

## **Annex 2. Transcripts of 60 semi-structured interviews performed as part of the research for the paper titled “The reuse trends in abandoned military land in Ljubljana, Prague and Pula. An overview through the lens of common”**

### **a) Semi-structured interview guide**

**Principle: 1.** How clearly have the boundaries of the former barracks been defined in terms of access, legitimate users, and governance responsibilities?

**Principle: 2.** To what extent are the institutional arrangements governing reuse adapted to the local social, spatial, and economic conditions of the site?

**Principle: 3.** How, and to what degree, have relevant stakeholders been involved in decision-making processes concerning the reuse?

**Principle: 4.** What forms of monitoring are in place to assess the functioning and use of the sites, and how effective are they?

**Principle: 5.** Are there graduated and proportionate responses to misuse, conflict, or non-compliance?

**Principle: 6.** What mechanisms exist for resolving disputes among stakeholders involved in the reuse process, and how well do they operate?

**Principle: 7.** To what extent have public institutions enabled or constrained the capacity of local actors to organise around the reuse of the site?

**Principle: 8.** How effectively is governance articulated across multiple scales in the site management?

**General question: 9.** Overall, how would you assess the social, urban, and institutional impact of the reuse of the site?

**General question: 10.** In general, what factors best explain the current situation of the site’s reuse process?

## **b) Socio-demographic characteristics of people interviewed in Pula in connection with the case of study of Rojc Community Center**

All the interviewees' personal data is classified in compliance with the European Union General Data Protection Regulation<sup>1</sup>.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Type of actor</b>	<b>Age group</b>
i1	M	Commoner	18-29
i2	F	Commoner	18-29
i3	M	Commoner	30-40
i4	F	Commoner	18-29
i5	M	Commoner	41-50
i6	F	User/visitor	18-29
i7	M	User/visitor	30-40
i8	F	User/visitor	18-29
i9	M	User/visitor	41-50
i10	F	User/visitor	18-29
i11	M	Local resident	30-40
i12	F	Local resident	51-60
i13	M	Local resident	41-50
i14	F	Local resident	18-29
i15	M	Local resident	30-40
i16	F	Local public authority	30-40
i17	M	Local public authority	30-40
i18	F	Local public authority	41-50
i19	M	Local public authority	41-50
i20	F	Local public authority	41-50

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679>.

**c) Transcripts of 20 semi-structured interviews performed in Pula in connection with the case of study of Rojc Community Center**

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i1	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries are operationally defined through access protocols, membership frameworks, and usage agreements. Although it is theoretically an open space, management responsibilities are distributed among registered associations under a coordinated management structure, ensuring a relatively clear - though flexible- delineation of legitimate users.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements have been progressively calibrated to local conditions, particularly Pula's socio-economic constraints and cultural landscape. The model integrates low-cost maintenance strategies, aligning governance with available resources and community-based capacities.		
Principle: 3	Our involvement is organised through RCC Coordination. This is where our representatives are appointed; working closely with the City Council, they make the final decisions, which usually concern the funding of the venue and programming priorities.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring combines formal reporting requirements to the City Council with informal peer oversight. For example, if a visitor fails to use the facilities properly, the security team or the caretaker will intervene. If the issue relates to an association failing to pay rent, this is reported to the local authorities.		
Principle: 5	Responses to cases of misuse usually follow a gradual approach, starting with informal mediation and escalating to formal warnings or access restrictions. On the other hand, when it comes to paying rent for association facilities, a delay of one month is not the same as a delay of four months. So yes, you could say they are graduated.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution relies on internal mediation bodies and facilitated dialogue processes by RCC Coordination body. While these mechanisms are generally functional, their effectiveness depends on willingness to engage constructively, which is not always guaranteed.		
Principle: 7	Without wishing to sound critical, public institutions have simply refrained from getting in the way, although they could do more. At times, we rely on them to carry out minor improvements or simple maintenance work.		

Principle: 8	Governance operates across local and municipal levels, though coordination remains partial. Strategic alignment with broader urban policies exists, but multi-scalar integration could be strengthened, particularly regarding funding streams.
General question: 9	The reuse has generated significant social and cultural value, fostering inclusivity and civic engagement. Urban impact is notable in terms of activation, while institutionally, it represents a hybrid model that challenges conventional management frameworks.
General question: 10	Key factors include strong community engagement. At the same time, structural constraints-such as unclear property status and limited financial resources- continue to shape the current trajectory.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i2	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Borders are clearly formalised through access control protocols. Governance responsibilities are shared but structured, with the Municipality retaining final authority and user organisations operating within an agreed co-management framework.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements reflect post-conflict reuse. Regulatory frameworks integrate social needs and economic viability, allowing adaptive management.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder participation has been substantial and structured through consultative processes. All user organisations contributed to rule-making, later formalised via representative bodies. However, participation operates within a mediated system where municipal validation remains a necessary procedural step.		
Principle: 4	The Coordination Body and municipal authorities track compliance using defined indicators, while security personnel ensure operational adherence. Overall, monitoring is systematic, though occasionally dependent on resource availability.		
Principle: 5	Yes, a system of graduated sanctions is implemented. Measures range from service suspension to lease termination. This structured escalation supports compliance while maintaining institutional legitimacy and operational continuity.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution relies on a tiered mediation system. Initial reporting is channelled through the porter, followed by intervention from the Coordination Body. Outcomes may depend on stakeholder cooperation and case complexity.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have both enabled and constrained local organisational capacity. While financial support and legal frameworks are provided, decision-making autonomy is partially limited by municipal approval requirements.		
Principle: 8	Governance is articulated across local and municipal scales through formal coordination structures. While vertical integration is functional, horizontal networking beyond the local level remains under development, with potential expansion linked to future EU-funded collaborative initiatives.		
General question: 9	The site demonstrates significant social and urban impact. Institutionally, its performance is positive overall, though certain administrative inefficiencies and structural dependencies persist.		

General question: 10	Key factors include adaptive governance frameworks and sustained municipal support. Additionally, the formalisation of informal practices and the development of representative structures have been critical in stabilising and legitimising the reuse process.
----------------------	--

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i3	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Access boundaries are operationally well-demarcated through controlled entry systems and user accreditation. Legitimate users are contractually recognised organisations, while governance responsibilities are shared, albeit with ultimate municipal oversight embedded in formal statutes.		
Principle: 2	The governance model reflects a calibrated response to local socio-economic realities and limited public funding. Institutional tools are intentionally flexible, maintaining compliance with municipal regulations and infrastructural constraints.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder engagement has been institutionalised via representative platforms, notably the Associations Alliance. Participation is broad but structured, while decision validation remains aligned with formal administrative competences.		
Principle: 4	The functioning and use of the site relies on a multi-layered system combining financial verification, regulatory compliance checks, and daily operational supervision. Effectiveness is generally satisfactory, although some processes depend on coordination efficiency between municipal departments and internal governance bodies.		
Principle: 5	A tiered sanctioning framework is in place. These include administrative warnings and contractual penalties, designed to preserve organisational stability and avoid disproportionate exclusion from the collective system.		
Principle: 6	While not fully formalised in legal terms, mechanisms provide functional conflict management, supported by established communication protocols and a shared interest in maintaining operational continuity. This mechanism generally functions effectively.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions play a dual role by enabling access to infrastructure and funding while maintaining regulatory control. This creates a balanced but somewhat asymmetric arrangement.		
Principle: 8	Multi-level governance is moderately consolidated, with clear articulation between user structures and municipal authorities. However, integration at supra-local levels remains limited.		
General question: 9	The reuse has generated measurable benefits in terms of cultural output. It represents a hybrid governance experiment, though its long-term sustainability		

	depends on continued alignment between civic initiatives and public administration.
General question: 10	The current configuration results from sustained collective action, gradual institutionalisation, and strategic negotiation with public authorities.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i4	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The perimeter and access regime are supported by time-based entry regulations and user accreditation systems. Governance roles are codified through contractual and procedural instruments, ensuring clarity.		
Principle: 2	Arrangements demonstrate a high degree of contextual calibration, particularly in relation to civic self-organisation and limited investment capacity. The framework balances flexibility with regulatory compliance, enabling incremental adjustments aligned with local socio-spatial dynamics and budgetary issues.		
Principle: 3	It is embedded through structured consultation cycles and representative governance bodies. While inclusiveness is prioritised at the deliberative stage, formal decision endorsement follows institutional protocols.		
Principle: 4	Evaluation mechanisms include financial tracking and on-site supervision. These are implemented through coordinated action between municipal services and internal bodies. Their effectiveness is generally adequate.		
Principle: 5	Corrective measures are designed as a progressive system, linking minor infractions to warnings and more severe breaches to contractual consequences. If any disputes arise with visitors or between them, the security team and the doorman step in to calm things down.		
Principle: 6	Dispute management is facilitated through internal mediation structures, primarily coordinated by the central governance body. These procedures rely on established communication channels and mutual institutional commitment.		
Principle: 7	Institutional actors have provided essential infrastructure, legal recognition, and financial inputs, which enable operations. However, their oversight role introduces certain procedural constraints, resulting in a governance balance that is cooperative but not fully autonomous.		
Principle: 8	Broader scalar integration remains in development, particularly regarding alignment with national policies and participation in transnational cooperation platforms. Nevertheless, governance operates effectively at the local-municipal interface.		
General question: 9	The initiative has contributed to urban regeneration, social cohesion, and cultural production.		

	Institutionally, it reflects an evolving governance model. Its impact is broadly positive.
General question: 10	The current situation is shaped by cumulative institutional learning and user-driven organisation.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i5	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The site operates under clearly codified access parameters, combining physical control points with contractual user recognition. Governance responsibilities are structured within a hierarchical framework where municipal authority retains final decision-making prerogatives.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements are pragmatically aligned with limited fiscal capacity and strong civic initiative. The model incorporates adaptive regulatory instruments, enabling operational flexibility.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder inclusion has been progressively formalised, transitioning from informal assemblies to structured representation through elected bodies. Participation is significant at the consultative level. Final decisions are subject to administrative endorsement.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring systems integrate financial control, contractual compliance, and day-to-day supervision. These functions are distributed across municipal services and internal coordination structures. Their performance is generally reliable.		
Principle: 5	Yes, enforcement follows a calibrated escalation model, linking minor breaches to warnings and more serious violations to contractual termination.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution is managed through a semi-formal mediation framework led by the Coordination Body. While not judicialised, it provides a structured approach to dispute handling.		
Principle: 7	Public authorities have played a foundational enabling role through funding, legalisation, and infrastructure provision.		
Principle: 8	Functional vertical coordination between user organisations and municipal authorities is demonstrated by governance arrangements. However, integration into broader governance scales, such as national or European networks, remains limited.		
General question: 9	The reuse has delivered substantial socio-cultural and urban regeneration outcomes, consolidating a diverse organisational ecosystem. Institutionally, it represents a mature co-governance model, although its long-term sustainability depends on continued alignment between public support and civic capacity.		
General question: 10	The current state is explained by sustained negotiation between grassroots actors and public		

	institutions, combined with gradual formalisation processes. Financial stabilisation mechanisms and governance structuring have been critical in consolidating the transition from informal occupation to regulated use.
--	--

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i6	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It feels quite clear to me. There's a main entrance with a kind of control, like someone watching. It's more organized than I expected.		
Principle: 2	I'm not really sure, but it seems adapted in a practical way. The place feels a bit improvised but alive. Like people just made it work over time.		
Principle: 3	I didn't see that directly, but I get the feeling users have some voice. It feels community-driven, like people care.		
Principle: 4	There is someone at the entrance, so at least physically it's controlled. I guess that helps. It feels safe but not strict. In other places I've been, there's either no control or too much.		
Principle: 5	I have no clear idea, honestly. But it doesn't feel chaotic, so I imagine there are rules. Maybe warnings first?		
Principle: 6	I don't know exactly how they solve problems. It feels calm though, not tense. Here everything seems smooth.		
Principle: 7	It feels like the city is involved somehow. Not fully independent but not fully institutional either.		
Principle: 8	I'm not sure about different levels, but it feels connected somehow. Like part of a bigger cultural scene. Compared to smaller local centers, this feels more connected to something bigger.		
General question: 9	The building is a bit rough, but full of energy. This feels more authentic, less commercial. Like people really use it, not just for show.		
General question: 10	I suppose it's because people stayed and kept using it. Also maybe support from the city helped, like a mix of improvisation and some structure.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i7	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It seems quite defined physically. I entered through one main door, and it felt controlled. Compared to places I know, here you notice more who belongs and who doesn't, even if it's not very strict.		
Principle: 2	I don't really know the rules. It's a bit rough, not polished, but it works.		
Principle: 3	I didn't take part in anything like that, but it feels like people using the place have some influence. It doesn't feel imposed. Compared to museums I visit, this feels more informal, like decisions come from inside.		
Principle: 4	I saw security and someone at the entrance, so there is some control. It feels enough, not too heavy.		
Principle: 5	I'm not sure. It doesn't appear like people can just ignore rules completely, so something must be in place.		
Principle: 6	I have no idea how conflicts are solved. From outside, everything seems calm. Maybe issues are handled quietly.		
Principle: 7	It feels like the city is present somehow, but not dominating the space. Like a background support.		
Principle: 8	I can't really talk about different levels, but it doesn't feel isolated. There are signs of connections, like events or posters.		
General question: 9	It appears a bit chaotic, but in a good way. The buildings look old, but full of activity. Compared to more commercial areas, this seems to be less designed for tourists, even if people like visiting.		
General question: 10	It feels like it grew naturally, not from a big plan. Also, some support from the city probably helped keep it running instead of disappearing.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i8	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It feels quite open, like you can just walk in with not so much control. Nor have I noticed any access restrictions. Compared to places in my country, it seems more relaxed and less structured.		
Principle: 2	I'm not completely sure, but it looks adapted to local life. The buildings feel reused in a practical way, maybe because resources are limited. It reminds me of creative spaces I've seen in other cities, but less polished.		
Principle: 3	I don't really know who makes decisions here. It seems like local people are involved, though, because the place feels very community-driven.		
Principle: 4	I didn't notice any obvious monitoring, like security or staff checking things. Maybe it happens in a subtle way. It feels quite free, which is nice, but also a bit unclear how everything is managed.		
Principle: 5	I didn't see any conflicts, so it's hard to say. I imagine they deal with issues informally. The atmosphere feels tolerant.		
Principle: 6	From the vibe, I'd guess people just talk things out. It feels like a place where problems are handled casually rather than through official procedures.		
Principle: 7	I'm not very aware of the role of public institutions here. It doesn't feel very controlled by the government, which is different from cultural spaces I've visited elsewhere that are more regulated.		
Principle: 8	I don't really see different levels of management. Everything feels quite local and grassroots. Compared to bigger institutions, it doesn't seem very connected to wider systems, at least from a visitor perspective.		
General question: 9	It feels lively and creative, like an alternative cultural hub. Socially, it seems important for young people.		
General question: 10	I think the relaxed atmosphere and the people using it are key. It feels driven by creativity rather than planning.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i9	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Honestly, it felt confusing. I wasn't sure where I could go or not. There is a door and someone there, but inside it feels messy.		
Principle: 2	It doesn't feel very adapted to me. The place looks worn out and a bit neglected. Maybe it works for locals.		
Principle: 3	I have no idea who decides things here. It doesn't feel very transparent. Everything seems a bit improvised. Compared to other cultural sites, here I don't see clear information or signs explaining anything.		
Principle: 4	I saw a guard, but inside it felt uncontrolled. Some areas looked chaotic. I'm not sure if anyone really checks what's happening.		
Principle: 5	I didn't notice any clear rules being enforced. People seemed to do their own thing. Maybe there are rules, but as a visitor I couldn't tell.		
Principle: 6	No idea about conflict resolution. If there are problems, they are not visible. The atmosphere felt a bit tense in some corners, not very welcoming compared to other places.		
Principle: 7	It feels like the authorities are present but not really improving things. The building looks quite degraded. In other cities, public support usually means better maintenance.		
Principle: 8	I couldn't see any clear organization across levels. It just feels like many things happening without coordination.		
General question: 9	For me, the impact is mixed. It's active, yes, but also quite rough and not very comfortable. I wouldn't stay long.		
General question: 10	It feels like it just continued without a clear plan. Maybe people kept using it. The result is a place that works somehow, but doesn't feel well cared for or easy to enjoy.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i10	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	For me it's quite clear. There is a main entrance and you feel when you enter a different space. It's not totally open like a park.		
Principle: 2	It feels very local, like people shaped it slowly. It's a bit messy but also familiar, like many Croatian places that reuse old buildings. Not fancy, but it works for everyday activities.		
Principle: 3	I've heard that associations are involved, and it feels like that. There are many different groups and styles. This cultural center feels more bottom-up, less directed by one single authority.		
Principle: 4	You can see some control at the entrance and inside. It feels safe enough. Not too strict. In other cities, you have cameras everywhere, here it feels more relaxed but still watched.		
Principle: 5	People here seem to know the rules. It doesn't feel out of control. Compared to more tourist places, behavior here feels more self-managed.		
Principle: 6	I'm not completely sure, but I imagine people talk things out. It feels like a community space, so maybe conflicts are solved internally. I didn't notice any open problems while I was there.		
Principle: 7	It feels like the city allows it but keeps some control. Like they support but don't let it go fully free. In Croatia this is quite common, not too strict but not fully independent either.		
Principle: 8	I don't really see all the levels, but it feels connected beyond just the building. Like events and groups link to other places. It doesn't feel isolated, more like part of a wider scene.		
General question: 9	I really liked it. It feels creative and alive. Compared to other places, this has more character. It looks like not just something made for tourists.		
General question: 10	I think it's because people stayed active and didn't leave the space empty. Also some support from the city helps. It seems like a mix of persistence and small institutional backing.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i11	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	From what I see, it's quite clearly bounded now. There's a porter and fixed hours, so it feels controlled. You kind of know who belongs and who doesn't.		
Principle: 2	I think the rules fit the place reasonably well, but maybe too bureaucratic now. It was more improvised back in the days. Now it reflects both local needs and city administration.		
Principle: 3	I'm not directly involved, but I've heard users had a say, especially active groups. Still, as an outsider, it feels a bit closed. Participation appears to exist, but maybe only for those already inside.		
Principle: 4	There's visible monitoring - security, the porter, and I guess internal checks. It seems effective in keeping order. It runs smooth, though maybe at the cost of some spontaneity.		
Principle: 5	I would like to think that, if you misuse the facility in a light way, there are different consequences than if you have a serious issue. That sounds fair in theory.		
Principle: 6	Conflicts seem to go through mediation bodies. I don't know details, but people say issues don't escalate too much anymore.		
Principle: 7	The city seems supportive but also controlling. They fund it, so they keep influence.		
Principle: 8	Honestly, I'm not sure about different scales. It feels mostly local, city-level. Maybe there are bigger connections now, but as a resident, that's not very visible in daily life.		
General question: 9	It gives space to culture and youth. Before, it was more marginal. Now it's recognized, though some say it lost part of its original spirit.		
General question: 10	I'd say the balance between grassroots energy and institutional control. That tension probably defines how it works today.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i12	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Well, nowadays it seems quite controlled. There's a doorman and schedules. Years ago, it felt more abandoned, more open. Now it's clearer who goes in, though I don't really follow who decides things.		
Principle: 2	I suppose the rules fit the city in a practical way. Before, it was more improvised, people just used it. Now it doesn't create problems for the neighborhood.		
Principle: 3	I can't say much about that. I think the people inside decide most things. As neighbors, we were never really asked. Maybe in the beginning it was more open, but now it feels like its own internal world.		
Principle: 4	It's calmer than before, less noise at night. You see security and someone at the entrance, so there is control. I guess it works, because there are fewer complaints among neighbors compared to earlier years.		
Principle: 5	From what I hear, yes, there are warnings and consequences. It sounds reasonable. Things seem more orderly now, which honestly makes living nearby easier.		
Principle: 6	I don't know the details, but I've heard they solve issues internally. We don't really see conflicts spilling outside anymore.		
Principle: 7	The city seems to allow it but also keeps some control, which probably helps keep things stable, even if less spontaneous. It's not completely free. Before, it felt more like an occupation. Now it's more official.		
Principle: 8	I wouldn't know about different levels of governance. For me, it's just a city facility now.		
General question: 9	I see it as positive overall. The building is used, not abandoned. It doesn't disturb much anymore. Maybe it's not for everyone, including me, but it adds some life without really causing trouble.		
General question: 10	I think city control explains it. At first, it was more informal. Now it's more structured, which probably keeps it going without affecting neighbors too much.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i13	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Before, it was clearly closed-military, no access at all. Now it's open, but boundaries are a bit blurry. People come and go, though regular users seem to know their place. I suppose responsibilities exist, but they might not be visible from outside.		
Principle: 2	Over time, it has adapted quite well to local realities. Pula doesn't have many resources, so this low-cost, shared use makes sense. It's not perfect, but it reflects how people here actually live.		
Principle: 3	At the beginning, it was more informal, driven by activists. Now, more groups are involved. Some neighbors feel decisions are made by a few core users, so not everyone feels included.		
Principle: 4	People who use the space regularly keep an eye on things. It works to some extent, but sometimes issues go unnoticed until they become bigger problems, especially with occasional visitors.		
Principle: 5	Usually, problems are handled step by step-first talking. It depends on the situation. There might be moments where responses feel inconsistent.		
Principle: 6	Conflicts are often solved through discussion. It works when people are willing to talk, but not always. Long-standing tensions between groups can be harder to resolve, especially when interests clash.		
Principle: 7	The city allowed this to happen, which was important. But support has limits, and sometimes regulations make things more complicated.		
Principle: 8	From what I see, most decisions happen locally. There is some connection with the municipality, but it's not always smooth. Coordination could be better, as I imagine is the case in many other places.		
General question: 9	Socially, it's very important - people meet, create, organize. The area feels more alive than before. Urban-wise, it saved the buildings. Institutionally, though, it still feels a bit uncertain, like it could change depending on politics.		
General question: 10	I'd say it's a mix of strong community effort and lack of alternatives. People made it work because nothing else was happening here.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i14	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The boundaries feel quite clear now. You know when you are inside the Rojc space and when you are not. The porter and opening hours make it very structured. Still, access feels open if you belong.		
Principle: 2	I think they've adapted quite well, honestly. It reflects the local creative scene and how cheap spaces matter here. It keeps that DIY spirit in some parts.		
Principle: 3	Very involved, at least from what I see. I attend events and you notice decisions that are discussed in meetings and assemblies. There's structure, but users still push strongly to be heard.		
Principle: 4	There's both formal and informal monitoring. Security checks access, but users also watch each other socially. As the community is active, I think it works well. At night events, sometimes things are messy around Rojc, but nothing to worry about.		
Principle: 5	Yes, there are clear steps now. I've seen discussions about this in meetings. It seems to be balanced, though some things have become strict.		
Principle: 6	Usually, mediation happens through coordination groups. I've seen conflicts about space use or noise resolved in meetings. There's a sort of formal mechanism, at least.		
Principle: 7	Institutions help and limit at the same time. Without the city, it wouldn't survive financially. Earlier it felt more experimental. Now it's more stable but also more dependent on official approval.		
Principle: 8	It's quite layered, actually. You have users, coordination bodies, and the municipality. I think it works, but it cannot feel so effective because decisions move between different levels before anything really changes.		
General question: 9	I'd say the impact is very positive socially. It shaped my generation's cultural life here. Urbanistically it revived an empty space. Institutionally it's more complicated, but overall it turned a forgotten barracks into something meaningful and alive.		
General question: 10	It's a mix of history and community energy. The early occupation created momentum, then institutions stabilized it. Now activism and local demand keep it alive. Without that balance, I don't think it would function like this today.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i15	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The boundaries are clear on paper, but in practice it feels mixed. You need permission or membership to enter, so it's not truly open. Before, I remember it being more unpredictable, now it's controlled, though not always transparent to neighbors like me.		
Principle: 2	Honestly, I don't think it matches local needs very well. It serves a cultural group more than the wider neighborhood. Earlier, after it changed from military use, there was hope for broader community functions, but now it feels quite specialized.		
Principle: 3	From outside, it seems limited. Decisions happen between associations and the city, not with people like us nearby. It's mainly institutional, so ordinary residents are mostly spectators.		
Principle: 4	There is security and some internal control, but I don't think it's about real monitoring of impact. It mainly regulates access.		
Principle: 5	I can't say much about it. I understand order is needed, of course.		
Principle: 6	I hear disputes go through coordination bodies, but I've never seen them affect daily life much. It's mostly internal.		
Principle: 7	The city enables it financially. Without funding it wouldn't exist, but that dependence means locals like me have little influence.		
Principle: 8	There's the City Council, associations and internal boards. Decisions don't really reach us. It might work but feels distant from everyday neighborhood concerns.		
General question: 9	Socially it's okay, it brings activity, but not necessarily for everyone. Urbanistically it improved a neglected space. Still, I would prefer more mixed-use functions. Institutionally it works, but I don't feel it represents the whole community.		
General question: 10	The city keeps it running, users manage it internally, but ordinary residents are outside that system. That separation explains why it feels somewhat disconnected from the neighborhood.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i16	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	In Rojc, the boundaries are fairly clear in operational terms. That said, the boundary is more social and institutional than purely physical, because the model depends on negotiated legitimacy rather than rigid exclusion.		
Principle: 2	The arrangement is substantially adapted to local conditions, especially the density of user groups and the city's limited resources. The governance model reflects Pula's pragmatic approach: municipal ownership combined with user-led management, which is more suitable than a standardized top-down scheme.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder involvement has been meaningful, though not fully equal. Users were consulted in rule-setting, and representation has been institutionalized through the Coordination Body and the Associations Alliance, but the municipality still retains final approval power, so participation remains partially bounded		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is relatively robust for a hybrid governance setting. The municipality oversees payments, security staff supervise daily use, and the Coordination Body tracks finances and compliance; this creates a workable system.		
Principle: 5	Yes, there are graduated responses. The system distinguishes between administrative arrears and behavioral breaches, using warnings, suspension of services, and ultimately contract termination, which helps avoid immediate punitive escalation.		
Principle: 6	Disputes are handled through a mediated channel: the porter receives complaints and forwards them to the Coordination Body. In practice, this seems reasonably functional for everyday tensions, although more complex conflicts likely require stronger institutional facilitation and clearer procedural safeguards.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have both enabled and constrained local organization. The city made the reuse possible by allocating space and funding operations, but it also limits autonomy by retaining final control over approvals and financial oversight, so self-organization remains enabled yet conditional.		
Principle: 8	Multi-scalar governance is present, but not fully mature. Local co-management operates at the building level, while the municipality anchors legal and financial authority; future integration into broader Croatian and EU-oriented networks could		

	strengthen this, but that remains only partially developed.
General question: 9	Overall, the impact is significant at social and urban levels. Rojc Community Center has generated a stable ecosystem of organizations, protected a large public asset from decline and produced measurable financial returns for maintenance. At institutional level, it has become a reference case for hybrid commons governance.
General question: 10	Strong user organization is the factor that best explains current situation. The model advanced when users demonstrated collective capacity and financial accountability, which made continued co-management politically and administratively viable.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i17	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	In practice, Rojc operates with a readable structure: access is controlled, legitimate users are identifiable, and governance duties are split between the city and user bodies. From an operational standpoint, the regime works because membership, opening hours, and responsibilities are all institutionally legible.		
Principle: 2	The governance model is shaped by context, though not perfectly. It reflects the municipality's need to manage a large asset without overextending resources. In that sense, it is a pragmatic meso-level arrangement rather than a generic template.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder participation has been substantial and has evolved over time. Users were consulted on rules, and representation was later formalized through the Coordination Body and the Associations Alliance, which improved legitimacy. Still, the municipality keeps the final approval authority		
Principle: 4	Monitoring combines administrative, technical, and social controls. The municipality tracks payments and the Coordination Body oversees finances and rule changes. This layered system is effective enough for routine management.		
Principle: 5	The system moves from warnings to service suspension and eventually contract termination, depending on the severity and persistence of non-compliance. That sequencing supports predictability and reduces the risk of arbitrary enforcement.		
Principle: 6	Conflicts typically follow an internal route where they are reviewed and addressed within existing organisational structures. This creates a relatively accessible conflict-resolution pathway for ordinary frictions. For more sensitive issues, the process can be slower.		
Principle: 7	City Council has granted access, formal space and annual operational support. Ownership rights and final approval powers remain on public authorities. So, the framework is enabling, but within clearly defined political and financial limits.		
Principle: 8	Governance is articulated across scales with moderate effectiveness. The building-level co-management structure connects to municipal decision-making, and there is potential for wider network integration through future projects. However, the multi-scalar framework still depends heavily on the city's willingness to translate participation into binding decisions.		

General question: 9	The impact is strong socially and urbanistically. Rojc has supported a dense ecosystem of associations and generated a recognisable public value for the city of Pula beyond its immediate users. Institutionally, it is important as a working alternative example.
General question: 10	The current situation is best explained by institutional compromise and municipal pragmatism. The site advanced when organized users proved they could manage it responsibly, and when the city accepted co-management as the most stable option. Financial transparency was crucial to that balance.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i18	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The definition of boundaries relies on municipal ownership arrangements and agreements with users, although access remains intentionally permeable. Management responsibilities are shared between the City and registered associations, which can occasionally generate ambiguities in operational delineation.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements have been incrementally aligned with NGOs economic conditions, prioritising affordability and adaptive reuse. While not fully formalised, the model reflects Pula's limited fiscal capacity and strong civil society presence.		
Principle: 3	Involvement has been ensured through the establishment of the Rojc Associations Alliance. Essentially, the meetings concern certain requests made by the organisations regarding improvements to the facilities, as a large proportion of the funding comes from the council's budget		
Principle: 4	Monitoring relies on a combination of administrative reporting and on-site coordination. Key indicators include space allocation, compliance with safety standards, and activity levels. But problems don't crop up every day either.		
Principle: 5	Talking about rent, there is a framework for proportionate responses, generally starting with mediation and progressing to formal measures if necessary. Enforcement exists, although its application may vary depending on contextual factors.		
Principle: 6	The Council only gets involved if we are asked to do so by the RCC Coordination Body in the event of prolonged delays in the hiring of spaces, although they mediate internally to ensure this does not happen. Otherwise, I understand that this internal body is primarily responsible for resolving any conflicts between associations. In addition, there is a security team that mediates with visitors to prevent any disturbance to residents.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have primarily enabled the process by granting usage rights and maintaining a flexible regulatory approach. Simultaneously, certain legal and administrative constraints inevitably shape the scope of local self-organisation.		
Principle: 8	Efforts are ongoing to improve coordination, particularly in aligning site management with broader urban development strategies.		

General question: 9	The site has generated notable social and cultural benefits, contributing to urban regeneration. Institutionally, it represents an innovative management model.
General question: 10	The current situation reflects a combination of institutional flexibility, active community engagement and public investment. Evolving policy frameworks also play a significant role in shaping outcomes.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i19	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries at Rojc are established through both spatial control and administrative mechanisms. Access is controlled, users are registered through lease arrangements, and governance responsibilities are split between the City and the user alliance. That said, the model depends on negotiated practice.		
Principle: 2	The reuse framework is reasonably adapted to local social and spatial conditions. It reflects the building's scale the need for cultural activation of a large municipal asset. Economically, the model is pragmatic because it combines municipal ownership with user-generated value and external project funding.		
Principle: 3	Users play an active role through collective representation. They are represented through the Rojc Alliance, which co-governs the centre with the municipality and channels collective interests into management. In strategic terms, participation has improved legitimacy, but final institutional authority remains with the city		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is multi-layered and operationally useful. The caretaker and security services supervise daily use, and the coordination structures track rule changes. This works fairly well for routine control, although transparency remains a recurring performance indicator.		
Principle: 5	Yes, responses to misuse are proportionate. There are warnings for operational breaches, followed by service suspension or lease termination for persistent non-compliance.		
Principle: 6	Rather than being handled ad hoc, disputes are usually routed through formal channels. The porter or management layer receives complaints, and the coordination structures mediate or escalate them if needed. The mechanism is workable itself.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have enabled organisation by providing legal access, basic funding, and an institutional framework for co-management. They constrain local autonomy through ownership rights, so the city acts as both enabler and regulator, which is not unusual in hybrid governance.		
Principle: 8	Multi-scalar governance is fairly well articulated, especially between the building level and the municipal level. The local alliance handles day-to-day representation, while the city secures the asset and sets the legal ceiling. Wider network integration		

	exists through civil-society links and European cooperation, but that layer is still developing.
General question: 9	Rojc has converted a former military structure into a dense civic infrastructure with high daily usage, so the impact at urban level is strong. Also at the social level, with diverse programmes and clear public value. It is important because it demonstrates that co-management can stabilize a large, difficult asset over time.
General question: 10	The availability of a workable co-governance framework. Financial transparency and external project opportunities also matter, because they make the arrangement more resilient and politically defensible.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i20	<b>Place</b>	Rojc Community Center (Pula, Croatia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	From a functional viewpoint, the system shows a clear structure: access rules and governance responsibilities are all identifiable, even if the model remains hybrid. As a planning issue, that clarity supports stability, though the final decision-making authority still sits with the municipality.		
Principle: 2	The institutional arrangements are well aligned with local conditions. Rojc works because it matches a large, underused municipal asset with a dense civil-society ecosystem. It is a context-sensitive solution shaped by the city's management capacity.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder involvement has been substantial and, in my view, strategically valuable. The user alliance and coordination body institutionalised participation, while the city retained oversight to protect legality and budget discipline. That balance has improved legitimacy, even if it occasionally slows procedures		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is fairly comprehensive. We rely on administrative checks, security supervision, and internal coordination to track payments, daily use, and compliance with rules. The system depends on consistent communication and clear reporting indicators.		
Principle: 5	Yes, the responses are graduated. The framework moves from warnings to suspension of services and then to lease termination for repeated breaches. That hierarchy is useful because it gives organisations room to correct behaviour before stronger measures apply.		
Principle: 6	Disputes are usually addressed through mediation within the coordination structure, rather than through formal litigation. In operational terms, that preserves cooperation. I would say it works moderately well, though more complex conflicts can test the system's capacity.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions recognise the site's social value and allow co-management. At the same time, City Council may constrain the process through ownership and budgetary control. That limitation is understandable, but it does cap the full autonomy of users.		
Principle: 8	Governance is articulated across scales in a reasonably coherent way. Local users manage everyday functioning; the municipality secures the asset and sets formal boundaries. The model is multi-level, but the municipal tier remains the decisive one.		

General question: 9	The impact is highly positive. At urban level, Rojc has kept a major barracks complex active. At social level, it has diversified the city's civic offer and generated a strong place identity. Institutionally, it shows that shared governance can sustain a public asset without full privatisation.
General question: 10	The situation is mainly explained by two factors: the city's willingness to maintain a hybrid arrangement and the practical need to keep a large building productive. External funding opportunities also matter, because they strengthen maintenance capacity and future planning options.

#### **d) Socio-demographic characteristics of people interviewed in Prague in connection with the case of study of Kasárna Karlín**

All the interviewees' personal data is classified in compliance with the European Union General Data Protection Regulation<sup>2</sup>.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Type of actor</b>	<b>Age group</b>
i21	M	Commoner	30-40
i22	F	Commoner	30-40
i23	M	Commoner	30-40
i24	F	Commoner	41-50
i25	M	Commoner	41-50
i26	F	User/visitor	18-29
i27	M	User/visitor	18-29
i28	F	User/visitor	30-40
i29	M	User/visitor	41-50
i30	F	User/visitor	30-40
i31	M	Local resident	51-60
i32	F	Local resident	51-60
i33	M	Local resident	51-60
i34	F	Local resident	18-29
i35	M	Local resident	51-60
i36	F	Local public authority	41-50
i37	M	Local public authority	41-50
i38	F	Local public authority	41-50
i39	M	Local public authority	51-60
i40	F	Local public authority	51-60

---

<sup>2</sup> Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679>.

**e) Transcripts of 20 semi-structured interviews performed in Prague in connection with the case of study of Kasárna Karlín**

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i21	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The site is defined by clear physical perimeters. Access is strictly channeled through the main entrance to ensure controlled site entry. Governance responsibilities are centralized within our management association, while internal building zones remain restricted to authorized personnel.		
Principle: 2	The current management model prioritizes local integration. We implemented noise mitigation protocols and waste management systems to align with community requirements. Economic sustainability is maintained through commercial activities, which subsidize the cultural program while respecting the historical integrity of this protected cultural monument.		
Principle: 3	Decision-making currently follows a streamlined institutional model led by our association. Formal participatory processes are not currently operationalized. We emphasize strategic alignment with sustainability standards and address resident concerns through direct operational adjustments to ensure the project's long-term viability in the district.		
Principle: 4	We have a monitoring approach involving both volunteers and security services. These resources focus on ensuring compliance with environmental guidelines and noise regulations. This technical supervision is essential for maintaining our operating permit.		
Principle: 5	Our management protocol employs a corrective approach to handle non-compliance. Security personnel provide direct oversight. Staff members facilitate immediate mediation for minor issues. This system aims to prevent escalation and maintain a secure environment for all users without resorting to drastic measures initially.		
Principle: 6	Internal disputes are managed through mediation by our operational team. However, macro-level conflicts with municipal authorities are handled via formal negotiation channels. Resolving larger governance tensions remains a strategic priority to ensure operational continuity.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have played a dual role. While the ownership transfer to the city provided a strategic framework for regeneration, unilateral regulatory decisions by district authorities have occasionally constrained our operational capacity.		

Principle: 8	Governance is focused on the local and municipal levels. We are working to integrate our cultural program into the city's broader urban development strategy.
General question: 9	The impact is significant, transforming an underutilized military asset into a significant cultural hub. We have successfully reactivated the public sphere and enhanced cultural provision. However, institutional friction persists regarding the long-term vision, balancing community-led initiatives with official urban regeneration and marketing strategies.
General question: 10	The current situation results from a complex interplay between temporary use agreements and shifting institutional ownership. The evolving vision for the site's future is the primary driver of the ongoing negotiation and management process.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i22	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Our operational strategy defines clear spatial limits. Entry is centralized via the primary gateway. Access to internal infrastructures remains restricted to maintenance teams and project coordinators, ensuring adherence to safety protocols and the current temporary lease framework. Public flow is maintained in the courtyard area.		
Principle: 2	Management protocols are calibrated to integrate heritage preservation with neighborhood needs. Economic viability relies on commercial revenue to fund the cultural agenda. Operational hours are specifically adjusted to mitigate noise impact, ensuring the project remains compatible with local urban development goals.		
Principle: 3	Decisions are currently centralized within our nonprofit entity. Broad public consultation is not formalized, but our planning incorporates feedback regarding environmental sustainability and resident comfort. This approach facilitates a stable management structure.		
Principle: 4	We employ a dual monitoring system using external security and internal staff. Indicators focus on occupancy levels, waste management compliance and acoustic thresholds. This technical oversight is vital for proving evidence of responsible management to local stakeholders.		
Principle: 5	Our disciplinary framework involves escalating interventions. If issues persist, external security enforce established protocols. This tiered strategy protects the site's reputation during sensitive negotiations regarding the future permanent usage of the architectural complex.		
Principle: 6	Disputes at operational level are resolved through internal coordination and management mediation. More complex issues are occasionally escalated to administrative or municipal actors.		
Principle: 7	Institutional involvement has been characterized by a complex regulatory landscape. Certain district-level administrative actions have occasionally restricted our activities. We view these constraints as opportunities to refine our management model.		
Principle: 8	Governance is currently concentrated on the municipal-local interface. We are working to enhance our strategic positioning within Prague's broader cultural network. Currently, cross-border institutional integration is not operationalized, as our primary focus remains the stabilization of the local management framework and site heritage.		

General question: 9	The project has successfully revitalized a dormant urban asset. Institutional friction highlights the need for more integrated governance structures.
General question: 10	The situation is shaped by the challenges of adapting a 19th-century military structure to modern zoning requirements. Balancing economic self-sufficiency with regulatory compliance and the evolving strategic vision of the city remains the defining challenge.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i23	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The perimeter and entry point are formally delineated, with differentiated access regimes. Governance responsibilities are contractually assigned to our association. Ownership and regulatory oversight remain with municipal authorities.		
Principle: 2	The operational model is intentionally calibrated to local conditions, balancing cultural activation with residential sensitivities. Programming, environmental protocols, and revenue mechanisms are aligned with district-level constraints, particularly noise thresholds and temporary-use regulations established by planning authorities.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder involvement has been selective and primarily consultative. No formal co-decision structures exist. Feedback loops with residents and authorities have informed adjustments.		
Principle: 4	Oversight combines internal reporting systems and attendance tracking. Key performance indicators include visitor flows, incident reports, and compliance metrics. Effectiveness is positively high, in my opinion.		
Principle: 5	Yes, responses are structured in a graduated manner, ranging from soft enforcement such as verbal reminders to exclusion measures when necessary. This proportionality is designed to ensure an inclusive and non-confrontational environment.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution is handled through on-site staff and contracted security, operating under general operational guidelines. Mechanisms are pragmatic rather than institutionalised, they have proven sufficiently adaptive for routine disputes, though more complex cases require external intervention.		
Principle: 7	They have enabled temporary use through contractual arrangements, yet regulatory interventions have at times constrained operational continuity, reflecting a broader tension between civic initiatives and formal planning frameworks.		
Principle: 8	Governance articulation remains relatively weak across scales. While local coordination is stable, there is limited integration with higher-level institutional actors, resulting in a fragmented governance landscape that affects long-term strategic planning.		
General question: 9	The site has generated significant cultural and social value, contributing to urban vitality and adaptive reuse discourse. Institutionally, its impact is moderated by evolving policy priorities at the municipal level.		

General question: 10	The current situation is best explained by regulatory compliance pressures. Institutional ambiguity and shifting political priorities have influenced the trajectory of the reuse process.
----------------------	--

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i24	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Spatial limits are well codified. From a programming perspective, we operate within clearly assigned competences, while strategic authority remains external. This clarity supports operational planning, although access regimes vary depending on activity type.		
Principle: 2	Cultural programming and scheduling are calibrated to comply with municipal regulations and neighbourhood expectations. The governance framework has been progressively adjusted to local constraints, especially regarding residential coexistence and economic viability.		
Principle: 3	Structured co-creation mechanisms are not formally embedded within the current governance model. Stakeholder engagement has been indirect and mostly reactive. Input from residents has informed programming adjustments.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring relies on operational data, including event evaluations and incident logs. Additionally, external security contributes to behavioural oversight. These tools' integration into long-term strategic assessment remains limited.		
Principle: 5	Sure. Enforcement follows a stepwise logic. This approach aligns with our objective of maintaining an adherence to operational and regulatory standards.		
Principle: 6	Dispute resolution is handled through staff intervention and mediation practices. These mechanisms are adaptable and generally effective for day-to-day issues.		
Principle: 7	Institutional actors have provided a necessary legal and administrative framework, but their interventions have occasionally limited operational flexibility. This reflects broader governance dynamics, where cultural initiatives must continuously fight with evolving regulatory priorities.		
Principle: 8	Multi-level governance remains only partially coordinated. Connections with higher administrative tiers are less structured, which complicates the consolidation of a coherent development strategy.		
General question: 9	The project has contributed to the diversification of urban uses. Socially, it has activated community engagement, while institutionally it has highlighted gaps in adaptive governance models for temporary reuse within formal planning systems.		
General question: 10	Uncertainty in planning objectives continues to shape both operational possibilities and strategic direction.		

	The situation results from the interaction between temporary-use conditions and regulatory requirements.
--	--

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i25	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries are operationally clear: a single entrance and controlled interior access. From a management standpoint, responsibilities are internally allocated, while compliance obligations are externally imposed by municipal and district-level authorities.		
Principle: 2	Day-to-day arrangements are highly responsive to local constraints, regarding crowd control and noise mitigation. Procedures are continuously adjusted to align with regulatory frameworks governing temporary cultural uses.		
Principle: 3	Direct participation in decision-making is limited. However, visitor feedback, incident patterns, and resident complaints indirectly shape operational adjustments. Engagement is therefore mediated through monitoring data rather than formal participatory governance structures.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is based on entry observation, incident registration and coordination with security personnel. We also track peak occupancy and behavioural patterns. These tools are effective for immediate control.		
Principle: 5	We follow a progressive model. We begin with guidance and warnings, escalating to removal from the premises when required. This ensures proportionality while maintaining a controlled and predictable environment for diverse user groups.		
Principle: 6	Conflicts are typically addressed on-site by staff through informal mediation. While there is no specialised unit, established protocols allow for quick resolution. However, strategic conflicts with administrative bodies are handled through institutional dialogues. We prioritize maintaining a constructive relationship with the District authorities to guarantee the continuity of our multifunctional cultural programming within the site.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have set clear operational limits through regulations and inspections. It reduces flexibility in managing visitors and adapting uses, particularly regarding indoor activities and capacity.		
Principle: 8	Coordination across governance levels is uneven. Operational alignment with local authorities is necessary but sometimes reactive. There is limited integration with broader policy frameworks.		
General question: 9	The reuse has increased public accessibility, particularly in cultural consumption. However,		

	institutional uncertainty and regulatory constraints have limited its full operational capacity.
General question: 10	The current situation reflects regulatory pressure and evolving urban priorities. Visitor-related issues, especially noise and compliance, have significantly influenced decisions.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i26	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It's super clear where you can go. You just walk in through the main gate on Krizikova street. The courtyard is lovely and open to everyone. Other old buildings like this are usually fenced up entirely.		
Principle: 2	I noticed they really care about the neighbors here. They have strict rules about noise and recycling, and they strongly encourage you to buy drinks to support the place. It feels very eco-friendly, trendier than the alternative spots in my hometown.		
Principle: 3	Honestly, I don't think regular visitors have a say. The association running it just sets the rules. It's not like they asked us what we want.		
Principle: 4	There are security guards walking around. It feels a bit stricter than I expected for an alternative cultural space, but they make sure people aren't making a mess. In other places like this, you don't always see that, so here it stands out more.		
Principle: 5	I'm not exactly sure what happens if you break a rule. I just see the volunteers and the security guys around. I suppose they'd just ask you to leave if you caused trouble, but the vibe is usually quite relaxed anyway.		
Principle: 6	If people argue, I think the security guards just step in to calm things down. They don't seem to have fancy mediators.		
Principle: 7	The local government seems really strict! They shut it down last year over some permit issues. It's a shame because it's such a cool spot.		
Principle: 8	As far as I can see, it's just a Prague thing. It just feels like a very local project run by local people.		
General question: 9	It brings such a great energy to the neighborhood! The courtyard is beautiful and full of life, way better than an empty ruin. It's just sad the city makes it so hard for them to use the inside spaces right now.		
General question: 10	Right now, it feels like they are just surviving. Because of the city's rules and the neighbors complaining about noise, they can only keep the yard open. They must play it super safe to avoid getting shut down again.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i27	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	I just walked in through a big gate. It's obvious you can hang out in the courtyard, but the old buildings are completely locked up.		
Principle: 2	It feels chill. They push you to buy drinks from their bar to support the place. I guess it's to survive?		
Principle: 3	Man, I'm just a tourist, I have no clue who makes the rules. It seems like whoever owns the bar just decides things. I heard they have to keep the noise down for the neighbors, though, so maybe they complain a lot.		
Principle: 4	I saw some security guys walking around the courtyard. They mostly just stand there looking serious, making sure nobody is being too loud. It feels pretty safe, honestly.		
Principle: 5	I assume the bouncers or the guys pouring beers would just kick you out if you started smashing bottles or screaming. I don't know, I haven't seen anyone do anything bad.		
Principle: 6	As I said, I think the security guards and the bar staff just handle whatever happens. I didn't see any managers or an office. If two guys started fighting, the guards would probably just step right in to stop it.		
Principle: 7	A guy I met there told me the city actually shut them down recently. That's crazy to me! In my country, the government doesn't care about old ruins, but here they seem super strict about permits.		
Principle: 8	No idea what that means, honestly. To me, it just looks like a local group running a cool courtyard bar. I doubt the national government or anyone else is involved. It just feels like a casual neighborhood hangout.		
General question: 9	It's an awesome place to grab a beer! The courtyard looks super raw and authentic. Much better than turning it into boring offices or fancy expensive apartments like they do everywhere else.		
General question: 10	I'm just guessing, but it seems like they are just trying not to get closed down again. They have security, they keep us outside, and they tell us to be quiet so the neighbors don't get mad.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i28	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It feels quite clear. There's basically one main entrance. I'm not really sure who is in charge. It feels a bit mixed, like cultural people and the city somehow.		
Principle: 2	It seems adapted in a practical way. The place feels relaxed but also a bit controlled, maybe because of neighbors. In my city, similar places are either very open or very restricted, but here it feels somewhere in between.		
Principle: 3	Honestly, I didn't notice much participation. It feels more like decisions are already made. Maybe locals influenced some rules, like noise, but as a visitor, I don't really see people actively involved in decisions.		
Principle: 4	I saw security staff around. It gives a sense of order, but also makes it feel slightly less free. Monitoring here feels visible.		
Principle: 5	It feels like they try to prevent problems rather than react. I'm not sure about different levels of response.		
Principle: 6	I didn't witness any conflicts, so it's hard to say. It seems informal, like staff or volunteers would just step in. It appears that they solve things on the spot.		
Principle: 7	The place is open, but you can sense limits. It seems like there's some risk of decisions coming from above.		
Principle: 8	It feels mostly local, maybe city-level decisions.		
General question: 9	Socially, it feels lively and welcoming, which is nice. Urban-wise, it gives new life to an old place. Institutionally, I can't say much.		
General question: 10	I think it's a mix of city plans and cultural use. Everything seems a bit in balance but not fully settled.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i29	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It is easy to understand where the place starts and ends. You go through one gate and suddenly you're inside. But beyond that, it feels a bit unclear from the visitor's point of view who runs everything.		
Principle: 2	To me it feels adapted in a simple, practical way. There's a relaxed vibe but also some limits, probably because people live nearby.		
Principle: 3	I didn't notice any kind of public involvement. It looks like decisions are taken somewhere else. Maybe locals complained about noise, because the atmosphere feels a bit restrained.		
Principle: 4	There were security people around, walking and watching. It made the place feel safe.		
Principle: 5	I really don't know about different levels of punishment. The environment feels calm, like they don't allow things to go too far before stepping in.		
Principle: 6	I guess if something happens, staff or volunteers just talk to people. I don't know if there's a formal system, or it is more like informal handling of situations.		
Principle: 7	The place is independent, but you can sense it depends on decisions from above.		
Principle: 8	I didn't notice any connection to external organisations, at least nothing visible during my short visit.		
General question: 9	It gives life to the area, that's clear. People gather, relax, have a drink. But it also feels temporary somehow, like it could change.		
General question: 10	I think the situation comes from local complaints. It feels like different interests are pulling in different directions, so the place ends up being a bit uncertain but still active.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i30	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It seems quite easy to understand physically, like you enter through one point and that's it. I know who is responsible. I saw while walking around the name <i>Pražské Centrum</i> , and I searched about it.		
Principle: 2	It feels like it fits the area in a basic way. In other cities, these places feel more alternative, here it feels a bit more adapted or softened.		
Principle: 3	I didn't see any sign of people being involved. It just feels organised already by the association. Maybe locals had some influence, but as a visitor, it's not visible at all, at least not to me.		
Principle: 4	There were some staff and security around, just watching. It feels controlled but not in a bad way. In some places I've visited, there's no one around, so this feels a bit more supervised.		
Principle: 5	I'm not sure how they deal with problems. I didn't see any situations where someone was warned or anything like that.		
Principle: 6	No idea, honestly. I didn't notice any conflicts. It feels like a place where people behave.		
Principle: 7	It feels like the authorities are quite present, even if you don't see them directly. I'd say there's some sort of control behind the scenes.		
Principle: 8	I didn't see any connection to bigger systems. Nothing suggests coordination with other cities or larger organisations.		
General question: 9	It seems nice for people who like culture, even if it's not really my thing.		
General question: 10	I'd say it's a mix of local complaints and trying to keep cultural activities. It feels like a compromise. Not fully one thing or another, just something in between for now.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i31	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	From what I saw today, it feels quite controlled. You enter through one main gate, and it's clear who runs things, but I'm not fully sure who is actually responsible beyond the people organizing events.		
Principle: 2	It seems partly adapted. A friend of mine told me it used to be more relaxed before. Now it feels a bit tighter, maybe because of complaints. Still, the cultural vibe fits the area quite well.		
Principle: 3	Honestly, I don't think people like me have much say. It feels top-down. Maybe locals complained and influenced some rules, but I didn't get the sense of open discussions or shared decisions.		
Principle: 4	There's visible security around, more than I expected for a cultural place. It gives a sense of order, but also tension. I can't judge effectiveness.		
Principle: 5	I didn't notice different levels of response, just a general idea that rules are enforced. My friend said they've become stricter over time. It feels like they want to avoid any risk now, maybe after past issues.		
Principle: 6	From what I understand, conflicts are handled informally. I imagine it works for small issues.		
Principle: 7	Public authorities seem quite dominant. The place was even closed before. So, they allow things but also limit them strongly.		
Principle: 8	It feels like a local experiment, but without broader coordination.		
General question: 9	Socially, it seems valuable. But institutionally, it doesn't. Like it could shift direction anytime.		
General question: 10	I'd say the main factors are complaints from neighbors and uncertainty about the future. It feels like a temporary balance. Before it might have been freer, now it's more cautious.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i32	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The limits are quite visible now, especially since they reduced access. Now there's one entrance, more control. Still, as a neighbour, I don't always know who is really accountable.		
Principle: 2	Some rules clearly respond to us, the residents. But overall, I feel the balance is off. Cultural use is prioritized, while daily life here is secondary. It wasn't always like this.		
Principle: 3	From my experience, we are not really involved. We complain, sometimes they react, but that's not the same as participating. Decisions seem already made. It creates frustration because we live with the consequences every night.		
Principle: 4	Security watch behavior inside, but noise still reaches our windows. So, from my side, monitoring exists, yes, but it doesn't fully solve the real problem.		
Principle: 5	I don't see whether something is allowed or restricted. It feels reactive. After complaints, they tighten things.		
Principle: 6	There is no clear channel for residents. It works informally, but not always fairly or consistently.		
Principle: 7	I feel local initiatives of this type depend too much on political decisions, not on stable agreements with neighbours.		
Principle: 8	To me, it looks fragmented. Local district decisions and the people running the place don't seem aligned. As residents, we feel caught in between those different levels.		
General question: 9	It brought life, yes, and at first, it was interesting. But over time, the noise and crowds became exhausting. Socially it divides people here.		
General question: 10	I would say constant tension explains it: between culture and housing, between users and residents, and between managers and authorities. Everything is still being negotiated.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i33	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	You go in through one gate, and activities are more contained. Before, it felt more open, people coming and going. Now I understand better who runs things, at least on the surface.		
Principle: 2	I'd say they've adjusted over time. Earlier, it didn't respect the neighborhood rhythm much. Now they seem more careful, especially with timing and noise. It's not perfect, but it feels more in tune with people living around here.		
Principle: 3	I don't think there's real participation, but complaints did have an effect. Neighbors pushed back, and things changed. It's more reactive than inclusive. Still, compared to before, I feel we're indirectly more heard.		
Principle: 4	There's definitely more oversight now. It's calmer, controlled. From my perspective as a neighbor, it works better, even if it still depends on the event.		
Principle: 5	I'm not sure about formal steps. In the past, it was either noisy or suddenly shut down. Now they seem to adjust gradually, trying to avoid escalation, which I appreciate.		
Principle: 6	Conflicts seem handled on-site. It's informal, yes, but more responsive than before, when it felt like nobody was in charge.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions stepped in strongly. The closure limited some freedom, but honestly, it also improved coexistence for us living nearby.		
Principle: 8	It feels mostly local, but with strong influence from the district authorities. I don't see much beyond that.		
General question: 9	Overall, I think it's positive, with reservations. Before, it was lively but overwhelming. Now it adds cultural value without disturbing daily life as much.		
General question: 10	I'd say pressure from residents, combined with institutional control, shaped the current situation. Also, the temporary nature of the project. Over time, they learned to adapt, and that made a big difference for people like me.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i34	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The boundaries are actually quite clear now, especially after reopening. There's one main entrance and more control over indoor access. Before the closure, it felt more open.		
Principle: 2	I think they've adapted a lot, especially after the protests. It's still a cultural space, but more careful. It reflects local tensions, trying to keep both community life and residents comfortable.		
Principle: 3	Honestly, formal participation is weak, but the protests mattered. I was there in 2024, and it showed that people care. Since then, decisions still come from above, but there's more sensitivity to public pressure.		
Principle: 4	There's more visible control now: security, staff, clearer rules. Before, it was more self-managed. It lost a bit of that spontaneous energy.		
Principle: 5	I'm not sure about formal sanctions.		
Principle: 6	Most conflicts are handled informally. I've seen staff talk to people, especially about noise. I've also spoken to them once or twice, and they were reasonable. There's no strict system. It's not perfect, but it feels human.		
Principle: 7	Local authorities have been both restrictive and necessary. The closure was frustrating, but it also forced negotiations. Still, they hold too much power over Kasárna Karlín.		
Principle: 8	It is shaped by the district and the city. There's no wider network, which is a shame. It could learn from other places.		
General question: 9	For me, it's essential. It brings culture, diversity, and life to the neighborhood. Losing it would be a huge loss for the area.		
General question: 10	Current situation comes from conflict and negotiation between residents, commoners and authorities. The protests were key. Temporary status keeps everything unstable.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i35	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Access seems channelled through one entrance, and inside areas are often closed. Who really decides things is not very visible.		
Principle: 2	It seems some rules came after complaints, especially about noise. Before, it looked more relaxed.		
Principle: 3	It never felt like ordinary residents had much say. People reacted when it closed, but that looked more like a protest.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring seems stricter, probably to avoid problems, but it also changes the atmosphere.		
Principle: 5	From outside, it looks like they try to prevent issues rather than respond gradually. If conflicts happen, I suppose they will react.		
Principle: 6	Staff or volunteers step in if needed. For bigger tensions, especially with neighbours or authorities, it does not seem very structured.		
Principle: 7	At times public authorities allowed activities, then suddenly stopped them. That creates uncertainty. Local organisers appear dependent on those decisions.		
Principle: 8	It feels mostly managed at a local level. There is little sense of connection to wider systems or policies.		
General question: 9	The place brought life to the neighbourhood, especially culturally. Before, it was quite empty. Still, closure reduce its positive impact, making it feel temporary rather than a stable part of the city.		
General question: 10	The situation seems shaped by neighbour complaints. Also, maybe economic interests play a role.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i36	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The site shows well-defined physical boundaries, with a controlled entry point. Governance responsibilities are split between municipal ownership and the cultural operator, producing a hybrid but still legible spatial and institutional delimitation of legitimate use.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements are partially adapted to noise mitigation and sustainability-oriented operations. However, their temporariness limits long-term strategic alignment with broader socio-economic transformations and housing pressures in the Karlín district.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder involvement is predominantly indirect. Decision-making is concentrated within municipal authorities and the managing association. Citizen influence hasn't still occurred through structured participatory planning.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring relies mainly on contracted security personnel and internal volunteers, focusing compliance with operational rules. This system is moderately effective for immediate control.		
Principle: 5	Sanctions exist in an informal and operational form, primarily security intervention.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution mechanisms are largely informal. This is functional for minor disputes but makes it difficult to address larger tensions.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have acted both constraining while also enabling reuse via temporary leasing arrangements. This ambivalence reflects broader urban governance tensions.		
Principle: 8	Multi-scalar governance is relatively weak, with decision-making concentrated at the municipal and district levels. The lack of regional or international institutional coordination limits strategic integration.		
General question: 9	The overall impact is significant in terms of urban regeneration, contributing to place-making and social vibrancy. It also generates governance friction, particularly around noise externalities and competing visions of urban redevelopment.		
General question: 10	Key explanatory factors include the transitional property regime and civic-led cultural programming.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i37	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Spatial and functional boundaries are clearly articulated. Governance boundaries remain partially ambiguous due to interests from municipal authorities and the cultural operator.		
Principle: 2	They are adapted enough to local socio-spatial conditions. Nevertheless, economic pressures linked to redevelopment agendas introduce tensions between temporary cultural use and long-term real estate valorisation strategies.		
Principle: 3	Decision-making is non-codified. Processes are dominated by municipal and district-level institutions. Civil society participation emerges mainly through episodic contestation, which indicates weak deliberative governance.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring focuses on behavioural compliance and event regulation. This produces limited evaluative capacity regarding broader impacts such as gentrification or social inclusion.		
Principle: 5	Responses to misuse are graduated, ranging from warnings to access restriction and police intervention. The absence of formalised enforcement tiers reduces predictability and may generate perceptions of discretionary governance.		
Principle: 6	Dispute resolution relies on mediation by volunteers and security personnel, without specialised institutional arbitration. This ensures operational flexibility and, at the same time, limits procedural legitimacy.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have alternated between enabling reuse through temporary leases and constraining it by regulatory enforcement.		
Principle: 8	There's no integration beyond municipal and district scales. Local operational governance remains quite functional.		
General question: 9	Impact is mixed: strong contributions to cultural activation and place-making coexist with regulatory conflicts and pressures of commodification and gentrification linked to broader urban regeneration dynamics.		
General question: 10	The current situation is best explained by temporary governance agreements, contested regulatory interpretations, and ongoing tensions between regulatory compliance and informal urban practices within a broader context of urban regeneration pressures.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i38	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Borders are physically precise, but governance boundaries remain contested due to ownership by municipal bodies. Access to the buildings produce differentiated user categories that reflect broader urban management logics.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements only partially reflect local socio-economic conditions. While cultural programming adapts to neighborhood demand, strategic planning remains influenced by redevelopment and administrative rationalisation.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder involvement is structurally limited. Decision-making is concentrated within municipal planning and heritage institutions.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is primarily security-based and compliance-oriented. While effective for short-term order, it lacks analytical tools for assessing long-term socio-spatial impacts such as displacement or cultural commodification.		
Principle: 5	Sanctioning is only partially graduated, relying on informal escalation. I'm not sure if there are codified procedural layers.		
Principle: 6	It operates through ad hoc mediation.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have simultaneously enabled activation through temporary leasing and constrained it through regulatory interventions and closure episodes.		
Principle: 8	Governance across scales remains fragmented. Municipal, district, and former state-level logics do not always align. This produces inconsistencies in decision-making, particularly when strategic planning collides with everyday management needs.		
General question: 9	The impact is ambivalent. Latent pressures toward functional conversion, often aligned with real estate-driven redevelopment trajectories, are something to worry about.		
General question: 10	The current situation is primarily explained by transitional property regimes, locally managed cultural activities and structural tension between public planning objectives and emergent commons-based urban practices.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i39	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundary definition is clear in spatial terms, with restricted internal circulation. Governance boundaries are fluid due to negotiated responsibilities, producing a semi-formalized regime.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements are partially calibrated to residential sensitivity and cultural demand. Redevelopment scenarios limit full adaptation to long-term economic and demographic dynamics aimed at future reprogramming.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder participation is asymmetrical. Cultural users and residents participate indirectly through conflict escalation, indicating low institutionalisation of participatory governance mechanisms.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring relies on operational surveillance and contracted security services. This system may not be effective in informing adaptive governance or long-term planning decisions.		
Principle: 5	Enforcement is partially graduated, ranging from informal warnings to exclusion measures and administrative intervention. However, the lack of formal protocols may reinforce perceptions of discretionary or politically influenced enforcement.		
Principle: 6	Dispute resolution is mainly informal and relies on operators and security personnel. There are no formal protocols to manage structural conflicts between cultural programming and residential regulation.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions' role reflects a dual governance logic balancing cultural activation with regulatory compliance and planning control in a contested urban redevelopment context.		
Principle: 8	Governance articulation remains predominantly local, though reopening negotiations required coordination across municipal departments. Despite this, integration with broader policy scales is still weak.		
General question: 9	Cultural issues and urban activation coexist with emerging pressures associated with more profitable opportunities in terms of land value. In this sense, it's possible to evaluate the impact as a self-contradictory outcome.		
General question: 10	Temporary cultural leasing structures or use agreements and contested planning authority may explain the current situation.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i40	<b>Place</b>	Kasárna Karlín (Prague, Czech Republic)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Over the years, boundaries have become more legible, especially after the partial reopening. Now access is structured around the courtyard. Still, governance roles sometimes overlap between municipal control and cultural management.		
Principle: 2	The arrangements have gradually adapted through trial and error. In the beginning, they felt too rigid for local life. Now they better reflect residential concerns and cultural uses.		
Principle: 3	In practice, involvement has been uneven. I remember earlier discussions where citizens felt excluded, and later protests changed the tone. Today there is more sensitivity, but real decision-making still sits mainly with institutions.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring has become more visible since reopening, mainly through security presence and on-site supervision. It works reasonably well for daily management, but it still feels reactive rather than preventive, especially when balancing cultural activity with neighbour complaints about noise.		
Principle: 5	Yes, but it is not always consistent. Usually it starts with warnings, then increased security presence, and in some cases restricted access. The problem is that people don't always perceive it well, especially during busy cultural events.		
Principle: 6	For everyday issues, disputes are mostly handled on-site between staff, security and users. Deeper conflicts between residents and the cultural programme are harder to resolve and sometimes end up escalating to municipal level decisions.		
Principle: 7	They have played a double role. At times they supported reopening and cultural activity, but at other moments they restricted it through regulations and closure. This inconsistency has made long-term organisation by local actors quite fragile and uncertain.		
Principle: 8	Coordination across levels is poorly integrated. Municipal and district authorities dominate, with limited coordination beyond these levels. This fragmentation reinforces short-term, reactive management approaches.		
General question: 9	Socially and culturally, the impact has been very strong. The place became a meeting point again after years of neglect. At the same time, tensions with residents and planning uncertainty show that integration into the neighbourhood is still not fully stabilised.		

General question: 10	It is mainly a combination of historical vacancy and strong local cultural demand. Also, conflicting visions for the future of the site explain why its reuse remains dynamic and sometimes unstable.
----------------------	---

**f) Socio-demographic characteristics of people interviewed in Ljubljana in connection with the case of study of Metelkova Mesto**

All the interviewees' personal data is classified in compliance with the European Union General Data Protection Regulation<sup>3</sup>.

Interviewee code	Gender	Type of actor	Age group
i41	M	Commoner	18-29
i42	F	Commoner	18-29
i43	M	Commoner	30-40
i44	F	Commoner	18-29
i45	M	Commoner	41-50
i46	F	User/visitor	18-29
i47	M	User/visitor	30-40
i48	F	User/visitor	30-40
i49	M	User/visitor	41-50
i50	F	User/visitor	30-40
i51	M	Local resident	51-60
i52	F	Local resident	41-50
i53	M	Local resident	30-40
i54	F	Local resident	41-50
i55	M	Local resident	51-60
i56	F	Local public authority	41-50
i57	M	Local public authority	41-50
i58	F	Local public authority	51-60
i59	M	Local public authority	41-50
i60	F	Local public authority	51-60

---

<sup>3</sup> Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679>.

**g) Transcripts of 20 semi-structured interviews performed in Ljubljana in connection with the case of study of Metelkova Mesto**

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i41	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The spatial boundaries are physically identifiable but institutionally diffuse. Governance responsibilities remain decentralized, with coordinated roles among collectives.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements are highly context sensitive. Informal governance mechanisms prioritize cultural production and autonomy over compliance with institutional frameworks.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder involvement is primarily internal and horizontal shaped. Decision-making occurs through assemblies and collective coordination, though without formal procedures.		
Principle: 4	Peer-based oversight and continuous presence are the keys of monitoring. Effectiveness varies, as this model bets on adaptability.		
Principle: 5	There is no structured system of graduated sanctions. External enforcement aligned with national legal frameworks is generally avoided to preserve operational autonomy.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution mechanisms are informal and dialogue-oriented. They depend on voluntary compliance and mediation among involved parties.		
Principle: 7	Dual approach from institutional actors, both enabling and constraining, relegates the site within a context of ongoing legal and planning ambiguity.		
Principle: 8	Governance operates through a group of local associations and transnational partners. This enhances cultural exchange and resource flows.		
General question: 9	Metelkova has generated significant social value and alternative urban identity. Institutional impact remains contested, particularly regarding compatibility with formal planning systems.		
General question: 10	Key explanatory factors include historical occupation dynamics and strategic tolerance by authorities. Additionally, external pressures such as real estate interests shape the current operational landscape.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i42	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Entry is informally mediated, and user legitimacy is flexible. Governance responsibilities aren't delineated managerial competences.		
Principle: 2	The governance model is embedded in local cultural dynamics and urban conditions. It responds to gaps in institutional cultural provision, privileging self-management and low-cost programming, which aligns with the socio-economic realities of Ljubljana's independent cultural sector.		
Principle: 3	Engagement is structured through open assemblies and working groups. Inclusivity is promoted internally. External actors, particularly municipal authorities, have limited participatory integration, resulting in an intentional exclusion from governance processes.		
Principle: 4	Oversight is conducted through continuous on-site presence and informal feedback loops. There are no standardized metrics or formal audits. Effectiveness depends on collective commitment.		
Principle: 5	Responses are context-driven and negotiated collectively. External legal enforcement is considered a last resort.		
Principle: 6	Dispute management relies on mediation practices within the community. When conflicts extend, resolution capacity becomes limited and occasionally deferred to external authorities.		
Principle: 7	Institutional actors have indirectly supported continuity by refraining from strict enforcement. This approach has enabled grassroots organization.		
Principle: 8	A network of local groups articulates governance with international collaborators' help. This enhances programmatic diversity and external visibility, and coordination mechanisms across scales remain informal.		
General question: 9	The reuse has generated substantial cultural capital and reinforced non-institutional creative sectors. Institutionally, it challenges conventional governance models and planning norms.		
General question: 10	The current configuration results from sustained collective action, strong ideological positioning, and adaptive informal governance. Additionally, political shifts significantly mark ongoing strategic decisions.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i43	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	From an operational perspective, boundaries are pragmatically enforced rather than formally codified. Access points are managed on-site. Governance is collectively assumed.		
Principle: 2	Reuse model leverages economic viability through self-financing mechanisms such as events and accommodation services while resisting standardized redevelopment logics perceived as exclusionary.		
Principle: 3	Decision-making is structured through internal coordination bodies and regular assemblies. Stakeholder participation is substantial within the network of resident organizations.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is based on staff presence, especially in publicly oriented functions like the bar and hostel. Feedback is qualitative, derived from user interaction, but lacks formalized indicators or reporting protocols.		
Principle: 5	There is no formalized system of progressive sanctions. Instead, corrective measures are applied situationally, often through direct communication.		
Principle: 6	Informal negotiation is generally effective for internal disputes, but less so when issues escalate beyond the site's governance capacity.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have indirectly facilitated continuity by tolerating existing practices. This has resulted in an operational environment which balances informal management with external legal and planning pressures.		
Principle: 8	Governance is articulated through interconnected local entities. There are also some international cultural networks involved. Coordination across scales remains dependent on voluntary collaboration.		
General question: 9	The site has produced measurable economic outputs, particularly in tourism and creative industries. Socially, it supports alternative participation models. Institutionally, it operates as a parallel system to formal urban governance.		
General question: 10	The current situation is shaped by diversified funding strategies and collective identity. Additionally, institutional selective tolerance influences the sustainability and direction of the reuse process.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i44	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries are maintained through controlled entry and community recognition criteria. There is a shared understanding of who can access and contribute, with governance responsibilities distributed across collectives committed to the site's political and cultural framework.		
Principle: 2	The governance structure is intentionally aligned with local countercultural dynamics and spatial conditions. It prioritizes autonomous cultural production and inclusive programming.		
Principle: 3	Participation is internally extensive, with decisions shaped through assemblies and thematic groups. We pretend to maintain ideological coherence and independence as strategic priority over broader participatory integration.		
Principle: 4	It is based on collective vigilance and continuous activity within space. Informal assessments occur through community feedback and event outcomes.		
Principle: 5	There is no formalized sanctioning system with progressive steps. Responses to non-compliance are typically addressed through dialogue and collective pressure, aiming for corrective rather than punitive outcomes.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution relies on horizontal mediation practices. These mechanisms reduce effectiveness when conflicts involve external actors.		
Principle: 7	Institutions from Ljubljana have created a condition of selective tolerance, permitted continued operation but maintained legal ambiguity. This approach imposes structural uncertainty, influencing long-term planning and investment decisions.		
Principle: 8	It is embedded in a network of actors aligned with similar political and cultural agendas. Coordination is informal but functional, facilitating knowledge exchange and program development despite limited institutional integration.		
General question: 9	The site has significant impact as a platform for anti-authoritarian cultural production and social inclusion. Urban effects are mixed due to externalities. Institutionally, it challenges conventional authority.		
General question: 10	The current situation is shaped by activist engagement and adaptive informal management. External pressures, including urban development and political shifts, interact with institutional tolerance to define the evolving operational context.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i45	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The perimeter is physically recognizable, yet governance boundaries remain intentionally porous. Responsibilities are collectively assumed, avoiding hierarchical allocation.		
Principle: 2	Arrangements are deliberately shaped to counter dominant urban and economic logics. They ensure contextual relevance while resisting standard regulatory frameworks that might dilute the project's transformative intent.		
Principle: 3	Resident collectives have strong involvement of. External stakeholders are not systematically integrated, as this could compromise strategic independence. Participation is therefore deep but selective.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring operates through continuous collective presence and mutual accountability. Operational awareness is high due to constant use. Effectiveness is uneven, particularly regarding impacts extending beyond the site's immediate control		
Principle: 5	Corrective actions are informally applied, prioritizing restoration of collective norms. External legal enforcement is considered incompatible with internal governance principles and thus remains an exceptional measure.		
Principle: 6	When parties share common values, dialogue-based mediation among collectives is effective as a conflict resolution method. This works but lacks procedural robustness. Internal mechanisms are sometimes exceeded by bigger conflicts.		
Principle: 7	Ambiguous positioning from public institutions avoids direct confrontation, reflecting a strategic balance between control and reputational considerations.		
Principle: 8	Governance is articulated through a decentralized network of local associations. Coordination with international actors is based on shared political orientations.		
General question: 9	It has significant socio-political impact, fostering alternative cultural production and civic engagement. Urban effects are complex, with both positive activation and negative spillovers.		
General question: 10	The current situation is explained by symbolic legitimacy. External dynamics interact with institutional tolerance to shape an ongoing, contested equilibrium.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i46	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It felt a bit unclear to me. There's like an entrance, but no real gate. People just come and go. I couldn't really tell who is "in charge," it seemed more like everyone and no one at the same time.		
Principle: 2	I'm not totally sure. It's quite different from touristy places, kind of improvised. Maybe it fits the city, but it also feels a bit chaotic.		
Principle: 3	I don't think there is any formal process. It looks like decisions are made by the people already there.		
Principle: 4	Is there any kind of monitoring? I think it's more like people watching each other. It could work somehow but also feels a bit uncontrolled.		
Principle: 5	I have no idea about formal rules. It seemed like if something happens, people just talk. I didn't see security stepping in, which is quite different from the usual thing.		
Principle: 6	I didn't witness conflicts, but I imagine it could get complicated since there's no clear authority to step in.		
Principle: 7	From what I heard, authorities tolerate rather than support. It's surprising something like this can exist without strict control.		
Principle: 8	I couldn't really see any big structure behind it. Maybe they are beyond connected, but as a visitor I can't say.		
General question: 9	It's definitely unique. It's raw and less organized than touristic places. At the same time, it may be problematic for neighbors.		
General question: 10	I think it works because people keep it going themselves and tourists are curious. Also, maybe the city sees it as something interesting to show.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i47	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	There's an entrance, but no tickets or guards like usual places. It feels almost like a public square but a bit hidden.		
Principle: 2	I guess it fits the city vibe, kind of alternative and relaxed, not fancy at all. It seems spontaneous and adapted to younger crowds.		
Principle: 3	I honestly don't know who decides things there. I noticed groups doing their own activities, but I haven't spoken to them.		
Principle: 4	I didn't really see cameras or security. Maybe people working there keep an eye on things. As there weren't obvious problems while I was there, I can't tell you.		
Principle: 5	I didn't see any clear rules or punishments. It seemed like people behave freely.		
Principle: 6	No idea about formal systems. It looks like if something happens, people talk directly.		
Principle: 7	From what I heard at the hotel, the city doesn't fully control it. That's quite different from other cities where everything is regulated more strictly.		
Principle: 8	I don't think there's any big organization behind it. It feels like different groups sharing an improvised space.		
General question: 9	It's a bit rough around the edges. It adds something to the city, though maybe not everyone likes it.		
General question: 10	It feels like a mixture of freedom and not too much control. Compared to other cities, it seems less managed and more spontaneous, for better or worse.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i48	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries felt quite unclear. There are no real borders like fences. Compared to places in my city, it feels more open but also a bit unsafe or uncontrolled.		
Principle: 2	It didn't feel very organized. It looks adapted to a certain crowd, maybe younger or alternative people. For me, it felt messy, not like similar spaces I usually visit		
Principle: 3	I didn't notice any structured involvement. It seemed like only the people already there decided things. As an outsider, you feel like you're just passing through, not participating from space.		
Principle: 4	I didn't really see any monitoring. It felt quite strange. I suppose someone might be supervising, but they won't show out unless something happens.		
Principle: 5	It looked like people just do what they want. That surprised me.		
Principle: 6	I imagine it depends on the people there, which doesn't seem very reliable from a visitor's perspective.		
Principle: 7	Authorities don't appear to be very present. In other Slovenian cities, public spaces are more controlled.		
Principle: 8	There was no sense of coordination like in official cultural centers.		
General question: 9	For me, the impact is mixed. It might attract tourists, but I can see why neighbors could have problems with noise or behavior.		
General question: 10	The current situation may come from the fact that the place is shaped by the people inside more than by any authority.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i49	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	It looks semi-open, like a tolerated zone. There isn't real sense of rules about who belongs. I know Christiania and even there I perceived clearer roles.		
Principle: 2	I'd say it fits a certain underground culture quite well. The rough look, the common environment... it matches that scene. But for the wider city, maybe it feels a bit out of sync.		
Principle: 3	From what I saw, decisions seem internal, among regulars or collectives. I'm used to similar spaces where assemblies happen, but here I didn't see anything like that.		
Principle: 4	Oversight didn't feel visible at all. No staff walking around, no obvious checks. It gives freedom, which I appreciate. In my country, squats have some internal control. I suppose it will be the same here.		
Principle: 5	I didn't notice any step-by-step reactions. Either nothing happens, or maybe something sudden if things go too far. It felt a bit unpredictable.		
Principle: 6	I guess conflicts are handled informally. That's common in alternative circles. I can't say if there are mediators or anything. It works if people cooperate, but maybe not always.		
Principle: 7	Public authorities seem to keep a distance, maybe on purpose. That allows autonomy but also creates tension. Negotiation is key in these cases.		
Principle: 8	It didn't feel very connected to larger systems, at least visibly. Maybe there are networks behind it, but on-site it feels quite self-contained. I'm used to seeing posters or links to other groups, it's not the case.		
General question: 9	It's vibrant. Urban-wise, it adds character, though maybe not order. I like the energy and I would like to live near a place like this.		
General question: 10	I think it comes from long resistance and strong identity. People built it their way and hold on to that. At the same time, pressure from outside keeps things unstable. It's a balance between freedom and conflict, I'd say.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i50	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	From staying at Celica, I feel the entrance is visible. You pass through a door and suddenly you are inside. I know there are some anticapitalists associations in charge, I don't know the names.		
Principle: 2	The spaces, bars and art all match the crowd. For tourists like me, it's exciting. In my city, cultural places are usually more regulated.		
Principle: 3	I see many different events, so I assume many groups are involved. It feels collective. Still, as a guest, I have not seen decision meetings. I suppose there might be regular assemblies or something like that.		
Principle: 4	I don't really notice formal monitoring. This could work in a space like this as it feels relaxed, almost like self-managed.		
Principle: 5	Nothing looks written or fixed. I guess responses depend on context and people talking directly. Sometimes things calm down naturally.		
Principle: 6	I haven't seen posters noticing formal procedures. Maybe locals know how to handle it better than visitors. It reminds me of some other spaces where everything is solved face-to-face.		
Principle: 7	That freedom given by institutions is probably why it feels so creative. In other similar places, authorities would probably try to formalise everything and punish almost everyone out of the rules.		
Principle: 8	I can sense links to other groups and international cultural networks, but not very visible day-to-day. It feels connected in a soft way, through events and collaborations.		
General question: 9	Socially it feels vibrant and very alive. Urban-wise, it's striking and full of character. Institutionally, it feels unusual but somehow stable enough. Personally, I'm really enjoying staying at Celica and being close to everything.		
General question: 10	I think it's a mix of community energy and cultural reputation. For me as a visitor, it just feels like a place you must visit if you're in the city.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i51	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	There are a gate and signs of control but seems a bit confusing in practice. It's more open than before but still unclear who really decides what happens.		
Principle: 2	It hasn't comfortably adapted enough for residents. Events bring people, but also noise. At night, the site changes the atmosphere in the neighborhood.		
Principle: 3	From what I see, involvement is uneven. There's not much clarity for people living nearby.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is almost nonexistent from what I see. No regular oversight, just occasional police when things get out of hand. Over time, problems like noise or vandalism have increased, so whatever control exists doesn't seem effective.		
Principle: 5	There's no gradual system, not that I've noticed. Either nothing happens, or suddenly the police intervene in serious cases. Day-to-day issues, like disturbances at night, usually go unaddressed, which builds frustration among neighbors.		
Principle: 6	Conflicts mostly spill outside the place. We end up calling authorities rather than resolving anything directly. Inside, I hear they handle things informally, but from our side, it doesn't work well at all.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions seem hesitant. They allow it to continue but avoid strong involvement. Over time, it feels like they tolerate it more than support or regulate it, which leaves both sides unsatisfied.		
Principle: 8	The city promotes it for tourism, but local concerns are ignored. There's a disconnect between what officials say and what actually happens on the ground, especially regarding daily impacts.		
General question: 9	It's mixed, but for me mostly negative. Culturally it may be valuable, I won't deny that, but socially it has brought noise, disorder, and insecurity. The neighborhood has changed, and not always for the better.		
General question: 10	I think it's the lack of clear rules and shared responsibility. Also the political sensitivity around it. Over time, that uncertainty has allowed problems to grow without proper solutions.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i52	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	I've been here many times, and they shift in practice depending on events. It's clear that the city council isn't in charge.		
Principle: 2	It adapts well to local cultural life, especially alternative scenes. It's not perfect, but it responds to real needs of communities. It feels experimental, its informal spirit remains.		
Principle: 3	Different groups have always been involved. In the past it was more direct and grassroots.		
Principle: 4	There isn't structured monitoring, no. It's more based on presence and mutual awareness.		
Principle: 5	I don't think there's a clear system of responses. It depends a lot on the situation and the people involved. Sometimes that flexibility works, sometimes it doesn't. It's not predictable.		
Principle: 6	Conflicts seem to be handled through conversation, when possible. It's informal, sometimes slow, but not absent. From outside, it may look chaotic.		
Principle: 7	Public authorities have been inconsistent. At times they support it indirectly, at others they create pressure. Still, without some level of tolerance, this place wouldn't exist today. So in a way, they've enabled it by not shutting it down.		
Principle: 8	There are connections beyond the site, especially culturally. I've noticed events involving international groups. Different actors move at different levels, and coordination isn't always visible from the outside.		
General question: 9	For me, it's valuable. It brought life to an abandoned area. Yes, there are disturbances, I won't deny that, but it also created a space for expression that didn't exist before.		
General question: 10	I think it's explained by history, strong community identity and the way the city gradually accepted it. Also, its popularity changed everything. What was once marginal is now widely known.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i53	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	The boundaries are not very clear in everyday life. There's an entrance, but people come and go freely. Before, I thought it was more closed off, almost hidden. Now it feels more visible, but it is clear commoners manage it.		
Principle: 2	Honestly, it feels like it doesn't really fit the surrounding neighbourhood. It has its own logic. I'm not sure if the arrangements match local everyday needs.		
Principle: 3	From what I've heard, some NGOs are involved. It used to feel more grassroots. It seems more like decisions are made inside a closed circle, which creates mistrust among people living nearby.		
Principle: 4	I don't really see any clear supervision. Sometimes police show up, but only when something happens.		
Principle: 5	I've never heard about any step-by-step system. It sounds more like either nothing happens or it becomes a police issue.		
Principle: 6	I don't see any proper system for disputes. It's more word-of-mouth or informal talks. When problems go outside, it becomes messy. I don't think there's a proper system connecting both sides effectively.		
Principle: 7	It feels like the authorities keep a distance. They don't shut it down. People say it's a kind of uneasy tolerance that's been going on for years.		
Principle: 8	I don't have a clear picture of coordination. There's talk about cultural networks, but locally it feels disconnected. What happens there and what the city plans don't always seem aligned.		
General question: 9	It's complicated. Some see it as cultural value, others as a source of problems. I feel both pride and frustration.		
General question: 10	Probably politics, I think. Nobody really resolves it, so it just continues like this, with tensions but also a kind of stability.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i54	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	I don't go inside, but I know the gates. From outside it seems people enter freely at certain times. Years ago, it felt more hidden and tense around; now it is calmer. Responsibilities seem to come from the inside.		
Principle: 2	I think the arrangements are partly adapted, but not fully. The area works for cultural events, yet for nearby residents it feels less considered.		
Principle: 3	From what I hear, some groups and the city are involved, but ordinary residents are not really.		
Principle: 4	I rarely hear about any formal control. It seems things are only checked when problems become too visible. Compared to years ago, people now talk more about issues, so monitoring might not be keeping up.		
Principle: 5	I don't think there's a gradual system. That lack of consistency probably makes it harder to manage everyday conflicts.		
Principle: 6	From what I gather, disputes are handled informally, if at all. I'm not sure those internal ways are enough for broader community relations.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions seem cautious. They neither fully support nor fully restrict it. Over time, that hesitation has allowed the place to continue, but also left many questions unresolved.		
Principle: 8	There's a cultural image promoted, but local concerns seem separate. It feels like different agendas coexist without really connecting.		
General question: 9	It has brought cultural life and international attention, but also problems. Living nearby, the tension is noticeable.		
General question: 10	I think it comes from its history as a self-managed space and its strong cultural identity. Over time, tourism increased, but governance didn't fully adapt.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i55	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Years ago, it was more chaotic. Now there is some informal order, but I can't tell who is responsible for what.		
Principle: 2	I think it has become more adapted over time. For residents like me, some nights are harder because of crowds.		
Principle: 3	Participation seems internal mostly, but that hasn't really changed. What has changed is that the city listens a bit more now, at least compared to the early years. Neighbors still aren't central, though.		
Principle: 4	There's no strict system, but I notice fewer extreme situations than before. In the past, nights could get quite out of hand. Now it feels like there's some informal watching, even if not officially organized.		
Principle: 5	No clear progression of measures, but things don't escalate as wildly as they used to. Before, it was more unpredictable. Now, even without formal steps, situations seem to calm down more often.		
Principle: 6	Most conflicts seem to be handled by talking directly or through informal contacts. I don't see a real system. People involved seem to know each other better.		
Principle: 7	Authorities used to be more confrontational. Now they seem to have found a balance—letting it function while stepping in only when needed. That shift has probably helped reduce friction overall.		
Principle: 8	You can see links with cultural networks beyond the area. Before it felt isolated; now it's more embedded, even if coordination isn't perfect.		
General question: 9	I'd say the impact has stabilized. It used to feel like a constant source of problems. Now it's more predictable, even if not ideal. There's still noise, but also a sense that it belongs to the city.		
General question: 10	Time is a big factor. People adapted, both inside and outside. Also, the city stopped pushing too hard. That combination has made the situation calmer than it once was.		

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i56	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries remain semi-defined and socially constructed rather than legally codified. Access is physically controlled but symbolically open, generating ambiguity between public space and autonomous enclave. Governance responsibilities are internally assumed, producing blurred accountability vis-à-vis municipal authorities.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements are highly contextual, emerging from post-socialist transition, activist occupation, and cultural marginality. Their adaptability reflects path dependency and resistance to commodification, yet limited formalisation reduces capacity to address externalities such as tourism pressure and neighbourhood conflict.		
Principle: 3	Decision-making operates through horizontal, consensus-oriented practices within the activist community. However, inclusivity is internally bounded, excluding external stakeholders such as residents or municipal planners, which generates asymmetries and weakens broader legitimacy across the urban governance system.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is informal, based on peer observation and collective responsibility rather than systematic evaluation. This produces high internal awareness but low measurability. From an institutional perspective, effectiveness is uneven, particularly regarding external impacts like noise, safety, and illicit activities.		
Principle: 5	There is no structured system of graduated sanctions. Responses to misconduct rely on social pressure or, in extreme cases, state intervention under criminal law.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution is primarily ad hoc and relational, relying on negotiation and voluntary compliance. While effective for minor internal disputes, it lacks procedural stability. Conflicts involving external actors often escalate to formal complaints, indicating limited integrative capacity.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have adopted an ambivalent stance: enabling through tolerance and symbolic recognition yet constraining via regulatory uncertainty and episodic interventions. This duality preserves cultural vitality.		
Principle: 8	Multi-level governance is articulated but fragmented. Municipal, national, and transnational cultural networks intersect without full coordination, producing a layered but unstable governance ecology dependent on political cycles and urban development pressures.		

General question: 9	The impact is paradoxical: strong cultural production, identity formation, and urban resilience coexist with externalised social costs. It functions as a counter-hegemonic space yet also contributes to tensions linked to nightlife economies and spatial stigma.
General question: 10	The overall impact is significant in terms of cultural regeneration and urban resilience, but also produces externalities such as nightlife pressure and perceived insecurity. Institutionally, it remains a contested model of commons-based urban redevelopment.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i57	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries are operationally porous and legally unresolved. While entry points exist, user legitimacy is informally regulated by internal actors. This produces governance ambiguity, complicating municipal responsibilities, particularly regarding land-use control and compliance with planning regulations.		
Principle: 2	Existing arrangements reflect historical contingency rather than strategic planning alignment. They partially respond to local cultural demand but insufficiently address current urban pressures, including public health infrastructure deficits, which justify interventions such as the proposed medical facility.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder involvement has been uneven and conflictual. Internal actors dominate decision-making, whereas institutional stakeholders participate through formal planning procedures. This asymmetry generates procedural fragmentation and limits integrative governance, especially in projects requiring spatial reconfiguration		
Principle: 4	Predominantly relies on external observation by municipal services and police reports rather than internalised systems. This creates reactive governance, where interventions occur post-incident, reducing anticipatory capacity.		
Principle: 5	No calibrated sanctioning framework exists within the site. Consequently, minor infractions accumulate without correction, while severe cases trigger disproportionate legal enforcement. This discontinuity exacerbates tensions between autonomy and rule of law.		
Principle: 6	Informal negotiation prevails internally, whereas external conflicts escalate into administrative or legal channels. This dual system is inefficient, as it prevents consistent conflict mediation across stakeholder groups.		
Principle: 7	Public institutions have tolerated self-organisation but within implicit limits. Current planning initiatives aim to rebalance this by introducing regulated functions, including essential urban services.		
Principle: 8	Multi-scalar governance is formally coherent but functionally fragmented. EU-aligned cultural policies, municipal planning strategies, and local autonomous governance operate in parallel, producing coordination deficits and institutional friction.		
General question: 9	The site generates significant cultural capital and urban distinctiveness. However, it also limits functional		

	diversification. From a planning perspective, introducing complementary uses enhances resilience and mitigates mono-functional dependency.
General question: 10	The process is primarily explained by post-socialist urban transition dynamics, path dependency in land reuse, and increasing pressure from strategic infrastructure planning. Cultural valorisation acts as both stabiliser and catalyst within this contested urban governance field.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i58	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Spatial limits are only partially legible. Controlled entry suggests enclosure, yet continuous accessibility blurs distinctions between insiders and visitors. This ambiguity weakens responsibility allocation and contributes to perceived insecurity, especially under nighttime conditions with high-intensity uses.		
Principle: 2	Governance reflects adaptive informality aligned with alternative cultural production, but insufficiently addresses broader urban externalities. Mismatch emerges between internal logics and surrounding residential expectations, particularly regarding safety, public order, and environmental quality.		
Principle: 3	Participation is internally cohesive but externally exclusionary. Organized groups shape decisions, while institutional and neighbourhood actors remain marginal. This selective inclusiveness produces governance imbalances and limits the integration of diverse risk perceptions into planning processes.		
Principle: 4	There is no structured monitoring framework. Oversight occurs indirectly through complaints, policing, and municipal inspections outside the site. This reactive model fails to systematically address recurring issues such as noise or illicit practices.		
Principle: 5	Sanctioning mechanisms are discontinuous. Everyday misconduct often lacks response, whereas serious incidents activate formal legal enforcement. This gap undermines regulatory proportionality and contributes to a perception of unpredictability in rule application.		
Principle: 6	Conflict management relies on informal negotiation, which is context-dependent and inconsistent. Complex conflicts, especially involving residents, are displaced to formal institutions.		
Principle: 7	Institutional frameworks simultaneously enable cultural activation and constrain redevelopment potential. Support for creative industries coexists with regulatory tension around land use, particularly where strategic infrastructure such as healthcare facilities intersects with existing cultural functions.		
Principle: 8	Governance across scales remains disjointed. Local practices are weakly integrated into municipal and national frameworks, leading to policy incoherence. Strategic projects, such as healthcare infrastructure, highlight the necessity of vertical coordination mechanisms.		
General question: 9	The impact is characterised by urban regeneration and cultural valorisation, enhancing place-based identity		

	and tourism attractiveness. However, it also produces measurable externalities in terms of perceived insecurity and land-use conflict.
General question: 10	The current reuse trajectory is explained by cultural commodification strategies and increasing infrastructure pressure. These dynamics reinforce a contested equilibrium between autonomy and formal planning integration.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i59	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundary definition is hybrid: physically identifiable yet institutionally indeterminate. Access control mechanisms coexist with open-use practices, producing a semi-public condition. This hybridity complicates distinctions between authorised and non-authorised users, affecting governance clarity.		
Principle: 2	Institutional arrangements display contextual sensitivity to alternative cultural economies but remain weakly aligned with evolving urban demands. Informality enables flexibility, yet limits capacity to respond to increasing pressures such as tourism intensity and neighbourhood externalities.		
Principle: 3	Stakeholder engagement is unevenly distributed. Internal actors maintain high participation levels, whereas external stakeholders are incorporated mainly through formal procedures. This creates a dual governance structure with limited deliberative integration across social groups.		
Principle: 4	Municipal oversight depends on episodic inspections and complaints, while internal surveillance is informal. This configuration hinders evidence-based policy adjustments.		
Principle: 5	Regulatory responses lack gradation. This polarisation undermines regulatory consistency and reduces the effectiveness of self-governance practices.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution operates through informal negotiation internally and formal escalation externally. This bifurcated model produces variable outcomes, functioning adequately for just minor disputes.		
Principle: 7	Municipal acquisition in 2008 theoretically provided protective zoning, yet legal frameworks remain restrictive regarding the site's total autonomy. Public institutions oscillate between recognizing Metelkova as a cultural asset and perceiving it as a legal anomaly, creating a precarious balance between organizational empowerment and institutional constraint.		
Principle: 8	Multi-scalar governance articulation is weakly structured. Local autonomous practices operate largely independently from municipal strategic planning, which often reframes the site in cultural or touristic terms. This misalignment generates coordination deficits, despite indirect connections through cultural policy networks and international NGO collaboration.		
General question: 9	The site produces significant positive externalities: cultural vibrancy, social inclusion, and urban identity.		

	Despite some negative spillovers, it enhances resilience and diversifies the city's cultural infrastructure.
General question: 10	Key explanatory factors include historical occupation dynamics, strong cultural capital accumulation, weak formal enforcement, and robust transnational NGO networks. Additionally, the symbolic value of autonomy and increasing touristic commodification shape its persistence, despite ongoing regulatory uncertainty and periodic institutional conflict.

<b>Interviewee code</b>	i60	<b>Place</b>	Metelkova Mesto (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		
Principle: 1	Boundaries are perceptible yet flexible, combining controlled entry with open cultural accessibility. This semi-permeability fosters inclusiveness and urban porosity, although it complicates formal attribution of responsibilities between self-managed actors and municipal authorities.		
Principle: 2	The governance framework represents a radical bottom-up response to post-independence transitions. Governance arrangements are highly responsive to local cultural ecosystems and creative economies. Informality supports experimentation and adaptability, aligning with grassroots urbanism, although it remains partially misaligned with regulatory frameworks governing safety and land use.		
Principle: 3	Participation is intensive within the internal community, structured around horizontal governance. External stakeholders engage primarily through indirect channels. This configuration strengthens internal cohesion while limiting broader co-production with institutional and neighbourhood actors.		
Principle: 4	Monitoring is embedded in everyday practices of co-presence and mutual observation. While lacking formal indicators, this social embeddedness sustains operational continuity. However, it does not fully address external impacts requiring systematic assessment.		
Principle: 5	Graduated sanctions are absent, yet social regulation operates through reputational mechanisms and collective norms. This fosters community accountability, although it may be insufficient in addressing recurrent external disturbances.		
Principle: 6	Conflict resolution relies on dialogue-based practices and negotiated adjustment. These mechanisms function effectively within cohesive groups, but encounter limitations when disputes involve actors outside the shared cultural framework.		
Principle: 7	Institutional tolerance has been crucial in enabling self-organisation and cultural innovation. At the same time, limited formal recognition constrains long-term stability, reflecting a delicate balance between autonomy and regulatory integration.		
Principle: 8	Governance operates through networked relations, particularly with cultural organisations and NGOs. While horizontal linkages are strong, vertical integration with formal planning systems remains partial, affecting policy coherence.		

<p>General question: 9</p>	<p>The impact is dualistic: the site serves as a vital catalyst for cultural production and social inclusion, enhancing Ljubljana's creative resilience. Conversely, the institutional impasse has led to negative externalities, including localized insecurity, challenging the site's sustainability as a stable urban common.</p>
<p>General question: 10</p>	<p>The current situation results from the tension between bottom-up cultural autonomy and neoliberal urban commodification. Metelkova's survival is explained by its international symbolic capital, which functions as a shield against redevelopment, even as it faces increasing pressure from gentrification and institutional demands for formalization.</p> <p>As a planner, I recognize the immense value this cultural hub brings to our city's identity, but how do you believe we can bridge the gap between autonomous self-management and the necessary integration into the formal urban legal framework?</p>