



---

607457-CREA-1-2019-1-ES-CULT-COOP2

# Quality assessment report / Evaluation materials 2022-23

Deliverables 5.2 and 4.3

---

CREATIVE EUROPE Cooperation Project Agreement number 607457-CREA-1-2019-1-ES-CULT-COOP2

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

**A-Place**

Deliverable 5.2 Quality assessment report /  
Deliverable 4.3 Evaluation materials  
2022-23

**Editors:**

Maria Irene Aparício

**Contributors:**

Carolyn Leslie  
Ivone Ferreira  
Leandro Madrazo  
~~Luiza Bravo~~  
Maria Irene Aparício  
Marta Fiolić  
Nuno Fonseca  
Petra Pferdmenges  
Rosalice Pinto  
Rosaura Romero  
Špela Verovšek  
Teresa Tourvas  
Veronika Antoniou

**NOVA-FCSH Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas**  
**Nova University of Lisbon**  
**Lisbon, Portugal**  
**November 30, 2023**

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	4
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Evaluation materials .....	6
3 Methodology.....	13
PART A. Placemaking Activities .....	16
1 "A Weaved Place" in L'Hospitalet (Barcelona).....	17
2 "A Happy Place" in Brussels .....	21
3 "A-Pla(y)ce" in Ljubljana .....	24
4 "Just Place" in Brussels.....	29
5 "A Reconnecting Place" in Lisbon.....	32
6 "A Playful Place" in Nicosia .....	37
7 "A WISH-full Place" in Nicosia.....	39
8 "A Seedling Place" in Nicosia .....	41
Conclusions .....	44
References .....	46
Annex 1 - A Re-Place (assessment guide).....	47
Annex 2 - A Just Place (assessment guide).....	51
Annex 3 - A Weaved Place (self-evaluation) .....	54

## Executive Summary

This document contains the 3<sup>rd</sup> year quality assessment report on the placemaking activities of the project, carried out until the end of December 31, 2022. The document comprises two parts: Deliverable 5.1 "Quality Assessment Report", corresponding to the result of the evaluation of activities carried out by the partners in 2022, and Deliverable 4.3 which includes materials made available by the partners for evaluation.

The report is structured in the following sections:

- **Evaluation materials**, with a summary of the materials provided by partners to be analysed by the evaluation team, and those publicly available which have been used for this purpose.
- **Methodology**, describes the methodology followed in the evaluation and its relationship with the evaluation framework proposed in Deliverable 5.1
- **Description and Analysis of the placemaking activities**
- **Conclusions and recommendations** for the next iteration of placemaking activities.

Finally, **Annexes** includes a guideline with the evaluation criteria to be adapted to each placemaking activity; tables provided by partners with complementary reflections.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose and target group

This evaluation report (2021-2022) aims to describe, analyse and interpret the impact of the activities of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the project on places and people. As in the previous report (2020-2021), the purpose of this evaluation is, on the one hand, to find out to what extent creative participation (e.g., inclusiveness, creativity); social involvement (e.g., place meaning, place attachment); and community building (e.g., interculturality, sharedness, joint activities) were supported by the placemaking activities and, on the other hand, to assess their influence on changes of social discourses, socially engaged artistic practices and space-place transformation. Moreover, it is intended to understand the levels of cultural involvement of residents in the activated spaces, and what is the degree of transformation of these spaces, permanent or temporary.

## 1.2. Contribution of partners

La Salle-URL, AA, UG, NOVA and UL provided the evaluation team with diverse assessment materials related to the local placemaking activities carried out in the period 2021-2022. In addition, other materials of the activities carried out partners and published in the project website were used in this evaluation.

## 1.3. Relations to other activities in the project

In this report, the “Plan-Implement-Reflect” model was followed. The evaluation was based on the activities described in the [Deliverable 4.1-4.2 “Local Placemaking Activities 2021-22”](#), as well as materials provided by the partners, including self-reflexions provided by the partners themselves, concerning the implementation and development of the activities in their places.

Not all partners provided self-assessment information, which would be essential for understanding the processes and their impact. Some partners responded with short and ambiguous sentences that did not allow any results to be deduced in relation to the indicators.

It is important to underline that, in [Deliverable 5.1 “Quality Assessment Plan”](#), it was proposed a theoretical framework that includes ethnographic, phenomenological and aesthetic aspects as part of the evaluation. Also the methods and tools to be used in the evaluation work were identified: semi-structured interviews, interviews, focus group discussions (FGD), surveys, socio-ethnographic note taking, concept mapping/participatory cartographies, and reflective narratives. Despite that previous rigorous planning exercise, extensively discussed and adjusted with partners, the work in the field revealed the impossibility of applying multiple methodologies of assessment, specifically some coming from specific disciplinary areas. The partners are dealing with mixed activities, mostly placemaking, but events that also involve artistic practices, what makes difficult to apply a single assessment model, as well as identical instruments in all activities. In addition, it is important to mention the consequences of the difficulties caused by a long period of continuous or periodic restrictions resulting from the pandemic situation (e.g. difficulty in engaging institutions and organizations, restrictions in the access to public space, communication problems with local stakeholders, etc).

Under the circumstances, as in the previous years, the procedure regarding the collection of assessment materials by partners followed the non-mandatory guide prepared to facilitate a more flexible evaluation framework than the one initially proposed (see Annex 2). According to this guide, each partner could create the most appropriate framework and the corresponding tools depending on the materials collected, and the evaluation contained in this report is based on particular methodologies adopted by partners in their placemaking activities.

## 2 Evaluation materials

Materials provided by partners

In this section we provide the lists of materials made available by the partners for evaluation, as well as the respective links in the case of materials published on the Project's website or in the social networks.

### **"A Weaved Place" in L'Hospitalet (Barcelona)**

The partner provided different materials for assessment at the website

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/14>

- Urban walk in La Florida neighbourhood  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/75>
- Mapping the territory: Photographic survey  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/76>
- Signifying the territory: Video  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/84>
- Mapping and constructing places  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/85>
- Placing audiovisual narratives  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/111>
- Mapping Places  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/110>
- ES\_CULTURA open call - selected works  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/127>
- Collaborative collage workshop  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/133>
- ES\_CULTURA public art festival  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/134>
- Exploring the sociophysical territory with audiovisual media  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/137>

### **“A Happy Place” in Brussels**

The partner provided, at the website, different materials for assessment

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/35>

- Co-design workshops  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/46>  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/57>
- Pictures  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/35>
- Partial inauguration  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/72>
- Temporary Interventions  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/114>
- Permanent Interventions  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/113>
- Final Inauguration  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/112>

Other materials produced

- Audiovisual film “A Happy Place” (Brussels)
- A series of pictures taken during the activities as well as during the inauguration on 24.06.2022
- A series of pictures that were taken during the temporary interventions in 2022
- A video  
<https://youtu.be/q37Y8LKUnyA>

### **“A Re-Place” in Ljubljana**

The partner provided, at the website, different materials for assessment

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/43>

Description of workshop cycle (planning phase)

<https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/a-place2/Efr5o04lju9HnLT3jR9hfwsBiRP7Pqdl7uB0sGDb8Ei60g?e=LJMRm0>

# A Re-Place

Activities

## 1st part: learn-place

- weekly sessions
- open guest lectures
- debates with different user-groups and reflections - on particular aspects
- placemaking practices
- discussing the concepts of sustainable design

## 2nd part: spot-place

- establishing and demonstrating the connection with the local community
- physical interventions by students
- recycling and reuse of materials
- working on site - Krater

Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday	
18 April Easter Monday	19 April <b>spot-place:</b> rethinking design <small>Krater</small>	20 April <b>spot-place:</b> learning by doing <small>Krater</small>	21 April <b>spot-place:</b> learning by doing <small>Krater</small>	22 April <b>spot-place:</b> final presentations <small>Krater</small>	17 March <b>learn-place:</b> 'Crop' by Pedro Jervell <small>zoom</small>	24 March <b>learn-place:</b> 'Social matter' by ANTONIE AUSTENUS BELLASTOCK <small>zoom</small>	31 March <b>learn-place:</b> 'Three projects' by Tobias Rutih and Ales Korpic <small>zoom and Faculty of Architecture</small>
				7 April <b>learn-place:</b> 'Renewing Knowledge Production' by Neoptica Potrc <small>zoom and Faculty of Architecture</small>	14 April <b>spot-place:</b> making concepts <small>Krater</small>	15 April <b>spot-place:</b> presenting concepts <small>Krater</small>	16 April
							17 April Easter

- Detailed plan of the hands-on workshop (on-site)  
<https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:w:/s/a-place2/EfzB6XK18lBAnFKdAag0Zm4BGPmZyMe32dDWRP3CNx0yg?e=8u3thd>
- Workshop in short (implemented)  
<https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/a-place2/EXT3B0fnxqRAkddd7jnzHgBT9gnuqNhV-0jEWIEaTTM1Q?e=akfoij>
- Photos by students and others (Hands-on workshop on site)  
<https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/a-place2/EpgKqIBPUa5BjWy3mMfVp8IB0qyXArYo-5vRUXGVoghJ9w?e=M7K0QI>
- Photos by Professional Photographer  
[https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/a-place2/Ejy0MScE1QhAic9VDc\\_vcYYB9Hj9Hij4bkoPphAnNmd\\_iA?e=YC3BB6](https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/a-place2/Ejy0MScE1QhAic9VDc_vcYYB9Hj9Hij4bkoPphAnNmd_iA?e=YC3BB6)
- Invitation poster for student workshop  
[https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/a-place2/EcGvzkoOXp1Lji\\_EQT8pTxwBj57s7ETNrR8a9lcEboFnwA?e=Y9ZFfb](https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/a-place2/EcGvzkoOXp1Lji_EQT8pTxwBj57s7ETNrR8a9lcEboFnwA?e=Y9ZFfb)
- Invitation flyer for the open day (interested public)  
<https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/a-place2/ETZUJkXy9QZBpZM0FuTkWLYByQT6hIrhqv5bvBg3NHVVmw?e=UeTgwv>



- Invitation posters for the guest lectures  
[https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/a-place2/Eg7PyOrKI3ZH03y2fyOvrJkBXQP-Yk\\_dlo0ryhf2JrDklQ?e=rKfM6y](https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/a-place2/Eg7PyOrKI3ZH03y2fyOvrJkBXQP-Yk_dlo0ryhf2JrDklQ?e=rKfM6y)
- Communication and Dissemination proofs (screenshots)  
<https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/a-place2/EtClGkswmjFlunSTVyZqzoYBYH6tunlmNHBVX-HLpKeipw?e=7XUZTq>
- Guest lectures recordings (2)  
<https://lasalleuniversities.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/a-place2/EggQVJZwqZJHm16RA0eeMLcBvUvDe1qcjgDuzOr7aQVWx0?e=jmlsF8>

Lectures by guest lecturers (4)

- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/92>
- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/93>
- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/94>
- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/103>

Other workshop actions (4)

- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/104>
- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/105>
- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/106>
- <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/109>

### **“A Just Place” in Brussels**

The partner provided different materials for assessment at the website

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/46>

- Main goal and structure of workshop cycle (planning phase)  
[D1.1\\_YEAR3\\_KULEUVEN.docx](#)
- Facebook event  
<https://www.facebook.com/events/432371292020450>
- Opening speech  
[EXPO OPENER.pdf](#)
- Pictures of opening event  
[Expo opening event pictures](#)
- Exhibition
- [Expo print pictures](#)
- Videos opening event reflective performance  
[Expo opening reflective performance](#)
- Video of live interview at expo event  
[A Just Radio interview with NGO DoucheFlux.mp4](#)
- Podcast offsite prerecorded interview streamed at Expo opening event  
<https://rss.com/podcasts/collective-1030/736049/>

- Output assessment of presentation by Master KU Leuven students
- [Altering Practice.pptx](#)

### **“A Reconnecting Place” in Lisbon**

The partner provided different materials for assessment at the website

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/42>

- Music creation in the community  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/117>
- Creating a soundscape with Bairro do Rego  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/116>
- (Re)Connecting places through artistic practices  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/115>
- Sound walking in Bairro do Rego  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/125>
- Creative Dance Workshop  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/126>
- Reconnecting Place(s) through sound and dance  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/130>

### News

- Reconnecting Place(s) through sound and dance  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/news/107>
- Sound walking in Bairro do Rego  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/news/104>
- A Reconnecting Place at the New European Bauhaus Festival  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/news/92>

### Videos

- “I hear airplanes”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDF8C4HIC7Y>
- “It’s very cool”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sYhDxEIWYY>
- “Fábio”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fPmCSYwJDfM>

## A-Place • Evaluation materials

- "We all take care of everyone"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V-7Ekg-6XcE>
- "Oasis"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H60Jsm9H6PA>
- "Electromagnetic neighbourhood"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7RlZtbaHMMw>
- "Phantasm"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uRoS-HmCfPw>
- "A neighbourhood they say is bad"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UA2DgU8Dj1Y>
- "The hood"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=spbu7615KrA>
- "The bridge"  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cvyB\\_Tte98U](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cvyB_Tte98U)
- Soundwalk  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C01vrFmxVMU>
- Reconnecting Place through sound and dance  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0thdvTetkOo>

### Other materials

- radio program for the local online radio "Radio Pavão" about the final event - Sound walking in Bairro do Rego
- soundwalk on the ECHOES app - <https://explore.echoes.xyz/collections/sZANKAv9hpS8HSig>
- printed materials for the distribution in the neighbourhood

### Events and outputs

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/42>

**"A Playful Place" in Pame Kaimakli 2022 - Nicosia**

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/51>

## Materials provided

- Photographs
- Forestry department
- distribution of plants
- planting activity
- structure in use -two months later
- Poster AdoptAPlant
- Adopt a plant registration list
- Pame Kaimakli program

## Materials available online

- Activity description / placemaking or event (with link)
- (fb post/ Instagram screen shots +address)
- <https://www.facebook.com/pamekaimakli/posts/4968369903439578>
- Short video
- 5 photographs

**"A Seedling Place" in Nicosia**

Activity description / placemaking or event

<https://www.facebook.com/pamekaimakli/posts/4968369903439578>

The partner provided different materials for assessment at the website

<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/37>

## Materials on website

- Vertical gardens installation in Synergiasias Street  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/128>
- Adopt a plant  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/129> Storytelling
- Digital Repository  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/82> - Storytelling
- Venice Biennale  
<https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-action/83>
- Facebook  
<https://www.facebook.com/aseedlingplace>
- Instagram  
<https://www.instagram.com/aseedlingplace/>

### 3 Methodology

The methodology to be followed in the assessment process of the 2021-2022 activities is identical to the one described in the [Assessment Report 2020-2021](#). The evaluation was previously designed based on two criteria: the relevance of the activity and its impact on places and their communities. As described in [Deliverable 5.1](#), the assessment plan proposed several questions oriented towards values such as creative participation, social involvement; and community building. Most of these values depend on the social processes of interculturality, and it is possible to understand at least their limits and influences by answering questions such as: "What does the space/place offer so you can meet/know each other? What more could it offer? Have the activities helped to reveal the above-mentioned values (e.g., creative participation, social involvement and community building)"? Have the activities strengthened the communities, and the groups involved?; Have the activities contributed to increase the sense of belonging among the groups involved"?

The evaluation was predominantly qualitative, although, in some cases, quantitative data was considered, but not very relevant, due to post-covid circumstances. The basis for qualitative analysis was inference from texts, transcripts and recorded material, as well as interpretations of data provided by partners. Whenever possible, the data made available on the Project website (e.g., recorded material, interviews, posts in social media, etc.) was also considered, and the assessment team reached conclusions and recommendations on the basis of this evidence and reasoning. Above all, an attempt was made to understand if the basic questions could be answered and how the activities fulfilled the objectives.

The material made available allowed us to conclude that, in most of the creative placemaking actions and others related to it, was possible to fulfil the objectives and criteria defined in D5.2, namely "situated learning, sustainability, sensorial experience, community building, tradition, temporality and performativity". As the impact of the evaluation depends on the three phases - planning, performing and reflecting - the information was analysed considering the consequences of confinement between 2020 and 2021, which, in some cases, delayed the preparation processes for activities in 2022.

#### 1.4. Methodological approach

The approach to the evaluation process took into account the following data and contexts: a) The Project's programme, its objectives, and the assessment plan; b) The collected and produced data available on the project website, including photographs, audiovisual material, catalogues, reports, etc.; c) The creative outputs of placemaking activities (e.g. activities and its recordings such as videos, festival contests and programmes, etc.); d) Stakeholders' surveys, following a common enquiry based on the structure of evaluation (See Annex 1); and e) Reflective narratives of other participants in the placemaking process, including artists, collaborators and other partners who were not directly associated with the project.

Key concepts (as for 2020-2021)

**Quality evaluation.** According to the theoretical description in Deliverable 5.1, quality evaluation means: "(a) a creative participatory planning approach (Cilliers & Timmermans, 2014); (b) a social production of heritage, both visible and invisible, that promotes and sustains a community's engagement with both the physical and social characteristics of the heritage (Giaccardi & Palen, 2008); and (c) a building of social capital (Kelkar & Spinelli, 2016) and communities (Lepofsky & Fraser, 2003) as result of participation and engagement".

But, since the quality evaluation of placemaking is determined by indicators that are part of the creative process itself, and underpinned by levels of participation, social involvement and

community building (also described in Deliverable 5.1 as values), the present evaluation reflects the participants points of view, as well as the evidence generated from the activities such as actions, stories, outputs, etc.

**Social impact.** In Table 6 of Deliverable 5.1, the social impact is described in three levels (e.g. plan, perform and reflect) with different objectives (e.g. Increase social engagement/inclusion, Change/Increase users' connection to the space/place, Promote/enrich understanding of placemaking as an essential aspect of living together), target groups (e.g. local communities, Diverse permanent/temporal users, and policy makers, local communities and other such as artistic groups, academics and students), and impact factors also relative (e.g. Assessment methods and criteria are also different for each stage. Thus, the social impact is basically described through the impact indicators: Emergence of inter-community discourse or different ways of interacting with each other; creation of a sense of a place and emergence of different types of place sense/making experiences; references to placemaking in the authorities' future plans and/or discourses; Reference to place-making transformation potential in terms of community building; Reference to placemaking transformation potential in terms of socially engaged artistic practices.

Basically, it can be said that quality evaluation and social impact evaluation differ from each other, either by the focus of the actions (internal or external), or by the impact measurement factors that are also reflected by internal or external agency to the activities.

Evaluation frame (the same as 2020-2021)

The evaluation of every placemaking activity carried out in each city is presented in this report according to the following structure and sections:

1. **Introduction.** Description of the placemaking activity and motivation, according to the Project's programme.
2. **Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community.** This section encompasses:
  - **Participation and creativity of participation.** This section refers to the quality of social participation and creation of values (e.g., inclusiveness and creativity, for example) promoted by placemaking activities within communities.
  - **Social engagement and community building.** Concerning placemaking, social engagement encompasses the participation of stakeholders, in different phases of the activities, as well as the strengthening of the sense of places, and place attachment. As for community construction, the most relevant idea is that communities are dynamic social constructions whose boundaries are defined by common values. In this context, cultural and artistic experience can be important in creating intercultural communities of senses, for example.
3. **Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices.** This section includes: a) "social discourse"; b) "socially engaged artistic practices"; and c) "space-place transformation".
  - **Social discourse.** Although theorists are unanimous in saying that it is difficult to determine the cultural impact of an activity, either due to its ephemeral character or other factors, the change of socio-cultural discourses about a given place can be an indicator of the impact caused by activities such as those carried out within the scope of the project. Thus, the comparison between speeches before and after the activities can be a good indicator of their impact. Discourses can take different forms: they can be linguistic, but they can also take the form of an object or an image. Urban art can be an example of a cultural discourse,

since graffiti are, frequently, an expression of contradictory feelings about one place; an answer to... or a rebellious gesture.

- **Socially engaged artistic practices.** The mobilization of art as an agent of change is particularly evident in cases where the artistic practices socially engage.
- **Space-place transformation:** From a conceptual point of view, space may be considered as objective and empirical, thus mappable, but somehow separated from a kind of human affective experience. Space can also be understood as both a physical and social landscape. But most public urban spaces are actually non-places in the sense that people do not have strong attachment to them. As with place, people can identify some generic qualities frequently referred to as neighbourhood, territory, location, milieu, locale, region. In a sense that a place is a social construction with specific meanings and other characteristics such as cultural and social interaction between people, and an organized and institutionalized political life. One of the main objectives of the project's activities is to contribute to the transformation of many spaces that tend to lack meaning into places that can be recognized by the inhabitants or users as places of sharing and social and cultural interaction.

This methodology applies to all activities, but in some cases, it was not possible to answer the leading questions in order to delimit the scope of the assessment. The specificity of most of the activities, and the corresponding data for assessment, did not facilitate the use of a common, broader evaluation matrix, as proposed.

## **PART A. Placemaking Activities**



# 1 "A Weaved Place" in L'Hospitalet (Barcelona)

## 1.1. Introduction

L'Hospitalet de Llobregat is a city adjacent to Barcelona and a part of its Metropolitan Area. A small town surrounded by farmland at the beginning of the twentieth century, it became an industrial centre in the 1960s, attracting migrant populations from Catalonia, other regions of Spain and other countries. Subsequently, it suffered with deindustrialisation. Today, the neighbourhoods of l'Hospitalet's are as diverse as the local social groups that inhabit them and, in part due to the metropolitan transport infrastructures that cross it (railways, highways), the city can be characterized as a socially and physically fragmented territory.

In order to create a common reflection on the sense of place and collective identity in the city of L'Hospitalet, "A Weaved Place" brought together architecture students and faculty, local artists and citizens in several activities: analysis of the sociophysical territory jointly carried out by students, faculty and residents, and participatory activities in public spaces and premises of cultural and civic associations.

The activities programmed for public spaces in 2021 and 2022 were: "[Mapping and constructing places](#)", "Mapping Places", "[Urban walk in La Florida neighbourhood](#)", "[Placing audiovisual narratives](#)", "Signifying the territory: Video

## 1.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

### 1.2.1. Participation

In 2021-2022, the partner developed several actions within the scope of the A Weaved Place activity. Between April and November 2021 the activity "Mapping and constructing places" involved pupils from different educational levels in a learning process about the sense of place in public space. Pupils and teachers from local schools collaborated with architecture students and their tutors in the design and assembly of artefacts to activate and re-signify public spaces. In June 2022, under the subject - Mapping Places - an installation was created at Plaza Blocs in Florida in Hospitalet, Barcelona, with the texts and photographs submitted to the online competition A-Place MAPPING, representing and describing the domestic spaces inhabited by people from diverse backgrounds and cultures from all over the world, along with the works from the neighbours.

On another level, the partner organized an urban walk in the neighbourhood of La Florida, with the collaboration of civic organisations working with migrants (Sidecar), cultural associations (Contorno Urbano) and neighbourhood associations (Districte IV). The walk was a learning opportunity for the partner team and participants, since the old residents explained to the newcomers how the neighbourhood had changed, and identified negative or positive aspects of public spaces. The walk was mapped with photographic images captured during the activity.

From 22 June 2021 to 25 December 2021, and continuing the activity "Mapping the territory: Photographic survey" carried out in 2020, students made a video on the same subjects that inspired them in the case of photographs: history of places, artistic interventions in the city, the uses of public space, etc. Architecture students interviewed residents for the collaborative video production, tutored by artists. The public presentation of videos carried out by the students of the La Salle School of Architecture in Barcelona, under the guidance of the creators, Claudio Zulian

and Miquel García, was also a collective exercise of reflection on the work carried out and the spaces represented.

Most of the activities carried out in 2021 and 2022, and developed by Arquitectura de la Salle students, in collaborative work with artists, tutors and the community, were based on photography and video, with subsequent public presentation. There were also interventions in public space, and subsequent involvement of the community in discussing the results, namely a public debate in Tecla Sala with the participation of neighbour's associations.

#### 1.2.2. Creativity of participation

The creativity of participation was guided by persistent and permanent work of inclusion and promotion of diversity through interactivity between residents, artists and students. There was a continuous adaptation to the local conditions. The effort to adapt to the conditions resulted in creative solutions; for example, the use of spaces in artistic centres for debate meetings or even for the final exhibition of works. Tutors were also continuously adapting the development of the audiovisual analysis to the materials that students were providing, from their recordings, interviews, etc.

The 2-day workshop held in La Salle was an opportunity to create a collage of the city using photographs taken by students in previous activities. Those and other actions reveal the creativity of the process: the joint sessions with local students and their tutors, and with architecture students and their faculty, to explain the purpose of the joint activities; the interventions in public spaces carried out by architecture students and local students using a common language, based on a catalogue of PVC materials selected by students; the agreement on common pedagogic objectives, etc..

Photography and video were frequently used as visual tools in mapping and analysing the city's places and spaces and the involvement of artists in tutoring architecture students promoted creative and reflective work of both as the recordings made by students were used by the artists to produce two video works. The strengthening of relationships between artists, students and residents is demonstrated by this mutual collaboration.

All the processes of preparation and implementation of the activities reveal a deep involvement of the participants, as well as the existence of creative solutions in the moments of adaptation. Creative steps, either on the part of the La Salle team or on the part of the direct collaborators are an indication of creative participation, only possible through the design of the activities.

#### 1.2.3. Social Engagement and Community Building

As evidenced in the previous report all the activities were designed and implemented by La Salle A-Place team, in close collaboration with the schools, the artists and the community. The initial proposals for the activities were quite comprehensive, allowing adaptations and other creative contributions by the collaborators. For example, teachers adapted activities to integrate them dynamically into their specific programs and curricular needs. In schools, the participants were students from different socio-cultural backgrounds. The social and educational differences between the participants contributed to multicultural approaches to urban spaces, and the cultural differences triggered cultural enrichment of the experience, enhance the processes of integration of "the other" and the construction of inclusive communities.

The social engagement was mostly the task of the faculty members of the School of Architecture La Salle, in close cooperation with teachers from secondary schools. According to the partner, this was particularly relevant for the high school students, who had the opportunity to approach public space in a different way, identifying and communicating the places that were meaningful to them, and working with the architecture students to convey their experience of places to other citizens through the artistic intervention.

As for the community building, there was the participation of people from different cultural backgrounds, this diversity is manifested in the video interviews, and it is mainly translated by the exchange of diverse cultural experiences.

### 1.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices

#### 1.3.1. Social discourse

As written in the previous report, discourses about places after activities tend to change locally, especially due to interventions in public space - sculptures, gardening, etc. -, and due to an acuity of perception promoted by visual records and their display also in public spaces. The analysis of the speeches of the participants in the activities, and the cultural and educational agents in the videographic records, shows a specific transformation, although it is not possible to determine whether the activities contributed to a global common vision of the intervened territory.

The activities conceived by the La Salle School of Architecture clearly contributed to a critical reflection on the relationships between places and communities, through the arts, in order to understand the very meaning of public spaces before and after the placemaking activities.

As described by partner, the main hypothesis of their programme "A Weaved Place" is that L'Hospitalet is a fragmented city, physical and socially, with neighbourhoods very diverse and separated from each other due to the topography and the transport networks that cross the territory of the city. The goal of the programme was to re-connect those fragments with public interventions all over the city, but for reasons of time and circumstances, the implementation of the activities focused more and more on the Bellvitge and La Florida neighbourhoods.

#### 1.3.2. Socially engaged artistic practices

The open art festival "ES\_CULTURA" celebrated in November 2022, was a result of several interventions in public space jointly carried out by students from different levels. It is an example, and represented the culmination of all the creative and social processes carried out during the previous three years of work in the city.

The interventions in public space helped participating students to focus on public space, paying attention to places unnoticed in their daily life, and acknowledged the importance of the bonds that are created with the spaces they inhabit.

Also, the meeting organized by partner with the neighbours' associations, school members and municipality, at Art Centre Santa Tecla, in 2021, was an important action to approach the problems of urban planning processes, and discuss the social and political concerns towards the future of the urban spaces of the neighbourhood (See "Creating and learning in public space" at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=inMkrkP1E>).

#### Space-place transformation

One of the possible indicators, in relation to measuring the impact of activities from a social and cultural point of view, is the transformation of spaces, but also of people's perception, resulting from interventions in public space. Although it is not possible to objectively measure the level of transformation, the partner considers that neighbours experienced the transformation of the public spaces resulting from the insertion of objects and artifacts. They were curious about the reason of the objects to be there, interacted with them in space and interrogated students about their meaning.

According to the La Salle Team, the objects placed in spaces that were previously empty and disconnected, transformed the perception of both the passers-by and the participants in the activities. That is to say that the physical transformation of spaces and the changes in people's

perception of places - e.g. the installation of sculptures, the public exhibitions, the guided walks...  
- contributed to unveil new meanings, which is somehow a space-place transformation.

## 2 “A Happy Place” in Brussels

### 2.1. Introduction

Brussels is a vibrant city of “super-diverse” citizens from different cultures and social backgrounds. One of its most historical but also popular neighbourhoods is the so-called “Marolles”. The district has always welcomed the most disadvantaged inhabitants of the capital but also those who aspire to freedom and art. It is a neighbourhood where the first citizen movement fought for a respectful renovation of the urban and social fabric. One third of the dwellings in the Marolles are social housings.

Through the action plan “Contrat de quartier durable Marolles”, that aims to improve the living environment in the neighbourhood, (<https://www.bruxelles.be/marolles>) the city of Brussels launched a call for the socio-economic project ‘Valorisation of the Public Spaces’ in the open space of two social housing complexes, both managed by the institution of Brussels Housing (<https://logementbruxellois.be/>). Alive Architecture in collaboration with BRAVVO, the Prevention Service of the City of Brussels, won this competition.

Within this context Alive Architecture and BRAVVO co-transform from 2021 to 2022 the open space in the heart of two social housing blocs into a pleasant space where locals can meet and develop a sense of belonging. While in 2021 they focussed upon the Pieremans playground to allow participants to re-appropriate the neglected area, in 2022 the aim will be to generate use and encounter in the ‘Cité Hellemans’

### 2.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

#### 2.2.1. Participation

The partner organized 19 events, all of which were well attended, beyond expectations. The activities involved audiences of all ages, but it is worth highlighting the participation of children from the surrounding housing blocs and their parents.

In 2021 the partner focused upon co-producing transformations on the Pieremans playground, in 2022 the team expanded the project towards the alleys of the Cité Hellemans.

Of the 19 activities, 9 were carried out in the alleys of the ‘Cité Hellemans’; 4 of these participatory activities took place in April and 4 took place in June, both , focussing upon the ‘Cité Hellemans’. As the site is part of a historical heritage, and a protected one, the activities organized here in 2022 were temporary. Therefore, besides some balcony planters, the interventions will not have a future permanent trace in the alleys.

In 2022, some permanent transformations on the Pieremans Playground were realized, building upon the participative process that took place there in 2021.

The final inauguration of the project took place on Friday 24.06.2022. The event gave a context for AJointPlace. As such most of the A-Place partners joined the inauguration and painted together with the children of the neighbourhood an urban furniture.

#### 2.2.2. Creativity of participation

All participants were involved in a process of co-design and co-construction. It was a participatory process with people for people.

As a strategy to approach people, the partner invited the participants in all phases, giving them a role in the “production of space” through the interventions in the public space. During the co-

design phase people could choose among different activities to be organized. In the case of co-construction people got involved in painting on the ground with partner's team. People also planted different species of flora in public spaces or on their balconies, and constructed urban furniture.

The creative process was quite informal, with no guidelines from partner. The purpose was to include everyone interested in the activities, and the goals and tasks were adapted continuously based upon the feedback that we received from participants. This methodology encouraged people to interact and participate.

### 2.2.3. Social Engagement

Alive Architecture team (Simon Devos & Petra Pferdmenges) as well as the BRAVVO team (Ghazaleh) organized the activities that allowed participants of the activities to react upon the proposed interventions. As such, the participants contributed as much as the team to define and re-define the activities. The goal was the engagement of the participants, and the partner says that it was achieved through their presence on the site.

According to the partner, the activities stimulated the creation of place meaning and place attachment. The process of co-design and co-construction allowed participants to contribute to the production of the public space. In contrast, the activities allowed people to appropriate the space, creating meaning for it.

### 2.2.4. Community Building

From partner's point of view there was community building among inhabitants from different cultural background of the social housing blocs, including Belgian, Moroccan, Turkish and African inhabitants. The activities were an opportunity for them to share their cultural expression through participating into the events (e.g. wearing a scarf).

The approach of A Happy Place constitutes, according to Alive Architecture, "a common way of working within". A Happy Place is a clear case of a Placemaking activity that has the potential to contribute to more reflexive and participative local planning agendas, since it shows that it is possible to engage residents, even the children and youth, in thinking, debating and acting upon their surroundings. Furthermore, Alive Architecture not only implemented these temporary actions, but they also engaged with the institution in charge of the durational transformation to discuss the long term transformation of the site.

## 2.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices

### 2.3.1. Social Discourse

Participants were extremely positive about the events. The recorded interviews confirm the positive speeches about the activities carried out,

### 2.3.2. Socially engaged artistic practices

The mentioned activities are an answer to the question: How can we overcome the boundary between art and participation? From partner's point of view art opens possibilities to do participation in a creative way, rather than following an institutional guideline as it is often the case for participation in larger urban transformations.

In this case, the place intervened was the subject of a team of urbanists working on a proposal to renovate the social housing bloc around the Pieremans Playground. A-PLACE partner worked with that team in order to discuss needs and opportunities of the transformation of the site.

### 2.3.3. Space-place transformation

Before A-PLACE intervention, the Pieremans site was a totally neglected playground where almost no children would play anymore. It was taken over by drug addicts and as such become abandoned. Through the activities in the site, there was a transformation, as well as the involvement of the children and their parents. The space became a place that is today used more than ever.

The activities de co-production had an impact mainly on the relationships that people started to have with that space. The inhabitants painted the ground, the flowerpots and the walls. They also planted and made urban furniture. The use of the space was transformed by these activities.

## 3 “A-Pla(y)ce” in Ljubljana

### 3.1. Introduction

“A Re-Place” is the name of the third placemaking activity cycle carried out by the team of Ljubljana and can be seen as a follow-up of the 2020 and 2021 activity cycles already done in Bežigranski Dvor in Ljubljana. It is also a placemaking site and a student workshop initiated by prostoRož and the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Ljubljana.

In continuity with the previous placemaking activities, “A Re-Place” was set in the same neighbourhood but, this time, situated in the east part of a temporary construction pit within the residential area, sometimes called Krater. The last uninhabited section of the neighbourhood, it has been occasionally used, such as other terrains vagues within the urban environment, as a place where innovative ideas are explored, but also sustainable practices and arts, sometimes proposed by NGO’s as well as the residential community and even Ljubljana’s team itself. Since in the last years it has also attracted different interest groups, with several activities and events, it became a sort of landfill or dumping for the disparate and abandoned materials that were used or served in previous actions, eventually awaiting a future use.

“A Re-Place” was thus inspired by the sustainable concept of circular design and materials reuse, focusing on resource flows, repurposing of their design, thus giving them a new life, while also redesigning and recreating the place for people.

It mainly consisted of a workshop with students of the Faculty of Architecture and of the Academy of Fine Arts and Design - both of the University of Ljubljana -, conducted by educational and artistic mentors. Comprising an exploratory and enactment phase, it aimed at the creation of a learning platform for dialogue and for the assimilation of both professional and tacit knowledge, promoted by invited guest lectures and the ensuing discussions between the experts - experienced in architectural reuse, place redesign and the “art of recycling the art” - and the students, always eager to learn. The process also implied an inventory of the materials that were supposed to be reused and, of course, acquired knowledge and insight into the location dynamics, its social context and principal needs. The local community was invited to express their ideas about the redevelopment of the location in an initial phase of the cycle and then co-create the placemaking activities through the events and physical interventions on the site.

According to the Ljubljana team, this placemaking cycle comprised two types of A-Place placemaking activities:

- “Learning spaces for reflection (learn-place)”: the workshop with weekly sessions, including invited guest lectures, debates with the different user-groups and reflections on particular aspects of reuse and recycling practices in the context of placemaking activities;
- “On-site activities (spot-place)”: the preparation and the actual interventions in the site.

The purpose of the Ljubljana’s team planned activities, in accordance with the general objectives of the A-Place project, was: to create cross-disciplinary learning spaces arising from the confluence of the creative design practices; to develop and apply creative placemaking practices, focusing on the concepts of circular design, reuse and “the art of recycling the art”; to fulfil the broad objectives in placemaking, such as community building, enhancing the dialogue and mutual commitment of inhabitants, but also tightening the connections and synergies between the several partners, while promoting healthy, sustainable and inclusive places to inhabit.



## 3.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

### 3.2.1. Participation

During the spring of 2022, more specifically, between the 17th of March and the 7th April, there were five guest lectures delivered by renowned artists (Pedro Jervell, Antoine Aubinais, Tobias Outrih, Aleš Korpič and Marjetica Potrč) in the context of the workshop at the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Ljubljana. The lectures were firstly delivered to the 23 students from the Faculty of Architecture and the Academy of Fine Arts but were also open to the general public, functioning both in the live mode and via Zoom.

These lectures introduced the students, firstly, to the topics of harvesting, gathering, transforming and repurposing of available materials, waste, surpluses (from shops and industries, houses and gardens) in order to redesign the urban environment and evaluate its impact on our ecological imprint and social habits. Secondly, there was also an introduction to the social dimension of the reusing of materials, assessing the importance and value of public participation in the creation and reinvention of places. Thirdly, they were also introduced to the possibilities of digital computation applied to the design of environments, helping in the evaluation of environmental and economic constraints but also collective deliberation and decision-making processes. Finally, the students were lectured also on the interdisciplinary practices involved in on-site projects between research, architecture, participatory design and sustainable solutions (particularly concerning energy and water supplies). The ensuing discussions and lively debates involved not only the students and the guests, but also academic teachers, artistic mentors and other professionals.

Some international guests (prof. dr. Jose Luis Oliver, teacher at Faculty of Architecture, Universidad de Alicante; Hugh David Clarke, RIBA; dr. Petra Pferdmenges, Alive Architecture) were also involved in the following discussions but particularly on the opening day (14th April) of the intensive, hands-on part of the workshop on-site (the construction pit (Krater) in Bežigranski dvor).

In fact, in the following days, the students, the mentors, the guests and some visitors collaborated by sharing ideas and pondering strategies on how to rethink the design, plan the actions of reusing and recycling that would implement the desired transformations of the Krater. Then, mostly the students - which have tackled the hands-on work and begun the process of moulding the materials - but with the help of other (some already skilled) participants engaged in these practical learning activities. By the end of the onsite intervention, the participants fine-tuned their proposed solutions, made the final touches, made an inventory of the work done and even reviewed the progress of each working group, before presenting and demonstrating to the general public that attended the opening event. Through the in-person onsite presentations and the implemented recycling actions, representatives of the local community ended up also being involved. The groups of visitors that attended the monthly open days at Krater place were able to try out the new recycled objects and learn how the students proceeded to implement the place-making activities.

According to Ljubljana's team, «[a]ll the participants got an opportunity to get involved and engaged in a range acceptable to their own readiness to collaborate.»

During the 2022's activity cycle, Ljubljana's team has made considerable efforts to involve the academic community - mostly the students but of course the researchers and teachers of the University -, experts (the guest lecturers) and the members of the local communities.

### 3.2.2. Creativity of participation

In order to properly evaluate the creativity of participation different factors must be taken into consideration, from the availability of materials and guidelines that could have helped the participants to reach their maximum creativity potential to the ability to adapt a method to the given circumstances and also the inclusiveness and adaptability of the whole process.

In terms of the materials and types of approaches available to the participants, the Ljubljana team ensured that the student participants, who were more directly involved in the activities of the workshop, were properly equipped with the tools (work/handicraft) and materials necessary to implement their ideas for the renewal of the site and the recycling of the objects. A tutor from the Faculty of Architecture was present and available to help them throughout the process during the workshop on site. There were also a variety of techniques used by the students to represent the conditions of the Krater, as well as the ideas proposed for regeneration and recycling strategies. Since the pandemic restrictions, hybrid approaches between traditional live meetings and contemporary online/virtual (zoom) environments have been used, and even though the restrictions have gradually been eased, some of these approaches have been maintained mostly by the guest lecturers and advisory professionals.

In order to ensure that the participants could reach their maximum creative potential and to maximise the efficiency of communication and the productivity of the workshop, the Ljubljana team ensured that guidelines, task descriptions and appropriate feedback were continuously provided to the students, guest lecturers and even the artists involved. They did this by using email communication and shared digital space platforms (like Google Drive and Microsoft Sharepoint).

According to the Ljubljana team, 'all participants were given the opportunity to participate and engage to an extent that was appropriate to their own willingness to cooperate', and there is no indication in the detailed documentation provided that this was not the case, so there is no reason to doubt that the principles of inclusiveness and adaptability of goals and tasks were ensured during the 2022 Learning Place and Spot Place activities.

To ensure authentic interaction and contribution, participants were allowed and encouraged to communicate in their own way. They were given the freedom to participate and intervene using their favourite techniques. Whether through facilitated debates and presentations, written and visual stories, or direct participation in the events on the ground, everyone was able to express themselves in their own idiom.

### 3.2.3. Social Engagement

To assess the social engagement values of the 2022 activity cycle, it is important to know who was effectively engaged in defining, re-defining and implementing the activities and goals of the placemaking practices, but also if and how the activities stimulated the creation of place meaning and place attachment. In addition to the academic mentors from the Faculty of Architecture and the artistic mentors from prostoRož, everyone directly involved in the workshop had the opportunity to participate in the definition - sometimes re-definition - and the implementation of the goals and planned activities of Ljubljana's A-Re-Place, from the Slovenian and foreign students to the invited guest lecturers or artists.

In what concerns place meaning and place attachment, which are different ways of understanding the new symbolic meanings ascribed to a place and the actual bonds between people and this place, the most effective contributions could have happened during the open days and open events at the spot-place site, when there was an opportunity to stimulate the visitors and the public interest, especially with the events of the NGOs active in the A-Re-Place, but also when it was possible to link all the results of the workshop. At these events, all visitors were invited to participate and thus co-create the ongoing recycling and renewal activities. It is through this interaction and acquaintance with the placemaking activities, and most importantly

with the place itself, that one can trust the most certain engagement between the local community and the Krater.

#### 3.2.4. Community Building

In the 2022 A-Re-Place cycle of activities, the Ljubljana team continued to keep the values of community building in mind at all stages of planning, implementing and reflecting on the different activities. Not only in the learning phase of the workshop, but also in the field activities themselves - the practical part of the workshop - the values of interculturality, sharedness and inclusiveness were promoted by the team mentors and instilled in the various stakeholders. In order to assess this, it is essential to know whether and how people from different cultural backgrounds were brought together around a common goal, and whether the people involved shared and exchanged their different cultural expressions.

In the earlier stages, with the lively debates and exchanges of views after each guest lecture and during the on-site interventions, all participants were given the opportunity to express themselves and share their different cultural backgrounds. We have to remember that some of the students were Erasmus students, so they certainly had different perceptions and opinions about the place and what should be done there, but also that the artists invited to lecture and participate had already worked in different cultural environments, so each participant brought their own unique world view and had the opportunity to show their own attitudes towards the values of place, recycling and renewal. Most importantly, they were brought together to work towards a common goal: to redesign and recreate this place for the people, while at the same time raising awareness about the value of open public places in cities, their role and importance, considering the values of sustainability, ecological awareness and the ensuing social benefits.

Of course, the students and even the invited lecturers are neither residents nor the main recipients of the hoped-for transformation of the space into place, so it was important to promote the community-building values close to the residents. There was not much information available about the composition and cultural diversity of the neighbourhood and its residents, so it is difficult to assess the actual extent of interculturality, sharedness and inclusiveness among them. Nevertheless, the open events to which residents and other visitors were invited certainly created a good atmosphere for sharing these values and certainly raised awareness of the value of these open public spaces and their role and importance in terms of environmental impact and social benefits. Fostering these values and creating this kind of awareness paves the way for the future emergence of a desired community and a sense of belonging.

### 3.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices

#### 3.3.1. Social Discourse

The main purpose of the activities was to target the topic of circular design and materials reuse beyond the common take-make-waste extractive model. By discussing flows of resources and possibilities for keeping products in continuous use and repurposing their design, all with one overarching goal of sustainable development, the team raised social discourses, community building and socially engaged art practices through values' promotion, criticality, and reflexivity that happened on lecture sessions and in the on-site event. The processes of communication were also positive since students interacted with the interviewees and discussed their future expectations.

#### 3.3.2. Socially engaged artistic practices

The activities were inspired by the sustainable concept of circular design. The invited artists offered meaningful insights into their work and their experiences concerning renewal and recycling in different cities around the world. All the shared experiences were solid points for further discussions and considerations of how to apply this knowledge in a specific place of Bežigranski dvor.

New knowledge and positive experiences were the results of the workshop for students who were guided in the task of redesign and recycle. The community benefited and became aware of the political/governmental ecological agendas regarding the issue of sustainability. Both students and other participants paid attention to social, economic and ecological concerns, and the necessity of implement other placemaking activities addressed to the problem.

### 3.3.3. Space-place transformation

In 2022, the activities of A Re-Place contributed to a gradual transformation of the place's appearance, functionality and enhanced the relationship between people and the place of Krater construction pit in Bežigranski dvor.

(See also Table Annex 1)

## 4 “Just Place” in Brussels

### 4.1. Introduction

“A Just Place” in Brussels, also designated by the partner as “A Just Place”, was planned as a civic forum and a cycle of placemaking activities - “Up-cycled Furniture Workshop”, “A Seedling Place: A joint event with A-Place partners, Urban Gorillas”; “Open Mural: A participatory event”; “Exhibition and Talks: An open event in collaboration with local cultural associations”, “A Just Place: Expo & Radio”. These activities were carried out by KU Leuven Faculty of Architecture (See: <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/38> | <https://www.a-place.eu/en/placemaking-activity/46>) with the collaboration of other local partners, namely NGOs, citizens, artists, researchers and governmental, as well as A-Place Partners, with the main objective of co-transformation of an all-male homeless shelter in Brussels.

The partner began their activities with “A Just Place”, a civic learning space that was an opportunity for the citizens and students to discuss the meanings of place which the artistic-architectural installations aim to reveal. Designers, artists, sociologists and DIY makers participated in these discussions, in a previous process of communication and planning of activities. According to the partner, these previous meetings supported a bottom-up spatial design and production that were already in progress by a consortium of activist architects, architecture students, social workers, and shelter residents. The Academic team partner of A-Place worked together with students and residents in order to engage them in the process of transformation of the shelter. Besides, these learning places had an experimental potential to influence and change mentalities, since they are embedded in the community in order to facilitate the sharing of knowledge across realms.

One of the partner's contributions to this transformation was the attempt to draw attention to the claim for housing as a right and, according to this team, it was a proactive activity totally embedded in the peculiarities of the Brussels urban context, a city that harbours numerous solidarity network practices, diverse in culture, and with an expansive universe of spatial activism responding to socio-spatial injustice(s).

### 4.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

#### 4.2.1. Participation

From March 2022 to June 2022 the “A Just Place” activities engaged different social groups, namely, a diverse group of 24 students, an elective and one design studio, all from the Faculty of Architecture, at KU Leuven. 2 artistic activists, 2 social activists and 2 practicing architects collaborated with the partner, and allowed for the project to become trans-disciplinary, fostering a place where the multitude of knowledges intersected.

As the challenge of the project is to involve the local communities, especially the vulnerable groups which are often left out from participatory practices, this was an opportunity to fulfil the objective of participation. Particularly in Brussels these social groups require extra care and a different approach. Given this, “A Just Place, Expo and Radio” are platforms that bring awareness to practices and initiatives, and focus on claiming back the space for those marginalised communities. Students and partner’s team worked together to find strategies to help people homeless groups, and transmigrant community. In this sense, “A Just Place: Expo and Radio” were participatory actions in line with the work of the Architecture Design Justice Studio, an architectural design studio at KU Leuven’s International Master Brussels, with the artistic collaboration of “The City is our Playground”.

With the expo's partner intended to create an opportunity for people discuss questions raised by the "futuring projects", taking a critical perspective to the current political system and challenging the role of the architecture profession (Fry, 2009). This approach aims to change the perception of design as a practice. The word "futuring" brings the idea of experimentation into design strategies to enable change and experimental socio-spatial interventions to draw realistic but imaginative future directions. In this sense, the outcomes of the ADJ studio are futuring architectural projects, employing strategies and socially and spatially innovative interventions at different scales which address certain dimensions of Architecture Design Justice.

#### 4.2.2. Creativity of participation

The partner provided materials and guides for participation. Besides, there was a discussion and interactive exhibition of student's work, on the Expo. General public interacted, questioning partner's team and students about the activities. Additionally, there was a Reflection room immersive experience: that is, a room where the participants were guided by a music performance to reflect on the material and contents from the exhibition.

People were invited to draw on mirrors as a "reflection moment in silence", and then were invited to add something to other reflections too. The process triggered conversations that emerged naturally from the content written or drawn on the mirrors. This performative approach gave freedom and flexibility for the attendees to engage and share their feelings and thoughts, since the subjects discussed in the expo brought up sensitive topics. Live Painting on collective memory of space was another challenge to these communities: The availability of a live painting board allowed for everyone to leave a message and their own mark on the exposition, creating a sense of community and collective identity.

The partner provided a clear schedule of the event and gave the architecture students the role to guide the participants around the expo as well as the Radio room. Artists also facilitated the interactive board exercises as well as the guided performance. This method allowed everyone to explore the expo in a freeway. It was an inclusive process, and people get involved and became engaged until the end in each program. All participants were encouraged to interact in their own "language" and with their own means of communication, enabling them to be authentic and spontaneous. This is to say that the event was catered to multiple languages.

#### 4.2.3. Social Engagement

The event was open to anyone passing by the space of the Grand Hospice, a temporary cultural garden with a bar open to the public. The cultural activation of this public space resulted in a moment of interaction between inhabitants of various nationalities, ethnicities and classes, such as Belgians and foreign students from the Faculty of Architecture in KU Leuven, residents from the Foyer Bodeghem shelter, academic mentors from the Faculty of Architecture, artistic guests from "The city is our Playground", architecture civil servants, activists, and their friends.

According to the partner it also stimulated the creation of meaning and place by empowering the homeless shelter resident's narratives, and using a public space, such as the walls and open spaces like the garden, as relational objects in architecture, where multitudes of backgrounds and experiences can meet and create collective memories through the various action possibilities instore in the dynamics of other bodies and artefact.

#### 4.2.4. Community Building

The aim was to create an expo that would break the stereotypes of homeless people, making it accessible to the residents. The partner planned to use this event as a way of lobbying to improve the quality of living for the homeless community.

The community building was achieved in several ways. First, there was a plurality of languages and cultures among the group. Although the main spoken languages were French, Dutch and

English, some students were from similar backgrounds as the residents and so they could communicate with the residents who spoke Arabic, Spanish and German. There was also a hearing-impaired resident who joined the Project and taught the students how to communicate with them through sign language. In this specific case, we accommodated the resident, and created a silent drawing session, where everyone communicated by drawing, allowing the residents to write and express themselves in their language.

### 4.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices

#### 4.3.1. Social Discourse

The Radio studio was a parallel platform to the expo which was temporarily hosted at Grand Hospice. Through a series of radio interviews, the students constructed new narratives about 'The Grand Hospice' and its representation in the city. This temporary occupation of The Grand Hospice created an occasional community of artists and cultural activists, although it failed to provide an inclusive environment for the most vulnerable persons. The Radio just allowed the ADJ studio students to have access to insider information and to investigate closely the temporary occupation managing team (Pali Pali).

However, these actions were successful in bringing together a network of artists and NGOs involved in the questioning and protest of these new occupations. Students gathered interviews from activist groups, and the marginalized communities on their strategies for temporary occupations.

#### 4.3.2. Socially engaged artistic practices

A Just Place: Expo & Radio focused on sharing knowledge. Given this A Just Place addressed the following questions: (1) how do our practices relate to the politics of place and time? (2) how do we critically position ourselves in relation to placemaking activities? Is this manifested in the ways we work or in the things we produce? and (3) In which ways can we integrate issues of spatial injustices in our practice?

Our reference is the notion of Situated Creative Practices, which has a twofold connotation: on one side, it refers to the site and time sensitivity of the practices that we engage with and, on the other, the tools and tactics we use to critically position ourselves in relation to the contexts where we operate.

In context, students were guided to re-think their role as designers and become aware of the power relations between top-down urban planning, and the vulnerable, often forgotten communities. Students will be the architects and planners of the future, and most of them can understand better now how to engage with a challenging community.

#### 4.3.3. Space-place transformation

Even if for a short time, the common areas at the Grand Hospice, spaces located at the ground floor including the garden out back, became places to meet and discuss about space and places, and environments where the homeless residents can feel welcome.

(See also Table Annex 2)

## 5 “A Reconnecting Place” in Lisbon

### 5.1. Introduction

The Rego neighbourhood (Bairro do Rego) is right in the centre of Lisbon. However, it ended up isolated, like an island, with three freeways and a railway encircling it and marking its boundaries. The neighbourhood as we know it began to take shape at the beginning of the 20th century. The distinctive parts that make up the neighbourhood today were not joined together by planning; it was their isolation, or insularity, that brought them together. Today, the neighbourhood's social fabric is vibrantly multicultural. Visually, the urban area is marked by the strong contrast between the luxurious residences and the social housing, the memory of the once bustling market that now houses a supermarket franchise, the Communist Party headquarters in front of the former stock exchange, or the appropriated gardens along the busy railway and the view of downtown Lisbon.

In this context, the local Passa Sabi Association invests heavily in empowering people and increasing their welfare, intervening not just within the living community but in the space itself. All of this made them a perfect partner in developing the initiative.

Although in close proximity, the faculty and the neighbourhood previously did not have a lot of overlapping initiatives. Here, the Passa Sabi was an ideal partner to make this connection work and overcome the obstacles and challenges, principally in unfamiliarity with the people and space, bringing artists and researchers/staff from the university together with the neighbourhood residents.

"A Reconnecting Place" was an activity based on the idea of movement, eternal return and the four seasons (of nature, of life, of places, etc.). In this context, the Lisbon team wanted to make a connection between four different spaces of Bairro do Rego - a) the interior/exterior of Associação Passa Sabi; b) a children's playground; c) an old market; and d) a bridge - through a flash mob, an event choreographed with the participation of the residents of the neighbourhood.

The activities wanted to bring together the neighbourhood community, PhD students from NOVA FCSH, artists and researchers, with the aim of activating the public space through a series of activities designed with and for the Rego neighbourhood.

During 2022, the Lisbon team proposed creative placemaking activities aimed at achieving the following objectives :

- Through the collection of soundscapes and interviews, the residents of the neighbourhood would be involved in the process of mapping the territory and making it meaningful for the different individuals and communities that inhabit the space of the Rego neighbourhood;
- To create cross-disciplinary learning spaces and exploit the potential of networked artistic practices;
- Through creative dance workshops, the interested public from the neighbourhood could learn to express themselves artistically, creatively and collaboratively.
- To break down social barriers and promote community building.
- By bringing together PhD students from FCSH NOVA, artists and residents throughout the year in various proposed activities, as well as in the final event, the project aimed to connect the "insular" Rego neighbourhood with its surroundings, highlighting the rich



social fabric and its value, for the residents themselves, as well as for visitors and passers-by.

## 5.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

### 5.2.1. Participation

Throughout the processes of planning, implementation, and distribution, the team aimed at co-creation, collaboration, active participation, knowledge and idea-sharing, as well as transparency, visibility and accessibility for all of the actors involved. The team for the activity "A Reconnecting Place" - both the integrated members, as well as the collaborators - are trained in various disciplinary areas, namely Anthropology, Architecture and Urbanism, Educational Sciences, Communication Sciences, Cinema, Dance, Philosophical Aesthetics, Music and Sociology. This multiplicity of areas of knowledge, as well as the different skills of the Project members, allowed for a multifaceted and original approach to the city space. We tried to combine different perceptions of the Bairro do Rego in Lisbon: from the human and social perspective of a multicultural community, through the formation of a visual and aesthetic image, to the aural and sound component. These perceptions shaped the musical and performative creation, which also involved moments of learning, communication and exchange of values and knowledge, between the different participants - the neighbourhood youth, members of the Passa Sabi association, artists and researchers.

From 1st April to 30th September there was an exploration of the neighbourhood and a series of encounters with the local community, particularly the members of the Passa Sabi Association and the young local participants. The initial aim was to collect the musical influences of the young participants and their family influences in order to try and portray the community from the point of view of musical tastes and their origins, but also to collect various field recordings representing the soundscapes of the Rego neighbourhood, which would later be 'sampled' and incorporated into a final musical composition. During these months, the artists worked with the youth, strolling together through the neighbourhood equipped with different microphones and other recording devices. The sounds collected and imagined were then transformed into ten sound/musical pieces, inspired by the musical taste of the participants, by different spots in the neighbourhood, most striking sounds, and their diverse cultural heritage. Also, some designated video-clips were created to accompany the soundscapes and music (See "A Reconnecting Place" Playlist - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C01vrFmxVMU&list=PLkxb2Mo3KFIZPStdvOuxHPf52KRR4HARL>).

On the 29th of September, at 6pm, there was a sound walk through Bairro do Rego, accompanied by the young people who participated in the creation of the sound pieces, where all participants could share experiences and "listen" to the places in the neighbourhood. After the tour, everyone returned to the Passa Sabi Association for a get-together and the screening of the videos produced throughout the process. This event was the culmination of several soundscaping sessions in the neighbourhood. All of the pieces from the soundwalk were collaboratively made by the neighbourhood youth guided by the musician and composer João Dias Ferreira, who produced them. But the soundwalk, as a sonic public artwork, became accessible to everyone - from the local community to visitors to the neighbourhood - simply by downloading the ECHOES onto an electronic device (such as a smartphone) and using the app's geolocation system to activate the sound files in several pre-determined areas of the neighbourhood.

Taking as a starting point the music composed during the activities of music creation in the community, choreographer and dancer Inês Galvão Teles worked, from the 20th to the 22nd of October, with the neighbourhood youth with the aim of exploring the movement individually, to recognize the movement as an expressive tool of imaginary scenes and a narrative form, as well as to use the movement as a form of communication with each other. Basic structure was offered

by the choreographer, with enough space for the individual expressions, and at the same time bringing the group together.

The final event of "A Reconnecting Place" in Lisbon, that occurred on the 22nd of October, was integrated in the program of celebrations of Passa Sabi Association's eight anniversary. It was imagined as a culmination of activities carried out by the NOVA FCSH team with invited artists and youth from the Rego neighbourhood, and thus intertwined different artistic expressions. During the soundwalk, participants could explore the sounds of the neighbourhood and music composed for the neighbourhood, while watching short moments of dance choreographed as a flash mob, and prepared during the creative dance workshop.

#### 5.2.2. Creativity of participation

During the different phases of the placemaking activities, all participants, but especially the artists directly involved and the local youngsters, were provided with the necessary tools and materials to realise their ideas and express their views. Obviously, the tutors and artists were the main people responsible for communicating the guidelines and constantly guiding the various tasks. For instance, since the musical composition would include lyrics, there was a continuous effort to encourage participants to write their own lyrics, or at least suggest lyrics that could represent their realities that could be expressed in the musical composition. And of course, all participants had the opportunity to express their views and were constantly involved in the creative process.

Focusing on collaboration and active participation, the youth from the Rego neighbourhood had thus an opportunity to express themselves artistically and collaboratively, they explored the streets they know by heart through new and different forms, by soundscaping it. They went to the studio and learned about the processes and techniques of music recording and producing and finally the musical pieces composed they now call their own. Through them, their own visions of the neighbourhood gained visibility, sometimes quite differing from the "outside" views.

In all phases, but particularly during the interaction on site, the process was always very inclusive, participants were invited and even encouraged to communicate in their own idioms and styles. There was also an openness to adapt the tasks and eventually the goals of each moment in order to include the views of the different participants.

#### 5.2.3. Social Engagement and Community building

To assess the social engagement values of the 2022 activity cycle, it is important to know who was effectively engaged in defining, re-defining and implementing the activities and goals of the placemaking practices, but also if and how the activities stimulated the creation of place meaning and place attachment. In addition to the academic mentors from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (NOVA-FCSH) and the artistic mentors (Joao Dias Ferreira and Inês Galvão Teles), who were the main responsible for the definition of the goals, everyone directly involved in the activities had the opportunity to participate in the implementation (sometimes even the re-definition) of the goals and planned activities of Lisbon's A Reconnecting Place, from the members of the Passa Sabi association to the neighbourhood youth.

In what concerns place meaning and place attachment, which are different ways of understanding the new symbolic meanings ascribed to a place and the actual bonds between people and this place, the most effective contributions certainly have happened during the process of collecting the various field recordings, the soundscapes of the Rego neighbourhood, and creating the sound pieces and the choreographies, but also during the soundwalks through Bairro do Rego, where all had the opportunity to share this, firstly aural, but finally also multisensorial (visual, tactile, olfactory) and social experiences. Since the main soundwalk involved not only the local community but also the non-residents, it allowed everyone, guided by the co-creators, to go through the streets, parks, playgrounds, and other parts of the

neighbourhood in order to experience, to hear, to feel and to learn about Bairro do Rego, both as a built and a social environment, with its own history and multiple personal stories.

However through these activities, the benefits could be felt in several perspectives. The youth from the neighbourhood gained skills and explored artistic forms they didn't have access to, and through the art emerged from these experiences, they certainly felt closer to each other and mainly to their urban and social environment. The non-residents could learn more and eventually change their preconceived notions about the neighbourhood itself. The initiative thus contributed to the community building and empowerment of the local youth, brought visibility to the Rego neighbourhood by making the outputs easily accessible, highlighted the importance of access to art, and culture in general, and finally, connected the association and the university in their roles as facilitators in access to knowledge production and distribution, and creators of opportunities. It was also very important that the project is still available and easily accessible.

All this was done in a way that promoted the values of interculturality, sharedness and inclusiveness inasmuch as people from different cultural backgrounds were brought together around a common goal and had the chance to share and exchange their different cultural heritage and expressions.

### 5.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices

#### 5.3.1. Social Discourse and Socially Engaged Artistic Practices

The local youth was part of the process from the beginning, through first discussions, listening sessions of their musical influences and tastes, it was their suggestions that defined most of the sounds and spaces, etc. There was an ongoing dialog between artists, mentors and local residents about what it means to live in Bairro do Rego, the cultural heritage that is expressed in the sounds (the different accents from immigrants and their descendants) and the images featuring on the walls of buildings (the urban street art, the graffiti and the murals), the actual living conditions and social interactions between different generations and also the hope for a better future. The sound and musical pieces that were created by the participants, included personal stories, feelings, values and expectations, specifically from the neighbourhood youth, which contributed actively for the lyrical content of those pieces.

Afterwards, their relatives, and friends, as well as the frequent visitors of the Passa Sabi association, researchers, students and other interested audiences were invited to use the Echoes application for the soundwalk, free and easy to access for anyone, which meant that the original dialog could have impact outside of the neighbourhood and potentially engage non-residents with the local community. Also, besides finding the project online, it is available simply by scanning the QR code that was distributed on posters throughout the different parts of the neighbourhood. This availability and accessibility were very much valued in the community. In a certain sense, because it also means that the neighbourhood gained a new sort of visibility and a virtual new connection with the city of Lisbon as a whole.

#### 5.3.2. Space-place transformation

The originality of the A Reconnecting Place team's approach in the space-place transformation was in the sensory choice. Approaching the space(s) of the Rego neighbourhood through sound and music, through active listening of the physical and social locations, and through co-creative composing, didn't physically intervene in the space, didn't leave an obvious mark on the street or in the park, but the transformation still occurred at a more meaningful level, eventually transforming a space into a place. As poetically recorded by Inês Sousa, one of the participants from the neighbourhood: "they say that the neighbourhood is bad; they only see it from the front side, and from behind; us who were born here, we see the neighbourhood from above; the perspective changes; the memories come to mind; [...] and deep down, there is a longing; for a neighbourhood; that they say is bad." (See "A Reconnecting Place: The Neighbourhood They Say

Is Bad" - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UA2DgU8Dj1Y>) There is an obvious perceptual, semantic and social transformation, the transformation of awareness and/or prejudices about the space of the Rego neighbourhood, not only for the youth of the neighbourhood and other residents, as well as for the "outsiders".

## 6 “A Playful Place” in Nicosia

### 6.1. Introduction

A Playful Place is a series of activities which took place at the Pame Kaimakli festival 2022 -Urban Playground in Kaimakli, Nicosia between the 4th and the 13th of July 2022. The theme of Play inspired activities which brought together people of all ages, in activities, performances and screenings which activated various underused spaces of the neighbourhood. The A-Place project was featured in the festival with the following events, with an introduction by Luisa Bravo:

- The creation of a community garden (A Seedling Place described in separate table)
- Three screenings from Urban Visions festival as part of the pop up cinema which focused on Urban Play and migrant youth, followed by a brief discussion with the festival curator Luisa Bravo
- One screening from the LOOP festival as part of the pop up cinema which focused on rereading the city through disability and narratives
- Screening of the A-Place videos aiming to show the outcomes of the project to interested artists and a wider audience

A round table discussion with community members, artists, and cultural agents on the important role of festivals in generating new audiences, exchanges, and community engagement.

### 6.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

#### 6.2.1. Participation

The activities engaged different people from different social groups. The gardening activity brought many elderly inhabitants to a community gardening event while bringing and planting aromatic plants. As for The Urban Visions screenings, they managed to attract the local teens on their bicycles. The round table was mostly attended by cultural agents, however it had not a great impact. The added value of the debate was the creation of a common space for the neighbours and artists to come close and express ideas or observations about the festival. The planting activity achieved the active engagement of both elderly and youth.

The screenings attracted many people although the elderly were not present, perhaps due to time-evening, the subjects or the language. The screenings brought forward the need to curate content, which was addressed to the migrant population, the youth, and to the Arab community. Most of Arab residents of the area attended, following personal invitations as some of the films screened were in Arabic (with English subtitles)

#### 6.2.2. Creativity of participation

The partner set a pop up cinema in the central square, and placed bean bags and chairs in order to change, temporarily, the look and meaning of the space. For the round table event, the partner used a fishbowl format giving participants the opportunity to engage and express their opinions.

#### 6.2.3. Social Engagement

A-Place partners were involved in the curation of the films. The final event was an opportunity for engagement and collecting suggestions for future festivals.

The planting of a garden activated an unattended space, and a further second planting activity involved the municipality and some neighbours.

#### 6.2.4. Community Building

People of different cultural backgrounds were engaged in the creation of the garden, enjoyed the screenings, and were part of the final discussion. During the screenings the youth watching the films started singing Palestinian songs, and were proud to show their cultural heritage.

### 6.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices

#### 6.3.1. Social Discourse

The activities created a new understanding of the place, and revealed an invisible dimension of the places; actors were showcased and migrant youth was proud to be recognised. Neighbours could listen to each other through this platform.

#### 6.3.2. Socially engaged artistic practices

The screenings of the films showcased the youth on their bikes and skateboards. An activity which is often seen as a menace in the neighbourhood was suddenly placed at the stage.

The final discussion also created a platform for creative expression, for giving voice to wishes and dreams. The debate opened for new ways of engagement and participation of people that otherwise would not even dream of being part of an artistic context.

#### 6.3.3. Space-place transformation

Spaces were transformed into: a cinema theatre, a cultural production hub, a celebration of expressions, a community garden. The festival generated conditions for the next festival and revealed the desire for more frequent activities.

The final meeting unveiled gaps in communication on a local level, as some neighbours did not know about the activities. The organisers will look for new methods to approach them, working with posters, invitations door to door, and other media; Radio announcements, school classrooms, supermarkets.

## 7 “A WISH-full Place” in Nicosia

### 7.1. Introduction

AWishfulPlace is a playful interactive installation in a deserted shopping mall which took place within the framework of the Nicosia Pop Up festival. It involved the transformation of the large central atrium of 4 floors into a giant wish-catcher, where the public could create and fly origami paper aeroplanes containing wishes in relation to a better future.

The Festival has been organising events to respond to the urban degradation of the city centre since the financial crisis of 2013. Through open calls, Pop-up Nicosia generates temporal activities in the underused urban spaces in the City Plaza shopping centre.

The installation visible from the street level, invites the public to come in and be engaged in an interactive play. It aims to initiate a discussion on the issue of refugees. Using origami aeroplanes, visitors are asked to leave notes and thoughts for the future directed to any refugee, of the past, present or future.

The installation was made using 600 meters of fabric that has been meticulously hung from the balconies of the atrium. The installation engaged the public through play: asking the visitors to write thoughts and wishes on origami paper aeroplanes and throw them into the fabric clouds. During the 5-week residency of the installation the myriad planes were collected with the aim of a future exhibition in collaboration with Nicosia Municipal Arts Centre.

### 7.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

#### 7.2.1. Participation

As the installation was visible from the street level, it created a playful situation for the wider public. Many passersby stopped and engaged with the activities. For two months the installation attracted many people, and it drew several hundreds of paper aeroplanes.

#### 7.2.2. Creativity of participation

Participants created origami paper aeroplanes containing wishes and thoughts imagining a better future. Partner provided guidelines but the process was open to interpretation. It was an inclusive activity. No adaptation and no specific other goals than a momentary thought. The main objective was to create a meaningful moment of reflection.

#### 7.2.3. Social Engagement

The activity engaged Urban Gorillas team members and students.

#### 7.2.4. Community Building

According to the partner the space was open to all visitors and the wishes were written in many languages, So, the partner consider that there was a community building.

### 7.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices

#### 7.3.1. Social discourse

The activities revealed their potential for change and inclusion.

### 7.3.2. Socially engaged artistic practices

The possibility of play is a possibility of reimagining the future. The installation transformed the space into a magical ethereal space of wishes, and gave the public an opportunity for expression.

### 7.3.3. Space-place transformation

the activities were open for engagement and expression.



## 8 “A Seedling Place” in Nicosia

### 8.1. Introduction

A seedling Place is an activity conceived in 2021 through the creation of a digital community of urban visionaries that are actively working to transform their urban and rural environments through community planting initiatives.

In Pame Kaimakli 2022, A Seedling Place took place from April to July and was an urban intervention involving the creating of a vertical garden with seating and plants in Synergias municipal linear park (a park created on the site of a disused railway track), which is used daily by many people of all age groups for strolling, jogging and walking their dogs. The park is situated in a newer area of Kaimakli, which is undergoing significant social change, and requires the definitions of public spaces and community engagement.

Under the title AdoptAPlant, the three-month intervention involved the distribution of 40 saplings, clay pots and over 100 aromatic plants and seed packets to local residents and organised groups in the Kaimakli area, who looked after the plants for two months. After this period the residents returned the plants, planted in the ceramic pots. This was followed by a community planting event on the 8th of July to inaugurate the community garden, when the plants were placed in the steel, vertical garden structure.

The vertical garden remain in the park after negotiations with Nicosia city council. The garden is now a meeting point, a point for plants and animals, creating an important “place” in the linear park, and within the neighbourhood.

### 8.2. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community

#### 8.2.1. Participation

The participation and representation of different groups in the AdoptAPlant scheme was pursued by the partner through the use of social media and posters which were printed and distributed at key locations such as the central café, supermarkets and cultural associations. Three of these associations became actively involved - these were the Proodos Cultural Association, EKYSI Seniors Association and Kaimakkin Social Space. Local residents were also invited directly by door-to-door visits. According to the partner, on the day of the community planting event, participants who brought their adopted plants back to be planted in the vertical garden ranged in age from 2 to 88, and were of different social and ethnic backgrounds. Although there was limited attendance by the local migrant community at the planting event, the space has become a meeting place for parents, children and the elderly, as well as pet owners.

#### 8.2.2. Creativity of participation

According to the partner, guidelines on how to plant and how to look after the plants during the AdoptAPlant intervention were distributed to those interested, and the necessary materials such as the plants themselves, seeds, ceramic pots and soil were also made available.

The partner provided the steel framework, where the potted plants would eventually be housed. This framework had been housed for a few months in a storage space provided by the Nicosia city council, but after talks, a new site was found in the Synergias linear park.

The process was inclusive in the sense that both young and old participated and continue to participate by tending to plants, watering them and bringing new plants to add to the structure.

The partner states that although the hope had been that the local council would instal a watering system, this is no longer possible, and it is now hoped that a small reservoir can be installed to allow for efficient watering.

In the meantime, residents are involved in authentic interaction and community building, as they have organised themselves to coordinate watering the garden and have requested a second planting session to expand the garden. The partner states that the residents have 'embraced' the garden, claiming it as their own. In the future the partner hopes to propose new activities and create further occasions for authentic interaction and participation.

### 8.2.3. Social Engagement and Community Building

According to the partner, although this project was initiated by Urban Gorillas, the social engagement of residents in the neighbourhood has been vital to sustain and maintain the significance of the activities and goals. Without this social engagement, the plants would die, and the 'place' will be lost, and so the continuing engagement of a small number of residents, who are taking on the roles of active local agents, is vital.

The participants engaged with the broader community, giving valuable feedback, and actively contributing to the project. The provision of the vertical garden in a key location - the linear park - stimulated the creation of place meaning and place attachment. While walking their dogs, or taking a daily stroll, residents use the place as a meeting point, or a stopping point, where they can water plants or tend to them in some other way. This also offers the opportunity to interact with others, and with the environment created by the vertical garden. It has therefore become an important social and community 'place' in the linear park, and in the wider neighbourhood.

As for community building, the project has brought together people from different cultural background who have helped to create and maintain the garden. The local migrant population was part of the planting scheme, although it is still unclear if they are taking part in the upkeep of the garden space. Although some plants involved in the planting of the vertical garden were those provided by the forestry department, others were donated by residents who brought herbs and other plants which reflect their culinary traditions, thereby sharing and expressing their culture.

## 8.3. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking activities

### 8.3.1. Social Discourse

Before the activities, the linear park was occupied by deactivated railroad tracks, which was significant as it gave the place a name, an identity and a connection. That is, it was already a place of significance in the community. The planting of the vertical garden created a new meeting point and gave residents the opportunity to claim ownership of this space - to reactive it as a shared public space which is of significance today when public spaces within urban and rural contexts are increasingly becoming privatised.

In addition, the partner states that through its design, the garden has created occasions for social exchange and expression. It has achieved this by including seating in a spatial installation which means visitors when seated, face one another or sit diagonally opposite each other.

This is in contrast to benches in traditional parks which are placed linearly and dissuade interaction. However, in the vertical garden, social discourse, social exchange and engagement is encouraged through careful design, even though the garden does not actively engage in the arts. To summarise, social interaction has been promoted both by the creation of the garden and the creative arrangement of the benches in the open space.

### 8.3.2. Socially engaged artistic practices

The building of the garden does not engage arts, but it demonstrates how design can create situations for social exchange of experiences. The activity involved the municipality, local organised groups, and community members. The direct engagement of the Mayor's office bypassed long planning processes and achieved the activation of a site which had no meeting/socialising places until then. The planting achieved the continuing engagement of community members, by creating a process of ownership and daily/weekly rituals.

The activity also created an opportunity to look at the public space differently. This intervention can act as a prototype for other projects in the city, and an ongoing discussion by different actors, promoting community engagement in the design and sustainability of public spaces.

### 8.3.3. Space-place transformation

The activity involved multiple groups such as the local council, organised groups and community members. The engagement shows how a site lacking in areas for meeting or socialising can be transformed through planting to become a space where residents are engaged with the space on a continual basis.

Residents identify with this space as they themselves have created it through a bottom-up process of ownership, demonstrated by the emergence of daily and weekly rituals related to the care of the plants.

This contrasts with other public spaces created by top-down municipal initiatives, and allows the community to see public spaces differently. The space has become a reference point in the local community and the partner suggests that it could act as a model for other projects in the city, and contribute to the ongoing discussion on community engagement in the design and sustainability of public spaces.

## Conclusions

In 2021-2022, A-Place, and the general recommendations for subsequent activities, follow the two main evaluation criteria used throughout the document: 1. Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community; and 2. Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices. The assessment of the 2022 activities, as well as the conclusions and recommendations, result from the viewing, analysis and interpretation of the materials provided and/or available at the A-Place website and social media, as well as the information in Table 1 - Assessment guide (See Annex 1) filled in by the partners.

The assessment was more accurate in the case of activities whose information received was more detailed, which determined different levels of reflection between activities. In some cases, the materials received did not allow to go beyond a basic description and identification of agents and actions. Some partners did not provide sufficient or relevant information, so in these cases it was not possible to develop more in-depth work on the impact of the activities.

The most relevant conclusion is that the partners overcame the difficulties generated by the confinement period, developing a substantial number of activities until the end of 2022. Moreover the activities had a reasonable immersion in the communities and spaces intervened or activated through placemaking. Similar to the previous report it can be concluded that the level of imagination and creativity of partners and collaborators remained high, with the production of artistic pieces, but also socio-cultural and ecological placemaking activities of high impact, albeit at a local level, in some cases

Recovering the recommendations of the previous report, it can be concluded that the partners made an increased effort to fulfil them, namely with regard to paying attention to the participation of a diversity of local representatives and of local communities at large, in the definition of placemaking goals and in the placemaking activities, but also with regard to the diversity of modalities for participation.

In terms of creative participation, social engagement and community building, the cycle of placemaking activities for 2022 by partners was diverse, inclusive and representative of several social groups: academics, artists, local residents in neighbourhoods, including children, youth people, but also visitors/non-residents, and passersby who participated in the activities of different cities. The participants, the team members, and the artists had the opportunity to discuss activities and their goals, and they had the opportunity to express themselves in their own idioms, using their specific technical, cognitive and social skills.

A Seedling Place is an example to highlight: the work of modifying the public space was well appreciated by the Nicosia City Council. It was negotiated for the garden installation to remain permanently on a public walkway, allowing residents to continue to maintain the vertical gardens, taking care of the plants and watering them.

Also the creation of a digital platform (Digital Planting Repository) linking people from different parts of the world, contributed to building a community that seeks to transform the rural and urban environment by planting seeds, creating green spaces and maintaining them. The connection established through digital platforms between people from different parts of the world has a positive effect at a global level, inspiring many other initiatives.

In the third year of A-Place Project (2021-2023), participation in the activities was clearly positive, both in terms of community involvement and in terms of interaction between the project teams and the population of the neighbourhoods and places involved. The involvement of social and cultural partners with communities was clearly outstanding, considering the huge number of activities described by partners. The number of spectators and active participants in the proposed and

developed activities, also increased, although it was not possible to obtain more concrete statistical data.

Assessing the socio-cultural impact of placemaking activities may not be exactly a question of research, but it is quite rightly integrated into a theoretical-practical reflection, insofar as it seeks to glimpse the effects of artistic and/or placemaking practices on the transformation of physical and urban environment of places, or even to comprehend the transformation of participants' attitudes and mentalities towards their neighbours or towards a public space.

Raising the question "How can we assess or measure change?", and writing about "Assessing Arts for Social Change" Kim Berman (2017) says that "textbook methodologies often presume that there are rational and objective ways of analysing data for research purposes." (p. 135) Berman's assumption is also the dilemma that A-Place Project faced since the beginning: to assess the social impact of placemaking is not an easy task, because transformations require time and continuity, and the impact may not be immediately noticeable.

However, as claimed by Berman, "in general, artists are able to imagine and create other realities as part of their creative practice, and this allows for imagining solutions rather than focusing on problems. [She] claims that artists who engage in artistic collaborations with identified communities can bring into the field additional qualities—such as aesthetics, multiple modalities, imagination, alchemy, and reciprocal processes of becoming—that can enhance, deepen, and enrich practices of engaging social change." (p. 136).

Having this in mind it is easy to recognize the usefulness of Berman's described principles and methods - such as action research, cooperative inquiry, participatory action research, narrative inquiry or action learning, etc. - in different contexts of evaluating creative processes that seek to involve communities in changing public spaces. Although Berman's theory is very specific, and related to evaluation and arts-based assessment in South African social challenges and contexts, a final reflection on the processes of interactivity and evaluation in the A-Place activities, reveal some similarity of procedures, especially with regard to the participatory processes, whether in creative activities or in placemaking, and in other more hybrid ones. The same procedures intersect learning and urban intervention in specific places, both with clear objectives of socio-cultural and space-place transformation. That is, A-PLACE Project has been applying art-based methods as possible instruments of social change and strengthening identity, by performing the construction of places of community and sharing.

Most partners did not record their impressions and conclusions on the social impact, for inclusion in this report, but it is possible to mention the case of A Reconnecting Place: the openness and continuity of the dialogue between the different participants contributed to mutual understanding, self-expression, authenticity and the promotion of cultural, linguistic and community values. It was certainly important that a cultural association acted as an intermediary between the academic, artistic, pedagogical and local groups, but it was undoubtedly the intervention of the team members and the artists that gave the necessary energy and impulse to the activities.

The creative process, but also the soundwalks, and especially the fact that the project had the possibility of remaining open and accessible for the future, gave the participants a sense of visibility, meaning and representation of the neighbourhood for the outside, the non-residents. To a certain extent, we could almost talk about social justice, in the sense that the residents had the opportunity to express themselves, to show their reality, their struggles, but also their hopes for the future, and to change a previous negative (mis)perception of Bairro do Rego. It is difficult to be sure about the success of a space-place transformation in placemaking activities, especially when they are limited in time, but the feedback from the community was very positive and the availability and accessibility of the project results make us hope for the best.

## References

Berman, K. S. (2017). *Finding Voice. A Visual Arts Approach to Engaging Social Change*. University of Michigan Press, 2017.

## Annex 1 - A Re-Place (assessment guide)

Questions for help (copied from D5.1)	ACTIVITIES OUTCOMES / MANIFESTATION		TARGETING PROCESS for SOCIAL IMPACT			
			social discourses	communit y building	socially engaged art practices	+ generation of knowledge through cross-disciplinary collaboration
<p>Spot-place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Has the placemaking activity contributed in the involvement of local groups/communities with the process of preparing and performing the activity?</li> <li>•Has the placemaking activity contributed in the creation of new collaborations between different local groups?</li> <li>•Has the placemaking activity contributed in stimulating the creativity of local participants and/or their aesthetic awareness/perception concerning the place where it was developed? [rationale: people in urban spaces, normally, have a purely functional attitude towards them so if the process of placemaking makes people look differently at the physical and social environment and discover aesthetic properties and values in the surroundings, they will also start having a different sense of place and of belonging].</li> <li>•Has the placemaking activity contributed in actually changing existing social dynamics and the perception of other local groups?</li> </ul> <p>Learn-place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in</li> </ul>	No. of students enrolled at the workshop / present at sessions	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No. of students completing the self-assessment survey	/				
	No. of sessions or hours of sessions done at the workshop	4 zoom/hybrid lecture sessions 7 onsite daily sessions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No. of guest lectures at the workshop	5 lecturers/arti sts 4 additional professional critics 1 partner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>raising awareness in the academic community (students, teachers, researchers) and in policymakers about the virtues of placemaking through artistic practices?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in opening a consistent dialogue between the academic community, artists, local communities and policymakers about urban and social issues in general but also the specific issues of the spaces where placemaking activities were prepared and implemented?</li> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in discussing new approaches to community building and socially engaged practices?</li> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in establishing ways for future cooperation between the academic community, artists, local communities and policymakers?</li> </ul>		member observer (KUL)				
	Materials produced in the course (teaching, mentoring, guiding materials)	see materials (Share point and Google Drive); 4 implemented objects on site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- no. of posts on A-place website (dissemination and Storytelling)	8				
	Discussions on placemaking held in the course (wider audience: students, mentors, lecturers, invited guests)	4 See recordings of the sessions (Sharepoint; on request)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Location data collections and analysis done by students	Materials were not collected, only final implementations were recorded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Interviews/survey implemented with the interested stakeholders	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Interviews/survey implemented with the local community members	2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Responses/survey regarding the actual on-site implementations, local residents		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Qualitative analyses of the responses gained by interviews	Done in the process of student group work as an input for tailoring the planned interventions				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Qualitative analyses of the observations on-site and behavioural analyses	Done in the process of students group work as an input for tailoring the planned interventions				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Students' proposals for on-site interventions (temporal, semi-temporal) - installations, events	4 final proposals 4 final implementations			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Actual implementation of on-site installations, events, exhibitions	1 community event on site; 1 exhibition on-site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

	Interactions/contacts with the locals	Guided tours and on-site talks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
--	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

## Annex 2 - A Just Place (assessment guide)

Questions for help (copied from D5.1)	ACTIVITIES OUTCOMES / MANIFESTATION		TARGETING PROCESS for SOCIAL IMPACT			
			social discourses	communit y building	socially engaged art practices	+ generation of knowledge through cross- disciplinary collaboration
<p>Learn-place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in raising awareness in the academic community (students, teachers, researchers) and in policymakers about the virtues of placemaking through artistic practices?</li> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in opening a consistent dialogue between the academic community, artists, local communities and policymakers about urban and social issues in general but also the specific issues of the spaces where placemaking activities were prepared and implemented?</li> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in discussing new approaches to community building and socially engaged practices?</li> <li>•Has the Learn-Placemaking activity contributed in establishing ways for future cooperation between the academic community, artists, local communities and policymakers?</li> </ul>	No. of students enrolled at the planning of expo and radio / present at sessions	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No. of students completing the self-assessment survey	/				
	No. of sessions or hours of sessions done at the workshop	10 onsite weekly sessions and 3 online planning sessions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No. of guest lectures at the workshop	2 artists 3 professional critics 1 partner member observer (KUL)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Materials produced in the course (teaching, mentoring, guiding materials)	implemented expo objects on site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		pictures on site				
	- no. of posts on A-place website (dissemination and Storytelling)	3			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Discussions on placemaking held in the course (wider audience: students, mentors, lecturers, invited guests)	See pictures on drive link	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Location data collections and analysis done by students	Materials were not collected, only final implementations were recorded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Interviews/survey implemented with the interested stakeholders	2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Interviews/survey implemented with the local community members		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Responses/survey regarding the actual on-site implementations, local residents		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Qualitative analyses of the responses gained by interviews	Done in the process of student group work as an input for tailoring the planned interventions			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Qualitative analyses of the observations on-site and behavioural analyses	Done in the process of students group work as an input for tailoring the planned			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		interventions				
	Students' proposals for on-site interventions (temporal, semi-temporal) - installations, events	2 final proposals 2 final implementations One radio team and One expo team			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Actual implementation of on-site installations, events, exhibitions	2 weeks of expo, one open community event on site; 1 radio event on site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Interactions/contacts with the locals	2 week exhibition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Annex 3 – A Weaved Place (self-evaluation)

Quality evaluation: The process of creating art, meaning, place and community		Activity: your answer, supported, whenever possible, by the materials made available for the evaluation (with links, if applicable)
<b>Participation</b>	How participation and representation of different social groups in the placemaking activity was pursued and to what degree it was achieved?	<p>Neighbour's associations participated in the public debates in Tecla Sala, and in the urban walk in the La Florida neighbourhood.</p> <p>Artists collaborated as tutors of architecture students in learning activities embedded in L'Hospitalet communities.</p> <p>Architecture students contacted residents of various background and origins, and interviewed them in videos which were then used to make a collaborative video production, tutored by artists.</p> <p>Pupils and teachers from local schools collaborated with architecture students and their tutors in the design and assembly of artefacts to activate and re-signify public spaces.</p>
<b>Creativity of participation</b>	What materials and approaches were available to the participants?	<p>The interventions in public spaces jointly carried out by architecture students and local students used a common language, based on a catalogue of PVC materials selected by students.</p> <p>We have strengthened the collaboration with artists in this third year, in different formats and settings. An artist and art educator was invited to give a 2-day workshop at La Salle, to create a collage of the city with the photographs students took in the previous semesters.</p> <p>A filmmaker and a multidisciplinary artist tutored architecture students in the analysis of the living environment using audiovisual tool. The recordings made by students were used by the artists to</p>

		produce two video works.
	Were guidelines to the participants made available? So that they can reach their maximum creativity potential.	There were joint sessions with local students and their tutors, with architecture students and their faculty, to explain the purpose of the joint activities. Both groups of students interacted within their teams, and tutors from school and university agreed on their respective pedagogic objectives.
	Was the process inclusive? Was there continuous adaptation of the goals and tasks?	<p>The was a continuous adaptation to the local conditions. For instance, some of the artistic centres offered us the possibility to use their spaces for group meetings, and at the end of the semester they offered their place to have the final exhibition.</p> <p>Tutors were continuously adapting the development of the audiovisual analysis to the materials that students were providing, from their recordings, interviews, etc.</p>
	Were participants in the placemaking processes and activities need to be given opportunities for authentic interaction and participation?	There were opportunities for architecture students to interact with residents of L'Hospitalet in the process of recording testimonies.
<b>Social Engagement</b>	who was engaged in defining, re-defining and implementing the activities and goals	This was mostly the task of the faculty members of the School of Architecture La Salle, in close cooperation with teachers from secondary schools.
	If and how the activities stimulated the creation of place meaning and place attachment?	This was particularly relevant for the high school students, who had the opportunity to approach public space in a different way, identifying and communicating the places that were meaningful to them, and working with the architecture students to convey their experience of places to other citizens through the artistic intervention.

<b>Community building</b>	Were people from different cultural backgrounds brought together under a common goal?	The diversity was manifested in the video interviews, but there was not specific action oriented towards putting them together under a common goal.
	Did people share and exchanged cultural expressions?	Mostly through the videos, in particular the video "A journey to L'Hospitalet de Llobregat"
<b>Social impact assessment: The social impact of the placemaking practices</b>		
<b>Social discourse</b>	What are the discourses associated with the place and the activities? before, during and after the activities	The main hypothesis of our programme "A Weaved Place" is that L'Hospitalet is a fragmented city, physical and socially, with neighbourhoods very diverse and separated from each other due to the topography and the transport networks that cross the territory of the city. The goal of the programme was to re-connect these fragments with our interventions. However, the implementation of the activities was focusing more and more on the Bellvitge and La Florida neighbourhoods it was not possible to extend the scope of our interventions to all the city.
<b>Socially engaged artistic practices</b>	How did the artistic activities contribute to opening up new lines of thinking about the relationship between places, situated arts and communities?	The interventions in public space, jointly carried out by students from different levels, opened up a path that led later on to the "ES_CULTURA" open art festival, celebrated in November 2022.  This festival represented the culmination of all the creative and social processes carried out during the previous three years of work in the city.
	How did the artistic activities contribute to approach urban planning processes in a critical manner, paying more attention	The interventions in public space helped participating students to focus on public space, paying attention to places they were unnoticed in their daily life, and acknowledged the importance of the bonds that are created with the spaces they inhabit.



	to wider social and political concerns beyond the established boundaries of each realm	
<b>Space-place transformation</b>	How the activities contributed to transform the space and the people's relation to it?	Neighbours experienced the transformation of the public spaces resulting from the insertion of objects and artifacts, were curious about the reason of the objects to be there, interacted with them in space and interrogated students about their meaning.
(optional) <b>Other relevant information (if applicable and/or possible)</b>	For example: SWOT Analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats,)	