectories of the urban transformation processes that may derive.

The mission of the HOMEE project has been to first initiate this process of research and discussion; the following steps will be to formalize these initial findings in a charter that assists policy and decision makers to appropriately consider and include heritage from the early stages of bidding for a mega-event to its legacy. The project will continue to analyze and digest these findings in coordination with other experts, academics and the stakeholders responsible for making decisions in such events to fully develop the final work. The project has also been studying, in real time, the Matera 2019 ECoC as it occurred. In that context some of the findings derived from the case studies were discussed in dedicated sessions with local stakeholders and experts. Though not presented alongside the other cases, the learnings from that investigation will likewise help to inform the final charter. The effort is great and might lead to partial results within the project's time frame, but the issues at stake are important for European cities and communities and, without doubt, worth trying as the lessons learned, we are fully convinced, can benefit future cities hosting mega-events in Europe and beyond.