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Abstract: This paper reports initial findings of a critical, comparative study of recent practices of ‘temporary’ and ‘tactical’ (T/T) urbanism in Australia. T/T urbanism is a major recent global movement in urban planning and design. It encompasses a myriad of small, experimental design projects led by diverse actors that transform underutilized urban spaces, ranging from temporary parks and container villages to informal ‘DIY’ and ‘guerrilla’ urbanism. Advocates argue T/T urbanism heralds a more agile future for urban design and planning, enhancing urban intensity, community engagement, innovation, resilience and local identity. While T/T projects’ short-term benefits are often apparent, their broader and longer-term problems and impacts are harder to discern. This study examines the diverse, dynamic assemblages of actors, interests and contexts that constitute different T/T approaches, and the varied ways they intersect with the wider public interest. It explores how T/T urbanism’s innovations might link to the deregulated planning regimes, austerity policies, inequities and gentrification of neoliberal urban development, and the decline of long-term state planning and investment. This paper discusses the distinctive ways T/T urbanism is defined and enacted in the Australian context, drawing upon a database of ninety projects identified in six cities, an analysis of state and local policies that shape temporary and tactical urbanism, and interviews with expert practitioners from the public, private and non-profit sectors. The findings suggest a need to better understand how the various actor relationships forged through temporary and tactical urbanism link to a variety of broader urban planning and management interests.
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Introduction

This paper reports findings from an ongoing research project that seeks to identify the scope of practices of ‘temporary’ and ‘tactical’ urbanism within Australia; the diverse constellations of actors, interests and contexts that shape them; and their wider implications for the planning and design of urban public space. This area of practice promises to enhance the agility and innovation of planning and design, broaden civic engagement, and increase open spaces’ diversity and resilience.

‘Temporary’ and ‘Tactical’ (hereafter ‘T/T’) Urbanism has emerged as a significant global movement in urban design and planning in recent years. It encompasses a myriad of small, experimental design projects led by diverse actors that transform underutilized urban spaces. Such projects range from temporary parks and container villages to less formal ‘DIY’ and ‘guerrilla’ urbanism (Bishop and Williams, 2012; CDS and SPC, 2014). Advocates argue that T/T urbanism heralds a more agile future for urban design and planning (Oswalt et al., 2013; Gadanho, 2014; Lydon and Garcia, 2015). This movement resonates with the call from Australian policy-makers, planners and designers to make cities smarter, more innovative and more resilient (DPMC, 2016; PIA and Urbis, 2016). T/T projects’ short-term benefits are often apparent in their intensive usage and transformative imagery. But the complex and dynamic interactions between actors within T/T projects make their broader and longer-term problems and impacts harder to discern and articulate (Mould, 2014; Fabian and Samson, 2016). To date there has been no systematic critical analysis of the varied assemblages of actors and interests engaged within different T/T approaches, or of how they engage with the wider public interest (Groth and Corijn, 2005; Pagano, 2013).

‘Temporary’ and ‘tactical’ urbanism have diverging definitions, highlighting that they can involve a wide range of actors, interests, materials and processes, both in the short term of individual built projects, and over the longer-term of urban planning and development. In prior research, the authors have distinguished and compared the divergent approaches and motivations behind T/T urbanism as it has developed outside Australia, their divergent forms and components, and a range of new human actors
and flexible development processes that shape them. They have identified five key issues within the discourse and practice of T/T urbanism around which its benefits and problems are defined and debated: urban intensity, community engagement, innovation, resilience and place identity (Stevens and Dovey, 2019; Dovey 2016). These core issues draw different actors into relationships that shape the production, operation and regulation of T/T urbanism, as well as resistance to it.

The current research explores emerging Australian practice in T/T urbanism and examines how these five matters are defined and acted upon by specific sets of actors, spaces, opportunities and regulations. It examines how both short and long-term public interests are engaged within T/T urbanism’s highly agile modes of producing public space. To explore and critique current practice in T/T urbanism, this paper analyses three sets of original data: a database of temporary and tactical urbanism projects identified in Australian cities, a content analysis of current state and local government planning policies that shape temporary and tactical urbanism, and interviews with a set of expert practitioners from the public, private and non-profit sectors. This approach triangulates evidence to illustrate the variety of T/T urbanism projects in Australia and the different needs they serve, and provides a thick and critical description of local practices, which positions them within global practice and theory. The findings show that while T/T urbanism meets underserved needs of local communities, practice is also shaped by the competing interests of commercial land developers and managers, and of existing planning regulations, which risks the instrumentalisation and formalisation of practices that seek to avoid both.

**Existing practice: A review of cases**

Extensive online searching identified sixty-six unique examples of temporary and tactical urbanism in Australia, dating from the period 2010-2019. Twenty of these projects were identified in the sole published review of recent practice in Australia and New Zealand (CDS and SPC, 2014). The remaining cases were identified either directly from internet searching around the idiosyncratic key terms “temporary urbanism”, “tactical urbanism”, “pop-up urbanism” and “parklet”, or from snowballing of other examples mentioned in literature and on websites that discussed the examples already identified. Twenty-four projects were created in the five years since the 2014 publication’s free release on many online platforms. Fourteen of these projects appeared in the year immediately following its release, which was also when the “handbook” Tactical Urbanism, by a leading US practitioner and co-author of the Australia/NZ study, was released free online (Lydon and Garcia, 2015). It appears that these publications thus inspired a relative flurry of activity.

The sixty-six cases can be grouped into twelve specific categories and three broader categories in terms of their forms and functions. The most numerous projects (32, 48%) were those primarily focused on temporary greening of underused urban spaces. This included both temporary parks or gardens installed on vacant parcels of private or government-owned land (which were often community-led or focused on community engagement) and parklets, which were in most cases installed into urban streets or footpaths, often for very short periods as political actions or demonstration projects. The next most common type of temporary urbanism we have dubbed ‘urban infrastructure’ (14 cases). This ranges from temporarily providing additional seating in public areas (6 projects had only this scope), playground equipment, sports facilities, sculptures, and improved pedestrian infrastructure. Seating was also one component within a large number of other projects. The third distinct category was temporary commercial uses (12 cases), including markets, outdoor cafés, retail pop-ups in open spaces, and food trucks. The last of these includes temporary events organised around food-truck dining, but excludes, at one extreme, both itinerant food trucks which do not transform urban spaces, and at the other, relatively-permanent food truck venues that are institutionally organized. The remaining eight examples involved some combination of these three formats – a mix of greeneries, public amenities and food. The three categories of T/T urbanism projects identified in Australia strongly parallels the most expansive existing survey of temporary urban uses, in Berlin, which classified over 100 open space projects into four main activity categories: gardening, sports, food, and culture (Overmeyer et al, 2007).

Based on websites and publications discussing the sixty-six individual projects, the twelve identified types of temporary uses across the three broad categories were categorised in terms of which of the five key kinds of public benefits each type of use sought to promote - urban intensity, community engagement, innovation, resilience and place identity (Table 1). This analysis shows that different kinds of temporary use projects pursue and provide for a different range of benefits, which between them give roughly equal attention to four of the main kinds of benefits. Temporary greening projects primarily emphasize ecological resilience; temporary urban infrastructure projects emphasize community engagement and innovation (by bringing people together in new ways); and temporary commercial uses focus on intensification of activity in urban spaces.
Table 1: A Summary of the Functions of Identified Australian Temporary and Tactical Urbanism Projects, and their Potential Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use category</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Number of projects identified</th>
<th>Potential benefits served</th>
<th>Number of benefits served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREENING</td>
<td>park/garden</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parklet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>seating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pedestrian infrastructure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sculpture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sports area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>playground/installation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>market</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor cafe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food trucks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exception is place identity, the least clearly defined and measured and least broadly served benefit, which seeks to recognise T/T urbanism's "capacity to renew and transform the image of derelict public spaces and neighbourhoods" (Stevens and Dovey, 2019, p. 331). This benefit is only clearly provided by open space projects that incorporate distinctive artworks. In principle, the temporary addition of other infrastructure, greenery, new commercial uses, and new stakeholders and patrons for any of these projects, can also play a role in expanding and transforming the identity of a neighbourhood.

Setting aside the 'combined' projects, where multiple functional elements serve multiple aims, this analysis suggests that pedestrian infrastructure and temporary markets are the specific uses that provide the widest range of benefits, by attracting and engaging people, increasing activity levels, and enriching urban diversity and resilience, by complementing and extending existing facilities (Stevens and Dovey, 2019). The projects that pursue the narrowest range of benefits are still important. While temporary seating is physically small, it provides the opportunity for people to extend the time they spend in public, which increases the likelihood and amount of social contact. Cafés and food trucks similarly extend people’s use of public space, as well as attracting more people to spaces that are little-used (Whyte, 1980; Gehl, 1987). While small temporary plantings may have limited uses, they provide important environmental and psychological benefits that urbanised areas may lack, and, like all temporary uses, can build support for larger and longer-term changes (Lydon and Garcia, 2015).

In terms of geographical distribution, the 66 identified examples of temporary urbanism were predominantly located in the two largest cities, Melbourne (40%) and Sydney (25%), with six cases in Adelaide (9%), a total of eight in the other three mainland capitals, and seven in five smaller cities: Hervey Bay, Maryborough and Maroochydore in southern Queensland, and Victorian regional centres Geelong and Morwell. One other temporary intervention, Park(ing) Day, is a worldwide annual event on the third Friday of every September, now in its fourteenth year, which creates approximately 1000 temporary parks in 35 countries (Thorpe, 2016).

Local government regulations on ‘temporary’ and ‘tactical’ urbanism

Different state and local governments use a variety of strategies and procedures to regulate temporary and tactical development and activities. An analysis of existing policies and regulatory frameworks sought to identify what kinds of temporary and tactical land uses are regulated, what kinds of sites are involved, what aspects of them are regulated and in what ways, the key institutions involved in regulating T/T activities, and the differences and similarities in regulatory practices and procedures used by various governments. This review primarily focuses on planning policies and regulations that
Concern T/T projects that have physical design components, involving modifications of the existing urban landscape through installation of new structures or materials. It includes both broader planning instruments that regulate temporary uses, and policies that specifically support or shaping temporary uses. The analysis covered statutory planning documents of the local governments responsible for the core areas of Australia’s six largest cities: Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Perth, Adelaide, and Gold Coast.

A review of planning regulations of the six Australian cities showed that all the councils were responding to the emergence of T/T urbanism by developing guidelines and planning codes for assessing temporary uses (Table 2). These codes expand the scope of ‘temporary’ structure or occupancy as provided in South Australia’s Development Act 1993 (Section 57) and Victoria’s Building Act 1993, including its latest amendments in the Building Regulations 2018. The content of these Statutory Acts is similar across most state governments in Australia. ‘Temporary (Structure, Occupation)’ as per the 2018 amendment to Victoria’s Building Act 1993 is defined as ‘a booth, tent, marquee or other temporary enclosure, whether or not a part of the booth, tent, marquee or enclosure is permanent’ (July 2018 amendment (version No. 115) of Building Act 1993, p. 17). Here the focus is on structures, with less attention to the conduct of activities on site. Specific reference to temporary use activities has only recently been provided through various guidelines and codes. In Adelaide, a series of regulatory guidelines were formulated including Temporary Structures – A Guide for Hire Companies and Events & Festivals on Council Land, which provide some instruction to actors. The central aim of temporary regulations, as stated in the Market and Temporary Use Code of the City of Gold Coast, is to ensure that ‘temporary uses do not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the subject site and its surrounding area’ (City of Gold Coast, 2018, p. 1). This forms the basis for setting benchmarks that define the distance between temporary activities and adjacent land uses. Gold Coast sets 50-metre and 30-metre minimum separation between temporary uses and adjacent residential areas and waterways, respectively.

Among the six cities, Adelaide, Gold Coast and Sydney had more elaborate definitions and benchmarks for assessing temporary activities. In 2006, the New South Wales state government instituted standard legislation (Standard Instrument – Principal Local Environmental Plan) that provides a common template for the assessment of temporary use activities within the state (O’Dell, 2015). Assessment periods (mostly 4-6 weeks) and application fees (AUD $700 to $1000+) vary between councils and depending on the scale of the activity. These factors pose limitations to prospective applicants, especially private individuals, artists and community groups who often have limited budgets and opportunities to participate in place-making activities (Mahjabeen et al., 2003).

Temporary use regulations mainly focus on events, particularly those being conducted in public spaces (parks, gardens and streets) managed by local councils (Gibson, 2013; O’Dell, 2015). These events include festivals, pop-up shops, music concerts, and motor racing, as opposed to temporary and tactical use activities that involved more durable structures and constructions. Regulations target temporary uses in the sense of organised short-term gatherings that erect relatively simple prefabricated structures like canopies, scaffolding and stages for events. Temporary interventions that involve extensive modifications to the landscape by installing artworks and building structures are not adequately provided for. Tactical Urbanism is not mentioned in any of the regulations reviewed.

These policies tend to make T/T activities expensive and institutionalised, rather than being accessible and achievable by ordinary citizens (Shaw and Sivam, 2015). Regulations were fragmented across various statutory policies, local planning laws and ad hoc guidelines. Adelaide, for example, has at least six different regulatory documents which relate to different aspects of temporary structures and activities. Identifying what codes to follow can be difficult for actors who are not conversant with planning codes and regulations. One consequence is the growing use of private consulting firms to help plan, approve and undertake temporary uses, further institutionalising and increasing the cost of T/T projects. Meanwhile, contradictions within and among regulations have resulted in court cases, for instance in Murray Shire Council in NSW in 2016 (Kondillos, 2016).

Overall, there has been some progress in integrating T/T urbanism into regulatory policy. However, challenges remain, including the rigidity and extensive bureaucracy of Australian planning systems (Rowley, 2017). Diversity among T/T uses compounds the difficulty of effectively integrating them into statutory policy and regulations. Regulatory gaps mean that most T/T uses are assessed on a discretionary basis by local councils. Inconsistent treatment is therefore likely (Booth, 2007). Approvals for temporary activities such as community gardens, farmers’ markets and pop-up structures can easily

...
be influenced by local residents’ attitudes toward the proposed activity. Loopholes can be exploited by actors who may avoid applying for approval for activities that are not explicitly addressed in current planning regulations. For these reasons, much uncertainty remains regarding whether planning regulations can suitably facilitate T/T urbanism (Bishop and Williams, 2012). It remains unclear whether the co-optation of T/T urbanism into formal land use planning is a viable and appropriate approach, in light of the potential impact on temporary and tactical urbanism’s principles, aims and practices. Formal regulation and institutionalisation of T/T urbanism would clearly affect its perceived value as an open, flexible, inclusive and agile approach to place-making.

**Table 2: State and local government regulations for temporary uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Statutory and local regulations/ guidelines</th>
<th>Definition of temporary use</th>
<th>Application requirements/ benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Adelaide  | • Development Act 1993  
• Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016  
• Development Regulations 2008  
• Temporary Structures – A Guide for Hire Companies  
• Events & Festivals on Council Land                                                                 | • Temporary development involves activities:  
(i) reviving a previous land use or using an existing zone for a new that will cease after a certain period  
(ii) the space must be restored to its original state immediately before the development. | • 4-6 week assessment period  
• Site Plan  
• Application fee  
• Online application system  
• Fixing & construction details  
• Evidence of landlord consent |
| Brisbane  | • Building Act 1975  
• Planning Regulation 2017 (under Planning Act 2016)  
• Major Events Act 2014                                                                 | • carried out on a non-permanent basis;  
• does not involve the construction of, or significant changes to, permanent buildings or structures. |                                                                 |
| Gold Coast| • Gold Coast Planning Scheme: chapter 34, Temporary use  
• Market and temporary use code (9.3.13)                                                                 | • The use must not require the construction of a permanent building;  
• the use must not require the installation of permanent infrastructure or services;  
• the use must be irregular or infrequent;  
• the use must not have a duration exceeding 7 days. | • Site management and restoration plan  
• 30-50m from nearby land use  
• Max. noise level of 50db(A)  
• Adequate accessibility  
• Adequate sanitary facilities |
| Melbourne | • Building Act 1993, Section 57(1)(a)  
• Activities Local Law 2009  
• Street Activity Policy 2011  
• Melbourne Event Planning Act 2018                                                                 | Relevant uses are only listed:  
Tents, marquees, booths etc. |                                                                 |
| Perth     | • Building Act 2011  
• Building Regulations 2012  
• Temporary Bars Policy (2018)  
• Building approval process guide                                                                 | Relevant uses are only listed:  
Tents, marquees, booths etc. |                                                                 |
| Sydney    | • Major Events Act 2009  
• Standard Instrument – Principal Local Environmental Plan (2006)                                      | Temporary use:  
• will not adversely affect subsequent development on the land  
• will not adversely impact adjoining land or activity  
• space must be restored to its original state immediately before the development.  
• maximum duration not exceeding 52 days in any 12-month period |                                                                 |

**Expert practitioner views**
The semi-structured interviews with six leading T/T urbanism practitioners based in Melbourne explored five distinct aspects of recent practice:

- the definitions of ‘temporary’ and ‘tactical’ urbanism, and other related terms (including informal, ‘guerrilla’ and ‘DIY’ urbanism), identifying ways that Australian practice differs from other countries
- the range of benefits and impacts of T/T urbanism
- how T/T urbanism is influenced by local urban, political and economic pressures and by existing planning, development and policy contexts
- the scope of different actors and influences that shape T/T urbanism
- what longer-term impact T/T urbanism might have on the future of Australian planning and urban development, and whether T/T urbanism itself is changing over time
Interviewees G1 and G2 were local government planners who had both implemented and facilitated T/T urbanism. Interviewees C1, C2 and C3 were private-sector consultants who had led T/T urbanism projects for government, commercial and community organisations. Interviewee A1 was an academic who had done action research in T/T urbanism with a range of government and community stakeholders.

**Definitions**

Interviewees gave varied definitions of T/T urbanism. These predominantly focused on the testing of ideas; project done quickly and with small budgets; and activities conducted as a means of obtaining community feedback or participation. The interviewees tended to be wary of definitions. Interviewee C3 felt that existing definitions and labelling of T/T activities are limiting, and that attention needed to focus on doing rather than judging and categorising:

> I think the moment something is labelled and put in a box, I think the easier it is [for it] to be dismissed or misunderstood, it tends to create a shorthand for what people think your intent is, and if it’s not a really precise understanding of the underlying intent, I think it’s problematic. (C3)

Interviewees generally agreed on a distinction between ‘Temporary’ and ‘Tactical’ urbanism. ‘Temporary Urbanism’ is a more common expression in Britain and Europe, which focuses on physical transformations of space that have limited time horizons. ‘Tactical urbanism’ has more currency in North America and has a stronger emphasis on the ‘bottom up’ nature of spatial practices, and new forms of social agency that develop through them (Stevens and Dovey, 2019). However, the interviewees’ views on the different meanings and implications of these two rubrics varied. C1 and C2 considered ‘Tactical Urbanism’ to be mainly associated with the idea of seeking and testing community response, relating it to terms such as ‘provocative’, ‘catalyst’, ‘experimentation’, ‘consultation’, ‘vision’, and ‘direction’. Tactical urbanism was seen as more future-oriented and long-term than temporary urbanism. A1 used the compound term ‘temporary-tactical’ to describe projects that sought stakeholders’ responses to ideas that could then be made more permanent and scaled-up. Several interviewees associated ‘Temporary Urbanism’ with ad hoc, gap-filling, short term activities such as pop-up shops. In contrast, C3 disagreed with the widespread view that temporary activities such as festivals are necessarily focused on short term impacts. They believe T/T urbanism should be defined by its intent rather than its duration. C1 highlighted that one project they had managed had been in place for a full decade; “it’s absolutely temporary, but it’s certainly not short-term”.

**Range of benefits and impacts**

Interviewees identified a range of benefits of T/T projects. They were seen to provide new services, infrastructure, amenity and job opportunities to communities that would otherwise not have access to them. They provided new public open spaces, by creating community gardens and converting unused carparks, which provided health and welfare benefits by promoting a healthy lifestyle through walking, as well as active community engagement. Interviewees also mentioned ecological and general environmental improvements brought about through T/T projects. G1 emphasised that local council projects are increasingly being driven ‘bottom-up’ by communities. T/T projects were seen to galvanise community response and participation in urban development activities. One T/T consultant (C3) indicated that T/T urbanism’s claimed benefits for economic development should be seen as serving four out of the five broad areas of impact: it increases urban intensity by making specific spaces and uses more productive; increases resilience and adaptability by facilitating changes in the uses of spaces and in people’s activity patterns and relationships; increases community engagement by drawing people into new relationships of production, decision-making and consumption; and transforms place identity by “changing [its] narrative from a negative one to a positive one”.

A range of negative consequences of T/T projects were also highlighted. One key negative effect of T/T urbanism raised by several interviewees was gentrification. This is the opposite side of the economic development narrative noted by C3. Some T/T projects were said to have contributed to the rebranding of areas, a transformation of place identity that had also facilitated broader redevelopment, leading to displacement of marginalised groups by middle-class residents and commercial uses. Interviewees suggested property developers tend to propose the use of temporary urbanism to deliver necessary community services, to help secure approvals and funding for development projects. Sometimes these promises were not fulfilled. Local governments were felt to sometimes use temporary urbanism as a way of reducing budget outlays on more permanent maintenance and upgrading of the public realm. Local politicians were also alleged to have used T/T projects as a means to quickly secure votes for
their re-election, producing quick and eye-catching outcomes but implementing minor and sometimes low-quality infrastructure. One interviewee suggested that T/T urbanism was becoming more politicized, with local government approval and funding for these activities increasingly having political strings attached.

Interviewee C1 suggested that some anticipated or potential aims of T/T urbanism are not being achieved. One is their potential to enhance climate change adaptation and awareness. Another is contributing to social justice. While community engagement is a core principle of tactical urbanism, marginalised groups including the poor, indigenous, young and older people and ethnic minorities are not effectively involved and represented. This criticism aligns to findings of international research that the discourse and practice of T/T urbanism often serves those who already have resources and power (Mukhija and Loukaitou-Sideris, 2014; Douglas, 2019).

**Context**

Interviewees noted that T/T urbanism is not a recent phenomenon in Australia. It was, however, initially conducted mostly by individuals rather than larger groups, and its early practices were largely considered radical and illegal – tactical in the sense of finding ways to work around the constraints of existing power relations (de Certeau, 1984). In earlier times, T/T urbanism was, according to both C1 and C2, mainly a response to community frustrations about local councils not doing enough, to the gradual retreat in governments’ role in service and infrastructure provision, including the privatisation and deregulation of public assets - in short, neoliberalism. This critique of local experience thus appears to parallel the UK’s experience with ‘austerity urbanism’ (Tonkiss, 2013). T/T urbanism in Australia was also noted to have developed through a transfer of ideas about how to activate underutilised public spaces from many other places, including Mexico, Brazil and the USA (G1).

**Scope of actors and influences**

The actors involved in T/T urbanism are diverse and play a wide range of different roles. Interviewees identified a range of professional actors who collaborate, exchange and struggle over T/T urbanism. These include urban planners, architects, landscape architects, and urban designers; local council staff in many other departments such as engineering, maintenance and transport; politicians including state premiers, MPs, and local mayors; academics; and private consultants who work on the delivery of T/T projects. Interviewees also mentioned a wider range of non-professional actors who had little prior experience in shaping and managing the built environment. These include community groups and social organisations (indigenous groups, non-profit organisations, churches, local lawn bowling clubs, street traders) and local residents and individuals (young families, the aged, musicians, painters) engaged in self-organised activities like pop-ups, as well as advocating for councils to implement T/T projects that improve public spaces and community life. Private individuals including artists and urban design advocates played crucial roles in creating awareness and getting communities to engage with T/T initiatives. Local councils and various public and private agencies provide funding and sites for implementing T/T projects. Interviewee A1 noted that the City of Perth have established ‘town teams’, structured groups that bring together city council departmental staff with businesses, community leaders and other interested parties, who can then strategise about initiatives that might be temporary or tactical. Media agencies such as local newspapers were noted to be influential actors that could promote and advocate for T/T projects.

Two interviewees highlighted the role of ‘nature’ as an actor in T/T urbanism. C1 pointed to the deployment of temporary uses in the reconstruction of Marysville, Victoria and Christchurch, New Zealand as illustrations of the influence of natural disasters such as fire, drought and earthquakes on the activation and reconstruction of urban spaces. In a related sense, C1 saw the economic collapse of Australian regional towns as a driver of T/T urbanism: “they’re trying to regenerate, and they’ve got no money. This is the other thing with tactical urbanism, [when] there is no money, [T/T urbanism is] quicker, lighter, cheaper” – a reference to the catchphrase of the New-York-based consultancy Project for Public Spaces (PPS, 2015). The same interviewee claims they were also directly motivated by nature to start working in the T/T urbanism sector: they left a career in the commercial property sector, and “after a swim with the dolphins… had an epiphany [that their] life had to be something else”. Influenced by thinking in Deep Ecology, they then went to work on the temporary activation of public spaces. Interviewee A1 noted that nature is an actor that expresses its ‘needs’ in T/T projects through the benefits that will flow back to human actors.
Future directions
The interviewees identified several interconnected ways that T/T practices in Australia are changing. As noted above, the range of actors involved continues to expand, as does the diversity of projects. Tactical urbanism was seen to have evolved from unsolicited and illegal activities to solicited and legitimated practices, with councils, property owners and developers increasingly endorsing T/T urbanism as an innovative place-making activity. In line with the policy review discussed above, some interviewees also suggested that the practice is being regularised by state and local governments and by professional urban designers, architects and landscape architects. Regulations are becoming friendlier toward T/T urbanism, and academics are building a knowledge base and lending legitimacy to the practice. Temporary and tactical urbanism itself is developing from informal to more organized, institutionalised practice, through consultancy services. As G1 noted, “There are firms now that specialise in pop-up design and consultancies around how to do it and coming and doing it for councils”. Practice is also being formalised and commercialised through the development of formal training.

Conclusion
This review of examples, regulations and practitioner views of temporary and tactical urbanism in Australia over the past ten years has identified a range of kinds of uses and a range of spatial and governance contexts where it occurs, a diversity of actors, processes and values that drive such projects, and a range of benefits and impacts that they can provide. The online survey of examples suggests the practice is concentrated in the largest cities, Melbourne and Sydney, but has also spread to regional centres. Further research could explore what economic, spatial, governance and professional factors might drive this distribution. The survey also revealed the scope of local temporary uses is similar to earlier overseas practice, with a strong emphasis on greening of under-used spaces. Nature was identified with recent T/T urbanism in Australia, both in terms of nature’s needs and the role of natural disasters in necessitating the rapid re-activation of urban spaces. Different kinds of temporary uses and physical interventions seem to align to providing different benefits. An analysis of regulatory frameworks suggests that while some traditional temporary uses are closely regulated, many of them are neither regulated or guided by policies, leading to uncertainty and the potential for circumvention of the planning process. Expert T/T practitioners who were interviewed indicated that labelling and categorizing these practices was somewhat inimical to their very purpose and method, and their capacity to innovate in transforming urban spaces and planning processes and delivering public benefits. Practitioners also emphasized the potential negative uses and impacts of T/T urbanism in supporting urban gentrification and facilitating developer approvals. The overall finding is that T/T urbanism in Australia is continuing to both diversify and become institutionalised, with both dynamics suggesting an ongoing need for formal planning and design processes to understand it and to learn how to engage with it.
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