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Abstract

The focus of this thesis is the regeneration of industrial harbor and brownfield areas to properties primed for urban development along the urban waterfront of Oslo, Norway. The project revolves around an empirical study of Tjuvholmen, a privately operated waterfront development scheme, centrally located in the city. The point of departure for the thesis is to explore how Tjuvholmen was conceptualized as urban environment, within a particular model of political-economic conduct, to better understand the relation between the current-day urban development policies and the urban form of waterfront redevelopments.

The thesis frames the case study in a historical framework of political, economic and disciplinary practices in Oslo, tracing urban waterfront redevelopment in Oslo from the late 1970s. A specific emphasis lays on the area Aker Brygge, developed within a similar model of conduct 25 years earlier. The comparative study of Aker Brygge brings insights to the relations between architectural practice forms, political economic practices, and the project-based development strategies that characterize Oslo’s urban waterfront today. The project relates to a broad scope of urban research that scrutinizes forms of fragmentation, gentrification and aesthetics of urban landscapes, within the political-economic context of what David Harvey has labeled “the entrepreneurial city,” but is fundamentally based on a morphological approach to research on the city. The aim is to disclose how ideals and interpretations of the city affect Tjuvholmen as urban environment, and expose the dynamics of architecture and urban form within entrepreneurial forms of urban planning and governance.
Motivation

The public realm has been a long sustained interest throughout my training and practice as an architect, further triggered by the unfolding of Fjord City along Oslo’s waterfront. As a long-awaited and highly profiled reclamation process, the project swiftly sparked controversy, where critiques were raised towards the laissez-faire policies of the Oslo government. Oppositely, the new emerging harbor front impressed and sparked pride in the population of a city often overshadowed by the more cosmopolitan vibe of Stockholm and Copenhagen. Independent of whether these new spaces actually performed as they were meant to, the different conceptions rendered visible that the way we understand and interpret the built environment is biased by what purposes we assign the urban spaces of the city. For me, the specific role of architecture is especially interesting to explore, including how large-scale urban space development schemes are organized and executed. Rather than commencing a study of user experiences related to these spaces, this led me to question the role architecture plays as creator and mediator of new urban environments. It further directed me towards questioning how neo-liberal forms of political economic practice affect such developments. In this context, Tjuvholmen, as a contemporary waterfront development, allowed for both physical explorations and detailed inquiries into the processes that led to its realization.

Having completed the work, I would like to thank those that directly or indirectly made this thesis possible: The contributions from my patient and persistent supervisors Jonny Aspen and Peter Hemmersam were essential. Jens Kvorning’s insightful comments were more than helpful in the final phases of the work. I am also grateful for my parents’ both personal and professional backing, and for the support from my friends. I would particularly like to thank Mirza Mujezinovic for our rewarding and entertaining exchanges throughout the years, and the various projects our collaboration has led to in Norway and abroad. Finally, my gratitude goes to Linda for her love and support, David for hanging in there, and especially, my son Hartvig, for being himself.
I Introduction: Towards Tjuvholmen
1 Thesis Focus

In spite of the scrutiny to which the entrepreneurial city has been subjected, there has been a surprising lack of attention given to the architectural form of such redevelopments, particularly the myths and meanings, which they themselves project. - Phil Hubbard

The quote above belongs to geographer Phil Hubbard, taken from a now 20-year-old article on urban design and social representation. In the text, Hubbard argues that while there is a substantial body of research addressing the transition from “managerial” to “entrepreneurial” forms of governance in the city, studies of the physical urban landscapes of this era remain underexplored. Hubbard is preoccupied with the role urban design and architecture play within “entrepreneurialism,” particularly with how meaning and symbolism is produced and used by corporate developers to legitimize them. Notwithstanding the two decades past since Hubbard published his study, his claim still seems to hold legitimacy: Despite the many large scale architectural schemes in the city commencing from project-based urban development concepts, in-depth studies of urban form that explore the interactions between political economic practices and architecture remain few.


3 “Project-based urban development” is a term used by e.g. architect and researcher Elin Børrud to describe how the development of urban form in the Oslo context increasingly is driven by private, large scale urban development projects. She describes the result of project based urban development as “peacemeal urban development” (Bitvis byutvikling). Elin Bør rud, Bitvis byutvikling: møte mellom privat eiendomsutvikling og offentlig byplanlegging (PhD diss., Oslo School of Architecture and Design, 2005).
RESEARCH FOCUS

Addressing new urban waterfront redevelopments as built form within the entrepreneurial city here implies discussing them as physical objects (urban form), a particular mode of conduct (project-based urban development), within a specific political-economic climate (entrepreneurialist forms of governance). I therefore scrutinize waterfront developments not only as architectural manifestations, but also as real estate development models catered for within a system of political economic conduct.

The thesis specifically explores the built environment of a recent waterfront development project Tjuvholmen in Oslo. Tjuvholmen, a privately-operated urban development scheme centrally located in the cove Pipervika, was completed in 2014 as the first project to be realized within Oslo’s development plan for its urban waterfront, called the Fjord City Plan. Today, Tjuvholmen is a mixed-use area of high-end office functions, housing schemes and various leisure and culture programs, set in a pedestrianized streetscape of cafés, restaurants and art galleries. Notwithstanding the massive development of Oslo and Oslo’s waterfront the last decades, there have been relatively few studies on the built environment resulting from the transition from managerial to entrepreneurial forms of governance in Oslo.

The “city-ness” of cities

The focus on the built environment in the thesis specifically addresses the “physical public realm” of cities. I label the urban fabric and spaces of the physical public realm as “urban environments,” defined by urban form, infrastructure, architectural expressions and functions, as well as the forces that condition them in terms of ownership and use. The specific urban environments discussed here are privately developed and administrated waterfront areas, boasting various leisure and attraction programs. I posit that such urban environments are conceptualized with specific purposes in mind that can be identified and addressed. I also believe that these environments are informed by different normative conceptions on the role and meaning of the physical public realm of cities. The many conventions, connotations and definitions of the city and the urban demand that a clarification for how this public realm can be understood: In Europe, the common spaces of the city have historically been linked to the Agora of the Greek polis. These spaces were attributed specific symbolic and functional roles, as areas of particular

---

5 Linking urban culture to the aesthetics of urban form was most famously discussed by Camillo Sitte, linking the Roman Forum and Greek Agora with the “Festival Hall,” noting how “dramatic performances” took place in scenographic urban spaces that had the character of the atriums of single family dwellings, and decorated as “interiors.” Camillo Sitte, The Birth of Modern City Planning, George R. Collins, Christiane Crasemann Collins, and Camillo Sitte (New York: Rizzoli, 1986), 141–150.
social, commercial and political significance in the city. The Roman connection between “Urb” and “Civitas” was seen as the ideal socio-spatial relation in the city, reflected in the organization of settlements built around the Forum. Both displayed a linkage between cultural functions and particular spatial configurations of urban form. Renaissance architects evoked Roman ideals, and organized the city through urban designs based on the “primary straight street,” “grid iron based districts” and enclosed spaces, encompassing “squares, piazzas and places.” Renaissance urbanists aestheticized and organized the city as a spatially delimited unit. But while the cities of the early renaissance era were defined by various institutional criteria (legal status and systems of government, privileges of production and trade, scale and extention), the contemporary city lacks such definite spatial, cultural or economic demarcations.

Although the city’s administrative borders remain, its social, cultural and economic imprint today is defined by a “territory of integrated functions,” encompassing metropolitan areas or large scale urban regions. Rather than its morphological characteristics, it is the degree of functional integration that delimits the territory of the contemporary city. The city, however, can also be identified through capacities linked to the containment and densification of people and functions, intensity of economic and cultural activity, or the multitude of cultural, social and functional structures, as well as specific economic and institutional roles. Such definitions do not attempt to provide geographical delineations, but rather to identify certain common features specific to the “urban” as basis for studies of the city as a physical, economic and socio-cultural territory.

Within these studies, several have attempted to define “the urban” as a specific social and cultural condition defined by the intensity, diversity and multitude the city potentially has to offer. Sociologist Saskia Sassen prefers the term “city-ness” to describe such conditions. She notes that “urbanity” is a charged word, often associated with cosmopolitanism and sophistication (“urbane”), as well as particular spatial types where such forms of cultivation take place. Sassen does not see the urban as representing a specific culture, but rather to harbor a social potential, derived from the multitudes of certain

9 Quantitative data is the most widespread model for delineating urban territories See e.g. “Population and land area in urban settlements,” Statistics Norway, 1 January 2015.” Retrieved 14 September 2016.
10 “Bydefinisjon – geografisk avgrensning” Storbyprogrammet.
urban areas. Throughout the 20th century, urban theorists have attempted to substantiate how the city can be seen to represent a specific social condition: In Georg Simmel’s seminal text “Metropolis and Mental Life,” the urban constituted a particular experience, based on the money economy and the “metropolitan man.” For Simmel, the city represented a specific culture enabled by the contestation of people and goods, where the metropolitan man evolved particular abilities that were specific to the urban condition in which he dwelled. Louis Wirth attempted to quantify these thoughts in “Urbanism as a way of life”, where the urban condition was tied to large size, density and social heterogeneity. The historian Lewis Mumford similarly defined the city as an entity that inherently revolved around the social: In his seminal article “What is a City,” he defined the city as “a geographic plexus, an economic organization, an institutional process, a theater of social action, and an aesthetic symbol of collective unity.” Mumford thus delimited the city by both its geographic, economic, institutional and symbolic characteristics, but first and foremost defined it by its social agency, arguing that the city is first and foremost a “social drama,” and that human settlements in the new, poly-nuclear city should be dramatized through appropriate individual and urban structures.

Simmel, Wirth and Mumford explored the interplay between the urban as a political economic entity of a certain scale and density, and the urban as a social condition. But where Simmel speculated in how the city forms man, Mumford accentuated the notion of community, and addressed how the city can be formed to accommodate man’s needs, as a social being, through regarding the city as a “theater of social action.” Philosopher Walter Benjamin similarly saw the city as a socio-cultural phenomenon, but for Benjamin, “the urban” emerged in the interrelation between personal experience and various cultural expressions. Danish urban geographer Jon Pløger defines this as meaning that appears between on one side, societal mythology and forms of collective symbolization, and on the other, individual interpretation. Urbaneity, thus, can be regarded as experiential, or as Pløger puts it; an inter-weaving of experience, reflection and practices.

12 Jonny Aspen and John Pløger, utilize “vitalism” as concept to provide a theoretical basis for this mode of approach. Jonny Aspen and John Pløger, The Vial City (Den Vitale Byen) (Oslo: Scandinavian Academic Press, 2015).
16 Ibid.
17 Pløger, “Tracing urban theory,” 23.
18 Ibid., 19.
Analyzing Tjuvholmen as urban environment

While the thesis asks how the urban spaces of the city are linked to certain experiences, or associated with particular social or cultural abilities, it does not pursue a more subject- or content specific definition of the urban. Here, urban space is a term that labels those spaces that are partly or permanently open for public use, regardless of whether these spaces are public or private properties, the amount of control they are subjected to, or the extent to which they offers particular experiences linked to “city-ness.”

Neither does the thesis address the city as a personal experience interrelating with cultural expressions. Rather, with Mumford in mind, it focuses on material urban space and the production of new urban environments, coined to describe new urban areas produced through project-based urban developments. The specific case study explored here exemplifies such an architectural scheme, aimed towards cultivating a distinct urban environment. The development of such environments might be motivated by specific ideas and values connected to use, or be derived from certain aesthetic and spatial preferences, that represent or facilitate forms of social congregation. On the other side, they can be aimed towards obtaining strategic goals linked to increasing property prices or attracting particular user groups to the area, involving the instrumentalization of urban space for commercial purposes through mythmaking and mediation. In other words, it is assumed to be a realm of differently motivated intentions and ideas that become, through different means, conceptualized as an urban environment on Tjuvholmen.

The thesis questions and discusses this conceptualization, attempting to shed light on the interrelations between political economic practices, real estate development and architectural practice in the urban environments of new waterfront redevelopments. In the context of Tjuvholmen, I posit that such forms of conceptualization are linked to three main aspects: First of all, it is linked to its preconditions, meaning the different political, economic and socio-cultural factors that inform and define its development envelope as project in the city. The second aspect regards how the project is defined as development scenario within this development envelope. Finally, it is linked to architectural practice and the project seen as built. Thus, it is in the intersection between, political prerequisites, development strategy and architectural articulation that Tjuvholmen is conceptualized as urban environment.

---

20 The terms concept, conception and conceptualize respectively refer to “an abstract idea generalized from particular instances,” the “capacity, function, or process of forming or understanding ideas,” and “to form (an idea, picture, etc.) of something in your mind.” Source: Merrian-Webster Dictionary. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The thesis’ prime emphasis on the urban environment (instead of e.g. office or housing facilities) of waterfront redevelopments, is based on the notion that such environments plays a particular important role within the project-based urban developments discussed: Both Tjuvholmen and Aker Brygge are projects whose building mass are built up around urban environments supporting a range of different amenities and various commercial functions. Thus, both from a political and commercial perspective, the physical public realm of large-scale projects for the city play a key role in contemporary urban development processes. I investigate how these projects are conceptualized as urban environments, meaning that the urban spaces, buildings and functions of Tjuvholmen are, through different means, articulated to facilitate its various assigned purposes, while simultaneously instituting a coherent, distinguishable physical urban environment in the city. This leads to the following research question:

**How was Tjuvholmen conceptualized as an urban environment?**

The research question implies a broad approach to the built urban environment of Tjuvholmen, including how it came into being, and how it was developed as a site for commodity exchange, social congregation, and community building. In order to develop a more concrete research design, I introduce three sub-questions:

1: *What are the important components of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as it appears today?*

The first sub-question addresses Tjuvholmen as a realized urban environment. Approaching this question involves an analysis of Tjuvholmen as concrete urban form, as a symbolic realm, and finally, as a mediated urban environment. The form, iconography and dissemination of Tjuvholmen constitute the thesis’ main analytical topics, supported by the two subsequent questions.

2: *How was Tjuvholmen conceived as a development scenario?*

The second sub-question addresses the development scenario behind the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as urban environment. This involves studying the development structure of Tjuvholmen, meaning how the Tjuvholmen area was primed for development, its juridical and strategic frameworks, as well as the architectural development scheme comprised by the Tjuvholmen competition entry articulated by architectural office Niels Torp Architects AS.
3: How do these conceptualizations reflect urban development policies?

The third sub-question addresses how the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as urban environment can be interpreted in context of entrepreneurial forms of governance. The basis of this analysis consists of a historical review of the relations and dynamic between urban development and urban development policies in Oslo, from the late 1970s until the development envelope for Tjuvholmen was defined three decades later.

The three sub-questions are used as a basis for the thesis’ three main parts, preceded by this introduction, (part I) and succeeded by the conclusion. (part V) Each part make out an assessment related to Tjuvholmen as urban environment. Below, I approach the sub-questions in reverse: The empirical enquiries of the thesis is initiated by the focus presented in the third sub-question, followed by addressing the second, and concluding with approaching Tjuvholmen as built environment, as described below.

RESEARCH DESIGN

To approach the research question, I apply a morphological approach to urban form. “Urban morphological research” encompasses a tradition of research based on studies of “[…] urban form, and on the agents and processes responsible for their transformation […]”21 In the context of this thesis, this means that the analysis of urban form is supported by studies of both the project’s preconditions for development, as well as its means of production. This approach is diachronic in the sense that the built environment is regarded in context the different forces that over time conditions urban form.22

The morphological approach to Tjuvholmen adopted here first approaches urban form in the perspective of the political economic forces that precondition it. Secondly, it approaches urban form in light of its development scenario, meaning the production of Tjuvholmen. Thirdly, it approaches urban form as a physical, urban environment in the city, addressing Tjuvholmen through its urban form, its symbolic meanings and as a disseminated urban environment in the city.23

---

22 Ibid., 37. “Diachronic” and “synchronic” modes of analysis in urban morphological research are inherited from linguistic theory, referring respectively to a historical understanding of how language evolves, and language as system in itself. It has been argued that synchronic and diachronic relationships must “cohabitate” in “urban morphological processes.” Eduardo Camacho-Hübner and Francois Colinay, “Preliminary insights on continuity and evolution of concepts for the development of an urban morphological process ontology,” in Ontologies for urban development, eds Jaques Teller, John R Lee and Catherine Roussey, (Berlin, Heiderberg: Springer, 2007), 95–108.
23 The three angles thus both correspond with the research sub-question, as well as with approaches within morphological research, where the historic, “morphogenetic” and morphological aspects of urban form is accentuated. This is further addressed in the section on morphological theory below.
The thesis is divided in five parts. Part one encompasses three chapters where the current chapter (chapter 1) addresses the thesis focus, chapter two provides a theoretical backdrop for the thesis, and chapter three introduces urban morphology research as approach and method. Part two three and four constitute the empirical enquiries of the thesis. Each of these is further subdivided in three chapters and followed by summarizing remarks, exposing intermediate findings and preliminary conclusions. Part five closes the thesis with a conclusion based on the summarizing remarks of each chapter and an overall assessment of how the work answers to the initial research question: How was Tjuvholmen conceptualized as urban environment. The following sections outline the three main empirical parts of the thesis, found in parts two, three and four.

**Part II Preconditions: From Aker Brygge to Tjuvholmen**

Part two details the political and economic practices that lead to the current day urban development policies Tjuvholmen emerges within. It reports on how the urban waterfront evolved from an early vision in the late 1970s, to the municipal “Fjord City Decision” that emerges three decades later. Here, the waterfront redevelopment Aker Brygge is discussed as a historical reference and a comparative study to that of Tjuvholmen. Part two also touches upon the historical origins of commercial waterfront developments located in North American harbor projects emerging in the late 1960s and 1970s. Part two consists of three main empirical enquiries:

Chapter 4: The first empirical enquiry identifies the spatial context and evolution of the Oslo waterfront. This enquiry encompasses a study of how this large-scale transformation process was initiated, providing a historical backdrop for waterfront redevelopment in Oslo, where the city’s harbor was conceptualized as sites for new urban environments in Oslo through the competition The City and the Fjord – Oslo year 2000 (Byen og fjorden – Oslo år 2000).

Chapter 5: The second empirical enquiry discusses Oslo’s first realized waterfront redevelopment Aker Brygge, a project with several comparable characteristics to that of Tjuvholmen, including the architect involved. It discusses its conceptual framework, economic backdrop and its imprint in the city both as urban environment and development model.

Chapter 6: The third empirical enquiry addresses the transition from managerial to entrepreneurial forms of governance in Oslo, and how urban development can be interpreted in light of these political economic practices. It addresses the recent spatial politics that preconditioned the Fjord City vision, the Fjord City plan and ultimately, Tjuvholmen.
Part III The Production of Tjuvholmen

In order to answer research the second sub-question, part three of the thesis explores Tjuvholmen as development scenario, meaning that I discuss Tjuvholmen’s development prerequisite, juridical and strategic frameworks, and architectural development scheme. This involves scrutinizing the Tjuvholmen sales competition and the subsequent contracts and zoning plans, the economic strategy of the owner group, and the architectural conceptualization of the competition entry “Utsyn.” Part three thus encompasses the following empirical enquires:

Chapter 7: First of all, there were formal prerequisites defined in the Tjuvholmen competition program and competition process. Here, the Tjuvholmen sales-competition can render visible both mandatory and latent requirements that conditioned how Tjuvholmen was conceptualized as urban environment.

Chapter 8: Subsequently follows the study of Tjuvholmen’s strategic and juridical framework. Tjuvholmen is owned and administered by private agents, who through juridical contracts, zoning documents and real estate development strategies articulated a development scenario for Tjuvholmen. These elements are therefore also seen to condition how Tjuvholmen was conceptualized as urban environment.

Chapter 9: The third enquiry addresses how Tjuvholmen was conceptualized as architectural vision and idea. This encompasses the disciplinary backdrop of architect Niels Torp, and his conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as architecture and urban district in Oslo.24

Part IV Tjuvholmen as urban environment

In order to answer the first research sub-question, part four constitutes a morphological analysis of Tjuvholmen that explores the structure, organization and volumetric buildup of Tjuvholmen as architecture and physical environment. The outset here is Torp’s conceptualization of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as volumes, spatial sequences and building types, including Torp’s use of architectural metaphors and motifs. It further portrays how the area facilitates and accommodates specific forms of use and activities, addresses symbolic aspects of the urban environment through an iconographic analysis, and finally addresses the dissemination of Tjuvholmen as urban environment:

Chapter 10: The first empirical enquiry of part four addresses the volumetric build up and architectural form, structure and programming of Tjuvholmen as built. This includes the spatial organization of voids,

24 Throughout the thesis, Niels Torp Architects AS will be referred to by its principal Niels Torp, or architect Øyvind Neslein that was project leader on Torp’s buildings on Tjuvholmen. (Partner since 2014)
volumes, infrastructure and programming, planned through both organizational and compositional parameters for design. It involves scrutinizing how the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as urban environment manifests as physical spaces in the city.

Chapter 11: The second enquiry of part four addresses the urban environment of Tjuvholmen as symbolic realm through an iconographic analysis. This analysis not only addresses architecture and urban form as aesthetic expressions, but also scrutinizes both programming and spatial organization as symbolic aspects of Tjuvholmen as urban environment.

Chapter 12: The final empirical enquiry of part four is the dissemination of Tjuvholmen outwards. This involves addressing how Tjuvholmen is disseminated as urban concept, environment, investment-opportunity or destination in the city. The reason why mediation is identified as an enquiry on the morphological analysis of Tjuvholmen as urban environment is due to the perceived interplay between, on one side, architectural representations and descriptions of the built environment, and the physical urban environment on the other. This also includes different place-making strategies that disseminate Tjuvholmen as an urban community, a culture destination, or investment opportunity.

**Tjuvholmen as a critical case**

The broad empirical scope of the thesis is based on the notion that Tjuvholmen constitutes a **critical case**: “A case with a strategic significance in relation to an overall problem or discussion.”

Several observations support this position: Firstly, the negotiations around the use and ownership of the area were crucial for the instigation of Oslo’s Fjord City development program. Secondly, the project’s central location and role as a “flagship development” suggest that the project might have substantial imprint on later development projects and processes in Oslo. Thirdly, it shares faculties with the adjacent Aker Brygge development, a project initiated in 1982 that in development model and format is comparable to Tjuvholmen. Finally, the project is a clearly delimited, recent development with a defined owner group and relatively few involved “agents of change” and thus suited for the discourse of this thesis.

---


26 Franco Bianchini, John Dawson, and Richard Evans, “Flagship projects in urban regeneration,” in *Rebuilding the city: Property-led urban regeneration*, ed. Simon Davoudi et al. (London: E. & F.N. Spon, 1992), 252. Flagship developments are described as “significant, high-profile and prestigious land and property developments which play an influential and catalytic role in urban regeneration.”

Using an approach that scrutinizes Tjuvholmen as built environment in context of its development framework and means of production, is also kin to the concept economic geographer Bent Flyvbjerg labels as “progressive phronesis,” a term referring to how relations of power are regarded as a vital part of a case study’s context.28 It can further be seen to be in accordance with Henri Lefebvre’s definition of architecture and urbanism as a “social practice” involving multiple agents.29 Approaching architectural projects and urban designs as informed, not only by architectural designs, but also by parameters external to specific disciplinary practices, further resonates with the work of Albena Yaneva, who in her book *Mapping Architectural Controversies* argues that regarding “society” and “architecture” as separate constructs renders the former isolated as domain, and the latter reduced to a static artifact.30 Yaneva’s perspective is that the built environment is better understood through understanding its constituting processes rather than exclusively evaluating its qualities as object.

Similarly, the perspective adopted in this thesis regards urban form as more than a mere product of political economic practices. Rather, urban environments emerge as products of processes that involve the synthesis of different political economic practices, disciplinary ideologies, architectural objectives, building technology and production strategies, but also differing conceptions in terms of how such environments should perform and what it entails to build “public realms” in the city. By addressing the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as urban environment, I aim to unveil some of these interrelations.

In terms of waterfront redevelopment research, this approach is also akin to what Desfor and Laidley define as the “fixity and flow” of waterfront change where “fixities” label the built environment, institutional structures or cultural practices, while “flows” describe the liquid processes of capital accumulation, information or labor.31 They point to waterfronts as liminal spaces, which through history have been transient and marginal sites, defined by transformation. While their focus on transformative processes attain a much larger philosophical perspective than the framework of this thesis allows for, their perspectives underline the relevance of regarding the

---

28 In his discussion on the value and use of case-studies for research, economic geographer Bent Flyvbjerg define a research-method he labels “progressive phronesis,” derived from Aristotle’s ethics and Foucault’s discourse on power. Progressive phronesis is a method used to address the relations of power as a vital part of a case study’s context. Flyvbjerg, *Rationalitet og magt*, 69–89.
30 Yaneva argues that while the architectual object traditionally either is regarded as a separated product of capitalist forces, or a means to obtain specific objectives (e.g. social control), architecture can be approached in a “non-representational way”. Nevertheless, while Yaneva denounces the symbolic in architectural analysis, the iconography of urban environments is here regarded as relevant to address, as discussed below. Albena Yaneva, *Mapping Controversies in Architecture* (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012), 2.
“fixities” of the built environment as dialectic to the many “flows” involved in waterfront transformation and redevelopment.32

Empirical Material
In order to address the research questions, the empirical approach is based on interviews, architectural drawings and representations, press material, juridical documentation including formal plans, and a diverse amount of media coverage and articles related to the area:

1 Architectural representations, juridical and political documentation
A central empirical source to approach both Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen are the architectural representations, including sketches, illustrations, diagrams or technical drawings of each project. This material includes both initial sketches and early representations of architectural visions, as well as the renderings and plans of the apartment sales prospectuses. These are supported by juridical and political documentation, including strategic municipal plans and zoning plans, written accounts from the involved architects, and various forms of abstracts from political approval processes, contracts, and building permits relevant for the developments discussed.

2 Interviews
The empirical material is also gathered by interviews with central agents of the development. They provide insights to particular and personal approaches of individuals, as well as giving insights to specific parts of the Tjuvholmen development. The interviews provide first-hand information of how events were played out, from the perspective of the specific agents interviewed. Here, Kjell Wester, head of the Aker Brygge development, provided insights into the Aker Brygge process, supported by perspectives from architects Fredrik Torp and Peter Butenschøn. The latter have also provided insights into the changing urban development policies in Oslo in the era discussed. Architects Øyvind Neslein and Torhild Gausereide of Niels Torp as architects, as well as Niels Torp himself, have given accounts for both the Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen developments as architecture and development process. Øyvind Bøyum, former CEO of the Tjuvholmen owner group’s development company Tjuvholmen KS, now CEO of Aspelin Ramm, represents the developer perspective on Tjuvholmen. I have chosen Bøyum as a main informant due to his position as responsible CEO for the development, mediating between architects, contractors and the leader group.

32 The authors refer to Gilles Deleuze and his concept of reterritorialization and deterritorialization, where the city is “both the basis for, and the an result of, processes of urbanization.” Ibid., 7–8.
Finally, an interview with Ole Christian Apeland, who was responsible for public relations and the media strategy of Tjuvholmen, has provided information about Tjuvholmen seen as a media phenomenon and branding strategy. The interviews are taped and conducted in Norwegian.

3 Published material, press material and prospectuses
The research has also included the multiple publications, books and reports published on Tjuvholmen. Here, several publications from the owner group have been helpful, where written interviews with central agents have supplemented the empirical material gained from interviews and through media. As the thesis discusses the conceptualization of the urban environment of Tjuvholmen, such publications might be regarded as part of a larger branding and place-making strategy, while also providing insights into the process of development, are informative. The many sales prospectuses and pamphlets on Tjuvholmen are also included here.

4 Various printed and digital media
Forms of mass media are here seen to be crucial for any large-scale development project in the urban core, and are regarded as a key element of both Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen. This includes using newspaper articles and interviews as empirical source, as well as advertisement material and strategies that involve mass media, including web pages, pamphlets or forms of social media.

5 Observations
The empirical approach of this thesis is also founded on observations conducted on site, as visitor and user throughout the development of Tjuvholmen. As an observer, I have experienced Tjuvholmen as an industrial harbor-front pier, as a slate for projection of a diverse set of different development scenarios, and a building site that successively opened its completed urban spaces for visitors as they were developed. I later followed the sales procedures of the apartments and offices of its separate building phases, and finally experienced it as a completed urban environment and destination along the waterfront. My morphological analysis is therefore also based on on-site physical registrations.

33 Below, I use the term "owner group" to describe the constellation of corporate developers that built Tjuvholmen. This group comprises of corporates Selvaag Gruppen and Aspelin Ramm.
34 Alex Krieger defines place-making as “the provision of distinctive, lively, appealing centers for congregation to alleviate the perceived homogeneity of many and large urban areas.” Alex Krieger, “Where and How Does Urban Design Happen,” in Urban Design, eds. Alex Krieger and William S. Saunders (Minneapolis: Minnesota Press, 2009), 120.
Related research

The thesis relates to a broad scope of urban research and theorization scrutinizing the fragmentation, gentrification and changing aesthetics of urban landscapes, including research based on the emergence of the “entrepreneurial city” and its effects on planning practice. These comprise studies of what is referred to as “packaged developments” and the social imprints of such environments in the urban cores and waterfronts. Linked to juridical and political reforms initiated in the late 1970s and the emergence of “new governance” as tool in public administration, urban theorists have analyzed the political economic practices tied to a perceived commodification of urban space. The focus on the impact of globalization on the redevelopments of cities in Europe has been explored through numerous case studies, focusing on the socio-spatial and of the political economic configurations of cities. The commodification of urban space has been linked to various culture strategies involved in the consumption of cities. Its impact on the cities worldwide has been discussed by several that have problematized the public domain of these areas, and the “quasi-public role” of private forces in urban development. The research especially finds kinship in studies of urban form and the production of the built environment. Especially relevant is research conducted on the relationships between political economic practices and urban development. But the focus can also be seen in context of the numerous architects and architectural theories that deal with how we can understand and interpret urban space and the built environment. The work can further be seen in context of urban waterfront redevelopment research that has been discussing and comparing projects on a global scale, and with a broad analytical approach discussing the first and second-generation waterfront projects in the last decades of the

38 See e.g. Steven Miles, Spaces for Consumption (London: Sage Publications Ltd, 2010).
39 Jon Lang uses the term “quasi public” to describe the condition where public institutions rely on private investment for realizing public realms in the city. Jon Lang, Urban Design, 19.
40 The work of Phil Hubbard’s as well as Albena Yaneva has already been mentioned above.
41 Matthew Carmona has done extensive research into the process of making in planning and urban design. For example, his study of Dockland’s Isle of Dogs concludes in five planning models describing an era in waterfront development. Matthew Carmona, “The Island of Dogs: Four development waves, five planning models, thirty-five years, and a renaissance… of sorts,” Progress in Planning 71 (2009): 87–151.
42 From Kevin Lynch’s Image of the City, to Rem Koolhaas’ Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan, the thesis is inscribed in a tradition for architectural research on urban form and the development of urban form emanating within the architectural discipline.
20th century.\textsuperscript{43} I also encompass more recent research, focusing on the “new wave” of waterfront redevelopments of the 21st century that partake in the “globally scaled growth strategies” of cities.\textsuperscript{44}

Research on urban development practice in Norway relevant for this thesis includes architect and planner Elin Børrud’s Oslo-based research exploring project-based urban developments from the perspective of their planning processes.\textsuperscript{45} Hilde Haslum’s research on “socio-spatial interplay” is based on the city as urban form, exploring the relation between architectural space and social space as a specific urban dynamic.\textsuperscript{46} Heidi Bergsli’s research on harbor-front developments is a comparative study of respectively Marseille and Oslo’s waterfront project, and takes a critical stance to the restructuring of urban areas based on market-driven forces from the perspective of human geography.\textsuperscript{47} Several publications and research reports deal with how forms of governance affect urban development in the Oslo area, and will be referred to accordingly.\textsuperscript{48} There has also been an emphasis on the spatial outcomes of culture-driven strategies for urban development.\textsuperscript{49} Further, research on forms of spatialization of the social is a substantial research tradition at the Oslo School of Architecture and Design, where also this thesis is written. Here, urban theorist and historian Jonny Aspen has published extensively on topics related to the public realm of the entrepreneurial city.\textsuperscript{50} With architect and urban researcher Peter Hemmersam, Aspen is also the supervisor of this thesis. These references have all related trajectories of discourse to those conducted here, with regard to how structural, economic and political changes affect the built environment as physical and as social space.

\textsuperscript{43} Of the most prominent examples are B.S. Hoyle et al. (Eds.) Revitalising the Waterfront: International Dimensions of Dockland Redevelopment (London: Pinter Pub Ltd 1993), and Richard Marshall (ed), Waterfronts in post-industrial cities (New York: Spon Press, 2001).
\textsuperscript{44} Desfor and Laidley, “Introduction,” 2.
\textsuperscript{45} Børud, Bitvis byutvikling: møte mellom privat eiendomsutvikling og offentlig byplanlegging.
\textsuperscript{46} Hilde Haslum, Reading socio-spatial interplay, (PhD diss., Oslo School of Architecture and Design, 2008).
\textsuperscript{47} Heidi Bergsli, Urban Attractiveness and Competitive Policies in Oslo and Marseille – The waterfront as object of restructuring, culture-led redevelopment and negotiation processes (PhD diss., University of Oslo, 2015).
\textsuperscript{48} See e.g. Anne Lise Fimreite & Tor Medalen, Governance i norske storbyer (Oslo: Scandinavian Academic Press, 2005) or Hege Hofstad et al., Kompakt Byutvikling – Muligheter og utfordringer, (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2015)
\textsuperscript{49} See e.g. Marit Ekne Ruud and Oddrun Sæter, Byen som symbolisk rom: hypolitisk, stedsdiskurser og gentrifikasiing i Gamle Oslo (Oslo: Norges byggforskningsinstitutt, 2005).
\textsuperscript{50} See e.g. Aspen and Pløger, Den Vitale Byen.
2 Theoretical Landscapes

As introduced above, the thesis’ approach relates to a tradition of studies of the built environment of cities encompassed by the term “morphological research.” But before presenting a more thorough outline of traditions of morphological research, and where I situate this work within it, I will outline a broader theoretical framework that informs the morphological analysis of urban form. To approach the research question posed on Tjuvholmen, a wide theoretical perspective is called for, that combines knowledge of urban form and iconography with comprehension of political theory related to urban governance. These theoretical perspectives are threefold:

In the first theoretical segment, to address the political economic and social structures that precondition urban form on Tjuvholmen, I utilize theoretical perspectives lent from geographer David Harvey. Further, I give an account for post-Fordist forms of governance. Both perspectives are applied as analytical tools to decipher political economic practice forms in the Oslo context, both in a contemporary and historical perspective.

In the second segment, I address how Harvey’s theorization on entrepreneurialism and the neo-liberal city can be nuanced and contextualized in a site-specific discussion on the Oslo urban waterfront and Tjuvholmen as conceptualized urban environment.

Furthermore, as entrepreneurialism interacts with cultural systems, through symbolic capital and various commodification-processes, I address how these relations have been interpreted within sociological and geographical urban theory, also with regard to the urban waterfront. While the critique towards project-based waterfront redevelopments within these fields of research is substantial, I question whether in-depth analysis of urban form might nuance these decisive conclusions. I further introduce the term “social centrality” and provide a theoretical base of the relation between different “collective practices” and material urban space, and discuss the spatial performances attributed “post-Fordist” forms of production.
THE ENTREPRENEURIAL CITY

The thesis relates to the fields of spatial political economy and urban studies concerned with the role “concerned with urban planning as part of the state apparatus because of its role in the social control and regulation of urban space.” The scope of this thesis is defined by a shift in the global economy in the 1970s and the impact this had on cities globally. The political shifts and economic reforms that occurred in the wake of a globalized and de-industrialized economy had severe implications for urban form and introduced new regimes for urban development that an area such as Tjuvholmen can be seen in context of. Below is an account of theoretical approaches inherited from political economy and governance theory that are used to frame these political shifts and reforms in the Oslo context. The section is initiated by David Harvey’s account for the entrepreneurial city and neo-liberalism, and attempts to nuance these perspectives. Here, geographers Tim Hall and Phil Hubbard provide relevant theoretical insights. Further, I address the “symbolic economy” of the entrepreneurial city, and how entrepreneurial strategies specifically can be discussed as forms of “governance.” Finally, an account for the theorization of the role of urban design in the entrepreneurial city is presented, through the term “flagship developments.”

Origins of the entrepreneurial city

David Harvey rhetorically marks the shift from urban “managerialism” to urban “entrepreneurialism” in urban governance with a reference to a colloquium held at Orleans in 1985, whose origins are found in the recession of 1973. The colloquium focused on how cities could counteract the erosion of their urban economies through innovation and entrepreneurship. This was linked to the transition from a Fordist-Keynesian regime of capital accumulation to a regime of flexible accumulation. The recession undermined the “Fordist compromise” (made between capital and labor) and led to economic restructuring resulting within a new regime of growth, based on new forms of political and social regulation.

52 “Deindustrialization, widespread and seemingly ‘structural’ unemployment, fiscal austerity at both the national and local level, all coupled with a rising tide of neo-conservatism and much stronger appeal (though often more in theory than in practice) to market rationality and privatization, provide a backdrop to understanding why so many urban governments, often of quite different political persuasions and armed with very different legal and political powers, have all taken a broadly similar direction.” David Harvey, “From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism,” 5.
53 Harvey argues that problems with Fordist forms of production emerged in the mid-1960s, due to rationalization and the consequential decrease of demand, and the inability for Fordism and Keynesianism to “contain the inherent contradictions of capitalism.” Harvey points to the fixed ties between large institutions of capital, labor and government, that resulted in a rigid labor market and inflexible forms of production, that together with the inelasticity of overstretched economically governmental social programs led to a monetary policy resulting in high inflation. David Harvey, The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Conditions of Cultural Change (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 142.
was a reaction to the lack of flexibility embedded in Fordist modes of production and organization, and is characterized by a plasticity in terms of labor and consumption patterns, as well as the emergence of new production sectors and a high degree of innovation.54 David Harvey uses the term Neoliberalism to describe a theory where governments facilitate for free markets, free trade and strong private property rights, founded on a belief on individual entrepreneurial freedom as a primary tool for “human well-being.” Harvey defines neoliberalism as an “economic theory of political economic practices” with the following characteristics: It favors strong private ownership, free trade and free markets to secure “individual entrepreneurial freedom” within an “institutional framework” that promotes and facilitates these practices. Where such markets are absent, the state’s role is to create them, if necessary through direct intervention. Once markets are created, the state must keep any further intervention to a minimum. Harvey further argues that the turn towards neoliberalism is omnipresent in any national political economic practice since the 1970s.55 However, this generalization veils the scope and scale of which neoliberalist principles of entrepreneurialism were implemented in the worlds national economies.

**Governance in the entrepreneurial city**

Within entrepreneurialism, various models for governing and developing the city have been established. For David Harvey, the term “New Governance” describes the structural answer to the lack of maneuverability within the rigid bureaucracy of traditional government, and the ideological answer to the new roles and focus of governmental institutions. New Governance, or New Public Management, became strategies set to replace the old institutions of Fordist modernism.56 These were built on the partnership and division of responsibility between public and private institutions, as well as the implementation of entrepreneurialist modes of administration within the public sector. New governance thus describes new forms of socio-political administration, interventions and interactions: “Rather governance signifies a change in the meaning of government, referring to a new process of governing; or a changed condition of ordered rule; or the new method by which society is governed.”57

According to political scientist Roderick Arthur William Rhodes, “governance” refers to a network-based approach to societal administration. Governance describes patterns of organization that to larger extents interact in networks rather than within dichotomies of private-public

---

54 Harvey, The Condition of Postmodernity, 147.
distinctions. The term thereby points to a general mode of political and administrative conduct based on self-organizing, inter-organizational networks that are characterized by interdependence, resource exchange, and game-like interactions that are granted significant autonomy from the state. This includes an inter-organization of public and private sectors along with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), rendering the distinctions between them sometimes diffuse. As control and power is splintered from its traditional and coherent forms of political institutions and new agents are introduced to contribute in policy shaping, we see a process of fragmentation of traditional modes of political organization and forms of governmental power. Understood as a mode of political steering, Rhodes defines New Public Management (NPM) as a form of governance where concepts borrowed from business-management theory are used to effectuate political administration and policy implementation. Here, Rhodes refers to D. Osborne and T. Gaebler’s article “Reinventing Government,” that metaphorically distinguishes between service delivery, understood as “rowing” and policy decision, labeled “steering” in political administration. Where the former represents governmental practices of Fordist modernism, the latter points to how political decision instead is effectuated through “steering” within NPM. Rhodes divides NPM in “Managerialism”, the strategy of introducing private sector management methods to the public sector, including explicit standards and measures of performance, and “New Institutional Economies,” the strategy of implementing market competition between public agencies, thus decreasing bureaucracy and boosting performance within smaller units of administration. 58

In his case studies of Britain, Rhodes shows that the latter is the most prominent in Britain today, suggesting that the introduction of managerialism can be seen as a precursor of the New Institutional Economies. NPM strategies were incorporated both into conservative party politics and embraced by Labour’s “third way” politics in the UK as shown in Rhodes’ example. The drawbacks of new governance in London were in Rhodes’ eyes linked to the fragmentation of the public sector (as obstacle for implementation), problems of steering and sustaining accountability within decentralized networks. In terms of New Public Management, Rhodes points to the contradictions embedded in NPM strategies that implement an intra-organizational focus based on objectives and results, within the administration of inter-organizational networks that inherently undermine them. 59 Rhodes describes how the splintering of traditional modes of government into governance has several, and differing implications for administration. His account for the implementation and evolution of

58 Ibid., 655.
59 Ibid., 662.
entrepreneurialist strategies, and how they can be addressed, is pertinent in terms of understanding urban policy-making and urban development strategies in Oslo.

The cultures of the entrepreneurial city

While governance theory provides insights as to how entrepreneurialist forms of management play out as urban politics, Harvey’s aim is to point to how entrepreneurialism also influences cultural practices in the city. Using New York as an example, Harvey describes the transition to neo-liberal urban entrepreneurialism. Here, the impoverished urban core of the 1960s had led to governmental funding and employment strategies. With President Nixon’s removal of federal aid, a recession ensued where public resources were turned towards facilitating business investment through tax incentives and infrastructure. Harvey links the new focus on culture and tourism to these processes, as well as the emergence of a bourgeois elite and ultimately, the neo-liberalization of culture.60 Harvey sees entrepreneurialism as an agent that affects not only urban politics and urban planning, but also urban culture in North American cities. He specifically links entrepreneurialism to public-private partnerships that are speculative by default (opposed to rational coordinated planning) and focused on the political economy of place over territory: While the impact of place-based public-private partnerships can be far-reaching, there are no guarantees that the effect is not contained within property borders, where public benefits are indirect consequences of political and economic goals.61

For Harvey, urban space within entrepreneurialism is a mere means for accumulating capital on the cost of the territorial and consolidated planning-models that preceded it. In the urban scenarios of Entrepreneurialist development, consumer centers compete by imitating each other on a global level, rendering any competitive advantage temporary, and resulting in a “maelstrom” of various urban innovations, based on consumption.62 Harvey argues that urban designs are a postmodern phenomenon that diverges from modernist forms of planning by accentuating the city as palimpsest of past forms, driven by aesthetic aims devoid of social purpose. Such urban designs are tailored to stimulate aesthetic tastes and preferences, becoming complicit in creating forms of symbolic capital. Architecture and urban spaces thus become tailored to suit consumer demands.63 Harvey’s perspective contrasts
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60 Harvey quotes Rem Koolhaas’ 1978 book Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan as descriptive of a new cultural mindset that “erased the collective memory of democratic New York,” and made it the “epicenter of postmodern cultural and intellectual experimentation.” Harvey, A Brief History of Neoliberalism, 47.
61 With “territory”, Harvey refers to master planning with social objectives, education and housing policies initiated for public benefit in a given area. Harvey, “From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism,” 7.
62 Ibid., 12.
63 Harvey, The Condition of Postmodernity, 77.
that held by the morphologists above, that holds urban form to inhabit forms of knowledge that Harvey’s “material projections” on urban form by external forces seem to overlook. As we shall see below, Harvey’s view is prevalent among geographers and social scientists, which with reference to Harvey or urban theorists such as sociologist Manuel Castells sees post-Fordist entrepreneurial waterfront developments as representing systems that dislodge, reconstruct and commodify urban identities. Simultaneously, there are critics that suggest that such analyses tend to be superficial in regards to understanding the local specificities of such developments sites, as the next paragraphs suggest.

CONTEXTUALIZING ENTREPRENEURIALISM

David Harvey regards urban design as largely following the patterns of commodification under “flexible accumulation”, and that it plays a role in legitimizing forms of new governance under urban entrepreneurialism. As geographer Phil Hubbard argues, Harvey’s analysis of urban entrepreneurialism implies that the commodification of urban landscape both is a means to attract investment through the “cultivation of a new urban aesthetics”, as well as playing the ideological role of “diverting and entertaining” its inhabitants. He further maintains that Harvey’s link between post-modern aesthetics and entrepreneurial place-making has led to a wide range of research dealing with “ideologically charged” entrepreneurial landscapes, where “urban regimes are capable of organizing space and mobilizing its meaning so as to give a semblance of democratic legitimacy for their activities.”

Architecture and urban design in this perspective become tools of specific social, political and economic processes as spatial and aesthetic reflections of power structures and forms of social control.

Nuances of Entrepreneurialism

Nevertheless, the denunciation of new urban environments as mere spatial manifestations of urban entrepreneurialism represents, according to Phil Hubbard, a simplified take on the entrepreneurial landscape. With Geographer Tim Hall, Hubbard also points to public-private partnerships as a means to enable governments’ “capacity to act.” This capacity, they argue, trumps simplistic views on power and dominance. In their critique towards entrepreneurialist theorists, Hall and Hubbard point to three aspects of entrepreneurialist landscapes, the first of which is that the promotion of place is not a new phenomenon: First of all, representations of place and
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64 Desfor and Laidley, introduction, 7.
65 Phil Hubbard, “Urban Design and City Regeneration,” 1444.
community have a longer history than what is conveyed in literature on the entrepreneurial city. Secondly, they criticize the inclination to discuss city imagery and place branding strategies autonomous of the spatial context and cultural systems they engage in. Instead, the focus has been on how such spaces are staged and on larger scales and towards competing spaces elsewhere. The third is the lack of research on how such representations are received and interpreted locally. A final critique posed by Hubbard is on how economy is linked to aesthetics and spatial relations, without regards to the complex relations between economy and culture. He notes that literature on the entrepreneurial city has tended to uncritically link architectural style and urban form with entrepreneurial policies, “failing to elucidate the way the relations of culture and capital are played out in different contexts.” Still, Hall and Hubbard do not attempt to discredit the academic work on the entrepreneurial city, rather they argue that entrepreneurialism has become an academic quick-fix for explaining a wide range of changes that occur within the city, with blind spots yet to be explored by researchers.

This thesis marks a similar attempt to specify and nuance what entrepreneurialist, project-based urban developments entail within the specific context of Oslo, through an analysis of a particular urban environment. The features of this environment, including its urban form, but also the strategies in which urban form emerge, become tools to explore the mechanisms that impact entrepreneurialist practice forms in the city, but through the particularities of one defined context, rather than the generalization of many.

Flagship developments in the entrepreneurial city

The entrepreneurial city is a theoretical model applied here to frame urban development in Oslo within a larger political economic context. This is due to the assumption that while Norwegian governance strategies differ from those found e.g. in the USA, there are parallels that are of particular interest with regards to planning and urban development. Here, the Oslo harbor front becomes concrete manifestations of political economic practice forms that are akin to similar developments elsewhere: The spatial manifestations of the political economic practices of entrepreneurialism are typically developed within the city centers and on urban waterfronts. These developments have been labeled “flagship projects” due to their scale, the prestige of the projects and role as pioneer projects in brownfield areas, symbolically charged due to location and design. As argued above, the conjuncture between leisure,
consumption and tourism makes flagship developments strategic tools not only for local regeneration and economic development in the inner city, but also for external place-branding purposes. As Hubbard notes, the commoditization of urban space “is a requisite strategy to lure external investment to the city,” meaning that harbor-front developments have played a role in a global wave of competition between cities to attract investors, tourists and personnel, facilitated by their respective administrations.71 Flagship projects thus emerge under public-private partnerships, manifesting global competition, municipal governance strategies and the economic prospective of real estate, within an increasingly attractive city core. Both the main case study Tjuvholmen as well as the comparative study Aker Brygge complies with all of the above. This also means that the undertaking of the projects themselves has symbolic meaning on a city scale, implying that they are exceptional projects that deserve a particular focus with regard to securing public interest. It is therefore interesting also to focus on how public institutions define and facilitate for such interest, with regard to the urban environments that are created.

**Tjuvholmen as entrepreneuralist development model**

The discussion here utilizes Harvey’s terminology and theories to scrutinize how political-economic practices have affected the policies and execution models of urban development. Part two will substantiate how both entrepreneurialism and neoliberalism in Harvey’s interpretation can be descriptive and informative terms to the discourse of this thesis. Harvey’s universal critique, however, where commodified urban space is instrumentalized to target consumers, detached from “message and substance,” and legitimized by what they connote, might render superficial when projected on the specific and highly different cases that make out the world’s entrepreneurial urban landscapes. For Hubbard, new urban landscapes should not be regarded as a mere expression of economic or cultural forces, but as implicated in these processes.72 This approach attributes built space with an agency that transcends its role as mere symbolic expression of power or as an aestheticized commodity of accumulated capital. I therefore posit that ideological backdrops, production methods and the built environment might fuse in more complex relationships than Harvey’s argument allows for, and attempts to validate this hypothesis through the exploration of Tjuvholmen as “urban environment.” Here, insights into the dialectics between the commercial and spatial
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71 Hubbard, “Urban Design and City Regeneration,” 1441.
conceptualization of Tjuvholmen conducted by respectively the owner group and architect Niels Torp can exemplify the dynamic between agents and the role architectural representations play within such processes.

Real estate in the entrepreneurial city

Before commencing in the next theoretical section, a final note on entrepreneurialism and real estate development is called for: When this thesis sets out to discuss the dialectics between urban environments, their commercial development framework and political economic practices, it is not because real estate-driven urban development was a novelty emerging out of the late 1970s. Quite the contrary, real estate can be said to have played a crucial role for centuries in urban developments across the world. Architect Richard M. Sommer argues that the figure-ground gestalt of Giambattista Nolli evoked by e.g. Colin Rowe was less a visualization of public and private space (concepts unknown at the time) than a “figurative profile of the Vatican’s holdings following a period of rapid growth in papal power,” meaning that it in reality was a real estate portfolio.73 A later example is Georges-Eugène Haussmann’s boulevards in Paris that were realized with assistance from investors who helped finance the construction of e.g. Rue de Rivoli in exchange for real estate rights.74 Similar logics of development are found in North American cities, where the “speculative impulses so basic to American urbanism” meant that e.g. the distribution of park systems in mid-19th century Chicago was more than anything a key stimulus to the city’s real estate market.75 When the issue of development model, political economic practices and the premises of real estate development is accentuated here, it is based on the rapid political and economic changes of the 1970s and 1980s, that radically altered a regime of synoptic, comprehensive land use planning strategies that had dominated urban development since the Second World War, towards a planning regime where I posit that real estate no longer only was a means for urban development, but also its purpose.

ENTREPRENEURIALISM AND URBAN SPACE

Within urban theory discourse, the dynamics between capital and culture, and the relations between socio-economic processes and the symbolic realm of urban space are addressed by many, some of which are introduced below. In this section, I make an account for the symbolic economies on cities,

74 David Harvey, Paris – Capital of Modernity (New York: Routledge, 2006), 120.
symbolic capital as term, and the interplay between political-economic and cultural practices. Finally, I make an argument for how post-Fordist modes of production and consumption may be discussed in relation to spatial organization.

Urban space and symbolic capital in Oslo

As noted by Harvey, the political-economic practices of entrepreneurialism affect and interact with the cultural systems within the city. Among the most influential concepts that describes this interrelation, was coined by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, whose term “Symbolic capital” refers to a person’s prestige and ranking within social structure. It is based on the notion that symbolic values are tied to capital, production and consumption. Symbolic capital is therefore a legitimized form of other types of capital. 76 Bourdieu regards culture as an active agent within capitalist production, opposed to the “rigid distinctions between the economic base and the ideological superstructure (culture)” of traditional Marxist theory. For Bourdieu, “Ideologies, meaning systems, identity and image are intimately tied to consumption, rendering any isolation of the economy from culture as seriously problematic.” 77 Bourdieu further regards urban design as a way to transform economic capital to “symbolic capital” by forms of “symbolic violence.” 78 To what extent such built environments can be regarded, as a “spatialized form of social and cultural domination” is not disclosed here. But I posit that the investment in e.g. waterfront luxury apartments like those of Tjuvholmen can illustrate convergences from economic to symbolic capital, and that representations of such forms of symbolic capital partake in place-making and branding strategies of the area.

In the larger context of urban development, symbolic capital can also be seen as accumulated by cities as part of a strategy for reinvention to attract investment (including tourists, jobs, companies and wealthy residents), through art, culture and other recreational programs, flanked by the aesthetification of cultural heritage and other identity markers for its main target groups. 79 Geographer Allen J. Scott has called this a “market convergence between spheres of cultural and economic development” that include the commodification of forms of culture (art, history, urban life forms) as well as urban and architectural space, where utilization values are replaced by exchange value. 80 Cultural practices are thus intertwined with entrepreneurial strategies for branding and legitimizing urban development.

77 Cuthbert, The Form of Cities, 18.
78 Pierre Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice, 190.
79 Cuthbert, The Form of Cities, 190.
In light of the recent relocation of several of Oslo’s large cultural institutions towards the city’s waterfront, the “market convergence” of culture and economy is also illustrated by how specific political economic practices merge with cultural practices to precondition the development of new urban environments in Oslo. In the specific case of Tjuvholmen, market convergences between the symbolic value of culture and the economic value of property are granted a specific emphasis, as symbolic forms of capital are seen to play a particularly important role in the development and transaction of real estate. (As we shall see below, the market convergence of art and finance on Tjuvholmen is especially tangible). Furthermore, forms of symbolic capital are thought to affect architectural production itself, in terms of the role architects and architectural representations play in the development processes of Tjuvholmen.

**The social function of entrepreneurialist urban space**

The social function of urban spaces of the entrepreneurial city is duly addressed within urban theory, also within a Norwegian context. One of the theorists discussing the issue in the 1990s was Sociologist Sharon Zukin, who linked the “symbolic economy” to urban entrepreneurialism, where symbols of growth are transformed to economic profit. Within the symbolic economy, “sites of visual delectation” established gentrified place-bound identities where culture was the agent that differentiated between places. Cultural institutions, seen as “specialized sites of consumption” became entrepreneurial tools linked to economic growth. Zukin argued that the symbolic economy feeds back as added value for investment, by merging with commercial culture, or through framing and “humanizing” real estate developments. But for Zukin, the synergies of art, finance and politics found in the new entrepreneurial landscapes to a lesser extent seemed to benefit others than the real estate market, tourist industry and “high cultural institutions.” In terms of consumer behavior, as Jennifer Craik argues, however, there is also convergence between patterns of consumption, leisure and tourism, meaning that the same commodities are offered to different user groups. This perspective points to how new urban environments might accommodate several different target groups through the same amenities offered.

The exclusive and excluding character of entrepreneurialist urban space is further criticized for its homogeneity and lack of ability to perform outside its commercial function: Geographer Steven Flusty uses the term
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“displacement of diversity” to describe this condition. Another geographer, Don Mitchell labels it as the “contrived and controlled diversity” of urban space, accentuating how intentions of multiplicity at best become forced and superficial. Karen Frank and Quentin Stevens introduce the term “loose space” to describe the spatial alternative to this homogenization process. These critiques emerge from the notion that entrepreneurialist urban spaces are supported by forms of formal and informal control that exclude and constrain the use of urban space. Oppositely, “loose spaces” are inclusive, socially flexible and diverse. Similarly, Sociologist Richard Sennett argues that the diversity of cities is what makes them attractive, where the unforeseen and unpredictable is both an opportunity and a potential menace. The city is where you meet the stranger, something that entails both prospects and risks. The performance of a city’s urban spaces is thus tied to how the diverse and unpredictable is catered for, and how forms of social inclusion and control play out in space.

The critiques towards the constructed diversity of entrepreneurial spaces seem almost in unison within sociology and geography, and seem to encompass most flagship developments by default, also in the Norwegian context: While facilitating differential social functions is assumed to be a prerequisite for flagship developments such as Tjuvholmen, such forms of differentiation are seldom seen to create inclusive and diverse urban spaces by researchers studying the Fjord City of Oslo. But while the critique of entrepreneurial urban space within urban theory unveils central problems regarding the aesthetification and commodification of diversity, it to a lesser extent seems to differentiate between these “sites of consumption,” or to discuss their particularities as built environments. Nonetheless, with Hall and Hubbard’s critique of entrepreneurialism as “quick fix” in mind, the architectural production of urban space in flagship developments such as Tjuvholmen seems potentially to comprise more complex relationships than what e.g. Harvey’s link between “capital accumulation” and aesthetics allows for.

The use and grading of diversity, and the various means to facilitate, or represent diversity, is discussed both in regard to Aker Brygge and
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89 See e.g. Bengt Andersen and Per Gunnar Roe, “The social context and politics of large scale urban architecture: Investigating the design of Barcode, Oslo.” *European Urban and Regional Studies*, published online 22 April 2016, ISSN 0969-7764. doi: 10.1177/0969776416643751.
90 Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, 142.
Tjuvholmen below. The review of Aker Brygge in part one covers decades of development and transformation, where architectural ambition, development concept, cultural policies and commercial forces come together in a narrative that might both confirm and contrast some of the views presented above. The study of Tjuvholmen, involving an in-depth analysis of architectural form and the principles and concepts that guide architectural form similarly both represents a viewpoint that lacks within most studies of waterfront redevelopments, that can visualize commodification process as well as challenge claims of universality with regard to how such phenomena are theorized.

**Social congregation and centrality in the entrepreneurial city**

Diversity of use in urban space also encompasses how the physical public realm facilitates forms of social congregation. To describe sites of social congregation, I apply the term “social centrality.” Borrowed from Rob Shields’ interpretation of Lefebvre’s account for centrality and urban form, social centrality involves a “crowd practice” Shields defines by two factors: Its ability to engage all willing or unwilling, and its capacity to cross social division. Shields argues that the marketplace traditionally also was a meeting place, and that commodity exchange is interlaced with “symbolic and dialogical” elements. As social centrality occurs if “a space is appropriated as public by people,” it can also be commercially cultivated. 91 Thus, social centrality is a term that neither excludes private ownership nor the impact of commercial forces, but rather one that, Shields suggests, might precondition consumption in itself.92 Both Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen are private areas that through different strategies facilitate public use, and where public-accessible urban spaces play a central role within their spatial and commercial development concepts. Therefore, knowledge into how these developments facilitate various forms of public use, and the values and qualities attributed to such spaces, provide valuable insight into the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment. Further, if urban spaces can be regarded as “the manifestation of the spatial demands of the dominant mode of production,” the strategic implementation of socially central sites for both political and economic purposes in these developments is relevant to address. 93
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92 Geographers Nigel Thrift and Paul Glennie also points to that consumption cannot solely be connected to industrial production, arguing for the relevance of regarding current day consumption patterns as in regard of pre-capitalist forms of consumption. I include these considerations to point to that there is not necessary any inherent conflict between public realms of the city and commercial forms of consumption. Nigel Thrift and Paul Glennie, “Historical Geographies of Urban Life and Modern Consumption,” in Aspen and Pløger, *På sporet av byen*, 105–126.
The organization of space in “late capitalism”

As introduced above, theorists such as Sennett, Zukin or Craik address the symbolic realm of the entrepreneurial city through forms of social exclusion, but to a lesser extent discusses the urban form as a spatial configuration. One theorist that directly discusses material urban space as organization within entrepreneurialism is cultural theorist Frederic Jameson, who has explored the spatial condition of the “city of late capitalism.” For Jameson, the era is represented spatially by spaces articulated as “total worlds” or “miniature cities,” exemplified by John Portman’s Westin Bonaventure Hotel lobby. Jameson argues that this urban interior spatializes a “new collective practice” for movement and congregation. He underscores that the Bonaventure example provides other insights to postmodern space than “traditional” postmodern architectural examples.94 Jameson thus points to how the political-economic practices of the late capitalist city give way to new spatial configurations harboring a new form of collective practice: “A new mode in which individuals move and congregate.”95 From Jameson’s perspective, space in the late capitalist city is not just a platform for consumption, or a commodity in itself. Rather, it produces new types of space and new patterns of use, meaning that the relations between political economic practice and form cannot be reduced to symbolic capital or aesthetics. While the sociological and geographical perspectives above primarily concern the relation between spheres of capital and culture, Jameson’s view adds to those already introduced by Hall and Hubbard: Built forms are more than vessels for accumulated capital, meaning that their symbolic realms transcend their “postmodern” imagery often associated with waterfront redevelopments.

Another architectural perspective that links political economic practices, collective practices and space, is architect and theorist Vittorio Aureli’s reflections on Cedric Price’s Potteries Thinkbelt.96 Aureli argues that within the post-Fordist economy, “free time” is no longer the opposite of productivity. Pointing towards how knowledge, information and cooperation play a crucial role in creating economic surplus within post-Fordist forms of economic production, Aureli illustrates how specific architectural configurations and urban spaces anticipate and facilitate these forms of production to take place. This perspective further points to regarding urban environments with greater emphasis on how they manifest in the city, how they facilitate differentiated use, and the symbolic meanings they convey.

95 Ibid., 40.
To what degree Tjuvholmen or Aker Brygge represent “a new mode in which individuals move and congregate” in the late capitalist city is thus tied to the extent to which they facilitate post-Fordist forms of production and answer to the spatial demands of the era they are conceived within.

The “creative city” paradigm

Another manifestation of how the city physically caters to the logic of production within the post-Fordist city is how cities globally compete as destinations and investment opportunities through means of culture. While the “formal cultural precinct” had been a modernist ideal until the 1970s, culture in the post-industrial city became internalized in post-Fordist production, as a consumption commodity, strategic development tool, economic asset and branding instrument in place-making processes. It came to encompass everything from the enactment or “lost” social milieus or the reinstitution of cultural heritage, to the publicly supported and/or financed development of the “big four:” A concert hall, performing arts performance space, national museum and major visual arts center (which, in a slightly different constellation, currently is being realized in Oslo). In the global competing market between cities, such cultural assets were crucial to establish a creative city brand, where cultural institutions and architectural icons played a particular important role throughout the 1990s.

As urban theorist Richard Florida has argued, culture is a strategic asset in attracting a creative class of professionals who make up the economic basis of the culture economy. In 2008, Florida complemented his three T’s for economic growth (technology, talents and tolerance) with a fourth: Territorial assets. Territorial assets are described as places that provide diversity, vibrancy and authenticity. For Florida, specific forms of urban environments attract particular user groups, which provide economic growth, making the city’s spaces themselves vehicles for the economic growth of cities. From this, the urban environment as brand cannot only convey diversity through form or iconography content, but needs to provide a spatial experience that is attractive for investors and consumers, in the form of urban environments, such as those discussed here.

The competition among cities towards attracting “creatives” (that might result in the displacement of local residents), and the homogenization of commodities towards different user groups, are among the reasons that allow
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97 Alex Krieger defines place-making as “the provision of distinctive, lively, appealing centers for congregation to alleviate the perceived homogeneity of many and large urban areas.” Alex Krieger, “Where and How Does Urban Design Happen,” 120.
for the critique towards flagship developments to be generalized on a global scale. But simultaneously, the critiques above are suspected to miss insights into local contexts, for the benefit of theoretical generalization. While these generalizations provide valuable input also for this thesis, I posit that such insights must inform, but not make up the basis on which “flagships” are scrutinized as developments in the city. Here, perspectives that explore form and organization in relation to a production regime (Aureli’s post-Fordist spatial organization) or forms of consumption (Jameson’s new collective practices) can help render such insights visible.
3 Urban Morphological Research

The thesis is set within a framework of urban morphological theory, studying the relationship between the built environment, the production of the built environment, and the preconditions of the built environment. Below, I render visible how urban morphological theory provides a research tradition the thesis can be inscribed within, and the theoretical framework that supports a morphological analysis on Tjuvholmen.

First, I present an account for morphological theory and how it supports the thesis’ three main parts: The preconditions of Tjuvholmen, the production of Tjuvholmen, and Tjuvholmen as urban environment. This overall assessment for urban morphological research marks the point of departure for the first analytical perspective on Tjuvholmen that scrutinize it as urban form and organization.

The second segment addresses the theoretical framework for conducting and iconographic analysis. Derived from the hypothesis that spatial organization and collective practices for movement and congregation uphold as much symbolic significance as architectural motifs, I define the framework of an iconographic analysis to involve architectural expression, organization and programming, as well as “attributed” forms of symbolism. This marks the second analytical perspective on Tjuvholmen.

Thirdly, Tjuvholmen’s iconography is furthermore thought to partake in different branding and promotion strategies, where architectural representations are seen to play a crucial role. Therefore, the final theoretical section addresses how mediation can be addressed through the term “image-text.” This makes up the third analytical perspective on Tjuvholmen. In light of the logics of project-based urban development, I posit that mapping urban form, iconography as well as the mediation of built form are three analytical perspectives, that, informed by the theoretical frameworks introduced in the former section, can provide a distinct analysis of Tjuvholmen as conceptualized urban environment.
ANALYTICAL TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES: TJUVHOLMEN AS BUILT

Urban morphological research includes a wide field of theorization, from several different disciplines, and with different research outputs, whose common denominator is their focus on built form. The research tradition is of a particular relevance for the thesis theme, due to its focus on urban form, how urban form is developed and within what framework this development takes place.

Morphological framework for research

Urban morphology can be regarded as a scientific tradition and interdisciplinary field of research, where the physical faculties of the city are the focus, on different geographical levels. In the article “Mapping urban morphology: a classification scheme for interpreting contributions to the study of urban form,” the Canadian human geographers Pierre Gauthier and Jason Gilliland distinguish between “externalist” and “internalist” approaches to urban form. The former primarily focuses on the political economic practices, or is based on anthropological, geographical, historical or perceptual approaches to explain the development of urban form. Here, urban form is primarily regarded as an “end product” of external processes.

Seminal representatives of this tradition include Kevin Lynch’s *Image of the City* or the historical approach represented by Lewis Mumford or Spiro Kostof. The internalist approach “finds the primary explanation for morphogenesis in the constraints and potential for change present within the system itself.” This approach is primarily concerned with the internal logic and resilience of built space, represented e.g. by the Italian pioneer in morphological research Saverio Muratori in the 1940s and Gianfranco Caniggia in the 1960s, that both were studying the dynamic between political economic practice and internal logics of urban form in a historical perspective.

According to architect Anne Vernez Moudon, Muratori was in search of a “more continuous tradition of city analysis.” In her essay “Getting to know the built landscape: Typomorphology,” Moudon uses the term
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“typomorphology” to describe the “internalist” tradition of urban research. Moudon distinguishes between three main schools of typomorphological research, that each contributes with relevant perspectives on the built landscape. The Italian tradition foundation in urban form history was introduced above. Geographer M.R.G. Conzen, who studied medieval urban form, represents the British tradition. Moudon defines his approach as “morphogenetic,” due to its evolutionary perspective, and accentuation of the city’s temporal dimension. The third is the French tradition, which maintained a critical and theoretically orientated perspective on urban form, and is discussed further below. Common for all is that the built landscape is understood within three dimensions: Time, form and scale. Moudon accentuates this to describe the “intricate web of relationships” consisting of transformative socio-cultural forces (time) that make the built landscape (form vs. open space) morphogenetic rather than morphological. Finally, the focus on scale also accentuates the architectural dimension of urban planning.

As Moudon argues, relevant studies of the built landscapes are inherently “morphogenetic” more than morphological, as they accentuate transformative aspects of the built environment. To understand our built environments, then, we need to address their preconditions that enable and condition development and study the processes that facilitate their development. Moudon’s account for urban morphological research, within an “internalist” perspective on urban form is largely coherent with the approach presented here. Below, the “transformative socio-cultural forces” are accounted for through the political economic perspective obtained, and the historical review of the history of waterfront development in Oslo. Moudon’s typomorphological approach to form and scale also coincides with the analytical perspective on urban form development.

A final clarification might also be relevant to mention: In contrast to “traditional” forms of morphological research, whose research subject was the multifaceted urban fabric of historical urban districts, the case study here comprises a single, large scale development whose urban environment emanates from a single owner group. The area is thus approached as an architectural outline and composition, which is regarded to have brought

105 Ibid., 289.
106 Ibid., 300. The relation between volume and open space is described as a “built landscape type,” and is an attempt to avoid notions of universal and site-less types of urban form. The addition of land for Moudon represents a link between the city scale and the building scale.
107 Architect and theorist Karl Otto Ellefsen labels Conzen’s approach as “descriptive theory over the city’s build-up, where physical structure is regarded as historical text.” (My translation). Ellefsen, “Studier av byens fysiske transformasjon,” 64.
108 Moudon, “Getting to know the built landscape: Typomorphology,” 300.
109 Ibid., 308.
110 Ibid., 295.
about a significant impact on the urban fabric of Oslo’s urban waterfront. Simultaneously, I address singular structures and spatial relations within this structure, involving other architects and architectural perspectives. Based on the morphological theory introduced above, I regard these perspectives to be in accordance with morphological principles of urban research. This also applies to the historical framework provided by part two and the outlining of Tjuvholmen as “development scenario” found in part three.

**Applying morphological principles for research**

Among “internalists” that have maintained an architectural and architectural-disciplinary focus on urban form research are French architects and theoreticians Philippe Panerai, Jean Castex and Jean-Charles Depaule. With reference to Henri Lefebvre, they argued that the “relative autonomy” of urban form does not “exclude either the economic or cultural determinants which have their significance in the production of the city and of architecture, nor the pressure on the social conditions on the life of the city’s inhabitants.” In their article, Gauthier and Gilliand paraphrase the French morphologists, stating that the city to a certain extent is “a material projection of social, political and economic systems or structures.” But by comprehending the city as built form, one is allowed to “observe that this projection proceeds through various systems of spatial symbolization and is manifested in a substance, the built space, that has its own consistency and resilience.” This resilience allows built space to be scrutinized as a relatively autonomous system. In the work *Urban Forms*, the authors discuss how urban form relates to different political economic practices, by revisiting historical examples of the built urban landscapes. Their research on the interplay between detailed, physical designs and socioeconomic forces was novel in an era preoccupied with social policy. Similarly innovative was their in-between scale of research, which linked architectural form with the urban fabric. *Urban Forms* discusses how spatial concepts and ideas are translated and transitioned within architectural culture, through publications, conferences and architectural offices. For the authors, “the relative autonomy of urban form” enables them to identify what they call “architectural models”, while maintaining a social, cultural and economic perspective on urban form. Through five case studies, they explore how “social questions” are translation into built form:

113 Castex et al., *Urban Forms*, vii.
In each of the realizations considered, forms and operations are expressed that structure their composition. These forms refer to specific concepts and techniques, from which the project is managed. These are referred to as architectural models. The history of architectures must include the history of these models, the study of their creation, their transmission and of their alterations.\textsuperscript{114}

This thesis can be inscribed in a similar mode of research, where the “specific concepts and techniques” ascribed Tjuvholmen inform the morphological analysis. But while Urban Form’s architectural models transcend socio-economic divisions through disciplinary disseminations, the perspective held here maintains a focus on how the urban environment is informed by its production framework and the political economic forces that affect it. This focus is largely coherent with the idea that the study of built form can help decipher the “systems of spatial symbolization” that filter different “material projections of social, political and economic systems or structures.” While part two’s focus on preconditions can render visible such “social, political and economic systems”, Parts three and four respectively reflect the “systems of spatial symbolization” and “material projections” of urban form.

**ANALYTICAL TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES: TJUVHOLMEN AS SYMBOLIC REALM**

With Fredric Jameson’s “Bonaventure Hotel” in mind, symbolic meaning in the new, conceptualized urban environments of the late capitalist city might be as much associated with their patterns of use as the use of patterns. When the focus on the symbolic realm of Tjuvholmen is based on an iconographic (instead of semiotic) analysis, it is a deliberate attempt to demarcate the discussion on symbolic meaning within one of several different identifiable analytical perspectives that originate in the urban morphology of Tjuvholmen. When I nevertheless borrow from semiotic theory below, it is based on the observation that the applied methodology for iconographic analysis enables addressing symbolic meaning beyond what is inherent in the architectural object’s form, as explained below. Secondly, as the focus on urban environments is seen in context of urban development processes, I also utilize a perspective inherited from semiotics that helps structure the relation between “consumption” and “production” within urban development processes. However, the accounts from semiotics provided below are not meant to provide new analytical perspectives, but to define a theoretical backdrop in support for an expanded, iconographic analysis on Tjuvholmen.

\textsuperscript{114} Jean Castex et al., *Urban Forms*, 134.
Iconography origins

I approach iconography broadly as a term that encompasses motifs (referring to a theme, recognizable pattern or reference), forms and programs, whose physical shape, reference, or symbolic expression finds resonance within specific conventions (customs, tradition or conduct), derived from cultural codes (i.e. specific cultural features) or ideologies (set of ideas/beliefs). When the iconography of urban form is addressed here, it is based on the presumption that flagship developments can be approached not only as form, but also as symbolic expressions. I posit that these expressions might represent forms of intended, symbolic meaning, linked to aesthetic, spatial and programmatic concepts. As will render clearer in the next paragraphs, the iconographic analysis does not represent an attempt to identify absolute meaning based on subjective experience. Rather, I try to establish a framework that can facilitate reflections on how the urban environment of Tjuvholmen is conceptualized through various forms of iconography.

Symbolic meaning in architecture has, since the mid-20th century, often been linked to the semiotic discourse of structuralist theorization: As structuralism as methodology in architecture is inherited from linguistic theory, semiotics was the natural approach towards mapping symbolic meaning in architecture.115 While iconography is interwoven, and partly shares its vocabulary with the field of semiotics, it emerges within a different disciplinary tradition and with a different research subject.116 Iconography as a field is largely influenced by the work of German-American art historian Erwin Panofsky.117 Focusing on both textual analysis and documentary research, Panofsky did not explore perceived or altered meaning, but “intrinsic” meaning in artworks.118 Panofsky’s theory of iconology was an attempt at providing a consistent tool for content and meaning analysis in medieval art.119 By isolating interpretation from description, Panofsky

115 The “intersubjective” perspectives in structuralist urban theory were criticized of reducing social practices to social structures through a form of “structural reductionism.” Kirsten Simonsen, Byteori og hverdagspraksis (Denmark: Akademisk Forlag, 1993), 44.
116 Originating within art history, iconography has traditionally dealt with the interpretation and classification. It evolved as a discipline in the circle around cultural theorist and art historian Aby Warburg and most notably his follower Erwin Panofsky in the mid-20th century, as a tool to map the symbolic content and meaning of medieval art and architecture. Paul Crossley “Medieval Architecture and Meaning: The limits of iconography,” The Burlington Magazine 130 no.1019 (1988), 116.
117 Panofsky applied this method to unveil “the origins of certain conventions and undo the ideologically convenient effects of what Bourdieu has called genesis amnesia.” With other words, Panofsky feared that the interpretation of symbolic meaning too often was biased to suit the interpreter’s purposes, instead of unveiling true meaning. Theo Van Leeuwen, “Iconography and Semiotics,” in The Handbook of Visual Analysis, eds. Theo Van Leeuwen and Carey Jewitt (London: SAGE Publications, 2004), 102.
118 Panofsky’s method was an attempt to reach beyond the identification- and classification techniques that constituted 19th century iconography. Erwin Panofsky, Meaning in the Visual Arts (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books 1955), 40.
119 When addressing Panofsky’s iconology, it is with the backdrop that his iconographic analysis primarily focused on renaissance art, that is thought to have a specific “narrative representation of predominantly literary subjects,” Christine Hasenmueller, “Panofsky, Iconography and Semiotics,” The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 36, No. 3, Critical Interpretation (1978): 299.
wanted to avoid the traps of intersubjectivity. Instead, his model allows for a system of empirical findings to be discussed in the context of their technical and cultural conventions, before being subject to a discourse in inherent meaning: The iconological level. Panofsky’s model for mapping iconography is in coherence both with the thesis’ purpose of mapping intended meaning, and how processes of spatial symbolization have been addressed within morphological research. The following paragraphs describe a method in which iconographic mapping can be articulated as a tool that encompasses the physical spatialization and visual expressions of symbolic meaning in architecture.

**Iconography and architecture**

In the late twentieth century architectural culture, iconography has famously been linked to Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown’s ventures into the commercial urban landscapes of the American West. Iconographic studies, however, applied systematically to architecture emerged already in the 1940s, and if broadly regarded as a search for symbolism in architecture, it can be traced back to the seventh century. While these theories specifically evolved with medieval studies in mind, Norwegian architect Hilde Haslum in her doctoral thesis provides an updated and simple definition of architectural iconography for contemporary use:

> [Iconographic analysis] implies analysis of patterns and systems in the uses of architectural means to express “style”, symbolic content and communicate meaning, in order to specialize or tailor elements of the architectural environment for a specific range of practices or users.

Architects and urban theorists Dag Tvilde and Karl Otto Ellefsen’s definition, in their theoretical work *Realistisk byanalyse*, similarly state:

---

120 Panofsky’s three-stage model was introduced by registrations of “primary meaning” or “representational” meaning of artworks. These include “stylistic conventions and technical transformations involved in the representation.” The following iconographic analysis considers cultural conventions attached to the object, linking concepts with artistic motifs. Although not referring to “signs” as such, these two first levels comprise an analogy to the “signifier and signified” in semiotics. The third stage is the iconological level, revealing meaning derived from contextual research and the mapping of underlying principles. Being “inherently interpretive,” this synthesis contrasts the two preceding, descriptive phases. Hasenmueller, “Panofsky, Iconography and Semiotics,” Van Leeuwen, “Iconography and Semiotics,” 100, and 290–291.


123 Haslum, *Reading socio-spatial interplay*, 123.
“Iconographical features are signs and symbols of social or cultural character that carry meaning and are repeated as physical signs in the architecture of the city.”¹²⁴ Neither Haslum, nor Tvilde and Ellefsen, however, problematize the idea of “meaning” as an intrinsic property of the object itself. Yet, in an article on urban transformation, Ellefsen identifies the symbolic dimension of urban environments as the third theoretical level of urban morphological research: The first is constituted by Italian architect Aldo Rossi, who established terms to address the fundamental structures of the urban morphology, akin to structuralist inspired urban theory. Secondly, the French tradition is seen to explore the performativity and maneuverability of these typologies. The third addresses the production of meaning in architecture, but remains, according to Ellefsen, a less explored area of research.¹²⁵

Art historian Staale Sinding-Larsen is among the few who have not only defined, but also attempt to provide a method for mapping architectural iconography. Sinding-Larsen identifies iconography through three “media levels” in three categories: 1) The “basic form” that constitutes the main architectural idea, 2) the context it is located within, that may color or define the interpretation of it, and 3) any “illustrative element” added to it as cues that strengthen the interpretation potential.¹²⁶ In the iconographical analysis of Tjuvholmen, I utilize these three media levels as a tool to structure the analysis. Here, “basic form” is discussed as the disposition of forms and voids of the development within Torp’s design scheme, but is also broadened to include the functions it harbors as structure, as accounted for below. Further, I will approach Sinding-Larsen’s “illustrative elements” as Tjuvholmen’s architectural, material and other visual cues that strengthen the basic form category. Finally, Tjuvholmen is addressed as “context” that discusses Tjuvholmen in context of its physical and medial setting.

**Iconography as function**

In order to approach Tjuvholmen as iconography, it is necessary to make a few distinctions: The work below focuses on intended meaning rather than perceived and experienced meaning by its users. Inherited from Panofsky, this distinction is also taken account for in the work of Sinding-Larsen: In addition to his three media levels through which iconography can be approached (basic form, context and illustrative elements), Sinding-Larsen also describes three modes in which iconography functions: Either as “programmed”, “attributed” or “perceived” iconography. While programmed iconography is embedded within the objects themselves, attributive

¹²⁴ My translation. Original: “De ikonografiske trekkene er meningsbærende tegn og symboler av sosial eller kulturell karakter som gjentas som fysiske tegn i byens arkitektur.”


iconography is a group’s or an individual’s *intentional projection* of meaning upon the object. Finally, perceptual iconography is based on convention or subjective interpretation. While “programmed meaning” is related to the “basic form” media level, and intrinsic to its object, the next two categories represent an attempt to distinguish between *projected meaning* and *subjective, perceived meaning*. Sinding-Larsen maintains this distinction with reference to how architectural objects historically also have been identified through external reference, not only through the symbolic content of the object itself. So while perceived meaning can be regarded as inherently arbitrary, and tied to both personal experience and connotation, *projected meaning* is the intentional ascribed meaning by a specific group or social segment with the political, economic or cultural power or position to do so.¹²⁷

Sinding-Larsen’s concept of attributed iconography thus accepts external and immaterial projections of meaning to be valid aspects of an iconographic analysis. This validates that albeit exterior to the object under scrutiny, symbolic meaning must not either be embedded within an object (recognized through convention), or resulting from individual interpretation through connotation. It can also emerge through the attribution of references, concepts and ideals to that object. Such forms of attribution of meaning upon an architectural object can be of particular interest here, especially when linked to the role representation and media play in urban development processes, through e.g. branding and place-making processes.

While Sinding-Larsen underscores the value of a rigid division between the three types of iconography, he also admits that they blend and interact.¹²⁸ Similarly, the iconographic analysis conducted here focuses both on programmed and projected meaning, but does to a lesser extent maintain a strict division between them. Rather, I believe that its intentional meaning in projects of several agents with different roles, might best be identified in the intersection between what is regarded as intrinsic in the object itself, recognized through cultural convention, and what can be recognized as an ascribed quality by agents related to the project.

**Iconography and urban semiotics**

The division between the experienced and intended forms of meaning marks an attempt to operationalize a discourse on symbolic meaning without needing for structuralist concept such as “intersubjectivity.” Among the more successful attempts within semiotic theory, that also find resonance in the work of Sinding-Larsen and Panofsky, is the “socio-semiotics” sociologist Mark Gottdiener and urban planner Alexandros Lagopoulos introduced in the

¹²⁸ Ibid., 30.
mid-1980s. An aspect of their theorization is included here, as their division between the consumption and the production of what they call “settlement space” contribute to the analytical perspective on iconography in the thesis. While “consumption” involves what Sinding-Larsen calls perceived meaning, “production” encompasses programmed and attributed meaning.

Gottdiener and Lagopoulos argue that spatial organization is a social product, and that the production of space involves cultural, political and economic activities that are both semiotic (cultural) and non-semiotic (political or economic). These processes are mediated through spatial ideologies, to become the built environment. Such social groups of producers are flanked by the users of urban space, whose consumption of urban space enables ideological, connotative and denotative codes to be “brought back to play again” through various forms of “multi-coding,” that produce new meaning. Gottdiener and Lagopoulos attempt to address symbolic meaning and create an operational model for semiotic analysis, while simultaneously taking into account how meaning is manifold, unstable and prone to constant change. In social semiotics, ideology and value systems replaces the “invariant;” structural semiotics’ notion of a stable absolute. This enables meaning to be shared through conventions and among different user segments (“socially stratified groups of synchronic users”), while acknowledging that urban form cannot possess universal meaning as such.

A similar approach is held here: I acknowledge that any approach to symbolic meaning must obtain a focus that defines the origins, and delimits the recipients in order to discuss Tjuvholmen’s iconography. Though recognizing the impact “consumption” imparts on urban environments through “multi-coding,” conceived meaning denoted from individual user experiences is regarded as external to the focus of this thesis. Instead, these subjects are addressed as “stratified users” – partaking in target groups or other identifiable user segments that can be addressed by the “social group of producers” of Tjuvholmen.

129 Such spatial ideologies can be seen as akin to the morphologies’ term “systems of spatial symbolization” where political economic practices is converted to urban form, and is here seen to be encompassed by the analytical perspectives that scrutinizes the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as urban environment.


131 Lisbeth Söderqvist writes that Claude Lévi-Strauss searched for universal structures of thought that were “invariant,” and that social systems could be identified as structured sign systems. In architecture, Söderqvist traces the invariant in Kevin Lynch’s search for universal meaningful structures in the city, or in Aldo Rossi’s “meaningful permanence” and “primary signs.” Alison and Peter Smithson and Candilis, Josic and Woods similarly attributed the street with social qualities related to the notion that physical structures should reflect mental patterns. Lisbeth Söderqvist, Journal of Aesthetics & Culture, 3 (2011). Date accessed: 15 July 2016. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/jac.v3i0.5414.

**Function as iconography**

A final iconographic perspective that benefits from such semiotic theorization is how form, the organization form, but also the *programming* of urban form might constitute an iconographic tool in the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as urban environment. This means that a specific function, or configuration of functions, can be linked to forms of symbolic meaning. Gottdiener and Lagopoulos argue that while an architectural object signifies its own function, it is also attributed a symbolic function. Such symbolic functions emerge from values or ideologies produced within different social groups, defined as connotative codes. Gottdiener and Lagopoulos argue that the utilitarian (the denotative) function **derives** from the symbolic (connotative) function, since “codified ideology which act as the system of connotation precedes the denotative system in urban space.”134 This means that while a building denotes its function, this function also carries symbolic meaning that dominates how it is understood. By this, they place conventional symbolic meaning, (“codified ideology”) as dominant over any form of “objective” identification of use. This semiotic perspective, addressing the relation between architecture and its designated uses, underlines the symbolic implications of programming as strategy, which not only caters to specific functional needs, but also contains certain iconographic capacities the urban environment of Tjuvholmen can be seen in context of. Embedding program as part of an iconographic analysis of Tjuvholmen can therefore both be seen in a semiotic perspective, as well as relating to how post-Fordist forms of production manifest in built space as building programs, or how specific functions partake in cultural development strategies that carry symbolic significance.

**ANALYTICAL TOPICS AND PERSPECTIVES: THE DISSEMINATION OF TJUVHOLMEN**

With reference to Roland Barthes’ text *The Fashion System* (1967), architecture historian Adrian Forty argues that architecture is a three-part system, encompassing “image,” “building” and “critical discourse.” He then problematizes this system with reference to how in architecture, images include both drawings and photographs, and, how language, as expression, differs from that of drawings.136 In his discourse, Forty delimits architectural means of communication to the architectural drawing and architectural

---

discourse. In regard to the project-based developments discussed here, however, the tools of communication include a wide array of representations that are mixed and disseminated through several different formats. While architectural representations are presumed to play a principal role among these, the ways representations are used, and the contexts they are embedded in, are seen to play a key role in project development, and how the built environment is attributed symbolic meaning. Therefore, the final section of Part four looks into how Tjuvholmen can be regarded as a media phenomenon. From the earliest architectural representations and realty prospectuses throughout the initial planning stages, to the advertisement programs of the finalized project, media representations seem to be omnipresent on Tjuvholmen. It is presumed that mediation comprises a strategic tool for development, where visual and textual material partake in branding processes, and in legitimizing the project as development scenario. Mediation is therefore regarded as integral to Tjuvholmen as a development model. Therefore, scrutinizing Tjuvholmen as built space necessarily also includes exploring the role and impact of media on Tjuvholmen. This section introduces the theoretical concept “image-text” to describe such forms of mediation and their role in relation to the built environment.

Tjuvholmen as image-text

Medial representations of Tjuvholmen are here understood as encompassing various visual techniques and textual descriptions that intersect through forms of “mixed media” open for regarding the material within a single category. To cover the vast amount of architectural representations and supporting textual and visual material, I therefore utilize the term “image-text,” coined by art historian W.J.T. Mitchell. For Mitchell, the visual cannot be regarded as a pure field of representation, but rather as constituted by interaction between pictures and texts.\(^{137}\) This means, “Any type of representation would be of a certain heterogenic character and contain different dimensions and juxtapositions of the visual and the verbal.”\(^{138}\) Mitchell suggests that the pictorial is interpretative beyond both its mimetic meaning (what is depicted) and constituting context (when and why was it depicted). This alleged semi-autonomy of images opens for encountering them beyond their capacity as mere representations. While I do not hold images to be independent of the context they are set in, I agree that visualizations might operate in a more dialectic relationship with the physical world than their role as depicting illustrations, and should be approached


accordingly. Mitchell’s work illustrates how the lingual and the visual material are thought to interrelate and overlap in a manner that in his eyes has remained unsolved within the field of semiotics and iconography – the two main theoretical traditions that deal with image analysis. His claim that the pictorial in general has been undervalued is relevant in context of architectural representations. Furthermore, regarding the lingual and the visual as interrelating entities is valuable when approaching the vast media apparatus supporting the developments discussed. Finally, the production of meaning within the cultural conventions attributed image-text also provides valuable input to the discussion and analysis of iconography and symbolic meaning on Tjuvholmen.

**Image-text applied**

I regard Tjuvholmen and the Tjuvholmen development model to be saturated by image-text through media content as municipal information, journalistic pieces, branding and advertisement material or even forms of augmented reality. Image-text is therefore seen as representations that support a physical site, through various modes of signification, but where the material environment is the basis for interpretation and experience. That being said, an implicit question within Mitchell’s train of thought is whether architecture not only is represented through imagery, but also might be influenced by the formats they are visualized through? The question seems justified in project-based developments that rely heavily on representations and mediation in their development processes, and will be pursued in the Tjuvholmen case study. Image-text representations are deducted into three categories: The first involves architectural image-text in the form of sketches, renderings, writings and other representations preceding the area as built, as well as the technical drawings, description and juridical material such as design manuals, contracts and building descriptions from participating architects. These are called “architectural mediations.” The second category involves the mediation apparatus where representations connected to the branding and sales strategy for the Tjuvholmen development by owner group and other agents involved through targeted, strategic marketing. The third category involves the external media coverage and “buzz,” which in various ways interact with architectural mediations of representations and the “mediation apparatus” of Tjuvholmen. This in mind, the architectural representations, advertisement programs and media coverage of Tjuvholmen

139 For example, Keith Moxey argue that images should be regarded as “presentations” more than representations, due to the impact of the visual object holds in contemporary culture. Keith Moxey, “Visual Studies and the Iconic Turn,” *Journal of Visual Culture* 7, no. 2 (2008): 133.

140 Additional image-text that is not covered here includes advertisement for events, and offers by groups or individual actors on site that maintains, evolve or contrast the area theme, both through web-pages or through peer-to-peer knowledge (digital or not).
tend to overlap and be applied for similar purposes, making it sometimes difficult to distinguish between the categories above.

**Urban Meaning, Form and Forces**

Harvey’s discourse on “entrepreneurialism” and the sections on governance theory help placing politics and urban development in Oslo within a theoretical backdrop the research critically can relate to. The critiques raised towards the urban spaces of the neo-liberalist city as social and cultural realm help focus the discussion on commodification process and the role symbolic capital play within project-based urban developments. The section on post-Fordist forms of production further display how the urban environment can be seen in context of its capability to obtain the production demands of the post-Fordist economy. The section on morphological research, and how iconographic and semiotic theory provides a methodology to approach symbolic meaning on Tjuvholmen, will provide the framework for specific analytical perspectives to crystalize. Finally, I will make an account for how I understand the terms “precondition” and “production” in regards to urban form through two perspectives held by respectively Manuel Castells and Henri Lefebvre. Castells’ perspective provides a theoretical backdrop on the relation between “urban meaning,” societal forces and urban development that supports the approach of this thesis. Lefebvre’s perspectives helps locate the forces of development on Tjuvholmen within a category of space production, and architecture as a “social practice.”

**The preconditions of Tjuvholmen: Urban meaning and urban form**

The “preconditions of Tjuvholmen” discussed above as the realm of political economic and socio-economic parameters that precondition development at Tjuvholmen can also be rooted in a similar theoretical perspective. Here, I adopt a perspective held by sociologist Henri Lefebvre’s protégé, sociologist Manuel Castells. Castells argues that urban form emerges from various “religious, economic, political and technological operations” defined as “urban meaning.” Urban meaning is tied to the power struggle between historical agents, and is therefore what regulates the characteristics of urban functions. Together, urban meaning and urban functions determine urban form. Urban forms are therefore regarded as “the symbolic, spatial expression of urban meaning,” superimposed throughout history by different, conflicting agents. Urban design, in Castells’ perspective, becomes “the symbolic attempt to express an accepted urban meaning in certain urban forms.”

---


142 Ibid., 304.
define the uses of the city. Here, urban form refers to, and symbolizes, these struggles and their outcomes. When urban development schemes are implemented in the city, they are regarded as attempts to symbolically spatialize a consensual view on how the city should perform.\textsuperscript{143} Castells provides a link between political economic practices that make out “regimes” of urban meaning, and the symbolic expressions of urban form, without necessarily imposing a direct causality between them.\textsuperscript{144} In this regard, he is in accordance with the perspectives of urban semiotics introduced above, as well as the “French school” of urban morphological research represented by Castex et al., that respectively accentuate the “mediation” or the symbolic spatialization processes of urban development. Where Castells defines urban design as “the symbolic attempt to express an accepted urban meaning into certain urban forms,” however, the French morphologists explore what such “symbolic attempts” entail from a morphological point of view, and how they are conceptualized and disseminated within the architectural discipline.

With Castells’ terminology, the study of Tjuvholmen focuses on the relations between “urban meaning” (assigned performance) and urban form (including symbolic meaning), where the “symbolic attempt to express an accepted urban meaning into certain urban forms” is represented by the production of Tjuvholmen, where projections of society “proceed through spatial symbolization and become manifested as urban form.” An aspect of such systems of spatial symbolization is architectural practice. How such practice forms are approached here is discussed in the next paragraphs, based on Lefebvre’s category “representations of space.”

**The production of Tjuvholmen: Architecture as social practice**

The focus of production, and means of production, of new waterfront developments derive from the focus on architecture, and the making of architecture, are prerequisites for the work presented in this thesis. But however influential the role of architects might be in the case study, their work does not proceed in a vacuum, particularly not when approaching the built environment in context of its development model. Here, social theorist Henri Lefebvre’s notion of architecture as a “social practice” might be descriptive. For Lefebvre, architecture produces space defined by external constraints imposed by other agents, and the internal limitations of concepts, ideologies and representations. From this, architect and theorist Lukasz Stanek deduces that:

\textsuperscript{143} Lending a phrase from urban theorist Alexander Cuthbert, urban design here becomes an “embedded part of other urban functions and processes using ‘meaning’ (not ‘economy’, as one might expect) as the ultimate measure of the performance of cities.” Cuthbert, *The Form of Cities*, 17.

\textsuperscript{144} He is careful not to establish any absolute relation between urban meaning and symbolic meaning, referring to the “relative autonomy” of formal representation in relation to functional content. Castells, *The City and the Grassroots*, 303.
Architecture thus becomes a sum of the aims, instruments, and regulations assigned to it; its field of possibilities is delineated by its dependencies and synergies with other practices, disciplines, and institutions.\textsuperscript{145}

The phrase used here to encompass this complexity was “systems of spatialization,” introduced by Castex et al. above, labeled as those processes involved in the “production of Tjuvholmen.” It refers to the agents and elements involved in the manufacturing of an architectural artifact, or spatial situation in the case study. In Lefebvre’s spatial triad of space production, the “production of Tjuvholmen” relates to the category “representations of space.”\textsuperscript{146} In the triad, that consists of perceived, conceived and lived space, perceived space is defined as “spatial practice”, identified in relation to society, and dialectic with the spaces of that society. Lived space is labeled “Representational space,” and is discussed as the space of the user. “Representations of space,” however, is:

Conceptualized space, the space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic sub-dividers and social engineers, as of a certain type of artist with a scientific bent – all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived.\textsuperscript{147}

For Lefebvre, “Representations of space” relate to the history of ideologies, and are spaces that “intervene” through architecture. They contain knowledge, understood as a mixture of understanding and ideology. Lefebvre argues that “the history of space” must account for the interrelationships between representations of space (space as directly lived through its associated images and symbols) that “co-exist, concord or interfere” with representational space. A similar interrelationship is attempted here, where the conceptualization of urban environments, and the symbol and sign systems that inform them, materialize as “representations of space.”\textsuperscript{148} Thus, it is not passively experienced space that is discussed here, but rather how urban spaces as physical manifestations, represent conceptions related to experience, induced by the agents involved as part of the production of Tjuvholmen.\textsuperscript{149}

\textsuperscript{145} Stanek, Henri Lefebvre on Space, 166.
\textsuperscript{146} Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1991), 40.
\textsuperscript{147} Spatial practice marks the uses of space, and can be divided, in Lefebvre’s words, in the “daily reality” or routine of life, and the “urban reality,” seen as the infrastructural systems of the city. Under neocapitalism, Lefebvre argues the daily reality and urban reality are closely associated entities. Ibid., 38.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 39–42.
\textsuperscript{149} Lefebvre warns against a rigid division between representation and representational space, accentuating instead the “unity of the productive process.” Here, the categories are used to distinguish between a focus on what is experienced and what is projected, while remaining dialectic to each other. Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 42.
II Preconditions: From Aker Brygge to Tjuvholmen

Part two’s empirical enquiries, comprises three chapters addressing Tjuvholmen’s “preconditions.” Chapter four explores the events that led to the transformation of the industrial harbor from industrial brownfield to urban waterfront. It is initiated by an account for the The City and The Fjord – Oslo Year 2000 (BOF2000) waterfront competition that introduced the industrial harbor front as development area in the early 1980s.\(^1\) It concludes with the selection of Telje-Torp-Aasen Arkitektkontor AS (Telje-Torp-Aasen, TTA) as architects for Aker Brygge’s phase one. Chapter five discusses how the waterfront project Aker Brygge was conceived and built, scrutinizing it as architecture, real estate development strategy and urban environment concept. It further locates Aker Brygge’s development strategy within a tradition of urban development, originating in the North American cities Baltimore and Boston, where the combination of real estate and redevelopment strategies became a model for waterfront projects on a global scale. Chapters six scrutinize the regimes and reforms that mark the shift towards post-Fordist forms of political economic practice in the late 1970s and onwards in Oslo. These pages display how a changed political climate and different economic conditions set the framework for urban development in Oslo. It is followed by an account that specifically addresses how the waterfront was politically primed for the development that led to the Tjuvholmen project.

The three sections and their sub-divisions attempt to render visible the interrelations between urban development and the changing political economic practices on the urban waterfront, discussing how urban development models are formed and legitimized through different private and public planning practices.

4 The waterfront rediscovered

The following pages presents an historical account for the Pipervika bay, followed by the succession of events that led to Telje-Torp-Aasen’s commission for developing Aker Brygge. It displays the evolution of an architectural project from its initial sketches in 1978 to becoming a full-fledged development scenario at the Oslo waterfront a few years later. It is introduced by discussing the preconditions of the open competition The City and The Fjord – Oslo Year 2000, with a short account for the historical backdrop of the competition, how it was initiated and organized. The section also looks into the different submissions and the jury’s evaluation of the competition. Secondly, I address TTA’s scheme Waterloo, and the strategic and architectural approach embedded in the original and revised project. The summarizing remarks discuss the competition in relation to respectively architecture, urban planning and post-Fordist political economic practice.

Fig. 1 Map of Pipervika/Bjørvika 1936. (Source: OBK)
A short history of Pipervika

The bay of Oslo is split into two coves: Bjørvika and Pipervika. They are divided by the ridge Akerryggen, terminating at Akerneset and its fortifications Akershus Festning. While both medieval and renaissance Oslo used the eastern Bjørvika as the city’s main harbor, Pipervika remained a ramshackle habitat for soldiers and fishermen, poverty and prostitution, delineated from the water by a grimy junk-filled beach. From the mid-1800s, a quay was constructed outside the beach, and as the southbound railway and station Vestbanen was established, a new row of buildings emerged along the new “Sjøgata.” In 1854, the mechanical factory Akers Mekaniske Verksted (“Akers Mek”) moved from the industrial belt along the river Akerselva to Holmen in Pipervika, expanding its activities also to encompass the construction of larger steamships. As the years passed, Pipervika became a deep-water harbor and later harbored the city’s official dock for the royalty and foreign visitors (1890). The new summer residences of the affluent Oslo Oslo populace along the coast meant that ferry traffic also blossomed in the area. In 1905, Akers Mek bought 14,500m² of the area Tjuvholmen west of Holmen, reclaiming land for its dry docks. In 1914, the state sold another 9,400m² to the shipyard, while the remaining 4,800m² was sold to the city of Oslo. The growing industrial enterprise now covered Holmen and most of Tjuvholmen. New quays stretched from the railway station Vestbanen to the fortress Akershus Festning on Akersneset. Pipervika was no longer peripheral to the city. A competition for a new town hall in Pipervika was held in 1916, but the building was not completed before 1947. The residential area Vika got its first zoning plan in 1920, but it was the Oslo Agency for Urban Planning’s (Oslo byplankontor, OBK) revised plan of 1953 that structured it to accommodate the increasing traffic and urban development. The infrastructure analysis for Oslo from 1965 (Transportanalysen av 1965), proposed a new tunnel underneath Akershus Fortress. The tunnel, called Grunnlinjen, was meant to link a new motorway that cut through the urban core, connecting the motorway system north of downtown with the south and westbound roads on Rådhusplassen. Revised versions cancelled the motorway, moved the tunnel junction thought to emerge west of Rådhusplassen. When the final course of the railway tunnel was decided upon in 1970, Grunnlinjen could be extended to relieve

---

3 Ibid., 75. The Oslo Agency for Urban Planning (Oslo byplankontor, OBK) changed its name to the Agency For Planning and Building Services” (Plan- og bygningsetaten, PBE) in 1992.
5 Ibid., 206.
Throughout the 1960s, Rådhusplassen had become surged in national rail and road traffic. While a connection between the two railway stations Vestbanen and Østbanen had been discussed since the opening of Vestbanen in 1892, the once intermediate solution Havnebanen of 1907 had become the permanent link for cargo transport through the city. The new tunnel would open in 1980. Parallel to these developments, the booming oil sector of the late 1960s meant that Akers Mek, now renamed Nyland, was granted commissions for multiple supertankers. But the Israeli-Egyptian war and OPEC boycott of 1973 led to losses from which the wharf never recovered. By 1978, their deficits led to large-scale layoffs for the company, and it finally closed in 1982. This concurrence, between the demise of Akers Mek and the reorganization of road and rail infrastructure in Pipervika, was crucial for the future development of Pipervika.

Fig. 2 Aerial photo of Oslo’s urban waterfront, late 1970s. Bjørvika to the far right, town hall in the middle, Nyland Wharf beneath it and Tjuvholmen at the bottom. (Source: TTA)

---

6 A competition had been held for the new central station replacing Østbanenhalen in 1946, won by John Engh Engh and Peer Qvam with their proposition “Grønt Lys.” Their building was not completed until 1987, and under difference circumstances. Vestbanen closed in 1989.

7 Akers Mekaniske Verksted was renamed Nyland Vest, later Nyland Verksted, after the owner Fred. Olsen & & Co bought the competitor Nyland mekaniske Verksted in Bjørvika (Nyland Øst). The two names would both remain in use until the wharf was cancelled in 1982. Holden, Aker Brygge og Tjuvholmen, 94.
Towards Byen og Fjorden – Oslo år 2000

The competition “The City and the Fjord, Oslo Year 2000” (B&F2000) was a seminal event in urban planning in Oslo, with direct and indirect ramifications for waterfront developments in the decades to come. Here, it manifested a disciplinary reorientation towards the city, in an era where the large architectural commission largely had been situated outside the urban core. Several concurrent events indicated a shift in focus to the city center within architecture and urban planning in Norway. First of all, the global critique of modernist architecture and suburban development schemes manifested in Norway through the Ammerud Report in 1969. It became the symbol of flawed ideals and determinist social engineering in Norwegian urban planning. Within the Fordist-Keynesian economic paradigm, the inner city had been outside the ideological framework and political strategies of governmental land-use planning. The patchwork of privately owned property in the consolidated urban core was not compatible with the corporatist arrangements between the government and the large housing cooperative unions at the time. But the 1970s brought with it social consciousness over social engineering, as well as new sensibilities towards the city’s historical structures. This cultural reorientation concurred with deregulation of the bank system, and a general liberalization of private property rights. At the waterfront, the shifts of the global economy and the decline and reorganization of traditional harbor industry further corresponded with the reorganization of infrastructure. These concurrent events all preconditioned the architectural explorations of the city in B&F2000 that not only rethought Oslo’s seaside, but also crystalized in a feasible urban development scenario at Nyland.

Competition framework

Among those who voiced the potential for urban development in the Vestbanen station area was the independent and politically neutral organization Oslo Byes Vel, led by Jan Sigurd Østberg. In their magazine St. Hallvard, Østberg presented Vestbanen as “Oslo’s large chance,” where 35,000m² public property lay open for development, at the waterfront, and in the middle of the city. At the time, the plans of the OBK still included a large motorway junction at Vestbanen, and the 1979 issue of St. Hallvard

---

1 The Ammerud Report was written by the architects Thorbjørn Hansen and Anne Sæterdal in 1969 and described the area as child-hostile, mentally disruptive and derived of life. Thorbjørn Hansen & Anne Sæterdal: Ammerud I. Planlegging av en ny bydel. (Oslo: Norges Byggforskningsinstitutt, 1969).
2 For more on the transition from Fordist-Keynesian to post-Fordist forms of production, see Harvey, The Condition of Postmodernity, 141–172.
4 Oslo Byes Vel Forening focused (and focuses), on beneficial activities for the city of Oslo.
(named “Vestbanen”) was an attempt to present more ambitious alternatives for urban development in the area. Among the more impressive contributions were the illustrations presented by architect Fredrik Torp and Telje-Torp-Aasen: Their project imagined a new urban borough to be established at Vestbanen, moving the junction further west to the area Hjortnes. The project presented consisted of 400 dwellings, a culture house and aquarium, set within a morphology of urban blocks contextualized to accommodate for the surrounding street network. Inspired by the Swedish Kulturhuset in Stockholm, Telje-Torp-Aasen envisaged large green spaces, dense with activities related to culture and diverse maritime activities, illustrated through a capturing perspective of a future Rådhusplassen.

In addition to presenting alternative futures of reclaimed urban space for Pipervika, the magazine also presented the forthcoming architectural competition initiated by Norske Landskapsarkitekters Forening (NLF) and facilitated for by Oslo Byes Vel: “The City and the Fjord, Oslo Year 2000.” Acknowledging the potential of the large, infrastructural and spatial changes Oslo was facing in the early 1980s, the organizations invited architects of the Nordic countries to participate in formulating visionary architectural schemes for the future Oslo waterfront. The competition was launched 20 September 1982, with funding from both stakeholders and the municipality. The framework was developed in cooperation with the planning authorities, and in the competition draft, the vision for the future seaside of Oslo was vocalized:

> A seaside where it is possible to live, work, relax, run a business, buy shrimp, have fun, meet people – to arrive in the city and travel from it. Oslo’s got the opportunity to become a happier city. This is what the call for ideas is all about.

Aasen and Østberg were also conscious of the strategic and political implications embedded in visualizing potential futures for such large infrastructural and industrial areas in the city core, something reflected in how the competition aimed towards generating a constructive debate and create interest among the Oslo population, and secure that the political decision process is as broad and perspective as possible. Nor did they denounce the existing harbor industry dominating the waterfront. Instead, the competition draft sought solutions that showed how industry

---

14 Oslo Byes Vel, represented by architect Jan Sigurd Østberg, and NLF, represented by landscape architect Bjarne Aasen, formulated the competition framework. The original title of the competition was in Norwegian, called “Byen og fjorden år 2000,” later “Byen og Fjorden, Oslo år 2000.”
could be combined with accessibility for the Oslo population.16

It was divided in three parts, two of which are discussed here:17 Part one included a masterplan for the entire waterfront area.18 This masterplan would address how to rationalize the harbor industry and the ferry terminals, seen in relation to the future central train station, a future bus station as well as subway services. Further, it should envision the organization and location of various maritime activities and future uses of the new vacant sites in the city.19 Part two addressed the Vestbanen station area and the wharf Nyland, including the central Holmen area. Tjuvholmen remained allocated for harbor purposes. The competition draft stated that areas should be envisioned as realistic schemes that could be developed in phases, with attractive indoor and outdoor spaces encompassing a diverse set of functions.20 It further requested diverse urban functions, combining housing, office, commerce and recreation, within a scheme that was independent of public investments, meaning that the development and administration of the area had to be based on private forms of financing. This implied locating solutions that were both appealing and useful for the city, as well as rendering attractive for capital investments. Therefore, a hotel and congress center was also preprogrammed in the competition draft. Functions in need of substantial national or municipal subsidies were regarded as unrealistic. The plan should also be flexible, and display functional diversity, and it was underlined that the property owners in the Aker Group requested a swift development.

Another central aspect of part two was how the massive infrastructural veins that ran through Nyland and over Rådhusplassen were solved. Preservation of existing building mass should also be evaluated. Finally, the competition draft informed of current building codes, and the possibility to get exemption from these.21 It also explicitly requested that the submissions envision realistic phasing strategies for the areas.22

16 Ibid., 8.
17 Østberg writes that the importance of the issues addressed meant that everyone should have the opportunity to participate and help create a broader debate on the development of the waterfront. Part three was an open call for ideas and visions without restrictions that could bring new thoughts and perspectives on the harbor front areas also from non-professionals. Ibid., 15.
18 In Oslo, Hjortnes in the west and Ormsundkaia in the east marked the demarcation of the harbor area.
19 The future requirements of the industrial harbor and the Port of Oslo were also to be considered, as it was expected to grow by 140,000m² in the following ten years. The Port of Oslo’s Sverre Lende set these guidelines. They included a including a ferry harbor and terminal, and a wide selection of different harbor installations set to accommodate future needs of both the industrial, infrastructural and recreational harbor. The guidelines were taken from the Port’s development plan: Harbour Act Proposal 1982–1990 (Forslag til Havneplan 1982–1990). Ibid., 11.
20 Ibid., 7.
21 At the time, the general permitted floor area ratio in the city center was 2,5 and limited to 5 floors. Jan Sigurd Østberg, “Konkurrensprogram” St. Hallvard, 1+2 (1983): 13–17.
22 Ibid., 13–15.
Competition evaluation

The competition deadline was 21 February 1983.® The jury concluded that the 178 submissions of the competition constituted material for “inspiration, discussion and use in physical planning.”© They praised projects that maintained harbor-related industry and infrastructure within the city, as ferries, cruise boats and yachts that were seen as attractions in themselves. Maritime functions in demand for specific security measures would preferably be relocated outside the urban core. For the jury, the largest spatial potential was the reunion between the urban fabric and the waterfront. They therefore discarded proposals that placed larger park areas or open-air amusement parks in-between the water and the city. One exception was the existing recreational area around the fortress Akershus Festning that preferably could be extended along the reclaimed area “Vippetangen.” Large-scale attractors such as an aquarium were also regarded as suited in this area, but the jury was skeptical towards relocating existing cultural institutions to the waterfront, in fear of impoverishing the existing city. In

---

35 In addition to Jan Sigurd Østberg and Bjarne Aasen, the jury consisted of Architect Birger Lambertz-Nilssen Nilssen (the jury chairman), and lawyer Erik Melander, both nominated by the Aker Group that owned Nyland Vest. Harbor CEO Sverre Lende was appointed by the harbor board (Havnestyret), while head of the Agency for Urban Planning Sven Meinich and plan coordinator Øystein Skibnæs were appointed by the Oslo municipality. Architect Per Bonesmo represented Norwegian Association for Housing and Urban Planning (Norsk Forøring for Bolig og Byplanlegging), while Danish professor of architecture Tobias Faber represented the Nordic architectural federations. Finally Trude Lund was the secretary appointed by the Agency of Urban Planning.

terms of preservation, the jury regarded the industrial, brick-clad building called Verkstedshallene as important. From the perspective of urban planning, the station building at Vestbanen was regarded as problematic, but it was still acknowledged as part of Oslo’s collective consciousness. Finally, the jury conceded with proposals that included the tunnel proposal Grunnlinjen in their schemes.

The City and the Fjord – Oslo Year 2000: Part 1

In regard to urban context, the jury accentuated that Pipervika must be regarded as a whole, and that developments of Vestbanen and Nyland should be articulated according to their relation with Akershus Festning, the town hall and Rådhusplassen. In terms of the latter, removing road infrastructure was essential. With regard to the waterfront, the jury noted that most projects maintained Bjørvika and Bispevika east of Akershus as industrial harbors, in order to free areas in the Pipervika area. They also warned against deep-water land reclaining strategies that would prove too expensive and unrealistic. In terms of housing, the jury highlighted projects that either showed developments where new building mass was connected to existing housing areas, or singular areas with a critical mass large enough to sustain different service functions. The winning scheme of part 1 was called “Deilig er Fjorden” (The Fjord is Wonderful). It did, according to the jury “present a map of Oslo so natural that it looks like it was this way the city was planned originally” and that “the plan is a strategy, an objective that makes it possible to control investments.” The projects incorporated the 350-year-old inner city structure (Kvadraturen) in a larger geometric scheme, creating an autonomous whole where the 20th century city faded out in the background. The team perceived the grid as “fundamentally democratic” due to its flexibility, and saw it as representative for the values and opportunities lost in the modernist city. Deilig er Fjorden also split the harbor into a recreational and an industrial zone, where the areas southeast of Bispevika would constitute the latter. This was applauded by the entire jury, with exception of the Port CEO Sverre Lende, who argued that the demand for harbor industry could not be contained within the eastern harbor areas.

37 Ibid., 18–22.
38 As both Filipstad and Sørenga were seen as future areas for urban development, the jury urged the Norwegian National Railways (NSB) not to invest further in these areas.
40 The proposal was designed by Per Johan Eriksen, Eilif Holte, Per Nokleby and Bjørn Warrenskjold.
The City and the Fjord – Oslo Year 2000: Part 2

The jury opted for a firm and dense development for Nyland, balanced with Rådhusplassen as well the town hall and Akershus Festning, sympathetic of “those proposals that enable to give this district an identity attractive for other of Oslo citizens than those living and working there.” The jury remarked on how the existing building mass of Nyland had a potential for developing rich and diverse development plans. The different proposals envisaged a broad spectrum of functions the jury sympathized with, including the future uses of Verkstedshallene. This building was also regarded as providing general dimensions for building heights. The competition entries also substantiated that 200–300 housing units could be built within the Nyland /Vestbanen area. The jury recommended that the ferries towards Nesodden, a municipality and housing area situated on a peninsula in the Oslo Fjord, were located close to Vestbanen. Finally, a future development plan should study alternatives for the “Grunnlinjen” tunnel’s exit points and explore how this development could be synthesized with phasing of the development.

The winner of part 2, Fint Snitt, was labeled “bold and playful” by the jury, “colored by an engaged will for city politics,” and that the description in itself was among the best proposal supporting the forthcoming discussion on Oslo and the harbor. Its designers, Peter Bogen and Didrik Hvoslet Eide argued that the amount of housing located in the area lacked the critical mass required to become a borough in its own right, concluding that Nyland /Vestbanen had to serve Oslo as a whole, both as city region and center. With
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45 Ibid., 39–42.
reference to Rome’s Piazza Navona, their proposal accentuated the buildup of a program of complimenting functions that accommodated organized and unorganized urban activity.\textsuperscript{47} The development should commence over time by different contractors and interest groups, to secure a diverse range of commercial and non-commercial functions that would result in the area becoming a district in the city. Tjuvholmen, as one of the city’s most attractive plots, would be reserved for future development: “This exceptional location must not be wasted, but reserved for future and crucial use.”\textsuperscript{48} While While Bogen and Hvoslet-Eide’s program mix and colorful descriptions won the competition, however, they were not granted the commission.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Telje-Torp-Aasen Arkitektkontor AS. Original competition entry \textit{Waterloo}, 1983. (Source: TTA)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{47} Peter Bogen and Didrik Hvoslet Eide, “Fint Snitt,” \textit{St. Hallvard} 1+2 (1983): 61.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 66.
**TELJE-TORP-AASEN AND WATERLOO**

**Fig. 6 Telje-Torp-Aasen Arkitektkontor AS. Original competition entry Waterloo, 1983.**
(Source: TTA)

**Competition winner**

Although the ideas presented in Fint Snitt regarding function-mix, media culture and identity would be mirrored in the forthcoming Aker Brygge development, it was the second prize winner Telje-Torp-Aasen that was granted the commission by the Aker Group. Their project Waterloo built on the existing dimensions of the area with reference to the adjacent districts Ruseløkka. By excluding Tjuvholmen, Telje Torp Aasen’s development became a compact volume concentrated on Nyland. The scheme was especially valued for its “realistic analysis” and infrastructural considerations. The proposal was conceived as a grid of urban blocks, articulated with basis in its ground floor plan set between a new harbor-front promenade to the east and the road Munkesdamsveien to the west. A new pedestrian street stretched from a large urban square behind the Vestbanen building, to an entertainment area southeast of the dry dock that divided Holmen from Tjuvholmen. The volumes along Munkedamsveien contained office functions set on top of two levels of parking, shielding the interior housing areas from traffic noise. Centered in the project, the architects located an educational institution in the form of a new school for architecture.

The volumes along the harbor-front promenade were from the south made out by a hotel and conference center, and a multi-use facility called “byhall.” The industrial buildings next to Vestbanen hosted various forms of retail. The Vestbanen building was integrated in a new seven-story culture house,

---

market and gallery framing Rådhusplassen to the east and harboring a new urban square on the former tracks west of the building. The new building structure would become a landmark in the city, “balance” its adjacent building mass and conclude Rådhusplassen in a manner the Vestbanen building lacked the scale to manage. Located on public property, the allocation of a culture house in this area was also a strategic move by Telje-Torp-Aasen, as it did not interfere with the commercial demands of the Aker Group owner.

Opposite of the urban square, the recreational area harbored a bathhouse, entertainment area, aquarium and restaurants. These two poles of the development complemented each other: Where the northern square marked an entrance point through its institutional program and formal urban square, the south tip was an attractor with the “pull factor” necessary to invite visitors southwards along the promenade, as well as flanking the congress center residing in this area. The central Holmensgate (street) linked the two areas, described as an “attractive local street (strøksgate) with varying widths, vegetation, covered areas and smaller passages linking it to the adjacent building mass.”

The street Holmensgate that ran through the wharf wharf was articulated as a pedestrian area. Munkedamsveien, running parallel to the waterfront, was the main access street to the development. A secondary access street was Cort Adelers gate, terminating at the waterfront next to Vestbanen.

Telje-Torp-Aasen led Grunnlinjen beneath Rådhusplassen, with exit points located west of the dock in a compact junction linking Ibsenringen/Sjølystveien with Munkedamsveien. The architects argued for a mix of cars and pedestrian areas, weighting the latter as dominant. Still, Fredrik Torp of Telje-Torp-Aasen meant that cars could help integrate the local infrastructure with the adjacent neighborhoods. They also proposed crossing the railway with pedestrian bridges, to link the project with existing housing areas westwards. Four buildings were proposed preserved, namely the large Verkstedhallene, and the three interconnected buildings Støperibygget, Snekkerverkstedet and Administrasjonsbygget.

### The strategic dispositions of Waterloo

Waterloo’s strength was its clear infrastructural dispositions and compact development, whose four corners were linked to the surrounding context. Rådhusplassen was addressed through the new building at Vestbanen, while the waterscape was appropriated with the bathhouse and recreational areas surrounding it. The delineation of the area north of the dock contributed to strengthening the Nyland area within a completed form, accentuated by the
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cultural facilities of Vestbanen. It also had an ingenious phasing strategy that enabled infrastructural development to be commenced independent of existing traffic: Nyland could be initiated instantly, while the northern part could evolve parallel to the discontinuation of rail activities. During this period, the traffic could be led through the south and north development. This area would be the final part to be developed. Telje-Torp-Aasen opted for mixed functions. The city center was regarded as a “social meeting place and recreation area” that Nyland would complement. It was argued that the dry dock constituted a natural delineation of the project, as a defined line between urban and industrial activities.

It is difficult not to regard the proposal as a strategic accentuation of the Nyland area (the actual property primed for development), supported by public attractors from both south and north, with a natural demarcation provided by Cort Adelers gate to the north. An interview with Fredrik Torp confirms this assertion: According to Torp, building economy was a crucial part of their conceptualization of the area. Furthermore, Telje-Torp-Aasen also attended meetings with Aker Gruppen before the BOF2000, in relation with their 85,000m² mixed-use proposal presented in St. Hallvard in 1979.

Waterloo introduced a gradual decommission of the shipyard for urban development purposes, providing a density that matched the potential increase of property value as consequence of rezoning the area. Torp claims that the jury lacked insights to the task at hand, resulting that the winning scheme was biased by ideology more than feasibility. Thus, Waterloo’s density contrasted the winning scheme Fint Snitt, whose volumes towards the water in certain areas were kept as low as two floors. Still, Fredrik Torp maintains that the competition proposal was “doodled”: The team’s design process consisted of meandering throughout the area without regards to property borders, regarding the entire development as a larger interior. Waterloo finally prevailed as winner after the Aker Group arranged meetings with the first, second and third place winners of the competition, granting Telje Torp Aasen the commission shortly thereafter.
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52 Fredrik Torp, interview by author. Tape recording, Oslo, 22 November 2011.
53 Telje-Torp-Aasen had made a concept for the area in front of the competition: “we knew some of the CEOs over there and I has a meeting with them to get a process going. Luckily, this faded out, as there was supposed to be a thorough process with an architectural competition.” My translation. F. Torp, interview, 2011.
54 F. Torp, interview, 2011.
Fig. 8 Revised project *Aker Brygge*. From presentation 20.08.1984. (Source: TTA)

Fig. 9 Revised project *Aker Brygge*. Ground floor plan with outdoor and indoor atria spaces. From presentation 20.08.1984. (Source: TTA)
**Waterloo revised**

The Aker Group did not waste time in the aftermath of the competition. But while the scope of the development was, in terms of ownership and zoning, limited to the property owned, the revised scheme kept the proposal for Vestbanen and also introduced Tjuvholmen as site for future development. In spring 1984, they were commissioned for making the Nyland zoning plan. For Telje-Torp-Aasen, this meant a reformulation of Waterloo into the envelope of Nyland. The new masterplan differed from the original scheme on several accounts. Now, Tjuvholmen was strategically integrated in the presentation, boasting Europe’s biggest aquarium. The former location of the congress center was replaced by a generic office structure. The Vestbanen urban square, free from constraints regarding both function and economy, was granted a glass dome and presented as a future site for an opera and culture house. The ferries toward Nesodden were located right outside the Terminal building. In front of the project’s diverse facades towards the water, a continuous promenade was intersected by the bathhouse, placed on a marina stretching eastwards, providing views back towards Rådhuset. Holmensgate was now partly covered by glass roofs, while the housing blocks were moved southwest, now as linear blocks framing the dock, unfolding westward towards Munkedamsveien. A cinema resided approximately where the former school of architecture was located, and the workshop building was to be transformed to an indoor farmers market. The reciprocity between inside and outside areas was even more accentuated in this revised scheme, where semi-climatized glass atria mediated between outdoor and indoor spaces, providing larger public accessible areas within the urban blocks. Some of these alterations were enabled by the removal of the former junction west of the dock that enlarged the site and provided a less congested situation along Munkedamsveien.

TTA kept the original blue-collar main entrance through the brick wall initiating at the north gate of the former industrial facility, as a central spine with a smaller square at each end, facing respectively the old dock and park area in the south, and Cort Adelers gate in the North. The project formed an intricate morphology of new and re-used buildings flanked by squares and narrow streets. This contrasted the spatial hierarchy of Waterloo, with its monumental spine connecting the northern and more ceremonial urban plaza with an informal park with intermediate programs in the south. Now, the project imposed different programs within single blocks, set in an arrangement of contrasting spatial situations. At its core, however, the
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55 The Aker Group would later become Aker Norcem (1987) and finally Aker A/S. Since the redevelopment of Vestbanen was decades away and Grunnlinjen still a controversial investment, Nyland would be developed independent of its adjacent areas.
original grid of Waterloo remained intact, including the preserved industrial buildings. The area’s proposed name “Aker Brygge” was conceived in a meeting with the Aker Group and Kjell Wester, the CEO of the Nyland development firm Aker Eiendom AS. The project also introduced the harbor-front promenade as the project’s main feature (While it had been present, it was to a lesser extent accentuated as key feature in Waterloo). The development prospect had four main images illustrating the quay promenade, the interior square seen from the dock, an image showing the northern square towards the partly covered Holmensgate and a visualization of Vestbaneplassen – the glass vaulted urban square behind the Vestbane building. A detailed façade drawing visualized the whole cross section from the town hall to the aquarium on Tjuvholmen, including Aker’s main headquarters. A large axonometric drawing depicted the volumes from above, rendering the area as visually dense and heterogenic. The drawing material made out a 160,000m² masterplan, proposed for regulation in August 1984, a mere year after the competition deadline. While Telje-Torp-Aasen were the responsible architects, Kjell Wester, representing the plot owner and leading the project, played a crucial role in articulating the revised scheme.

Fig. 10 Perspective, Terminalbygget. From presentation 20.08.1984. (Source: TTA)
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Telje Torp Aasen conducted the zoning plan and was project leaders for the development, while the developers were Hans Hjorth and Åke Larsson Construction.
Fig. 11 Phases 1 and 2. From presentation 20.08.1984. (Source: TTA)

Fig. 12 Phase 3 with the completed aquarium at Tjuvholmen and culture house at Vestbanen. From presentation 20.08.1984. (Source: TTA)
Fig. 13. Revised project towards Holmensgate. From presentation 20.08.1984 (Source: TTA)

Fig. 14 Revised project. Promenade/Tingvallakaia. From presentation 20.08.1984 (Source: TTA)
From Waterloo to Aker Brygge: Making an image

Nyland’s transition from wharf to urban waterfront was a novelty in the Norwegian context, both in terms of its scale and the development model applied. But there were several concurrent events that enabled the development to take place. As introduced above, the maritime industry was in a phase of restructuring, and the Aker Group were in the process of allocating their focus to the growing oil industry on the west coast, at the expense of their traditional shipyard activities in Oslo. While Nyland had produced the first “H3” platforms for offshore oil industry with considerable success, rationalization processes meant that their activities were now rendered ineffective and superfluous. Instead, the Aker Group aimed towards strengthening its engineering competences, and hired building engineer Kjell Wester to run subsidiary firm Aker Engineering. Wester’s former experience with the building industry made him suited for leading the transformation of Nyland. The climate for property development in Oslo had been difficult, due to the national focus on encouraging investment outside the larger cities, in the more rural areas of Norway. The national development bank Distriktenes Utbyggingsfond, founded in 1961, financially supported this strategy. In Oslo, different techniques were evolved to develop property, by locating building mass that could be extended through rehabilitation, small additions and later, new buildings. Kjell Wester had experience with such developments, granting him knowledge of the entire building process, from finding property to completing new buildings. Through successfully developing Aker Engineering, Wester had made an impression on the CEOs of the Aker Group. But it was through the development of Nyland from industrial brownfield to real estate property that opened the eyes of the Aker Group and Fred Olsen, one of Aker’s largest owners. Nyland, as a traditional industrial plant, was not valued as property within its accounts.

The 60,000m$^2$ site maintained a symbolic value of one kroner, until it became apparent that the property itself was far more valuable than the production it harbored. When Wester received an assessment for the property’s value, it was estimated to around NOK20–30 million, a sum that encompassed the building mass with little thought for its property’s prominent location. As the property hit the market as a real estate development scenario, this estimate increased dramatically: When the Aker Brygge plan was presented at a meeting with the Oslo politicians 20 August 1984, the project had an estimated value of NOK1 billion: the Aker Group had sold 25 percent of their development company Aker Brygge ANS to Den Norske Creditbank (DNC) through their subsidiary Aker Eiendom A/S,
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57 Kjell Wester, interview by author. Tape recording, Åmål, 7 May 2012.
58 F. Torp, interview, 2011.
securing capital investments and bank activity in the area for NOK250 million. DNC would move to Aker Brygge after the completion of the second phase of the development. This maneuver led the Aker Group to grant Wester and Aker Eiendom wide authorization for developing the project further.\textsuperscript{59}

**SUMMARIZING REMARKS**

Below, I approach B&F2000 from three different angles. The first discusses the impact of B&F2000 in terms of architectural practice forms. The second will address B&F2000 and its impact on urban planning. The third perspective comments on B&F2000 in light of the political economic practices that it emerged within.

**B&F2000 and architecture**

Oslo By Vel’s competition managed to put the design disciplines ahead of both market mechanisms and public planning, creating an arena for disciplinary speculation and drafting through 178 different proposals. These assessments commenced from the physical articulation of the urban fabric as architecture and urban space. For the jury, the link between the water and the urban fabric, the notion of “taking care of and strengthening the overall shape of the harbor,” and “instituting a search for order in the landscape” revealed that the harbor front was regarded as an identifiable landscape that could be sustained through specific designs. Contextual references to Verkstedshallene, the evaluation of the Vestbanen station building’s performance as volume and the denunciation of tall buildings illustrated the ideological and disciplinary foundations that dominated the competition.\textsuperscript{60}

The winning scheme Deiliger Fjorden’s conceptual continuation of the scale and patterns of the existing city correspondingly displayed a focus on preexisting urban form and structures.\textsuperscript{61} Several of the competitors also displayed an accentuation of spatial order and organization reminiscent of Leon Krier’s division of the city in its “Res Publica” and “Res Economica,” where the city’s public institutions, public functions and public spaces were granted specific aesthetic qualities based on architectural iconography.\textsuperscript{62}

Telje-Torp-Aasen similarly laid out a composition of urban blocks in a recognizable grid pattern. Between the formal square at Vestbanen, and the intermediate and informal southern entertainment area, they structured a miniature metropolis of urban blocks covering a range of different spaces and functions associated with the city. In this way, the project mediated between

\textsuperscript{59} Kjell Wester, interview, 2012
\textsuperscript{60} Lambertz-Nilssen et al., “Jury evaluation,” 22–43.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 54.
the consolidated city represented by Vestbanen and Rådhusplassen, and the nature landscape of Pipervika. But while their rooftop plan envisaged a structure of voids and volumes, their ground floor displayed a rich articulation of indoor and outdoor public accessible areas, where the city’s economic, private and public realm seemingly overlapped.63

The complexity of their urban spaces was not the only feature that contrasted its competing schemes: While Telje-Torp-Aasen shared the formal ideals promoted by most of their colleagues, their Watergate proposal also performed on a strategic level:

First of all, it had rational and efficient solutions to the infrastructural challenges, overlooked by many of their competitors. Aware of the commercial aspects of the development, they also had an increased floor area ratio than most.

Further, that Tjuvholmen was removed from the scheme meant that development could start instantly. A clear phasing strategy supported this. North of Dokkveien, the proposed large culture house on Vestbanen could easily be extracted from the plan, but both the building and its proposed culture house helped legitimize the project through its program and visual link to the city.

Finally, Telje-Torp-Aasen was also already familiar with the developer through meetings and their scheme presented in 1978, envisaging how informal channels of communication gave the architects new tools in their quest for commissions.

Telje-Torp-Aasen’s strategic approach to B&F2000 competition envisaged a disciplinary mode of conduct that anticipated the new political economic conditions that emerged in the 1980s in Oslo. Their flexible, market-oriented architectural development model was tailored for central, commercial and large-scale commissions, but found its full potential through the involvement of the Aker developer. The revised project’s development principles were both based on political flexibility and the project’s capacity to evolve outside traditional zoning practices. But while strategic measures of project-based planning secured economic viability, it was its architectural narration that envisaged its capacity as urban environment.

63 Telje-Torp-Aasen’s ground floor plan of indoor and outdoor public spaces have a parallel in the 1748 map by Giambattista Nolli that depicted the voids and volumes of Rome, also including the interiors of churches and other public accessible institutions. It had been evoked in the 1960s by, among others, architect Colin Rowe at Cornell University and further canonized by the influential competition Roma Interotta of 1978. It made the figureplan, and the instrumental use of urban voids a tool for architects worldwide. In Scandinavia, Jan Gehl’s 1971 book *Life Between Buildings* focused on the social capacity of the city’s urban spaces, and can be regarded as an equally influential work in regard to urban planning and design. See Jan Gehl, *Life Between Buildings: Using Urban Space* (Copenhagen: Arkitekten’s Forlag, 1996) and Aaron Betsky et al., *Roma Interrotta* (Monza: Johan & Levi, 2015).
B&F2000 and urban planning

The City and the Fjord – Oslo Year 2000 was a project initiated by a non-governmental organization, directly and indirectly comprising different agents and interest groups, supported by both private and public institutions. The relevance of the competition was not only limited to the transformation of Pipervika brownfield areas, but also helped define the political and economic perspectives on the harbor front for years to come. Thus, the competition can be seen as the commencement of what 17 years later would become the “Fjord City Decision” (Fjordbyvedtaket), the political approval of a large-scale transformation and real estate development strategy that initiated the development of Tjuvholmen. I base this assertion on the following observations: In terms of municipal urban policy, and through the work of OBK, led by CEO Sven Meinich, several of the jury’s conclusions would later become incorporated in the city’s urban planning programs.64 Equally important was the competition program’s focus on feasibility: The reorganization and financing of road, rail and harbor infrastructure would remain the largest obstacles for urban development for the decades to come, and many of the entries provided well-grounded infrastructural considerations in their proposals that were thoroughly discussed by the jury.65 The accentuation of road solutions as well as industrial and commercial harbor functions underlined how infrastructure had to precondition any visualization of the future Oslo in order to render it credible.

The jury’s recommendations, however, were not ubiquitously followed in the years to come. Illustrative is how the jury feared how culture-driven waterfront developments risked emaciating the existing city for its cultural institutions, a worry that would prove more well-founded than the jury at the time could imagine: 25 years later, the National Museum, the Munch and Stenersen Museum, the main library Deichman, the Oslo Opera as well as the private Astrup Fearnley Museum and numerous other galleries were relocated or planned to be relocated at the waterfront, as a result of a political restructuring of the city’s cultural institutions.

B&F2000 and the post-Fordist economy

While the large-scale redevelopment schemes B&F2000 at large were applauded, some were also skeptical of the long-term effects these redevelopments would have on the urban waterfront. Among the critical voices expressed in Oslo Byes Vel’s publication St. Hallvard was author Jon

64 The competition is mentioned as source for inspiration by Head of the Agency of Urban Planning Sven Meinich, in the municipal document Oslo’s Central Waterfront - Main report, Proposition for Municipal Plan (Oslos sentrale sjøside – Hovedrapport, forslag til Kommunedelplan) from 1987.
Michelet. He noted on how traditional forms of work were excluded from the schemes, where traditional forms of industrial labor were replaced with the “soft values” associated with recreation and leisure. With reference to an amphitheater proposal in Nyland’s former dry dock, Michelet suggested envisaging the dry dock as what it actually was: *A dry dock*. Michelet’s point was not only his nostalgia for the demise of traditional harbor industrial labor or to mock what he perceived as flippant ideas. He also raised the question whether a city without real production in reality was a city without real content. Michele’s comments anticipated the spatial imprint and functional functional impact of what David Harvey labels as the post-Fordist economy at Oslo’s waterfront. Here, the transition from an industrial facility, whose property value was irrelevant for its function, to a real estate development prospectus that placed property at the very center of production. The swift decommissioning of active industrial harbor areas to property primed for development seen at Nyland also represents what is called a short-term *frictional* vacancy (due to shift of land use), over the *structural* vacancy often found in brownfield areas, where location-specific or technical issues make land redundant. In the decades to come, such intermediate frictional vacancies would be instrumentalized within new governance strategies for development in the further exploitation of Oslo’s waterfront, as will be explored in chapter 6.
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5 The waterfront redeveloped

Fig. 16 Kjell Wester and Hans Svelleland presenting the Aker Brygge development concept, 1984. (Source: TTA)
The following pages explore the making of Aker Brygge, including its origins, framework for development, architectural articulation and conceptions of urban space. The section is initiated by describing the different phases of the Aker Brygge building process, giving an account of how the area was articulated as urban space, from the perspective of its architects and Aker Eiendom CEO Kjell Wester. A description and discussion of its strategic programming and use of culture as attractor and place marketing tool follows this section. 68 Thirdly, an account for how a study trip to the USA affected the Aker Brygge scheme is conducted, followed by a description for the articulation and evolution of the “Baltimore model” as a strategy for urban waterfront redevelopment. Finally, I discuss how Aker Brygge evolved in the years following its completion, and the impact the area would have in waterfront development in the decades to come.

PHASE 1: BUILDING AKER BRYGGE

The phasing of the area was divided in three, where phase one (B1) was to be completed in 1987/1988, the second phase (B2) set to be completed in 1988/1989 while the final phase (B3) was to be built in 1990. The first phase included the transformation of the 33,000m² existing building mass, and a 12,000m² development next to Vestbanen. Phase two encompassed 65,000m², while phase three consisted of 45,000m² built in the southernmost areas, including a marina and housing areas next to the dock. When Fredrik Torp presented the 160,000m², estimated to a value of NOK1.23 billion on Monday, 20 August 1984, Oslo Major Albert Nordengen, Municipal Councilor (Kommunalrådgiver), Hans Svelland as well as several other central Oslo politicians participated. In Aftenposten, Hans Svelland praised the regulation plan:

> It’s unique that only one year after the competition the City and the Fjord – Oslo Year 2000 there exists a complete zoning plan for one of the areas. I would like to say that Aker’s project is a manual of how to realize a vulnerable project. Here, there were negotiations where the involved parties knew that the other agents had the right to veto. 69

The political enthusiasm for the project meant that exceptions were granted that enabled Aker Eiendom to start building, despite the fact that the zoning plan lacked approval. B1 was initiated with the northern part of Nyland, and
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included the harbor-front promenade, the new Terminal Building in the north, and renovation of the preserved building mass. The Terminal Building hosted a ferry terminal supporting the Nesodden ferries that was relocated to this area.\textsuperscript{70} Time limits were held, and when the zoning plan was ratified in June 1986, B1 was reaching its completion.\textsuperscript{71} Fredrik Torp later wrote that the extreme time schedule and the construction management enterprise made quality control difficult. His concerns became a forewarning of the new climate for the building industry emerging in the 1980s, where economic control, budgets and time limits would precondition any large-scale development project.\textsuperscript{72}

**Building Aker Brygge**

The Terminal Building, opening in 1985, was a triangular, 7-floor structure with two sub-levels and a diagonal glass atrium. The shape and organization of the building was defined by the scale of the adjacent Verkstedhallene, while the brick wall of Nyland was preserved as “part of the city’s physiognomy,” delimited the buildings northwards. As traffic would be removed from Rådhusplassen, Munkedamsveien was altered northwards, allowing Cort Adelers gate/Dokkveien to again connect with, Tingvallakaia (the waterfront promenade) in a square in front of the building, accentuated by the building’s concave façade. The building became Aker Brygge’s “portal” towards Rådhusplassen. The glass atrium through the building called Grundingen opened for pedestrian connection between the waterfront promenade and Holmensgate. The two lower floors were mixed use areas addressing the atrium, whose program was “meant to link to the functions of Verkstedhallene.” The first floor also had a bridge connecting the two buildings. The remaining floors were office spaces.\textsuperscript{73}

Gromholt & Ottar Arkitektkontor designed and transformed Verkstedhallene. This structure consisted of a machine workshop, a diesel-engine workshop, and an additional smaller building. The structure was transformed to a culture center supported by retail and offices, through a complete renovation where only the original facades remained. Kjell Wester had initiated the transformation of Nyland’s existing building mass parallel to the waterfront competition, starting with the existing building mass that

\textsuperscript{70} F. Torp, interview, 2011.
\textsuperscript{71} Zoning plan S2919 (Reguleringsplan S2919) was ratified June 18, 1986.
\textsuperscript{72} According to Fredrik Torp, the Terminal building suffered from low production cost and short timeframes. In an interview, Torp extrapolates this further: “We always had the economy lingering in our heads, because it was enormously expensive to commence with the project, with piling in the water, parking and infrastructure. It was calculated in different pieces, roads, and sewers. Terminal Building was a terrible house that was forced through due to market demands. We never managed to refine it, it was so complex, working towards the city, so many parameters.” Still, Fredrik Torp credits Aker Eiendom for the efficiency and sustainable economy in B1. F. Torp, “Historien om Aker Brygge,” 504, and F. Torp, interview, 2011.
was thought to be preserved. The renovation of the carpenter and foundry buildings behind Verkstedhallene had already taken place, where the former hosted offices while the latter was the Aker Group’s cafeteria. The two inner “promenade streets” were “climatized urban spaces” with several superimposed functions, including hosting a theater foyer, shopping areas and logistical purposes.

Fig. 17 Terminal building completed with adjacent Verkstedhallene and additional workshop building. (Source: TTA)

74 Verkstedhallene and the smaller workshops were proposed preserved both by Telje-Torp-Aasen, in accordance with Aker’s own evaluation. An additional building further south was thought to be transformed as well, but was finally torn down as its orientation conflicted with the development. Aker Eiendom used explosives to demolish the building, itself an event on Nyland. Wester, interview, 2012.
According the architects, the spaces would be “like an Italian piazza, prosper in diversity.” The main office areas were located on the higher floors around the atrium street. Verkstedhallene housed the Norwegian Academy of Theatre as well as the independent Black Box theatre, including three main stages and multiple studio stages workshops/support functions. The building was conceptualized around the idea of synergy between the different cultural institutions, and their interaction with the office and retail areas.

For Wester, the municipality (represented by Hans Svelland and Albert Nordengen) was crucial for the realization of Aker Brygge. Not only did they accept that a 50,000m² development was instigated before the area zoning plan was ratified, they also had lines of communication with Wester and Aker Eiendom AS that enabled swift decision-making throughout the development phase. Wester, however, regarded the planning authorities as inflexible: They had administrative leadership with Svelland and political leadership with Nordengen, but the planning authorities did, according to Wester, their best to conserve the structure of the bureaucracy. Wester thus experienced the attempts to create a masterplan for the waterfront as a hindrance more than a resource for the development of Aker Brygge.

![Terminal building and Verkstedhallene ground floor plan. (Source TTA)](image)

---

76 Ibid., 102.
77 “They came down to the docks and went home again, talked a bit and such. These lines of communication were decisive.” My translation. Wester, interview, 2012.
PHASE 2: AKER BRYGGE CONSOLIDATED

The second phase B2 was initiated in autumn 1986. Five architectural firms were invited to supplement the zoning plan with architectural solutions for the four blocks south of B1. According to the jury, none of the firms managed to articulate convincing solutions for the area, and Niels Torp Architects was granted the entire development of 70,000m² (later 100,000m²), with an additional 30,000m² parking garage. Niels Torp and project leader Øyvind Neslein’s new scheme refined Aker Brygge’s concept, both on an architectural, economic and programmatic level. Their grandest move was to integrate the southern square and park areas next to the dock in one large monumental square called “Festplassen,” later Bryggetorget, and to align the ally (later called Fjordalleen) with the dry dock. The densities and the allocation of buildings around a grand central square convinced Aker Eiendom that the urban scheme should be applied in its entirety as a new development plan for Aker Brygge.  

With a price tag of NOK2 billion, the

---

78 The contract was won by Selmer-Furuholmen that inherited the architect and their sketch project for B2, drawn in scales 1:200.
area was to be completed in just two years. But when the project was presented to the Building Council in 1986, it did not buy into Kjell Wester’s attempt to describe the discrepancies between Niels Torp’s phase 2 and TTA’s original zoning plan as “minor adjustments,” stating that no further construction would be permitted before a political vote of a new zoning plan had been held: Corporate developers such as Aker Eiendom could no longer expect to be granted purpose-built exceptions from planning rules. After negotiations between the Conservative Party and Labor Party in the City Council, the zoning plan was passed in 1987 and the 140,000m² development completed in 1989.

![Fig. 20 Aker Brygge. Overview, phase 2 and 3 in dark grey. (Source: NTA)](image)

**Buildings of Phase II**

It was the reorientation of the street grid introduced by Torp that led to the demand for a new zoning plan, an alteration applauded by both Telje-Torp-Aasen and the planning authorities. According to Øyvind Neslein, the reorientation of the street was based on gaining a vista towards the island Hovedøya and the Kavringen lighthouse. Oppositely, the large building volume would become a bowl-shaped Fondbygning ("motif building"), whose 12-story height “marked a crescendo in the diagonal axis.”

---

79 Ole Mathismoen “Aker Brygge må vente med bygging,” Aftenposten Aften, 3 July 1987, 12.
80 S-2919 was ratified 26 August 1987, opening for a 140,000m² development. The FAR was 3.5.
81 F. Torp, interview, 2011.
82 Øyvind Neslein, interview by author, Oslo, 15 September 2011.
of Fredrik Torp and Telje-Torp-Aasen’s vision for a development built by several different architects, Niels Torp as Architects designed the new scheme in its entirety.

The project was conceptualized around the central square, with four building structures set around it: Kaibygning 1 along the waterfront promenade, Kaibygning 2 south of the diagonal Fjordalleen, the smaller Dokkbygningen west of the Wharf square and the adjacent Fondbygningen. The four buildings where conceived as urban blocks, constituting a “varied and nuanced building environment.” The four urban blocks were of approximately 70 times 80 meters, with heights varying from 5–12 floors. Kaibygning 1 became the headquarters for bank DNC, with ground floor retail and offices above, including a double height trading floor in the middle, facing a grand glass-covered semi-climatized atrium. On the top floors, diagonally-aligned walls divided the apartments, whose outdoor skyways stretched westwards to Fondbygningen. This building had a 3-auditorium cinema complex and a theater (Bryggeteatret) in its cellar, exhibition areas above and several floors of office space between levels three and seven. The theater would be rented out to different agents and could also function as a television studio. The six upper floors contained apartments.

The building faced Bryggetorget diagonally with a large glass façade dividing the inner atrium from the outdoor square. The structure was, according to Niels Torp, conceived as a monumental building, defined by the diagonal axis to the water, and with a height that made it function as a closure towards the city. In contrast, Dokkbygningen was a four-story residential building towards the square that peaked at nine floors to the north, allowing afternoon sun to hit Bryggetorget over its slanting roof. The building also contains a kindergarten and ground floor office programs. The final building, Kaibygning 2, was an office building with ground floor retail and top floor apartments. The horizontal layering of functions mean that the the top floors became a network of “footpaths on the city’s rooftop” were apartments across three of the four houses were interconnected by sky-bridges and sharing common functions and connected by external elevators. This enabled the top floors to function as an independent layer of the programs below. The atriums meant that the ground and first-floor areas connected, as in Kaibygning 1, where the reception, cafeteria and conference center of DNC was set on the first floor, connected to the ground floor by large staircases. The horizontal layering of program was “challenging but interesting” according to Øyvind Neslein, who explains that

83 Niels Torp as Architects, *Aker Brygge Byggetrinn II* presentation prospectus.
85 The alley Beddingen came in phase three. There were in total 208 apartments built in B2.
the resulting increased costs of building were accepted due to Aker Eiendom AS belief in rising real estate prices. The investor DNC and its CEO Leif Terje Løddesøl also granted Aker Eiendom AS the freedom to explore and take risks, contrasting the economic security measurements normally assigned conventional real estate development. The organization of the buildings themselves, however, was not inefficient: The high density and glass gallerias also provide the development with highly rational office floors.

Fig. 21 Illustration of phases I-III. From top left: Dokkbygningen, Fondbygningen and existing buildings. Lower left: Phase III building Strandent, Kaibygning 2 and 1, Verkstedhallene and the Terminal Building. (Source: NTA)

Urban spaces of Phase II

In the proposal for the architectural competition, Niels Torp conceptualized the urban spaces of Aker Brygge in five types: “Festplassen,” (later called Brygetorget, which is the name used in the thesis) was described as a “miniature Washington Square” (with reference to Manhattan’s lively and diverse plaza), where inhabitants, office workers, visitors and tourists would gather. Roller skating as well as street theaters was mentioned as potential...

---

87 Neslein refers to this optimism and enthusiasm as a product of the “juppie” age of the time. He also explains how DNCs CEOs were involved in the project in a manner that enabled Wester to take larger risks: “We worked a lot with the traders hall you see on television, large two story hall with mezzanine developed in close cooperation with DNC, whose top CEOs were very engaged in the project. It was a good process when they functioned as an engine, allowing Wester to take chances.” (My translation) Neslein, interview 2011.
activities. The second type was the “Intimate places for recreation” were park-like areas housing art exhibitions and a sculpture park. The third was the waterfront itself, where the boats and masts became “part of the architecture,” flanked by cafes, restaurants and retail. The fourth type were the narrow alleyways between the buildings, that gave access to the most important office areas and that were supposed to be filled with retail: “From butchers to fashion stores, articulated as a market.” Here, Torp referred to the docks of New York and Boston, areas that recently had emerged as examples of successfully regenerated city spaces and commercial zones at the urban waterfront. The last was the semi-climatized and semi-public spaces of the “gallerias.” Torp organized these areas within a hierarchy of streets, where the informal harbor-front promenade was contrasted by the monumentality of the parallel Holmensgate: According to Torp, the tall and slender arcade pillars flanking Holmensgate granted the street a “serious” atmosphere.

Holmensgate terminated at the 43x130 meter Bryggetorget, whose monumentality that was softened by the variation of its adjacent façades, again according to Torp. Festplassen was conceptualized as a space where several different and contrasting activities were brought together. This included the kindergarten of Dokkbygningen and the adjacent restaurants, flanked by exhibition and cinema programs, as well as the day-to-day activities of inhabitants and office workers: “The splashing sounds of the fountain bled with the sound of children on skateboards, restaurant guests and the sounds from the marina.” The “tension” between the inner Holmensgate and the Promenade was meant to enable a rich street life in the areas between, sufficient for retail to blossom in the alleys between the blocks eastwards. Torp’s differentiation of Aker Brygge’s urban spaces built on TTA’s scheme, where the semi-climatized streets and squares blended with the exterior, creating an “interior” of common spaces. These relations were pursued seemingly independent of the spatial or juridical status of these spaces. Instead, the focus was on how they could harbor functions that stimulated use and interaction. Torp’s contribution was to enhance the spatial situations embedded in TTA’s project, through introducing a monumental square and diagonal street, reintroducing architectural composition and hierarchy in TTA’s scheme, while maintaining its eclectic language of form.

---

88 As it turned out, roller skating and skateboarding would be banned from Aker Brygge. Niels Torp as Architects, Aker Brygge Byggetrinn II presentation prospectus.
89 Niels Torp as Architects, Aker Brygge Byggetrinn II presentation prospectus.
91 Ibid., 512.
92 To ensure activity on Bryggetorget, Torp also located the only parking garage entrance on the square, making it a main infrastructural hub on Aker Brygge.
93 Similar relations were also explored by other participants of the B&F2000, like Bogen and Hvoslet Eide’s Fint Snitt, who discussed the dynamics between enclosed and open common spaces on Nyland Vest.
Fig. 22 The diagonal street towards Fondbygget, 1989. (Source: Niels Torp Architect AS)
Fig. 23 Opening day at Aker Brygge, 1985. Bryggetorget with sculptures seen from west towards the diagonal street, connecting Bryggetorget with the promenade. (Source: Scanpix)

Fig. 24 DNC’s headquarters in Kaibygning 1, 1989. (Source: Niels Torp Architects AS)
Reception

Aker Brygge’s B2 was well received in the architectural press and among critics.\textsuperscript{98} Notably is how the Danish architect and urban theorist Jan Gehl would appraise the development after its completion and in numerous publications in the years to come.\textsuperscript{99} But from the perspective of the organizers of the B&F2000, Aker Brygge did not turn out the way they envisioned when commencing with the competition in the early 1980s. In 1987, as B2 was initiated, Jan Sigurd Østberg, noted that OBK and its representative in the jury Sven Meinich had been “very cooperative” with the developers. While in essence positive to the development, the new plans were disappointing:

Aker Brygge became a very different area than what was perceived after the competition the City and the Fjord - Oslo Year 2000. Here, the old machine halls of Akers Mekaniske Verksted were meant to be a benchmark for the urban environment, the atmosphere and the height of the buildings. Today, the developer is planning, with the blessing of the politicians, a modern district with an old machine hall. Here, the focus has been on the floor area ratio.\textsuperscript{100}

For Østberg, Aker had understood the importance of people in urban development, but felt three mistakes were conducted on Aker Brygge: It became too dense, too commercial and too “fashionable.” The cultural strategies that initiated the Aker Brygge development did not evolve beyond Verkstedshallene’s cultural institutions. In the same article, Østberg’s dark outlook was contrasted by Aker Eiendom’s Åse Kleveland: “I am very happy with the way it develops – This part of Aker Brygge becomes an example of how districts should be built, where culture and art is included as an important part.”\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{98} Also in the Norwegian review of architecture Byggekunst, where Ketil Moe acclaims the ambiguity of Aker Aker Brygge’s forms, where large corporations reside within a small-scale building pattern. Ketil Moe, “Tema med Variasjoner,” \textit{Byggekunst} 71 no.7(1989): 511.

\textsuperscript{99} As late as in 2008, Jan Gehl used Aker Brygge as a case study and prescription of how to create successful urban environments: Building density is compact, functions are mixed, urban spaces carefully designed to accommodate attractions, and ground floor areas are active, varied and face the most important public spaces. Jan Gehl, Jan Gehl, Lotte Johansen Kaefer and Solveig Reigstad, “Close encounter with buildings,” \textit{Urban Design International} 11 (2006): 44. Accessed 5 September 2016 doi:10.1057/palgrave.udii.9000162.

\textsuperscript{100} My translation. Wenche Lie, “Den nye bydelen ved Fjorden,” \textit{Aftenposten Aften} 30 May 1987, 10.

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
Culture and mixed use as development tool on Aker Brygge phase I & II

To introduce the Oslo population to the Nyland wharf, and later Aker Brygge, by means of culture had been a deliberate strategy introduced by Kjell Wester before TTA was granted the Aker Brygge commission. Verkstedshallene were used as frame for the “Kulturen Lever” festival (“Culture is alive”), which took place in September 1983, led by artist and future Minister of Culture Åse Kleveland. During the festival week, over 25,000 people passed through the gate of red containers marking the entrance to Nyland.  

After the festival, Kleveland was hired as cultural consultant for Aker Eiendom. One year later, Nyland housed a Pompeii exhibition, and in 1985, the festival Rock on the Dock was as launched, in a venue set up around Vikateatret that could accommodate up to 25,000 people. On Saturday 31 August, over 100 artists contributed to a 12-hour fundraising concert. Newspaper Aftenposten compared the concert with similar “Live Aid” events around the world, calling this “a new international means of communication with an impact the world have never seen before,” and that the event represented an expression tailored for modern communication technology.

Aker Eiendom AS also managed to get the Norwegian broadcasting service NRK to help launch Aker Brygge through their program “Saturday Night

---

102 Mette Newth from Norges Kunstnerråd used the event to lobby for a municipal focus on culture: “We have disproved that people are not attracted to living art. The Parliament cannot avoid the fact that Oslo needs a culture house.” My translation. Einar Holtet, “Suksess for den kulturelle ‘flodbølge’,” Aftenposten Morgen 26.09.1983, 52.

103 The fundraising initiative had support from Forente Artister, Norwegian People’s Aid, Save the Children, the Red Cross, the Norwegian Refugee Council, the Future in Our Hands and Norwegian Church Aid.

from Aker Brygge,” broadcast in August 1986. Responding to the program, Aftenposten wrote:

The true star, during such events, is the producer Stein Roger Bull who made the complex and varied machinery work, as well as conveying an attractive image of Aker Brygge as neo-commercial cathedral with lots of culture.

Kjell Wester says that “[these events] did not cost much, and we did not earn much,” but that they were strategic means to attract users to the area while it was being developed. Wester further sought to establish different cultural institutions in the area that would contribute through their cultural functions, but also through the people working in these institutions: “It was a great way to introduce people to the area, by attracting free-thinking people from the culture-sector.” The theaters Vikateatret and Det Åpne Teater were established in the area, as well as several other smaller cultural agents. Aker Eiendom also rented out spaces for the Norwegian Academy of Ballet and the Norwegian Academy of Theatre. They further got in touch with the theater group Frigruppen through the municipality, involving them with the theater. Verkstedshallene thus became a conglomerate of various culture institutions adjacent to the commercial office areas residing in the same building. As a cultural hub, it attracted attention and people, generated activity and provided the area with a social fabric consisting of different people and human resources. It also legitimized further development of the area.

In the years to come, however, the immediate programs would disappear, while the cultural programs would fade until they were removed in their entirety. In 2003, the Norwegian Academy of Theatre also relocated from Aker Brygge. The extensive art program of Aker Brygge’s streetscape, however, would continue to evolve as part of the culture brand established, through the subsidiary company Bryggedrift and its CEO Pål Moen. Moen, who led Bryggedrift from 1990 and onwards, would cooperate with the Association of Norwegian Sculptors over the next 20 years, evolving Aker Brygge’s extensive sculpture collection Kleveland had administrated and implemented as part of B2.

105 According to Wester, this was enabled through their relationship with an NRK project leader experienced with similar events. Åse Kleveland led the program that included shipping billionaire and Nyland Vest owner Fred. Olsen’s first TV performance. Wester, interview, 2012.


107 Most of the smaller, intermediate events were executed by Kjell Wester himself, with help from his family and friends. Wester, interview, 2012.

108 Ibid.

109 Wester knew they were looking for a location and offered them a deal. Ibid.
More conventional means for promotion were also applied to introduce the Aker Brygge concept to Oslo, such as the presentation of Aker Brygge in Studenterlunden (centrally located on main street Karl Johans gate) during Oslo'dagen in 1984. Other strategies included pamphlets (made by Wester and manager of culture Kari Dinesen) that were distributed around town. Wester and marketing manager Kristin Gjesvik also “ran around town” to find tenants for various retail and restaurant projects. But Wester’s biggest advantage was probably his charisma and ability to create enthusiasm around a risky business venture, that in many ways constituted a pioneer project in the Norwegian context, where mixed use building’s and a focus on the perceived common spaces of the area was the driving force of the development.

Fig. 26 In relation to the recent refurbishing of Aker Brygge, architectural office Space Group provided an overview of Aker Brygge’s art collection, 2014. (Source: SpaceGroup.no)

Mixed use as architectural organization and development strategy

While the Terminal Building was a relatively conventional office building with an atrium and ground floor shopping, the ambition was to link these shopping areas to Verkstedshallene, and to further explore the potential of its climatized urban space by adding a permanent fresh-food market with “unorthodox stalls.” This was, however, never realized. In B2, the cinema

110 Fredrik Torp notes in Byggekunst on how project planning, in the scale of Aker Brygge, demanded unorthodox methods of project sale and branding, unfamiliar to architects at the time. Fredrik Torp, “Historien om Aker Brygge – Et drama i 26 bilder,” Byggekunst 71 no. 7 (1989): 504.
111 Wester, interview, 2012.
complex was the commercial cultural addition to the smaller theaters. An IMAX theater would also be established as an attractor in the area. Niels Torp brought with him a new set of ideas, and his narration of the ground floor areas even managed to convince investor and future tenant DNC to locate their main entrance on the first floor of quay building one:

We couldn’t have a bank towards a main square, coloring it with its tiring and slightly dismissive atmosphere. You have to crawl up to the first floor and start from there! This they accepted, strangely enough, that was very strange and very great!114

Torp’s wish was that the bank should be a neutral element in balance with the kindergarten, nightclubs, theaters, offices, stores and apartments: “All of these functions are an absolute necessity to get the stimulating diversity a city should contain.”115 In a review of Aker Brygge phase two, architect and critic Frank Duffy of the Architectural Review wrote:

The complex is very exciting because it weaves together all the traditional elements of the city: work, dwelling, recreation and transport, into a humane whole that owes as much to past morphology but little to past typology.116

Duffy referred to the unorthodox architectural solutions, and “aggressive” blending of functions on Aker Brygge, which contrasted the, in essence, conventional urban blocks they resided within. Niels Torp’s four blocks and central square contained a horizontal layering of functions that blended office atriums with shopping facilities. The rooftop network of apartments interlaced the buildings and replaced the traditional notion of community tied to the semi-public courtyards of the urban block. This enabled Torp to create publicly accessed ground floor areas, and to dissolve these into indoor and outdoor areas to accommodate different spatial and functional tasks. The concept maximized exposure between retail and restaurants and Aker Brygge’s squares and streetscape. The horizontal division of programs in a single building, the glass vaulted labyrinth shopping center spaces, and the insistence on the common spaces that forced its largest investor to locate its main entrance to the first floor areas, displayed a trust in Wester urban development concept and belief in Torp’s architectural ambition by the investors and owners of Aker Brygge.

114 Niels Torp, interview by author. Tape recording, Oslo, 29 August 2011.
115 Ibid.
Fig. 27 Launching Aker Brygge, “Oslo’s new face towards the water,” 1984. (Source: TTA)

Fig. 28 Rock on the Dock, featuring “Ung Pie Forsvunnet,” 1985. Still from recording. (Source: Youtube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mXlJrhu4IZI)
The Death and Life of Aker Brygge

Wester remained CEO of Aker Eiendom until the contract was established with Niels Torp and entrepreneur Selmer Furuholmen, and “the hole in the ground was finished.” With Wester gone, the Aker Group became more involved in phase two. Wester claims that both the Aker Group’s top-down organization and lack of experience with land-based construction work resulted in increased costs. According to Wester, disagreement with the Aker administration arose when he wanted to “trim the balance” by selling property as soon as it was completed. Instead, the Aker Group preferred to remain in control of the entire venture until its completion. This proved fatal: In the early eighties, crude oil demand declined, parallel to increased production.

One year later, the oil price was halved and economy was weakening, followed by general budget cuts. On 19 October 1987 (known as “Black Monday”), the stock market crashed, and a global financial crisis, followed by a national housing crisis, ensued. As the economy of construction and the negotiated enterprises no longer proved economically viable, B2 was in a limbo. In February 1988, Aker Eiendom announced the opening sale of 200 unsellable apartments on Aker Brygge. Eventually, Aker was forced to re-evaluate its sales strategy. In June 1988, the third phase of Aker Brygge was postponed. When DNC bought 36,000m$^2$ of B2 the following weeks, liquidity increased. Though struggling to sell their former offices in the city center, the bank now practically bought its own property but managed to free NOK700 million for the Aker Group. This would, however, not be sufficient to save Aker Eiendom. Parallel to the housing crisis, the Aker Group experienced that while Aker Brygge was becoming an attraction, it did not function convincingly as a shopping area. It was also threatened by the new Oslo M and Oslo City shopping center developed across town. In August 1988, the tenants of Aker Brygge expressed that although they initially agreed on the Aker Brygge concept of exclusivity, they were critical towards Aker Eiendom’s branding strategy.

---

121 “Aker placed their organization on top of the developer’s organization to control all aspects of the development. This meant that Aker regained responsibility from the very firm they had bought the responsibility from. It became a good project in the end, though.” (My translation) Wester, interview, 2012.
122 Saudi Arabia had attempted to control oil prices by regulating production, but failing to convince OPEC and non-OPEC members to adjust supply, the country rapidly increased production in October 1985, plunging the price of crude oil globally.
123 The housing-crisis emerged unforeseen in 1988, and would last for the next five years until 1993.
124 A list of 1,700 potential buyers was used as proof of the projects viability in the media. In February 1988, NTB wrote that 10 “luxurious apartments” were reserved in one day, and that optimism was high in spite of the current crisis. See “Optil 35.000 kroner pr. kvm på Aker Brygge” NTB tekst, 29 January 1988, or “Salgstart for luksusleilighter på Aker Brygge” NTB tekst, February 01, 1988.
Brygge profile was altered to attract a broader audience, and the ground floor of B2 retrofitted to suit low-budget chains stores. Aker Eiendom CEO Osmund Ueland now publicly admitted that they had been deceived by their long list of potential stakeholders, and the company was forced to change the payment conditions accordingly. In 1989, Aker Eiendom sold B3 to Stranden A/S as a part of Akers “program for capital-release.” In August 1989, the 2.5 billion B2 opened. In a peaking housing crisis, 100 apartments remained unsold, in spite of reduced prices. At the same time, the Aker Group, now Aker AS announced that they relinquished property development altogether, and Aker Eiendom A/S was shut down the same autumn. Of the three billion invested by Aker in Aker Brygge, the company lost in total NOK850 million on the real estate venture.

Aker Brygge re-launched

In the years to come, Aker Brygge’s culture strategy would be abolished altogether. The first cultural programs to fall victim of the reality of real estate development had been Aker Eiendom’s own plans for exhibition of a sailing ship within Quay building 2. The next were the small-scale retail stores meant to fill the large glass atria, replaced by chain stores. This resulted in the demand for reorganization of floor areas that reduced the spatial porosity of the project. Over the years, the cultural and educational institutions also disappeared, and in 2004, Aker Brygge’s new owner Linstow AS re-launched the district as an unmitigated shopping center. *Aftenposten* writes: “Aker Brygge was supposed to become a meeting place for culture, business and architecture. Now, the owners are using NOK100 million to make the quay into a normal shopping center.” The newspaper criticized Aker Eiendom for “using culture as lubricant” when the township slipped through the system and was developed within a record-breaking timeframe.” The cultural and educational institutions established in the early 1980s were now replaced by a three-story shopping center in Verkstedhallene. *Aftenposten’s* commentary was crass, in context of the fact that the theater Black Box and the Academy of Theatre nearly had spent 20 years at Aker Brygge, and that the cinema Felix and IMAX theater shut down due to commercial failure. There were, however, no strategies among the new owners for maintaining the diversity represented by the educational

---

institutions of the area. Instead, Aker Brygge was stripped of both culture as well as the retail programs envisioned by Kjell Wester and his follower Osmund Ueland. When Norwegian Property (NPRO ASA) bought Aker Brygge for 2.3 billion in 2006, Linstow had conducted a due diligence, cleaned the accounts and primed the property for sale. Aker Brygge was rebranded, re-launched and re-sold. The sale displayed the vulnerability of Aker Brygge’s configuration as a single, privately administrated property, where “dead weight” systematically could be removed without evaluating the potential loss of its social utilization value. Norwegian Property commenced on an extensive rebranding and refurbishing of the entire area, including the demolition of the Terminal Building and a complete makeover of the shopping areas to increase commercial viability. When opened in December 2014, Aker Brygge had reemerged as an exclusive shopping district:

Aker Brygge is now on its way of becoming a lively township that offers urban experiences and a rare nearness to the water. With its own Christmas Street, art exhibitions, fashion shows and market, this urban borough should be accessible to all – How you want to use it is up to you!

In the new scheme, the celebrated ambiguity of spatial complexity and programmatic juxtaposition by the Aker Brygge architects were re-articulated in a tight and tidy configuration predicated on the perceived incongruity of the Aker Brygge ground floor areas. The strategy, according to the architects in Space Group, was to clarify the urban layer through a densified, clean-cut trajectory and corporate lobbies for offices. While a new glass-clad structure replaced the Terminal Building and the area was granted a general upgrade and architectural refinement, Aker Brygge was further consolidated towards similar destinations elsewhere in the city, attempting to reach the affluent middle class of the Oslo region, as well as the considerable segment of foreign visitors arriving Oslo by cruise ships during summer months. One might, however, argue that this consolidation process had in reality been in motion since before the opening of B2, where the initial Aker Brygge concept was altered to attract chain stores to meet the new conjunctures and increased competition from shopping centers across town.

132 The Academy of Theatre at Aker Brygge relocated together with the Norwegian National Academy of Opera and the Norwegian National Academy of Ballet (both located on Tjuvholmen), as institutions sorting under the new National Academy of the Arts.
133 In 1987, Osmund Ueland explains to the newspaper Aftenposten that Aker Eiendom AS would prioritize useful retail in front of exclusive fashion stores when selecting tenants for Aker Brygge. Wenche Lie, “Den nye bydelen ved Fjorden,” Aftenposten Aften 30 May 1987, 10.
135 http://spacegroup.no/projects/aker_brygge_masterplan/more.
Aker Brygge as a real estate development model

The development strategy on Nyland West had, through the leadership of Kjell Wester, been a largely successful venture until the financial breakdown in 1987. The Aker Group was an influential organization, and with Aker Brygge, they had managed to get the Port of Oslo, the rail and road authorities, as well as the Oslo politicians involved in their project. Wester’s knowledge of construction and supremacy as project leader gave Aker Brygge momentum, strengthened by economic growth. Importantly, the press conference and its architectural illustrations were also a means to legitimize the building mass projected on the site before the zoning process was initiated: In a de-regulated real estate market, the zoning plan and its floor-area ratio (FAR) became the single-most important document for establishing property value. DNC’s acquisition of as much as 25% of the area also contributed with financial strength, granting Aker Eiendom economic liberty and Wester the opportunity to pursue his vision for Aker Brygge.

Central to Wester’s vision was the function-mix that Niels Torp cemented in his scheme for phase 2. But while these buildings were integral to the conceptualization of Aker Brygge as experience, were they also economically feasible in a real estate perspective? Architect Frank Duffy addressed this question in his assessment of Aker Brygge B2 in Architectural Review. Reflecting on the lack of will to create multi-use buildings in Britain, he questioned to what extent user conflicts, infrastructural challenges and the economic viability between housing and offices was equally challenging in Norway as in Britain. While aware of Aker Brygge’s unlet office floors and empty apartments, he maintains a positive outlook: “Perhaps, – and this is the real question – this mix of uses, despite British property myths, is actively liked, bring benefits to all tenants, and is easily planned and managed?”

Duffy’s hope for the Aker Brygge development model was partly justified, in the sense that it unified central agents in urban planning, politics and administration, and retained an architectural ambition throughout its development phases. But Aker Brygge’s architectural innovations, programmatic complexity and high-end solutions can also be seen related to the fact that the project was a prototype realized in a recently liberalized real estate market: Wester, Neslein and F. Torp’s account for the Aker Brygge process envisages both competence and confidence, but also their inexperience with large-scale, multi-use urban designs and real estate

136 Aker’s CEO from 1981 to 1988 and Chairman of the Aker Eiendom board Harald Norvik was the secretary of Prime Minister Odvar Nordli (1976–1978) and governmental secretary in the department of oil and energy from 1979 to 1981.

speculation. This inexperience was strengthened by the fact that the Aker Group was an industrial owner, granting its subsidiary Aker Eiendom leeway to both control and conceptualize the development. In retrospect, when Aker AS retained control after Wester’s departure, the massive and top-down controlled development became exceedingly vulnerable for economic conjecture. The Aker Brygge model, where expenditure preceded income (due to the demand for large infrastructural investments such as parking garages, the fact that Aker retained ownership until completion of B2), and reliance lay on noncommittal market surveys, was not a robust development strategy. Instead, Aker Brygge’s B2 became an example of failed strategic dispositions that future developments would learn from. As real estate portfolio however, Aker Brygge became a financial success, and it was property value that would enable similarly large-scale investments to take place at Tjuvholmen nearly two decades later; however, this time within a different regime of risk management, and through a process initiated by and facilitated for by public agencies.

O R I G I N S
From Baltimore to Aker Brygge
Kjell Wester of Aker Eiendom AS was familiar with urban waterfront developments, and had visited several across Europe. As Telje-Torp-Aasen was granted the commission for making the zoning plan for the future development of Nyland A/S, the Aker Brygge team conducted a study trip to North America. In winter 1984, they visited a range of mixed-use waterfront developments based on entertainment concepts that would inform and inspire the development of Aker Brygge. The historical district of South Street Seaport in New York had been established as a maritime museum and was evolved as a tourist attraction from 1982 and onwards by the Rouse Development Company. Boston’s Quincy Market and Harbor Place in Baltimore, developed by the same company, were areas that, according to Wester were “extremely compact compared to their turnover.” They also visited Pier 39 in San Francisco, that according to F. Torp was a beautiful development with wooden quays, exciting stores and cafes, but that lacked the urbanity they sought after for Aker Brygge: “It was in reality not urban. It was a festival market on pillars in the water. But: it was a magnet!” In Toronto, the houses were nice, but the urban plan less so, according to Torp. And while Quincy Market in Boston made a massive impression, it was Baltimore’s harbor that mesmerized them the most. Here,

138 Wester, interview 2012.
139 Fredrik Torp, Kjell Wester and Hans Hjorth from Åke Larsson Construction
140 Wester, interview 2012.
141 Ibid.
the city continued “right down to the water” and there was an aquarium. According to Fredrik Torp, Wester exclaimed that “We got to make an aquarium, and we will put it on Tjuvholmen!” They also met with representatives of the Rouse Development Company, that later also would visit Oslo. For Wester, it was how the Rouse Development Company managed to conceptualize their entertainment-driven retail projects into a development philosophy that impressed the most. It was on their arrival home that Aker Brygge was given a name that referred to the single largest asset of the area: The waterfront itself. For Fredrik Torp, this remained the single most important conceptual tool and reference when developing Aker Brygge phase one: An open, public quay for common use.

Fig. 29 Front pages of time Magazine, featuring respectively James Rouse, 1981, and Philadelphia’s Executive Director of City Planning Edmund Bacon, 1964. (Source: Time Magazine)

The Festival Market Place

North American urban development projects became increasingly influential on a global scale throughout the 1980s, much to the credit of the Rouse Company, founded by James Wilson Rouse. On 24 August 1981, Rouse

---

142 F. Torp, interview, 2011.
143 Wester, interview 2012. Here, they were particularly impressed by the shopping street Bogstadveien, representing a type of retail lacking in their American developments.
144 Ibid.
145 F. Torp, interview, 2011.
was depicted on the front page of *TIME* magazine under the heading “He Digs Downtown!” The preceding five years, he had developed Philadelphia’s Gallery at Market Street East, Santa Monica Place in Los Angeles and Boston’s Faneuil Hall Marketplace. His latest project, Baltimore Inner Harbor’s centerpiece Harborplace Festival Marketplace, would soon become the symbol of neo-urban developments in USA and abroad. According to *TIME*, he had “shown a unique and uncanny ability to blend commerce and showmanship into a magnetizing force in the inner city. In the process, he has also sought to reshape current-day thinking about the functions and rewards of city life.”

Rouse, being responsible for large indoor malls and suburban developments was not the obvious candidate to represent the new wave of urban revival in USA, but through his position as chairman in the Greater Baltimore Committee, he had recognized the development potential of vacant downtown real estate.

James Rouse and architect Benjamin C. Thompson conceived the concept “festival marketplace” as a regeneration tool and revitalization strategy for urban redevelopment. Festival marketplaces were conceived to be diverse and mixed used areas, based on the idea that small-scale retail could represent an attractive alternative to the uniformed chain stores of Rouse’s former suburban shopping center developments. The marketplaces would be based on local produce, and ideally restore the relation between seller and buyer, as a form of small-scale capitalism. Rouse saw this as not only a commercial opportunity, but also a model that, through cultivating local entrepreneurship, also carried social benefits.

Central to Rouse’s idea was how private, centralized management of urban districts through festival marketplaces could facilitate and administrate areas that otherwise would remain uncoordinated and undeveloped. In 1972, Thompson contacted James Rouse with plans for reviving the Faneuil Hall-Quincy Market area in Boston. The plots were squeezed between downtown offices and the waterfront with its 1963 aquarium, and Thompson’s idea was to revive the area with a market-like concept of smaller distinct stores reusing the historical fabric on site. The concept was bold, something reflected in their difficulties in securing both capital and municipal support for the project. But eventually, Quincy Market was established in 1976. Thompson also drew Rouse’s Harborplace Festival Marketplace in an aesthetic described as “European style glass pavilions.”

Filled with an eclectic mix of local retail and restaurants, Harborplace would be the crown of the

---

149 Nicholas Dagen Bloom, *Merchant of Illusion: James Rouse, America’s Salesman of the Businessman’s Utopia* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2004), 151.
Baltimore harbor development. A skeptical population voted in favor of the project with 54 percent approval in 1978, after assurances that Harborplace not be a conventional commercial development, but also secure minority interests and public accessibility, and thus truly becoming a project for the city.151 Harborplace attracted 18 million visitors the first year, created 2300 jobs, had a $42 million profit and, according to TIME magazine, “helped restore a sense of community and vitality to a divided, decaying, once apathetic older city,” similar to what Faneuil Hall Marketplace had done for Boston.152

Fig. 30 Baltimore harbor and the Harborplace development, ca. 2010. (Source: http://baltimorewaterfront.com)

The Image of Baltimore
The success of Harborplace Festival Marketplace can be seen in context of the city’s large-scale revitalization plan initiated decades earlier: Suburbanization and de-industrialization had been tough on the city’s business community property tax base in the 1950s.153 The city needed a “body for mobilizing opinion” and an organization consisting of 100 executives formed the Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC) in 1955 to renew

the deteriorating downtown areas in order to achieve regional growth.\footnote{Concurrently, worried merchants and business owners had formed the Committee for Downtown recruiting members from banking, utilities and other property owners. Sponsored by the latter, the GBC’s subsidiary Planning Council approached renowned architect David Wallace to develop a plan and study for downtown. Ward, “Inventing and Spreading the Baltimore Model of Cultural Urbanism,” 273.} The GBC’s chairman J.W. Rouse had defined a clear concept for cultivating private-public cooperation: “To revive the city, its most precious resource – land – must be put back to work with bold planning, better organization, and a much faster pace.”\footnote{The GBC was inspired by the “Allegheny Conference,” a private-public partnership established in 1944 that successfully had transformed the Pittsburgh riverfront industrial district. The Greater Baltimore Committee – A Brief History.} Their first project, a mix-used development established in-between the financial district and the deteriorating retail district was initiated in 1959. In an article called “New Heart for Baltimore,” the 89,000m² mixed use Charles Center was acknowledged by urban theorist Jane Jacobs, who specifically remarked on how the streets and squares remained city property, and that the development consisted of multiple developers instead of one cooperation.\footnote{Peter L. Laurence, Becoming Jane Jacobs, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 248.} In 1963, architect David Wallace co-founded Wallace McHarg Roberts & Todd. The firm designed a 30-year long, $260 million development scheme for the Baltimore waterfront. The project included administrative buildings, cultural facilities housing and visitor attractions. The next 25 years, the company led the development of infrastructure, including promenades, piers and bridges, and exercised design control for all private initiatives.

The Inner Harbor Plan required more public spending than Charles Center had done, but was executed in the same public-private partnership framework and run by the same non-profit organization.\footnote{Charles Center Inner Harbor Management Inc. Ward, “Inventing and Spreading the Baltimore Model of Cultural Urbanism,” 273.} They brought together city government, business leaders and developers, mixing private and public expertise, often with public agencies as developers. Knowing that the Baltimore residents were skeptical of such a large-scale endeavor, GBC launched what they called a “public education campaign” to gather public support. Still, the plan met resistance, and the growing tension and unrest in Baltimore, culminating with the race riots of 1968, made federal funding more difficult. The removal of the housing subsidies meant that the project gained an increased emphasis on visitor attractions.\footnote{These middle-income housing projects were initially planned as part of a strategy against suburbanization. Ward, “Inventing and Spreading the Baltimore Model of Cultural Urbanism,” 273.} This shift towards cultural and tourist urbanism was crucial for establishing Baltimore’s reputation abroad.\footnote{Ibid.} In 1972, the USS Constellation warship became the first attraction in the area, followed by the promotion of free entertainment activities in order to convince potential investors of the project’s feasibility initiated by the new and ambitious Baltimore Mayor Don Schaefer. In 1976
followed a Science center, a marina in 1978, the Convention Center in 1979 and finally the Harborsplace Festival Marketplace in 1980, followed by a Hyatt Hotel and National Aquarium in 1981. In 1983, the city was visited by 4000 representatives from 87 cities, eager to learn from Baltimore’s success. Baltimore had become a showcase for urban revitalization that would gain worldwide impact.

**Exporting the Baltimore Model**

Baltimore’s fame as an urban model was based on the view that it, through urban redevelopment strategies, was seen to turn the downward economic spiral and unrest that had haunted the city for decades. But Rouse’s Harborsplace also initiated a wave of private, leisure and tourism-driven waterfront developments around the globe. This was both due to the general reorientation towards entrepreneurialist forms of urban management across Europe and Asia, but also based on the fact that Harborsplace’s spectacular urbanism actively was agitated worldwide: 160 In 1981, Jim Rouse pulled out of the company that bore his name and established the non-profit Enterprise Foundation to pursue his philanthropic passions in strategic urban development. To finance these activities, he established the Enterprise Development Company (EDC, later Enterprise Real Estate Services), to undertake project development, counseling services and business advising. This led to the emergence of a series of Harborsplace-inspired developments in mid-size coastal cities in the USA, but that, partly due to the lack of investment potential never gained the success of Baltimore. 161 At the same time, real estate prices dropped, combined with the decrease of public funding under Ronald Reagan in 1981. This led EDC to remove their focus towards metropolitan regions outside the USA. Now, Baltimore was not only an example to be visited, it was actively propagated as a development concept in Europe: Through the EDC, selected extracts of Baltimore’s extensive urban planning matrix was modeled, branded and sold as a commodity to cities as diverse as Sidney in 1983 and the Tempozan Harbor Village in Osaka, while EDC acted as advisor for developing planning concepts such as Rotterdam’s Kop Van Zuid. 162 Common to these were the configuration of spaces and programs that are recognizable in the Aker Brygge development: Leisure-based activities such as IMAX Cinemas and aquariums were flanked with business-based programs such as convention

160 In the introduction to the book “Architecture Between Spectacle and Use, architecture historian Anthony Vidler quotes Hal Fosters critique of Frank Gehry’s Guggenheim museum in Bilbao, who noted that while Guy Debord and the situationists defined spectacle as “capital accumulated to the point where it becomes an image.” The current production of architecture as event has reversed this aphorism: Spectacle is now “an image accumulated to the point where it becomes capital.” Anthony Vidler, introduction to Architecture Between Spectacle and Use, ed. Anthony Vidler, ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press: 2008), vii.
162 Ibid., 282.
centers, often set in the spatial context of a “festival marketplace.” The uniform appliance of such spatial and programmatic constellations seem to display a strong belief in the Baltimore model’s universal validity as a socially and commercially sustainable development strategy. Baltimore and Boston became main destinations for architects, developers and public officials that helped established their fame and influence on a global scale.

Baltimore Critique

While influential, the Baltimore model has been subject of numerous critiques. Social scientist Nicholas Dagen Bloom writes that Rouse underestimated the value of social welfare, while overestimating the number of business interested in “human needs in cities.” He further points to the “abject failure” of the Festival market concept, where local owner and entrepreneurship in most examples were replaced either by upscale retail, or the very chain stores Rouse wanted to avoid. David Harvey also exposes how the intended synergic effects of development on Baltimore’s poor failed to materialize. Further, Ward explains how the impact of public investment on the Baltimore model has been undervalued by those who advocate private ownership and execution of large scale urban developments: Due to the opaqueness of governmental tax and subsidies mechanisms in development processes, the substantial public investments made became obscured. By neglecting its social and economic frameworks, Harborplace could be isolated from its political-economic context and thereby applied as a general model for urban development. As the economic climate of the 1980s led to the accentuation of private investment strategies on the cost of the role of public agencies and funding systems, the distinctions between the overarching Baltimore model and the Harborplace project within it became disguised. As the Baltimore model became synonymous with Harborplace, its large-scale redevelopment strategy became mistaken for a commercial quick fix. But in reality:

It would be more accurate to say that the rapid completion of several key and individually successful visitor attractions in close proximity both to each other, to what was now an attractive harbor front and to downtown was mainly responsible for Baltimore’s reputation.

163 Aker Brygge actually had two different spaces that were assigned the term: The first was the interior of the renovated Verkstedshallene. The second was B2’s central “Festivalplassen,” later called Bryggetorget.
164 In Norway and Oslo, it was not Aker Brygge that looked to Baltimore. In the mid-1980s, both the Oslo Association of Architects as well as several of the city’s politicians visited Baltimore and other waterfront developments in North America.
165 Dagen Bloom: “Merchant of Illusion,” 151.
166 Ibid., 151.
167 David Harvey, Spaces of Hope (Berkley: University of California Press, 2000), 133–156.
169 Ibid., 276.
Ultimately, the Baltimore image might have conveyed only a partial truth of its own origins and success: The relevance of the festival-urbanism concept of Harborplace as a development tool was tied to the larger planning scheme it was part of. In spite of this, Harborplace came to represent a more or less instant and politically risk-free urban development concept that seemed to guarantee increase in real estate value and will for investment. The swift materialization of Aker Brygge, with its optimistic set of stakeholders, enthusiastic leadership and supportive politicians seemed to confirm this assertion. And although Aker Brygge would implement a stronger focus on a synthetic function-mix consisting of office, housing, retail and culture programs, the kinship between Aker Brygge and Harborplace as developments is clear, not least in how Kjell Wester conceptualized and administrated its development.

SUMMARIZING REMARKS
Below, I discuss how insights from Harborplace and the North American development projects were translated to the Norwegian context. Secondly, I address Aker Brygge as conceptualized urban environment in context of its development model followed by addressing the specificities and limitations of this model in the Oslo context. Finally, I place Aker Brygge within a macro-economic perspective as a “post-Fordist” urban environment.

From Rouse’s Harborplace to Wester’s Aker Brygge
Rouses’ notion of “fun cities” was driven by the idea that new patterns of consumption could create a new economic base for the revival of cities and recycle industrial leftover space in the process. In an interview with Aftenposten, Kjell Wester echoed Rouse:

> Only offices do not pay off economically, Wester determines. And it does not pay off for the city. It’s an entire little urban district that is developed on the harbor now. Here, it will, if Wester’s right, be vibrant from early morning to late evening. People can pop in, shop and entertain themselves, in a myriad of small shops around climatized squares and alleys, with a Norwegian version of the successful Swedish Saluhaller. ‘Tourists, for example, they arrive in Oslo and want to spend money. And what do we offer them? Postcards, and sausages!’

Wester’s business idea of Aker Brygge operated on four levels: First of all, Wester wanted to gather media attention and buzz. Secondly, he attempted to attract investors to the office and housing developments through grand representations of the area’s future prospects. Thirdly, tenants for the restaurant and shopping areas were brought in to curate the specific environment sought for, and finally, he attempted to draw users enticed by the events and activities in the area, and by the spectacle of Aker Brygge itself. Like Rouse, Wester saw that profit was embedded in the articulation of street-level urban spaces that could brand and sell the adjoining housing and office schemes: By framing urban space in a particular spectacular wrapping of attractions and aesthetics, and placing them within the historical narrative provided by the urban waterfront and its refurnished buildings, he could establish a bustling, public, diverse and historically-anchored urban environment.

But Aker Brygge also contained a level of complexity that exceeded its North American counterparts, in the sense that culture, retail, office and housing were superimposed within an area, and within individual buildings (As Fredrik Torp noted, most of the festival marketplaces the Aker Brygge team experienced in USA lacked the urbanity they sought for). This was also reflected in British architect Frank Duffy’s review of Aker Brygge in architectural magazine *Architectural Review*, where Aker Brygge was regarded as a more “interesting” waterfront development than those of Baltimore and Boston. According to Duffy, while the American role models had far more sophisticated retailing and were much busier, they lacked integrated living and working. The latter ensured that Aker Brygge also was seen to comprise the ordinary activities of people living, working and moving through urban space.171

The visions of small-scale retail failed to crystallize (much in coherence to the critiques raised against Rouse’s marketplace concept) and the original culture programs would be phased out in the years to come. Nevertheless, the accentuation of culture in B1 and mixed use configuration of B2 gave Aker Brygge not only an attraction value for consumers, but also a symbolic exchange value investors saw potential within: Its “curated” forms of social centrality, functionally catered for and aesthetically expressed by its urban environment. While Harborplace was an attractor and magnet for investment in its surrounding and decaying urban fabric, Aker Brygge was an investment opportunity in itself, where symbolic capital tied to specific urban lifestyles could be converted into financial surplus.

---

Aker Brygge as conceptualized urban environment

This conceptualization of the urban environment at Aker Brygge introduced new features to the Oslo context: First of all, its extensive pedestrian areas, with service traffic placed below ground, was a novelty in Oslo at the time.\(^{172}\)

Secondly, the high-end material use in urban space, such as the “Dutch brick” of Bryggetorget, and its extensive art program, contrasted the asphalt streets of Oslo in the 1980s.\(^{173}\) So did the “iconicity” of Aker Brygge’s combination of dense and elaborate architecture, and preserved, historical buildings. Thirdly, the project was conceptualized around the idea of social congregation as attraction in itself: Social centrality was strategically catered for through programming, including Wester’s attempt to curate specific human resources to the area. Cultural functions thus played the role as attractors as well as generators for gathering and interaction. And fourthly, the use of events and intermediate programs made the urban environment itself a development tool during the initial redevelopment phases.

On the other side, the “structural” question of ownership or social inclusion was to such a limited degree problematized in the project: Oslo Byes Vel Forening knowingly accentuated the commercial predisposition of the project already in the competition draft. They knew that any hope of realizing a development on Nyland was based on private initiative. Still, they did not question ownership, nor did they address any form of juridical responsibly that could be assigned the developer, beyond the spatial and functional qualities sought after in the competition draft. This was mirrored in both TTA and Niels Torp’s scheme, but with slightly different approaches. Where TTA perceived Aker Brygge to be built by different architects, and saw the waterfront promenade as its main and inclusive public space, Torp conceptualized phase two through the strategic juxtaposition and condensation of programs and architectural expressions, approaching the urban environment as an inherently architectural challenge. Thus, the different forms of conceptualization of Aker Brygge as urban environment did not entail addressing social issues or critically problematizing the task at hand. Notwithstanding, while Wester’s ideas for Aker Brygge were biased by his role as developer, his belief in the strategic juxtaposition of programs and intensification of use envisaged that he conceived that new urban environment of the city had to offer more than urban interiors harboring

\(^{172}\) The most challenging task was, according to Øyvind Neslein, that Aker Eiendom wanted a direct connection with the proposed “Fjellinjen” tunnel, an alternative to Grunnlinjen that later was cancelled. There were instead ramps built underneath the dock that would be attached to a future tunnel. Neslein remarks on the novelty of constructing such a large-scale pedestrian area in Oslo at that time. Neslein, interview, 2011.

\(^{173}\) 13.3 landskapsarkitekter was responsible for all outdoor areas on Aker Brygge, but were based on and guided by Niels Torp’s design concept. Aker Eiendom’s art program was led by Åse Kleveland and curated by hired art consultant Ulla Tarras-Wahlberg. The program included the fountain *Av en snegls dagbok*, by Geir Stormoen after a competition in 1987; *Ufjerdstrung* by Marit Wiklund, *L’arbre assassiné* by Axel Tostrup, *lek i luft* by Eli Gabrielsen, *Bolgen* by Thor Sandborg, and *Klassisk sitat* by Wenche Gulbransen. Bodahl, Aker Brygge 1985–1990. 55.
cafés and restaurants. Thus, the conceptualization of Aker Brygge as urban environment was at its most ambitious both before and during phase 1, where the incorporation of existing city functions and social milieus was as important as establishing new ones.

**The specificities and limitations of the Aker Brygge development model**

For politicians and investors alike, Aker Brygge was a compelling package of public amenities and investment opportunities. But there were also other aspects in favor of its development: First of all, the city’s reunion with the fjord and the formation of new, pedestrian-oriented, public accessible urban spaces was a much sought after public good. The goodwill granted the project, especially in the Oslo-oriented newspaper *Aftenposten*, can probably also be attributed both the development of new common spaces as well as the much sought after reunion with the waterfront. And further, the B&F2000 competition also seems to have contributed to legitimizing the development, by implementing it within the framework of an independent, open and inclusive competition format executed by an NGO with municipal support.

The enthusiasm surrounding the project, the weak municipal economy, or the simple lack of insights to what this form of development might entail, however, also seem to have created a few blind spots: In the case of the planning authorities, their main agenda seems to have been zoning the area for “common use” (allmennyttige formål), not whether the area was privately or publicly owned. This meant that the building mass could be legally divided in individual plots, while Aker’s subsidiary Bryggedrift administered the privately-owned streetscape. This development model, in which an urban environment was conceptualized within a single private property after real estate development principles, contained three inherent conflicts, regarding the delimitation as area, its limitations of use, and development prospects as area in the city: First of all, the project presented at the Aker Brygge press conference in August 1984 also encompassed the Vestbanen area. Inherited from Waterloo, it was retained as an illustration of how Vestbanen could link Aker Brygge to the city. Instead, they became strategic tools to support a

---

174 Sentrumsforeningen, *Sentrumsundersøkelsen*, 1977. While few surveys on urban space use were conducted in Oslo at the time, “Sentrums-undersøkelsen” of 1977 established a list of priorities given by a selection of users of the urban core. Here, fewer cars, more pedestrian areas, more green areas, parks and benches, as well as a cleaner city were prioritized. Ten years later, the survey Blylivsundersøkelsen led by Jan Gehl, established that the city still lacked pedestrian areas. In the survey, Gehl showed how the increased use of Aker Brygge did not entail decreased use of other pedestrian areas in Oslo, displaying the existing demand for such spaces. The size of the accessible urban waterfront in 1987 was 10,600m². In 2013, it had increased by 1200 percent.


175 Non Governmental Organisation.
plan delimited by Aker Eiendom’s property borders, contributing to the decades-long vacancy of the Vestbanen area.\textsuperscript{176}

Further, activities such as roller skating and skateboarding, both referred to as attractive pursuits by Niels Torp in his development prospectus were forbidden from the start. As were unlicensed demonstrations, begging, or any other public event that was not clarified by the owners. Conceptions of the urban environment that assigns it with certain social rights and potentials of use were thus absent in the production of Aker Brygge.

Finally, the single-owner model of ownership meant that the cultural profile of Aker Brygge was vulnerable for change, as property value was the area’s only true parameter for success. As the culture programs were abolished, Aker Brygge became recast as a strictly retail-driven shopping center. This points towards how Aker Brygge needed to be in a state of “permanent novelty:” As a persisting spectacle that attracts continuous attention and new user groups. Where Fredrik Torp hoped the passing of time would allow Aker Brygge to establish its own, unique character (“egenart”), the urban environment of Aker Brygge did not evolve to be appropriated by its users.\textsuperscript{177} Instead, an apparent entropic process towards the generic deprived the area of its incipient social fabric, shedding its straining past in favor of more market-calibrated concepts. This envisages a crucial limitation in the Aker Brygge model: While tailored to create meaningful environments, it apparently lacked the capability to obtain meaning through its users and uses, over time.

**Aker Brygge as post-Fordist development model**

I would also like to render visible a final perspective, which places Aker Brygge within the macro-economic perspective envisaged in the introductory chapters above: The conceptualization of Aker Brygge’s urban environment also synthesized leisure and labor in a manner that addresses a critical aspect of the post-Fordist economy. With reference to Vittorio Aureli’s account for production in the post-Fordist economy above, Aker Brygge’s juxtaposition of educational programs with offices and dwellings set in the scenography of leisure-oriented urban environment surpassed the simpler “fun palaces” of American harbor-front projects: Within a regime of “flexible accumulation,” *mixed use* represented the very premises of production of the post-Fordist economy.

The “miniature post-Fordist utopia” of Aker Brygge did not displace production for the benefit of recreation; rather it facilitated for new forms of economic production in the aftermath of the industrial age that preceded it on

\textsuperscript{176} Several other parameters also contributed to the vacancy of this area, that currently is part of the large-scale transformation of Vestbanen to accommodate the new Norwegian National Museum.

\textsuperscript{177} F. Torp, “Historien om Aker Brygge,” 505.
the Nyland wharf, merging consumption, leisure and learning within a framework of economic production. From a real estate perspective, conceptualizing the urban environment to facilitate for these activities, in essence was an “asset management” strategy for the Aker Group, based on mixed use, programmatic diversity and recreation.

The Aker Brygge model therefore operated on three levels: First, as a model for property development by private owners and investors. Second, it functioned as a model that allowed the public sector to utilize market-driven real estate development mechanisms as tool for urban development. And finally, it allowed for a spatial configuration and program mix that facilitated for new forms of economic production in the city to take place. This included the blending of immaterial production and leisure, where its spatial facilities housed new production methods, cooperation models, and goals for value creation, including tourism and Oslo’s role as regional center and capital. As a spatial manifestation of “flexible accumulation,” it represented a model for organizing and developing urban space that not only would encompass Tjuvholmen, but the logics of inner city urban development within the cultural economy of Oslo in the years to come.

A last point to mention is also that while Aker Brygge was developed through different building-phases, its urban environment can also be regarded as consisting of three main stages with distinct characteristics: The first stage was the “priming stage,” were Wester reconceptualised the industrial site to a culture-driven arena for social congregation. The second stage was the project phase, where Aker Brygge was introduced as a brand and investment opportunity through its name, its promenade and different events. The third was the production stage, where the bulk of volumes that made out the main volumes were built within one large development scenario surrounding a large, iconic square. Subsequent phases were basically additions to this third stage.
6 Towards the Fjord City

The following chapter explores the changing political economic practices for urban development in Oslo in the 1980s and 1990s. It is approached from two angles:

The first section, “Oslo’s political economic practices” maps political reform in Oslo and how it affected urban development practices within a neo-liberal paradigm of conduct. It accounts for the historical backdrop of changed national and global circumstances and its effect on Norwegian politics and urban development policies. It further looks into the different municipal plans and how they evolve and change over time to obtain the new ”entrepreneurialist” political economic climate in Oslo.

The second section “Governance strategies” maps the impact of new governance strategies on urban development practices, with reference to Aker Brygge as example of negotiation planning, the consultant firm IN’BY as example of intergovernmental practices, and the Oslo municipality as market agent.

The third section is called “The Fjord City Vision” and specifically addresses the restructuring and priming of the urban waterfront for development in the years following the completion of Aker Brygge. It render visible the political controversies and debates regarding the disposition of the industrial harbor, and the chain of events and plans that resulted in the Fjord City Vision, and ultimately, the Fjord City Plan.
OSLO’S POLITICAL ECONOMIC PRACTICES

The political economic climate that catered to the Aker Brygge model to emerge was the result of a liberal turn in national as well as municipal policy-making. These deregulations and reforms were based on management strategies, labeled “New Governance” or “New Public Management.” The reforms were ideological as well as structural answers to the lack of administrative maneuverability within the bureaucracy of Keynesian-Fordist governance strategies. In new governance theory, all governmental sectors relate to the market, through economically-founded principles for urban administration:

In fact, the new governance structures express the outcomes of an ongoing renegotiation between the different levels of government – local, regional, national, and European – and between public and private actors over competencies, decision-making powers, and funding. The establishment of these new structures frequently involves massive redistribution of policy-making powers, competencies, and responsibilities away from local governments to often highly exclusive partnership agencies, a process that can be described as the ‘privatization of urban governance.’

These reforms affected the political administration as well as the urban development, both in terms of project-based urban developments represented by Aker Brygge, and as municipal development strategies such as the Fjord City Resolution. Above, neo-liberalism was described by Harvey as an “economic theory of political economic practices,” and new governance as a structural tool to facilitate for these political economic practices. But to what extent can the Oslo context, and the projects here discussed be interpreted within such a framework? The following pages map the political economic reforms and events around Aker Brygge’s realization and the years both preceding and following its completion. It marks an attempt to map crucial political and juridical events and reforms that display the impact of neo-liberal forms of management affected and restructured urban development in Oslo from 1978 and onwards. Further, it exemplifies the effects of new governance principles in the Oslo context through three examples: First, I review the first postwar, mixed use, urban core regeneration project Vaterland. Secondly, Aker Brygge is revisited as model for negotiation planning within new governance. Thirdly, I address the strategic planning consultant agency In’by, and the municipality’s venture as realty developer in the late 1980s.

178 Moulaert et al., “Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe,” 578.
Reforms and regimes

Aker Brygge was initiated in a period of exceptional growth in Norway, and between 1980 and 2007, the Norwegian Gross National Product (GNP) was tripled.\(^{179}\) In the early 1980s, shorter working hours flanked increased and altered consumption patterns. Urban growth in the urban core was thus tied to social, as well as the political-economic changes in the Norwegian economy. These were rooted in large-scale reforms initiated in the 1970s. In Norway, the 1973 economic crisis ended a period of continuous economic growth that had begun in the 1950s.\(^{180}\) The crisis was met with countercyclical policies, where large sums were granted to the internationally-exposed manufacturing businesses such as the shipyard industry.\(^{181}\) As these policies increased governmental debt and slowed the realignment processes the industry needed to adapt to new economic circumstances; they were abandoned in 1978.\(^{182}\) In 1979, Labor Party Minister of Finance Per Kleppe introduced a new economic strategy that to a lesser extent was less based on the specific and selective subsidization-strategies of the previous years. Kleppe also reformed government interest policies in Norway that until now had been based on low interest as a strategic measure to maintain high employment rates.\(^{183}\) The reforms of the late 1970s marked the point of departure for a more market-oriented credit and money policy in Norway, further strengthened by the Conservative Party rule from 1981 to 1986.\(^{184}\) The Conservative Party commenced with the reforms introduced by the Labor Party, where ending government intervention in credit markets, and the reduction of restrictions on ownership and sale of real estate were crucial. By opening the credit market and canalizing it through private banks, the Willoch cabinet stimulated investment and development of private property. Easily accessible loans through private banks stimulated investment in real estate. The removal of price regulations on housing and reforms that set the pricing of housing association apartments (borettslag) closer to market value increased the transaction of housing estates.\(^{185}\) The price regulation of cooperative housing

---

\(^{179}\) While the GNP was 13 percent above average in 1980, Norway rose to second place in 1994. In 2007, while the country’s GNP was 50 percent higher than the OECD countries, Norwegian consumption had doubled in the same period. Finn Olstad, *The History of Norway (Norges historie)* (Oslo: Pax, 2010), 202.

\(^{180}\) Ibid. 155.

\(^{181}\) The Norwegian oil economy provided the government with the economic power to subsidize its industries as well as providing a softer landing for the period of stagflation that ensued. Ibid., 166–170.

\(^{182}\) Olstad, *Norges historie*, 166.

\(^{183}\) The subsidy strategies had increased inflation, but without the support of economic growth. Kleppe’s proposal “The 1979 Recommendation for Industrial Policy” (Instilling om industripolitikk 1977) through the Interest Committee in 1977. The recommendations from the committee became the basis for the economic reforms initiated in the years to come. Olstad *Norges historie*, 206–207.

\(^{184}\) In October 1981 the Conservative Party led by Kåre Willoch, took office. The Willoch cabinet was elected two years after Margaret Thatcher, and only months after Ronald Reagan.

was abolished in 1988, due to the rising prices of the unregulated market, further strengthened by the tightening of the public housing sector.\textsuperscript{186} The Labor Party government led by Gro Harlem Bruntland from 1986 to 1989 and again from 1990 to 1996 sustained these reforms, while the final blow to the postwar fiscal policies were formalized by the Stoltenberg government in 2001, when the Norwegian National Bank officially was granted the authority to set the interest rate autonomously.\textsuperscript{187}

While the restructuring of the municipal administration made real estate development a driving force in downtown development, there were also deregulations in other sectors that influenced the urban core and its uses. Among these were the loosening of restrictions on retail and restaurants, where a political compromise in 1985 enabled retail stores to extend opening hours. Relating both to the general increased wealth and leisure time of the population, these reforms were parts in a general shift towards economic liberalization that supported the urban core as arena for leisure-oriented consumption.\textsuperscript{188} Further, the dissolution of government monopoly on radio and television broadcasting, and the introduction of commercial content gave commercial forces a new arena to exploit. The Rock on the Dock festival and NRK’s broadcasting from Aker Brygge displayed how the new media culture mixed urban development and communication strategies with entertainment. Historian Finn Olstad links these processes to the “revolution of freedom,” a term introduced by historian Francis Sejerstedt referring to a “fundamental settlement against the ideals of equality and unity” which was to be realized through individual freedom and by market forces. Such freedoms emerged in the tension between technology, politics and commercial interests.\textsuperscript{189}

**Urban development reforms: From plans to strategies**

Within the larger deregulation of the economy and housing sector, several municipal reforms affecting the housing and planning sector were initiated to prime the public sector towards the new political and economic climate of the mid-1980s. In 1985, the Private Initiative of Regulation was introduced to nurse the growth and development of realty: The law was aimed towards making the planning system more conducive for privately initiated projects by reducing administrative procedure turnarounds and granting the proposer privileges.\textsuperscript{190} As the amount of administrative procedures grew, the planning authority’s role as caseworkers increased at the expense of its tasks in

\textsuperscript{186} Jardar Sørvoll, in Olstad, *Norges historie*, 214.
\textsuperscript{187} Olstad, *Norges historie*, 206.
\textsuperscript{188} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{189} Francis Sejerstedt paraphrased in Olstad, *Norges historie*, 212.
\textsuperscript{190} Private zoning proposals were allowed in 1924, but now it was mandatory for the planning authorities to proceed them within a specific time limit. “Oslo Municipality, Private Proposals for Zoning” (Private forslag om regulering) *The Planning and Building Act* (PBL), 1985-06-14 nr 77. Today, PBL §12-3.
traditional urban planning. Now, a division was made between the plans conducted by the agency itself and plans submitted by private agents.\footnote{Børrud, \textit{Bitvis byutvikling}, 63.} Further, the municipal division plan (Kommunedelplan) was introduced as part of the new planning act.\footnote{New Planning Act 29 August 1985.} It functioned as a normative instrument meant to induce physical and qualitative measurements for development.\footnote{OBK envisioned that the municipal plans of the future would become policy documents for division plans to be anchored within, that detailed regulation plans envisioning urban form could be based on Gudmund Hoel Oslo in the 90s – Towards consolidation or fragmented boomtown?, \textit{(Oslo i 90-åra – mot konsolidering eller fragmentert boomtown?) Byggekunst no. 4} (1987): 212.} Finally, planning tools such as order provisions (rekkefølgebestemmelser) and development agreements (utbyggsavtaler) were introduced as municipal planning tools to facilitate new forms of private public cooperation and negotiation processes.\footnote{August Røsnes, “Avtaler som styringsredskap i kommunal planlegging,” \textit{Plan} 6 (2002): 30–37.} Parallel to these reforms, the municipal property portfolio was reduced, meaning there were fewer plots in which the planning authority retained juridical control, and in 1985, the housing association OBOS bought all their former leasehold properties from the municipality, striking the “deal of the century.”\footnote{https://www.obos.no/om-obos/fakta-om-obos/obos-gjennom-80-ar.} Where the Agency of Urban Planning (Oslo byplankontor, OBK) within a Keynesian-Fordist economy traditionally had been a municipal land-use planner, private agents would initiate and lead urban development, quality controlled through the use of municipal division plans. With restrictions on property development and private loans removed and a booming real estate market, urban development in the city core became dominated by large-scale design schemes, mediated through street-view architectural illustrations.\footnote{Here, Peter Butenschøn and Tone Lindheim’s book \textit{The new Oslo. Ideas and Projects for the Urban Core} illustrated the architectural object as the fulcrum of 1980’s urban planning. Peter Butenschøn and Tone Lindheim. \textit{Det nye Oslo: Ideer og prosjekter for bykjernen} (Oslo: Dreyer Forlag, 1987).}

Fig. 31 Plan for the development of the urban waterfront. Municipal Sector Plan for Oslo’s Central Waterfront, 1987 (Source: OBK)
Municipal Sector Plan for Oslo’s Central Waterfront

In 1988, a City Government Act ratified the “Municipal Sector Plan for Oslo’s Central Waterfront,” and the “Revised harbor plan 1986–2000.” The Sector Plan, led by CEO Sven Meinich and Department Manager Rolf H Jensen, was based on ideas first presented in B&F2000, and consultancy reports regarding the harbor’s future initiated in January 1986. A goal of the plan was to resolve area dispositions in regards to harbor industry, by defining quantitative demands that would simplify casework. The relocation of harbor activities was to be financed by municipal property sales. As a general recommendation, it is written that recreation, housing, entertainment and exhibition activities should be prioritized. As an overall goal, the waterfront should become diverse, accommodate differentiated uses and facilitate new and “different” housing areas. The identity of the city was to be strengthened through developing streets, squares and buildings as a continuation of Oslo’s scale and structure.

But the waterfront was also to be Oslo’s new face to the world, with representations of Norwegian business sector, art and culture: In the plan, the waterfront is further seen as a central location for future international and national functions tied to finance, ocean rights, Nordic cooperation, health and sport. Public attractions mentioned included an aquarium, opera house and “science center.” Furthermore, a courthouse in the form of a “palace of justice” as well as a “House of Norway” was listed as potential programs for different parts of the waterfront.

Of the 800,000m² Planning Office CEO Sven Meinich identified as potential square meters for development at the waterfront, 70,000m² were located on Tjuvholmen, while 350,000m² were located in Bjørvika. Being by far the largest area for development, the KDP recommended that Bjørvika was the natural point of departure for waterfront development (A project had already been presented for Bjørvika in 1986). Thus, while Tjuvholmen was primed for development in a long-term perspective, the real potential for large-scale urban schemes lay in Bjørvika. But the agency also voiced concerns regarding the stakes at hand:

---

201 Ibid.
The development of Bjørvika should not happen too swiftly, and we should try different models for development. The municipality has ownership for most of the areas, and has the full capability to follow up the plans.202

In the report, the 35,000m2 Tjuvholmen was declared as a prominent location, which “with a conscious design could be an element that gives the city a more characteristic image.”203 A zoning plan for Tjuvholmen, however, would demand that Kongshavn, a harbor area east in the city, was developed as compensation. It was also written that the Port of Oslo considers Tjuvholmen as a highly valuable industrial asset due to its deep-water quay, but that they accept development “on a long-term perspective.”204 Tjuvholmen’s future role in the development of Aker Brygge was thus dependent not only on political initiative but also goodwill from the Port of Oslo.205

In the following years, the planning authorities went through a structural and strategic reform. In accordance with new governance principles, and to increase service and flexibility, the former “Byplankontoret” merged with the specialized units “Oppmålingvesenet” and “Bygningskontrollen” to become the Agency for Planning and Building Services in 1992.206 But while the agency’s relative independence had been severely reduced throughout the 15 years of Meinich’s rule, it was through his successor Ellen de Vibe that the ideological shift towards new governance truly rendered visible in new municipal plans.207

From land use planning to strategic planning

The 1998 document “Infrastructure, urban structure, urban environment – Municipal Sector Plan for Central Oslo” presented a framework plan for central Oslo.208 The agency’s ambition was now to formulate a general framework of principles, strategies and visions to guide urban planning in Oslo into the coming century, according to the guidelines and ideological orientation of the political administration. The plan encompassed several

---

202 My translation. Ibid.
204 Ibid, “B3 Tjuvholmen.”
205 The Agency of Urban Planning, recommends that heights are limited to 6–8 floors, which the area in general is reserved a mixed program with audience-oriented ground floor programs in the tradition of Aker Brygge. Aker Eiendom’s aquarium proposal is also mentioned in the document. Ibid.
207 Sven Meinich led Oslo Byplankontor (OBK) from 1983 to 1992, and became the CEO of the reformed Agency of Urban Planning and Building Services (PBE) from from 1992 to 1997. When De Vibe became CEO in 1998, the plan had been under way for several years, developed by Stein Kolstø, Freddy Lyvad, Trond Rogstad and project leader Tore Langaard.
themes of urban development that were linked with strategic ambitions based on identifying “key measures” for action. Urban development was explicitly regarded as facilitating for different development processes, sector administration and cooperation forms to take place: “It is by now accepted that the market is the driving force in urban development, and that the public sector should steer through a regulatory framework.”209 The plan accentuated the challenges of balancing market and public interest through urban administration, where the multiple interests, short time spans, concessions and impact analyses rendered traditional forms of inner-city zoning strategies oblivious. The document further presented three scenarios for future growth (where the first two seemingly were rhetorical constructions meant to contrast and thus, support the latter): The Fragmented City, the Traditional City and the City of Distributed Roles (Den rolledelte byen). In the latter, the document discussed “framework control,” where mobility, synergy and densification strategies within a market-driven and flexible urban development regime are keywords for sustainable growth.210

In the 1998 Municipal Sector Plan for Central Oslo, the planners did not propose which areas were deemed suited for what type of programs, like the plan presented ten years earlier. Instead, the plan stated that the harbor should be administrated as a “business area and real estate portfolio.” It is emphasized that unlike other harbor cities, most of the waterfront of Oslo was active, and that urban development in essence was a question of priority.211 While the advantages of harbor industry in central urban areas are seen as beneficial in terms of vicinity to the consumers of goods, the negative consequences of this in terms of transport and displacement of urban functions was underlined.

**Parliamentarism as political reform**

The increased municipal control over the planning authorities was linked to the introduction of Parliamentarism in Oslo in 1986.212 The reform was meant to secure political influence, locate political responsibility and to decentralize administrative functions.213 The goal was to “secure better steering, clearer areas of responsibility and a better overview.”214 It had rendered visible that politicians lacked both the knowledge and time to override recommendations made by the administration. This meant that political debate risked being driven by conflicts based on disciplinary

---

211 *KDP13*, 80.
213 Ibid., 14.
assessments more than politics. The fear was that agencies and public-private companies down the system could overrule political decision-making processes through their knowledge production and technical expertise. Parliamentarism increased political influence over bureaucratic rule, clarified political responsibility and effectuated decision-making processes, at the cost of the municipality officials. The reform was also a result of the economic recession in the early 1980s that impelled the need for a crafty political management. Parliamentarist reforms gave Oslo’s politicians increased influence and more direct jurisdiction. Within this extended mandate, politicians were more directly exposed to different social and economic interest groups, people’s opinion and technical expertise. This can be regarded as a formalization of a process that already was envisaged by Major Albert Nordengen and Chief Municipal Executive Hans Svelland’s engagement Aker Brygge. This in terms meant a decrease of influence for OBK, representing one of the traditionally powerful sectors within municipal government. It also gave rise to a more professionalized breed of full-time politicians with specific areas of competence.

GOVERNANCE STRATEGIES
While OBK’s transition from planner to administrator of urban growth through framework control rendered visible in the late 1990s, the structural effects of new governance strategies had emerged on Aker Brygge a decade earlier, as examples of negotiation planning. Further, the affiliated consultant agency IN’BY had emerged to accommodate the new forms of public-private cooperation enabled by political-economic reform. This public-private cooperation also manifested as speculative realty development projects where the municipality was shareholder, as in the project Oslo M. Simultaneously, there were also project proposals that predated the 1980s, but that like Aker Brygge, were mixed-use development scenarios driven by private initiatives, as in the example of Vaterland.

Vaterland A/S: Negotiation planning and mixed use
While the reforms and regimes of 1980s Oslo consolidated different political, economic and cultural practices within a new regime of urban planning, there were earlier examples of privately initiated development projects for the

---

215 With teachers on the school boards, doctors in the hospital administration and architects in the building council, the professionals controlled their own colleagues. The conflicts could therefore become based on disciplinary assessments rather than politics. Lund, Styringssystemet i Oslo kommune, 11.
216 While the former model was based on a City Council, whose decisions were executed by a Chief Municipal Executive, the new City Government presented political decisions as propositions to the City Council for approval.
217 Grønning, ”What is the Fjord City,” 141–150.
urban core where forms of negotiation planning were applied. The Vaterland project was placed between Bjørvika and Grønland in Oslo, articulated as a 260,000m² office and shopping center drawn by Platou Architects and financed by Vaterland A/S, a subsidiary of the bank DNC. The municipality had already recognized the need for urban clearing and renewal of Vaterland as acute, and projects for the area had been discussed since the late 1950s. In 1971, the Municipal Building Council accepted the plan, but doubts concerning its viability placed the project on pause. In April 1972, the Danish Institute for Centerplanlægning (ICP) led by John Allpass and the Norwegian research facility Norges Byggforskningsinstitutt (NIBR) reassessed the project. The new development revolved around ideas of integrated functions, leisure and experience. ICP concluded that the survival of downtown was dependent on variation and heterogeneity, and included both housing and cultural activities in the scheme.

The plan created controversy within Vaterland A/S, exemplified by board member Ole Borge: “I do not understand why leisure activities necessarily should be located in the same areas as serious work functions, I doubt the societal advantages by pulling people with free-time surplus to the city center!” The bonds to ICP were broken, but a lighter version of the project was presented the following autumn. Further disagreements with the municipality, however, meant the project was cancelled. Eventually DNC withdrew, receiving compensation of NOK37 million from the municipality. As the initiative came from a financial institution suggesting a large-scale multi-program urban development downtown Oslo, the project had been disputed from the start. Furthermore, the housing schemes proposed were controversial in an age still dominated by the corporatist constellations between the municipality and the housing cooperative unions. But the project both introduced a mixed-use development scenario for the urban core, driven by new forms of public private cooperation and negotiation planning. The Vaterland project that finally was built arose under other political and economic conditions and is not discussed further here. But the 1972 version of the project envisaged how private initiatives had introduced both process facilitation tools in combination with cultural development strategies for urban space as basis for large-scale project-based developments.

**Aker Brygge: Negotiation planning and governance strategies**

The B&F2000 competition and development of Aker Brygge was an early example of how private initiatives cooperated with non-governmental

---

220 “Norwegian Institute of Urban and Regional research.” (Norsk institutt for by- og regionsforskning), Sejersted, Hvem skal rede city?, 18.
221 Sejersted, Hvem skal rede city?, 20.
organizations, with support from both politicians and the planning authorities. The impact of Oslo Bye Vel and its validation of Aker Brygge as development concept can be seen as an example of the increasing influence gained by non-governmental organizations: From a governance perspective, B&F2000 was an indicator of what Rhodes calls “administrative networks” in urban planning: They were both linked to the disciplinary organizations of NAL (Norwegian Association of Architects) and NLA (Norwegian Association of Landscape Architects), the administrative agencies of the municipality, the political power of influential politicians, and was given mandate to initiate a large-scale competition for the future of Oslo. The jury was multidisciplinary, and with the CEOs of OBK and the Port of Oslo involved. Its influence would extend beyond their mandate to become part of future negotiation processes regarding the development of the waterfront.

The Aker Brygge model was also built on a strategy of negotiation. For Kjell Wester, everything was negotiable: From the programming as well as development volume and speed. Attracting the right retail tenants as well as establishing a cultural institution was a question of cooperation and mediation. Whether striking deals with the Norwegian Broadcasting Service NRK, Norway’s largest bank DNC, the transport sector or a local small-scale theater, Wester set an example of the potential embedded in merging social, cultural and economic forms of engagement. The planning authority’s attempts to regard Aker Brygge within a larger framework of urban development were merely an annoyance. Addressing the rigor and slowness of OBK, Wester told newspaper Aftenposten: “But why can’t the municipality establish a little organization, a small engine that could run such development, and earn some money to the shrunken municipal accounts?”222

The conflict between Wester and the OBK planning authorities was not only a skirmish between a private developer and a public institution, it also represented a clash of ideologies rooted in conflicting perspectives of how urban planning should be organized and executed. What Wester pleaded for was government institutions that could better mediate between public interest and private agents in urban development processes. Fredrik Torp similarly notes that the negotiation planning structure of Aker Brygge placed the architect as mediator between the developers and the various municipal agencies involved, while trying to maintain architectural quality in the process.223

Both Wester’s and Torp’s comments resonate within governance theory and principles of intergovernmental management, where “steering (the process of setting norms) is separated from directedness (the outcome of that

---

223 Fredrik Torp, “Historien om Aker Brygge,” 503.
Intergovernmental management replaces system control with process administration, focusing on compromise instead on top-down instructions, or to stimulate behavior through the allocation of resources. In Oslo, the first true example of intergovernmental management was the Institute for Urban Development (In’by), led by Dag Andersen and founded by Peter Butenschøn.

In’by as intergovernmental management

In’by was directly aimed towards facilitating intergovernmental management processes. In founder Peter Butenschøn’s words, this semi-public foundation was a direct answer to the challenges posed by the B&F2000 competition. It was to be a catalyst, mediating between private and public interests, giving account for potential projects around the city, developing project suggestions and negotiating between the administration, planning...
authorities, architect and developer. Additionally, they aimed towards generating stir for urban development through courses, seminars and media debates. In 1983, they arranged the “Bylivskonferansen” (City Life Conference), were the urban environment, economic sustainability and cooperation models for the city core was the agenda. Collecting agents in retail, administration and politics, the conference called for an increased focus on the urban core as commercial, institutional and spatial potential in Oslo.\footnote{228} A year later, a similar conference was arranged, where Jan Gehl argued for pedestrianizing streets and providing new common activities in the city center.\footnote{229} According to Butenschøn, In’by’s projects were examples of “privately financed, public planning projects” utilizing “urban design as an offensive urban development tool.”\footnote{230} Butenschøn was taught within the North American pragmatic planning tradition in a time where the European perception of the city, in Butenschøn’s words, was “large scale architecture.”\footnote{231} The In’by founders saw the organization as the missing link between municipal intention and private initiative. Their model allowed for more complex modes of cooperation seen in e.g. Vancouver, where the municipality could pose both detailed and extensive demands to private agents that on their side could calculate potential profit based on stable and long-term perspectives of development. Butenschøn’s focus on “benches and banks” manifested itself in a series of project proposals in the urban core, ranging from a glass pavilion in the Studenterlunden Park, to the reprogramming and renovation of various squares and streets around the city. But In’by also participated in large-scale urban schemes, developed in cooperation with the municipality. In 1986, In’by and OBK launched a large-scale proposal for the development of Bjørvika, after the city government had ratified that such a proposal was to be made.\footnote{232} The idea was to build an “entire new city” but that in scale and typology was identical to the perimeter blocks of Kvadraturen. In’by’s CEO Dag Andersen underlined in Aftenposten that they were not dictating how the new district would look, but “proposed a framework” for how it could be developed.\footnote{233}
From a governance perspective, In’by was a strategic answer to the challenges that arose as results of project-based forms of urban planning. As shown with the Vaterland example, several independent institutions such as ICP and NIBR similarly fronted forms of negotiation planning in their work. These perspectives were, however, often met with skepticism from the planning discipline, that conceived public-private partnerships as a resignation to market liberal ideology.\(^{234}\) Similarly, In’by’s motives were questioned, where the organization’s influence, network and high media profile, combined with its configuration as a semi-public actor were made prone to criticism. Jan Sigurd Østberg of Oslo Byes Vel especially pointed to how the foundation became an alternative instead of a mediator to the planning authorities. Still, central agents within OBK accentuated In’by’s role as “illustrator of visions.”\(^{235}\) From 1990, In’by went from foundation to corporation, and in 1992, its new CEOs Ola Bettum and Alv Skogstad Aamo told \textit{Aftenposten} that the era of “large-scale urban ideas” was over.\(^{236}\) As a private consultant agency, however, the organization would continue to inflict influence on urban development in Oslo, including Tjuvholmen.

\textbf{The municipality as market agent: Oslo M and Oslo Næringselskap}

In’by emerged from a paradigm where new political economic practices were facilitated for through new intergovernmental planning tools, public-private forms of cooperation and new publicly-owned realty development companies. One of these was Oslo Næringselskap AS, where the municipality was the largest shareholder, and ABC Bank its largest investor. This company, and several others set up in a similar configuration, were tools for securing municipal interests in matters of urban development, representing both the gains of private investment will and public financial and political stability. But while non-profit, they also represented a competitor in the market. The dormant Vaterland development project had been revived after the municipality repatriated the property in 1980. LPO Architects won a competition for the area in 1982.\(^{237}\) It consisted of a mixed-use development, a multi-use arena and a 400-meter-long indoor office and pedestrian mall set on top of the Oslo bus terminal. The project was supposed to be led, branded and sold by Oslo Næringselskap, which was dedicated solely to this development, and the economic stability the municipality secured financial goodwill in the market. A haphazard project thereby had the credit guarantees it needed to initiate development in 1986. Two years later,

\(^{234}\) Børrud, “Bitvis byutvikling,” 110.
\(^{235}\) Both CEO of urban planning Rolf H Jensen and and Sven Meinich points to In’by s role in stimulating debate. Kjersti Løken, “Autorisert storleverandør av luftslott,” \textit{Aftenposten} \textit{Aften} 7 August 1992, 30.
\(^{236}\) Ibid.
\(^{237}\) In 1985, Oslo Vekst A/S was established with a similar configuration. Oslo Næringselskap became the property developer, while Oslo Vekst’s overall goal would was to establish new jobs in Oslo.
Oslo Næringsselskap admitted that the costs were doubled from the original estimate of NOK 585 million. Additional financing became necessary the following year, but now, ABC Bank went to court. In 1990, Oslo Næringsselskap was declared bankrupt. Confronted with the financial crisis of the late 1980s, the municipal adventure into speculative real estate development had become a disaster. According to critics, the problem of 1980s urban development was how credit guarantees could be obtained without financial security. Oslo Næringsselskap had taken unnecessary financial risks while having excessive administrative costs, and with its demise, so was the Municipality’s role as “spec” developer terminated.

---

**Fig. 33** The Fjord City Plan 2012. Lower right: The relocated harbor on Sjursøya.
(Source: Oslo Municipality)

**THE FJORD CITY VISION**

In the years to come, the municipal strategy was to develop a strategic plan for the waterfront administrated by the municipality and development by

---

238 A similar company, Oslo Byfornyelse A/S did not do much better. Established in 1978 to execute and administrate the urban renewal program, it suffered severe loss 10 years later, due to lack of overview and control. Oslo Vekst A/S had an even shorter career, existing only 3 years.

private and semi-private agents. Neither the cultural ambitions of Aker Brygge, however, nor the virtues of strategic forms of planning fronted by Butenschøn and In’by would be decisive of this strategy. The following pages map the path towards the approval of the Fjordbyen plan, and Tjuvholmen’s role within it, as spearhead project and strategic tool in the Fjord City controversy.

**Tjuvholmen as spearhead in the Fjord City**

In regard to Oslo’s urban waterfront, a City Council Decision in June 1985 was the first political step towards the Fjord City, if not including the municipal support for B&F2000 competition. Seeing the existing Harbor Plan 1982–1990 from the Port of Oslo in relation to the competition, the city government requested a revised plan where the future waterfront development scenarios were taken into account. Soon thereafter, Aker Eiendom presented a survey for the development of Tjuvholmen.240 The Oslo municipality owned Tjuvholmen, but Aker had a long-term contract on the building Skur15. The area was originally regulated for industry in a zoning plan from 1942, but the City Council had decided, “Tjuvholmen should be released for activities of a more urban character, so that the development of this area can commence parallel to the further development of Aker Brygge.” Aker Eiendom’s framework plan boasted a 20,000m² aquarium with 220 different species, situated as a “grand closure of the new waterfront sequence” (“kaiforløp”) from Rådhusplassen, past Aker Brygge on out to Tjuvholmen, as an all-year attraction for the city.242 Aker Brygge would provide Oslo with a complete aquarium estimated to cost NOK258 million that would attract 75,000 visitors yearly.243 As a reimbursement, Aker Brygge would be allowed to develop the remaining part of Tjuvholmen with 37,000m² housing and office programs, and a 25,000m² development project called Oslo World Trade Center:

> Envision a building with a magnificent form, a powerful for-complex as a characteristic sign in Oslo’s harbor front image. The location is as prominent as the location of the Sydney Opera, and the ambition is to create a building of equal quality to the Sidney Opera.244

---

240 Aker Eiendom, *Tjuvholmen Aquarium – Aker Brygge’s Proposal for the City of Oslo (Tjuvholmenakvariet, Aker Brygges forslag til Oslo By)*, 1985. The BPK CEO Sven W Meinich called for an assessment of placing an aquarium on Tjuvholmen, after Aker Eiendom had signaled their interest in developing the project. This meant that the building council preliminarily had rejected plans for an aquarium at “Fiskvollbukten” four kilometers south of the city. An aquarium had been discussed since 1935, when the “Aquarium Committee” proposed an aquarium underneath the courtyard of the Town Hall.


243 Divided between 25 percent students, 30 percent Oslo inhabitants and 45 percent tourists.

Finally, the document states that the goal is to make the aquarium an attraction for Oslo as a tourist destination. The document provided descriptions, analysis and drawings, arguing that the location and the possibility for long opening hours were ideal for tourism.\textsuperscript{245} Aker Eiendom’s proposal also had an additional competitor, represented by In’by, whose proposal for an Ocean Center on Vippetangen included an aquarium, an exhibition pavilion, an extension of the existing fishmonger stalls and finally an office complex to finance it.\textsuperscript{246} Its conglomeration of investors and stakeholders (including the Port of Oslo) also gained support from the fishing as well as the tourist industry.

Tjuvholmen was not granted the aquarium Wester had conceived when visiting Baltimore with Fredrik Torp and Hans Hjorth. But the emergence of mixed-use schemes combining a large-scale attractor with an economic engine of real estate development on Tjuvholmen took the Aker Brygge model one step further: Here, it was not the development itself that was an attractor, rather it was the specific branding of a tourist attraction in the form of a public accessible iconic building that would spearhead and help legitimize the development. Additionally, the emergence of different, competing private-public conglomerates focusing of the growing tourist industry embodied how the waterfront’s new, common space also was regarded as a commercial zone for exploitation by a rising number of public and private agents.

\textbf{1993 – The City Council versus the Port of Oslo}

In the early 1990s, the Port of Oslo argued for a further expansion of their container harbor, due to increased freight traffic. Alternatives were evaluated, but rather than relocating to a single, larger site or reestablishing the port outside Oslo altogether, the Port of Oslo proposed to expand the existing container harbor at Filipstad, southwest of Tjuvholmen by reclaiming land in the fjord. In 1993, the City Council evaluated the environmental consequences of transport to be larger than those resulting from land reclaiming, leading to a heated debate in media where journalists, the architect’s association NAL, Oslo Byes Vel and a number of other agents criticized the project. In March 1994, the Minister of Environment Torbjørn Berntsen overruled the Oslo municipality and repealed the decision.\textsuperscript{247} This marked a turning point for the Port of Oslo, who since the BOF2000

\textsuperscript{245} Ibid., 3–6.
\textsuperscript{246} The project was led by In’by and drawn by Narud Stokke Wiig as and Arkitektkontoret GASA. It was presented as “Norsk Havsenter” in Butenschøn’s book “Det Nye Oslo” in 1987. Investors were Klosters Rederi A/S, Olav Thon Gruppen A/S og Selmer Sande A/S. 10.10.1985.
\textsuperscript{247} Editorial, “En nasjonal sak,“\textit{Aftenposten Aften}, 12 March 1994, 8.
continuously had struggled against urban development on the waterfront.\textsuperscript{248} From now on, the critique towards the Port of Oslo’s role in urban development escalated. In 1995, the liberal Party (Venstre) and party leader Odd Einar Dørum argued that the politicians of Oslo were “in the pockets” of the Port of Oslo, that was its own “government within the government” with undocumented needs for expansion. Since it’s exceptional status as organization meant it had no economic obligations towards the municipality, it had no incentives for rationalization. Dørum instead proposed that the Port of Oslo was closed down in favor of an intra-municipal port organization shared between Oslo and neighboring port cities.\textsuperscript{249} This marked an escalation of a dormant conflict between the Port and the municipality of Oslo that was initiated with the BOF2000, and culminated with the Fjord City Plan two decades later.

Fig. 34 New aquarium and “world trade center” on Tjuvholmen, 1985. (Source: TTA)

\textsuperscript{248} Alv Skogstad Aamo et al., \textit{Developer-driven Urban Development (Utbyggerstyrt Byutvikling)}, (NIBR Report 21, 2011), 99.
\textsuperscript{249} Hilde Lundgaard, “Ta kontroll over havnene,” \textit{Aftenposten}, 1 August 1995, 3.
1997 – Fjord City of Harbor City?
Parallel to the discussion on the future uses of the urban waterfront, municipal plans were developed that illustrated the awareness of the fjord and waterfront areas of Oslo. Among these was the 1991 Municipal Sector Plan 5 for the Fjord and Fjord Area. The plan was based on the Inaugural Address from the City Council led by Hans Svelland in 1986, and was the first larger municipal assessment where the fjord was approached as a recreational area for the common good of the city’s inhabitants. Now, the fjord area and its island were included in OBK’s strategic planning documents, and thus seen in context of the city’s development.\footnote{Oslo Municipality, \textit{KDP5, Fjordbruksplan for Oslo – kommunedelplan for fjorden og fjordområdet}, 1991.} In 1996, the City Council decided that PBE (former OBK) should develop alternative strategies for the harbor-front and waterfront areas, resulting in the “Fjord City or Harbor City” assessment from 1997.\footnote{Oslo Municipality, \textit{Fjordby eller havneby – Utredning om Oslos havne- og sjøside}, 1997.} The report, referring to the Port of Oslo’s Filipstad landfill controversy, stated “the time is ready for a principal decision on the use of the waterside areas.”\footnote{Ibid., 10.} In the report, an opposition is drawn between traditional harbor industry and knowledge industry, and a rhetorical question was posed:
The question regarding the harbor-front’s consequences for urban development touches a question regarding Oslo’s image: Once harbor city, always harbor city? Or should Oslo convey that the city has become a provident city of knowledge, culture and sustainability?\textsuperscript{253}

The report argued that in order to attract investment, current trends pointed towards “city profiling” through urban development. In competition with cities around the world, culture and recreation were crucial factors for success, and the urban waterfront was where a city exposed its face to the world.\textsuperscript{254} With regard to ownership, the report states that the Port of Oslo was a venture owned by the municipality, and while income from the industrial harbor was reserved for the Port Board through the Port Fund (Havnekassen), the City Council decides over properties owned by the Port of Oslo.\textsuperscript{255} The report concluded that the “Fjord City” alternative was the obvious choice due both for its local and regional synergetic effects on trade, tourism and quality of life in Oslo. Rationalization strategies were thought to enable new and efficient harbor installations, freeing property for urban development.

Later, the report’s project leader Elin Børrud, noted how the Port of Oslo and its CEO Per Mauritz Hansen, for years had been in a dispute with the municipality with regard to harbor area dispositions, frowned upon the architects and planners that enthusiastically reframed harbor strategies and seaside uses.\textsuperscript{256} Parallel to PBE’s work on the “Fjord City or Harbor City” report, the Port of Oslo developed their own waterfront strategy. Børrud describes this as “a race for the truth” between two competing institutions.\textsuperscript{257} Nevertheless, the Port Board would over time come to terms with the fact that multiple smaller detached areas scattered around the city were not sustainable for running an efficient modern harbor.\textsuperscript{258}

**The Fjord City Proposal**

In 1999, the parties supporting Fjordbyen led by the Conservative Party with their campaign slogan “The Fjord City Oslo” were granted the majority in the City Government.\textsuperscript{259} On 8 December 1999, the 2000 Municipal Plan for

\textsuperscript{253} Ibid.,15.
\textsuperscript{254} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{255} Ibid.,17. The profit from sale of such property, however, should be granted the Port Fund.
\textsuperscript{256} Elin Børrud, “Across the Fjord City,” in Voices About the Fjord City (Stemmer om Fjordbyen), (Oslo: Norsk Form, 2007) 36.
\textsuperscript{257} Ibid., 39.
\textsuperscript{258} Aamo et al., Ubyggerstøpt hytvtvikling?, 122.
\textsuperscript{259} Ibid. The “Fjord City” was coined by the Conservative Party as slogan in their 1999 campaign, arguing that it would be possible to build at least 10,000 housing units along the waterfront. The Labor Party and the Progress Party opposed the idea, fronting their own combined industry and urban development vision called
Oslo laid the foundation for a final political decision on the Fjord City. Here, Oslo was presented as “the Urban Fjord City,” stating the aspiration for continued growth within the current building zone, through densification and urbanization strategies in the old harbor areas. On 19 January 2000, the “Fjord City Proposal” was ratified by the majority of the City Council votes, based on the recommendation put forth in PBE’s 1997 report. In January 2000, the “Fjord City Decision” (Fjordbyvedtaket) established that the Fjord City alternative would be the basis for the development of Oslo’s urban waterfront, and that there is initiated assessments for regional harbor solutions and urban development on released harbor areas. Further, the Port of Oslo was requested to present a strategy for phasing out the container harbor, and the City Government to prepare plans for progress and succession for release of harbor areas for development. The Fjord City Decision would later become the basis on which the Fjord City Plan was developed, a document that was finalized and ratified in 2008.

In February 2000, the Port of Oslo’s CEO Per Mauritz Hanssen announced that they would not consider the City Government’s decision in their assessment for the development of the waterfront over the next 15–20 years, but only relate to already ratified zoning plans. The same month, the Liberalist Party politician Bernt Stilluf Karlsen was appointed chairman of the Port Board. Noting that the Liberalist Party was in opposition to the container harbor in Bjørvika, newspaper Aftenposten pleads:

What if the Port Authority Board Leader for once opposed the Port of Oslo director, to remind Per Mauritz Hanssen that there are politicians that decide the development of the city, and not a municipal CEO seemingly acting as both king and occupant? For most, “opposing Rome is a difficult task” – Do you dare, Bernt Stilluf Karlsen?

In June 2000, the city government, based on the City Council’s Fjord City Decision, concluded that the Governing Mayor had the main responsibility for the City Council decision, and requested that the Port of Oslo facilitate a swift discontinuation of Tjuvholmen and Filipstad as active harbor areas, preferably within the next two to four years. The future waterfront of Oslo
was to be developed as non-industrial recreational area, based on housing and commerce. To obstruct the Port of Oslo’s development plans, the City Council decided on a two-year prohibition against developing the harbor further as an industrial facility. Chairman Bernt Stilluf Karlsen’s reply was composed; saying that such a prohibition doubtless over time would slow the harbor’s activities down but that the national government probably would come up with a “countermove.”

The conflict between the municipality and the Port of Oslo regarding use and ownership of waterfront was based in the 1984 Harbor Act, when the harbor became a municipal (and not government) unit. The Port of Oslo was now sorted under the Harbor Law’s §23 where assets owned by the Port of Oslo and financed through the harbor tax were reserved for harbor purposes. The division between what was called the “Port Fund” and the “City Fund” was meant to secure the autonomy of the port’s financial dispositions in regards to harbor industry, but where revenues were reserved industrial purposes. The Municipality and the Port of Oslo referred to two different juridical entities to justify their claims, namely the Harbor Act and the Local Government Act. The former stated that all property the port authorities had profited from before 1984 was to be seen as Port of Oslo’s property. But in January 1999, the City government had stated that property attained through municipal funding was municipal property. Now, the national government (through the Department of Fishery) intervened, granting the Port of Oslo right to the properties. With a new Labor-led government in office in March 2000, the municipality appealed to the Department of Fishery, but the new Labor Party Government Secretary was in line with the party’s support for the container harbor in the city center and dismissed the municipality’s claim.

In June 2000, however, the Norwegian Parliament opposed the Minister of Fishery’s claim that the Port Fund only could be used for port-related purposes: “The substantial values in today’s harbor areas are both attained by harbor industry but also by the development of the Oslo harbor city.” This meant that the Parliament finally granted the municipality rights over the waterfront areas, and implicitly, that the harbor law had to be revised to accommodate urban development. The architect behind the proposal (“Document 8 Forslaget”) was Liberalist Party Representative Odd Einar Dørum mentioned above, a long-term supporter of the Fjord City vision and critic of the Port of Oslo. With the Parliament’s support for the

269 The Harbor Act: http://www.skoledata.net/Kommune/Lover/Havnelov/havn06.htm#a23.
270 Editorial, Aftenposten Aften, 28 June 1999. The conflict had escalated due to the dispute over the “triangle-property” of Aker Brygge’s phase 3.
municipality’s claims, The Port Authority CEO Per Mauritz Hanssen now had his back against the wall. But it was his chairman Bernt Stilluf Karlsen that was the strategic mastermind behind the development of Bjørvika and Tjuvholmen in the years to come.

The Fjord City Decision as development strategy
On 18 September 2000, the Port of Oslo’s Board announced a “strategy decision” (strategivedtak) regarding harbor development in Oslo as a follow-up of the city government’s Fjord City Decision. Now Bernt Stilluf Karlsen declared that “If we ever are to realize the Fjord City Proposal, we have to start somewhere.” In the decision, large parts of Oslo’s waterfront areas could be released for urban development within two to four years. In return, the areas southeast of the city center would be developed into a modern industrial but intermediate harbor until 2011. Aftenposten wrote of the Port Authority Board’s decision “it is almost too good to be true” but were skeptical towards the proposal of intermediate relocation to Sjursøya, as were many of the politicians behind the Fjordby Proposal.

The Port of Oslo’s “Plan of Action for the Fjord City 2002–2011” built on the strategy decision and established that Tjuvholmen would be discharged in the course of 2002, and that “The Port Authority will, through the sale and development of property, finance the necessary restructuring of the Oslo harbor, without funding from the municipality.” On 9 May 2001, the City government ratified PBE’s Follow-up Program for the Fjord City, and the process of developing a regional harbor solution outside the city was initiated. The harbor front was subdivided into 12 areas, and the report pointed out that the compensation for discharging Tjuvholmen and Filipstad would petition large investments. This was, according to PBE, in conflict with the Fjord City Decision, and more in accordance with the “Havneby” than the “Fjordby” vision of 1997. Now, investing in the eastern harbor had become the leverage for Tjuvholmen, which in the report was ripe for development and potentially an important symbol for the Fjord City:

274 Ibid. These included the Tjuvholmen, Filipstad, Bjørvika, Sørenga, Lohavn, Revierhavna and Vippetangen.
275 Ibid. These areas included Sjursøya, Bekkelaget and Ormsund.
279 Ibid., 16.
Tjuvholmen has a potential as a city attraction that underlines the spatial closure of Pipervika towards the fjord and marks a division between Aker Brygge and Filipstad. A development here is important as a counterpart towards Vippetangen, and the areas should be regarded in context of each other.\(^{280}\)

In a document dated 17 September 2001 from the City Government’s Department for Environment and Transport, it is concluded that profit from the sale of Tjuvholmen will be granted to the Port Fund, and that the Port of Oslo would facilitate the sale of the area. The sale of Tjuvholmen enabled the Port of Oslo to realize the Fjord City Decision. With this, the long controversy between the municipality and the Port of Oslo reached a preliminary conclusion. In a letter, dated 10 January 2002 from PBE and the Port of Oslo, developers were invited to participate in an open competition for the development of Tjuvholmen. The ambition was to “[…] locate physical solutions that attain the municipality’s goals for urban development, and that within this framework provide a sensible price to the trader.”\(^{281}\) The prospectus program was dispatched in April 2002, with a four-month competition period concluding on 15 August 2002.\(^{282}\) Thus, resulting from the ensuing conflicts between the municipality and the Port of Oslo, Tjuvholmen had emerged as the tool to the instigate the Fjord City and provide the Port with the financing necessary to establish a new “super harbor” at Sjursøya in the East Harbor.

**Strategists of the Fjord City Plan**

The Port’s strategy decision only marked the beginning of Bernt Stilluf Karlsen’s reign as chairman of the Port of Oslo. As chairman, he was controversial also within the organization, where his strategic negotiations with both the municipality and government were seen to exceed his mandate as chairman.\(^{283}\) Nevertheless, it was Stilluf Karlsen that would provide the final framework that resolved the long-lasting conflict between the core agents of Fjordbyen. On 19 March 2002, Chairman of Oslo S Utvikling Bjørn Sundt and Bernt Stilluf Karlsen sent a letter to Minister of Labor and Administration Victor D Normann, where they offered to finance the bulk of local infrastructure in Bjørvika, if the municipality assigned its property to Sundt and Stilluf Karlsen’s new private infrastructural company, a one-time contribution from the municipality of 200 million and that the 25-year


\(^{282}\) Ibid.

development scenario planned by the municipality was condensed to a mere decade.\textsuperscript{284} In April 2002, Victor Normann presented the “Parliament Resolution 28 – Utvikling av Bjørvi ka (2001–2002)” that addressed the development of Bjørvi ka. The resolution focused on core challenges regarding road infrastructure, fragmented ownership and the legal matters regarding the Port of Oslo’s ability to profit on real estate.\textsuperscript{285} In the resolution, the government granted a 4680 billion funding package for the Opera, road and tunnel in Bjørvi ka, and the Port of Oslo was granted the right to act as “regular landowner” (ordinær grunneier) to realize the potential value of the waterfront property, through its subsidiary property company HAV Eiendom AS.\textsuperscript{286} Finally, it was decided that future profit from areas Filipstad and Vippetangen would be granted the Port Fund.

Now, Bjørvi ka was resolved, Tjuvholmen primed for urban development, and the Fjord City Decision could finally be realized. The tactic dispositions of the agents involved, however, had not addressed some of the fundamental issues regarding the ownership of the urban waterfront: In the publication of Voices on the Fjord City of 2008, Elin Børrud discussed the process, calling the relation between the Harbor Act and the Planning & Building Services Act a “Gordian Knot” and questioned some fundamental aspects of the situation:

Who actually owns the waterfront areas? Why is it the Ministry of Fishery that is the final authority for area subordinate to the Harbor Act, which shall determine the urban development in Oslo? Why can’t the Port Fund, which is so full, be transferred to the Municipal Fund when both belong to the municipality of Oslo? As city planners, we were not allowed to ask such questions and were certainly not supposed to answer them. In this case, it was not the Port Authority Director that grumbled, but the Council Solicitor.\textsuperscript{287}

Børrud pointed to how the municipality, focused on realizing the long sought-after and prestigious Fjord City vision, seemed willing to accept the mandate granted the Port of Oslo due to the almost immediate initiation of the project inherent in the strategy decision of the Port Board: The hardliner power play of Port CEO Hanssen had been replaced by a tactical game that could profit all the agents involved. Chairman Bernt Stilluf Karlsen’s orchestrated strategy decision and cooperation with central politicians

\textsuperscript{285} The Harbor Act prohibited against using the Port Fund for other purposes than industrial harbor installations.
\textsuperscript{286} The resolution opened for a revision of t §23 in the 1984 Harbor Act, ratified soon after. Havne- og farvansloven, 8 June 1984, 51. Revised by the Department of Fishery, 6 March 2002.
\textsuperscript{287} My translation. Elin Børrud, “Across the Fjord City,” 43.
including Victor D. Norman and Odd Einar Dørum, that resulted in the Parliament Resolution 28, was a strategic masterpiece: Now the Port of Oslo, administrated most of Oslo’s urban waterfront, had its own development company in Bjørvika together with Oslo S Utvikling, and could facilitate and profit from the sale and development of Tjuvholmen. Further, the revenue from Tjuvholmen was invested in Sjurøya, where the Port of Oslo was granted intermediate harbor activities until 2011. 288

Børrud notes that this might have been the intention all along: Stilluf Karlsen’s mission was seemingly both to realize the Fjord City as well as the Harbor City vision, that had been posed as oppositions in PBE’s 1997 document “Fjordby eller Havneby.” 289 Stilluf Karlsen’s strategic success can also be seen in context of how the immediate release of Tjuvholmen for development gave the Port leverage and goodwill, which provided the organization with the power of definition on the future development of the urban waterfront. This was evident in the sale competition of Tjuvholmen, where the Port was granted the mandate to set the premises for development, admittedly in cooperation with PBE, as we shall see in part four below.

There are thus reasons to question to what extent the national government as well as the municipality grasped the consequence of granting an already powerful institution the semi-autonomy implied by enabling The Port of Oslo access to the real estate market: The Port today holds the privileges of any private landowner, simultaneously as its political influence is massive. While the Port of Oslo’s Board was the municipal body with the mandate to control HAV Eiendom AS, chairman Stilluf Karlsen displayed how such and organization oppositely could be utilized to strategically manipulate urban development policy processes (Admittedly often with considerable political support). The Port of Oslo became the “tail that wags the dog” in the development processes of the urban waterfront in Oslo. On the other side, neither the national government nor the municipality was willing to embark on a potentially risky development project such as Bjørvika. Stilluf Karlsen voices this in Aftenposten:

There was, however, no one that was willing to take the risk of establishing a new district in Bjørvika. The government would not pay for more than the Opera House. The motorists thought it sufficient that they were paying for the new tunnel. The Oslo municipality had bad experiences related to participating on the owner-side in urban development processes. 291

288 It soon became clear, however, that the massive investments in the container harbor at Sjurøya would be a permanent venture, ratified by the City Government in 2010.
289 Elin Børrud, “Across the Fjord City,” 49.
Stilluf Karlsen thus refers to the municipal lack of will to take responsibility of the development, linking it to the controversies of Oslo Næringsselskap in the early 1990s discussed above. Peter Butenschøn, referring Stilluf Karlsen’s above quote, notes that from an international perspective, it was unusual that projects built on public private partnerships “so swiftly and unconditionally disposed of the mandate to control the premises for content and quality of development,” arguing that the public sector should have been aware of the investment necessary to secure public welfares. ²⁹²

SUMMARIZING REMARKS
Below, I extract four perspectives that sum up and reflect on the pages presented above. First, I address the shift from comprehensive planning to neo-liberalism in the Oslo context. Secondly, I reflect on the effects on new governance strategies in urban development policies in Oslo, before discussing the potential negative implications of public-private cooperation models. Further, I address the relation between deregulation and the conceptualization of new urban environments, and discuss the relation between architectural production and real estate development in context of the Aker Brygge model.

From comprehensive planning to neo-liberalism in Oslo
As shown above, the alignment of political-economic practices towards entrepreneurialism was rooted in a belief that deregulation could facilitate economic growth and development in a new economic climate, where former models of administration and execution were perceived to fail. This transition also illustrated new ideological positions, concurring with multiple societal political, economic and cultural agents of change. Here, Aker Brygge exemplified the first project executed and completed within a transition period between synoptic forms of comprehensive planning and the incremental planning resulting from deregulation, privatization and implementation of “new governance.” This restructuring in both national and municipal levels of government administration is in coherence with David Harvey’s account for neo-liberalist political economic practices. His definition of neo-liberalism, which includes increased private ownership and “entrepreneurial freedom,” within an institutional framework that supports such practices, fits with the restructuring of both Oslo’s municipal system and its planning sector: From the reforms in the bank sector on a national level, to the municipal reforms of Oslo’s planning system to incite private initiatives for real estate development are “textbook” examples.

Furthermore, under entrepreneurial forms of governance, prosperity is linked with individual freedom and entrepreneurship. Traditional welfare measures such as land-use planning and collective consumption become replaced and/or extended through “mobilizing local resources in the scramble for rewards in an increasingly competitive free market.”\(^{293}\) The demounting of the housing sector and the end of price regulation throughout the 1980s exemplify such a transition. As a result, former regulated and public-sponsored projects built by the large housing associations projects were sold for market value. This shift, from housing as welfare good, to housing as a commodity investment, is maybe the single most influential aspect of “entrepreneurial” ideology in Oslo’s urban politics.\(^{294}\)

**Implementation of new governance in urban development policies**

The introduction of goal-oriented business management methods in public sector administration meant that emphasis was placed on measurable objectives more than control of execution. The planning authorities’ shift from being executor to controller and facilitator exemplifies this transition. While this transition process evolved gradually, PBE’s 1998 Sector Plan made out the most ideologically distinct planning document discussed here, accentuating frameworks and divided roles, and where the waterfront area is defined as a “real estate portfolio.” PBE’s role as facilitator thus concurred with intergovernmental management theories, where the system controller is replaced by a process facilitator without secondary objectives.\(^{295}\) The plan contrasted the ambition of PBE’s 1988 Sector Plan, that not only defined the distribution and amount of programs and building mass, but that also accentuated municipal ownership and controlled development speed. Furthermore, the municipality’s venture into real estate speculation through Oslo Næringsselskap and affiliated companies also concurs with Rhode’s description of managerialism, where public undertakings were run by private sector management strategies. In the years to come, however, the strategy for the Oslo municipality was instead to increase liquidity by disposing of public property to private developers, much in accordance with Rhodes’ term “new institutional economies.”\(^{296}\) The transfer of property between public agents (where the municipality transferred its Bjørvika-properties to The Port of Oslo), as well as within public agencies (where the Port of Oslo organized its properties by establishing HAV Eiendom),
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\(^{293}\) Hubbard, “The Entrepreneurial City,” 154.
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envisages such principles.

While the Port of Oslo’s exceptional status in Oslo called for an amendment of the 1984 Harbor Act, the strategy of establishing subsidiary companies to administer new real estate was not an exceptional *strategy*: In addition to HAV Eiendom, Rom Eiendom was established in 2001, as a commercial property company owned by the Norwegian National Railway (NSB). Further, the national company Statsbygg established the property company Entra in 2000. Although these companies have government ownership, they also have required rates of return. Competing for influence and financial surplus, these subsidiary profit-seeking real estate development companies dominate former sites of industry and infrastructure in cities all over Norway, and are among the most illustrative examples of the implementation of neo-liberal principles of governance within urban development and policy-making.

In the context of Tjuvholmen, these reforms meant that it was not the municipality that set the agenda for its development, but rather a partnership between PBE and (the chairman of) the Port of Oslo. Thus, the development model introduced at Aker Brygge by the plot owner private company Aker Eiendom was now a model appropriated and outsourced by public agencies, which appropriated private sector development strategies to capitalize on real estate. This in turn meant that logics of real estate development became the criteria for the development of new urban environments on Tjuvholmen, both mirroring and contrasting the events that led to the development of Aker Brygge two decades earlier.

**The masking of transparency in incremental planning processes**

In Oslo, intergovernmental forms of urban development had been introduced by the founding of In’by in 1983. While the foundation facilitated an excessive amounts of projects, debates and visions for urban development over the following ten years, it also exemplified how new governance strategies might diffuse the borders between public and private institutions, potentially masking the transparency of urban development. And while the organization accentuated its impartiality in matters of urban development, its role as opinion maker, initiator and advocate in numerous projects around the city, meant that it also became a powerful actor in the Oslo context. Illustrative was how In’by founder Peter Butenschøn and Tone Lindheim’s book “Det nye Oslo” was published parallel to OBK’s 1988 waterfront plan,
encompassing much of the same areas, implicitly representing a competing set of ideas and development strategies to those held by the planning authorities. Nonetheless, the “masking of transparency” with regard to In’by’s role in urban development processes is of academic interest only when compared to the obscurity of the processes that led to the Fjordbyen decision, development of the Opera house in Bjørvika and the release of Tjuvholmen for urban development. These processes displayed how the Fjord City vision in Bjørvika became entrenched in strategic negotiation processes between powerful public, semi-public and private agents and sector interests in a process masking the actual design and planning of the area, and where the development of Tjuvholmen became the compromise that enabled the initiation of the “Fjordbyen” vision.

Deregulation and the conceptualization of new urban environments

The sections above also displayed how the visions initially put forth in the BOF2000 competition eventually became a strategy for real estate development, facilitated by the municipality and executed by private and semi-public agencies. Within this logic of development, critics have pointed to how the focus increasingly lay on aesthetic cohesion, instead of the socio-spatial cohesion sought for in Keynesian-Fordist models of planning. But while the increased focus on aesthetics (represented e.g. by the document Aesthetic plan for Oslo from 1988 and 2005), was intrinsic with the goal of accommodating new forms of consumption, it also represent a focus shift towards project-based forms of urban development: The new emphasis on aesthetics was also driven by the reconfiguration of urban development policy that led to emphasis on representation and narration in urban development processes (illustrated e.g. by the press conference launching Aker Brygge’s phase 1 in 1984). Returning to In’by’s “media projects,” illustrated in Butenschøn’s Det Nye Oslo, the bird and street view representations were based on “standalone” schemes for the city, illustrated and mediated as conceptualized urban environments, whose spatial narratives often trumped the abstract tools of master planning. In’by’s projects thus exemplified how the graphic narration of new urban environments itself was an efficient tool to spark debate and spearhead urban development within the “entrepreneurial city.” While BOF2000 and Aker Brygge showed how the graphic narration of new urban environments could crystallize through real

301 Also noted on by Elin Børrud. Børrud Bitvis byutvikling, 65.
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303 Bergsli, Urban Attractiveness and Competitive Policies in Oslo and Marseille, 199.
estate development, the mediation of urban environments were now development tools themselves. In’by’s pragmatic embrace of real estate development logics, and their attempt to operationalize this logic in urban development processes, thus instrumentalized architectural representations to fuel urban development processes and communicate possible futures to the politicians, investors as well as the general public.

As Aker Brygge envisaged above, and new governance accommodated, these projects revolved around teams of investors, developers and architects here labeled as “architect-developers.” In the example of Aker Brygge, the reformation and demounting of comprehensive planning, the role assigned real estate as a development tool, and the size and complexity of the development project, attributed urban development projects with new demands for performance. Speculative construction and “turnkey projects” made buildings *products* of a *provider*. In Aker Brygge, this provider also facilitated the urban environments encompassing these products. Delimited by their configuration and development envelope (e.g. as turnkey projects), the conceptualization of an urban environment at Aker Brygge entailed the conceptualization of otherwise complex socio-spatial relations and cultural layers into packaged urban environments, partaking in the developer’s “asset management” strategy. Thus, the social and cultural complexity sought after in the Aker Brygge project was conceptualized by means of programming, urban form, aesthetic expression and mediation processes, meant to convey or represent forms of diversity. At Aker Brygge, this multi-faceted “development scenario” for new urban environments substitutes the “relative autonomy” of architecture. Instead, architecture merges with real estate development strategies, in a product package primed towards specific sites in the city, facilitated by new practices of urban development symbolized by the architect-developer constellation.

---

305 Exemplified by the close cooperation between Telje-Torp-Aasen and Kjell Wester/Aker Eiendom.
306 As well as Wester attempts to associate certain groups and individuals through phase 1.
307 That allowed Castex et al. to discuss the dissemination of “architectural models.” Castex et al., *Urban forms*, X.
III The Production of Tjuvholmen

Part three’s empirical enquiries, comprises three chapters, addressing respectively the development scenario of Tjuvholmen, the strategic and juridical frameworks for the production of Tjuvholmen, and an account for architect Niels Torp and the competition proposal Utsyn:

Chapter seven expose the Tjuvholmen competition, its framework, competitors and the controversial process that led to Niels Torp Architects AS, Aspelin Ramm and the Selvaag Group being granted the commission for developing Tjuvholmen. It envisages the political power-struggle between powerful agents and agencies, and the effect of new governance policies in the concrete example of Tjuvholmen.

Chapter eight looks into the development contract, development strategy, zoning of Tjuvholmen, where the competition proposal Utsyn manifested as a zoning plan and real estate development strategy.

Chapter nine looks into Niels Torp, his legacy as architect, and how the proposal Utsyn can be regarded in context of this legacy. The chapter presents a review of Torp’s previous works and describes his disciplinary approach to the task at hand, and how the city is conceptualized within his projects. Part three thus makes out a detailed account for the production of Tjuvholmen, and how it was articulated as a development model.
7 Development scenario

The scope and speed of the Tjuvholmen transformation required a private actor with substantial economic strength, something also accentuated in the competition preconditions described below. K.O. Ellefsen describes this as the ability to “mobilize capital to dramatic restructurings of the city, something the limited financial asset of the municipality cannot undertake.” 1 Implemented at the municipal level, such an incrementalist planning strategy was closely linked to municipal policies for urban development described in the preceding chapters, meaning that the economic, spatial and commercial strategies applied can be regarded as related to structural transformation at the city level, described through the emergence of the Fjord City Decision above.

The following sections respectively address Tjuvholmen’s development scenario through the Tjuvholmen competition and the process that led to Niels Torp+ Architects as Selvaag and Aspelin Ram’s “Utsyn” emerged as the winning scheme. It is introduced by an account of the competition framework and premises, followed by an account for the different proposals and the evaluation-process, before concluding with the contract agreement between the Port of Oslo and the owner group Aspelin Ramm, Selvaag Group and Niels Torp + Architects AS.

---

1 Ellefsen, “Studier a byens fysiske transformasjon,” 77–78.
THE TJUVHOLMEN COMPETITION

At its core, the sales-competition of Tjuvholmen was not only about urban development, but a strategy to finance the relocation of industrial harbor activities to the South Harbor. This meant that the Port of Oslo was granted the mandate to create the competition framework, partake in the jury’s evaluation, and negotiate with the individual contestants.

Framework

The Tjuvholmen masterplan was based on a regulation plan and the supporting contracts of agreements between the different actors involved. It was the result of an amalgam of prerequisite demands from public institutions, requirements from the former plot owner of the Port of Oslo and the planning authorities, design intention of Niels Torp and other participating architects, and the owner group’s development strategy: The purchase, realization, branding and sale of property. When Selvaag Gruppen AS and Aspelin Ramm Gruppen AS bought the area from The Port of Oslo, it was after a competition The Port of Oslo and Oslo municipality introduced in 2002, to finance the development of a new, compact industrial harbor on Sjurøya. The agreement that preceded this arrangement had in 2002 ended a 20-year long controversy between the municipality and harbor authorities, as discussed above. The Port of Oslo demanded that each participant in the competition should provide a bank guarantee of NOK450 million in order to qualify for the competition. Harbor board chairman Bernt Stilluf Karlsen described this “concept competition” as a novelty in the Norwegian context, where a broad constellation of developers, architects, planners and investors in teams presented scenarios for the future development of Tjuvholmen, contributing with the necessary initiative to instigate “dramatic” changes of the harbor front: “There had to be a pressure of such a scale that ‘everyone’ would agree, either out of pure enthusiasm, or because their arms were bent up their backs to the extent that they were forced to comply.” The plot owner thus set the premises, scope and content of the competition, including who was allowed to participate. Eight teams pre-qualified for the project, articulating eight different schemes based on criteria defined in the competition and framework for the development program. The competition program had five main objectives and ten “premises for urban development,” but did not set a definite project envelope, neither in terms of footprint or volume. The list of demands include that Tjuvholmen should remain a

---

2 My translation. Hugo Lauritz Jenssen, Tjuvholmen (Oslo, Forlaget Press 2015), 37. While Stilluf Karlsen used the term concept “competition,” the term used here is “sales competition.”

3 The Agency of Building Service and the Port of Oslo, Urban development and Sale of Tjuvholmen – Framework program for Competition for Urban Development (Byutvikling og salg av Tjuvholmen. Rammeprogram for konkurranse om byutvikling), 2002.)
peninsula with water on three sides, and to provide an all-accessible, “urban” environment with “high aesthetic standards.” It should also include a “signal building” and public attractor that would contribute to Oslo’s profile and identity. This was in the competition coined as “the gift to Oslo,” by the Port of Oslo, and priced at NOK400 million. Further, it was underlined that non-commercial assets were valued in the evaluation process. It finally stated that the City Council has the final saying in terms of sale, and that the sum received by the landowner the Port of Oslo was only one of several elements to be considered. The competition drafts both asked for a hierarchy of attractions that were mandatory, but would be conceptualized by the competitors in their proposals, as would the building program and model for operation. The price was thus defined as a “package of property assessment and qualities/attractions that the city would gain from when the plan was realized.”

The proposals were not evaluated on basis of their presentations alone. The Port of Oslo would also have meeting with all qualified proposals, and several follow-up meetings with selected contestants, discussing the particularities of economy and development strategy.

Fig. 36. Jury Chairman Bernt Bull and CEO of the Agency of Planning and Building Services, Ellen de Vibe, discussing Fjordparken, 2002. (Source: Scanpix)

---

The Tjuvholmen proposals

The eight participants approached the area differently: While the proposal *Vindu mot Oslo* (“Window towards Oslo”) applied a small-scale grid crossing the axis from Aker Brygge with a spectacular stage as end-motif, another team proposed a “children’s island” as their main selling point, with
support from Save the Children and the United Nations. Selvaag had two entries, where the second alternative was called "Sjøen for Alle" and was rooted in its legacy as a provider of high quality mass housing, by proposing three freestanding housing towers as the main eye-catcher. Lindstow Eiendom AS and Snøhetta’s proposal "Fjordparken" ("The Fjord Park") was a volumetric build up that remained dense towards Aker Brygge and porous towards the water. The project, like "Utsyn", kept its main volumes west of the sight line along Aker Brygge's waterfront promenade, with large park areas towards the east. The jury report stated that:

Projects C "Utsyn" and G "Fjordparken" have conspicuous common traits that the jury has chosen to prioritize, namely the disposition of Tjuvholmen’s eastern area as a park. This approach opens Pipervika westwards and contributes to a grand articulation of this landscape space, while strengthening Akershus Fortress’ position in the area.

This arrangement was paramount to why the two projects stood out at an early stage of the competition. The jury process thus became a race between two competitors, where, finally, four preferred "Utsyn", while six favored "Fjordparken": "The concluding discussion in the jury showed that while significant qualities were present in both "Fjordparken" and "Utsyn", the jury did not reach an agreement on how the projects should be ranked, instead, the jury decided to nominate both "Fjordparken" and "Utsyn" for further evaluation, while pointing to "Fjordparken" as winner of the competition."

Stilluf Karllsen remarks that he had been out when the jury were reaching consensus on "Fjordparken" in the last jury meeting, but personally made sure "Utsyn" also was nominated, to provide the City Council the “sense of ownership” of conducting a final decision, thus the paradoxical move of selecting a winner but nominating two projects. While Stilluf Karllsen claims he would have done the same if "Utsyn" emerged as winner, one might note that in a press release from the Port of Oslo board just twelve days after the jury decision, Stilluf Karllsen declared the Port Board’s unanimous support for "Utsyn". While of no legal significance, this was a clear political

---

1 "Finda mot Oslo" was proposed by Schmidt Hammer & Lassen, Arcasa Architects AS, ABG Sundal Collier ASA and developer Scandinavian Development. "Barna’s Øy" was presented by Tschudi and Malling Eiendom AS, in collaboration with Hvoslef-Eide Architects, Nielsen Prosjekt AS and Riseng & Kiehl Architects AS.
2 In collaboration with Narud Stokke Wiig Architects & Planleggere AS.
3 "Attivo AS, Sjølyst Utvikling AS and Base Architects collaborated on the proposal "Pier 20", while Byggholt AS, JM AB and LPO Architecture and Design submitted "Kongens Utsikt. Skanska AS, Selmer and Gert Wingårdh Architects alternative was labeled "Skanska’s Tjuvholmen."
4 My translation. PBE, "Tjuvholmen, 210, 12 Principal Propositions on Two Urban Development Proposals (Tjuvholmen, 210, 12 prinsippstudie om to byutviklingsforslag), 2002, 5..."
5 The jury consisted of Bernt Bull (Jury Chairman) Bernt Stilluf Karlsen (Chairman of the Port of Oslo), Gaute Baalsrud (Jury Secretary), Anne Sigrid Hamran, (CEO Port of Oslo), Stein Kolsto (PBE) Dag Hotvedt, Lars Ivarson, Helle Juul, Erik Rudeng, Karsten Almæs, Jostein Bjørbekk and Gro Bonesmo.
6 Lauritzen, "Tjuvholmen", 51.
advice to the City Council. PBE disagreed with the Port of Oslo. Based on the jury assessment, the planning authorities made a thorough evaluation to be presented to the City Council. Here, Utsyn’s two distinct zones of development were regarded as weakening the connection with the adjacent city, while the central axis towards Bryggetorget altered the hierarchy led by Aker Brygge’s waterfront promenade. The diagonal was also regarded as reducing the project’s connection to the “fjord landscape.” Fjordparken’s larger “wedge” towards Filipstad was also regarded as providing more freedom for future developments here.¹¹ Both the urban development committee of the City Government and the City Government itself supported the initial winner Snøhetta. City government chairman Erling Lae from the Conservative Party stated that:

We have after a thorough process concluded that Fjordparken provides the best and most exciting approach for this part of the Fjord City, and that it supplies the city with a new architectonic approach.¹²

Nevertheless, it was dissent within the Conservative Party, and disagreements between the party’s Councilor Group and the City Government.”¹³ In spite of this, and in contrast to the city Government’s appraisal, it was the “people’s favorite.” Utsyn prevailed in the City Council, gaining 47 of a total 57 votes.

Fig. 38 Volumes of Fjordparken (left) and Utsyn, 2002. (Source: PBE)

¹¹ PBE, Tjuvholmen, 210, 12, prinsippasak om to byutviklingsforslag, 46, and “Havnestyret i Oslo vraker Snøhetta-forslag,” NTB, 22 October 2002.
CONCLUSIONS AND CRITIQUES

There were many factors that contributed to the *Utsyn* victory, several of which sparked controversy. Among these was the competition exhibition at Rådhusplassen, where an informal popular vote was set up for the visitors. A similar poll was opened on the Internet. The poll had in principle no legal significance, but proved politically potent. Of the 16,214 votes, 29 percent favored *Utsyn*. Later, it was revealed that considerable amount of these votes came from the Selvaag servers.\(^{14}\) Jury Chairman Bernt Bull, who had not been informed that such a voting would take place, worried that an informal poll of only 20,000 votes would be granted weight in the decision process.\(^{15}\) City Chief Commissioner Erling Lae, however, stated:

*Fjordparken* is a very exiting alternative, but there are two winners here. When the people’s verdict is as clear as it is, we will process the two winners as equal. I can guarantee that we will accentuate the people’s verdict as much as the experts.\(^{16}\)

---


Thus, as the competition decision became politics, the opinion of the people, represented by a minuscule group of “voters” who were deemed as important as the jury’s professional opinion, and would be instrumentalized in the intense lobby period that followed before the City Council’s decision. During this period, the City Council Conservative Party Councilor Group turned against the decision of their Chief Commissioner in the City Government, Erling Lae. The Tjuvholmen evaluation was turning sour, and a growing concern of the legitimacy of the competition emerged in media.

Conflict and disagreements
the nomination of two projects, and the subsequent disagreement by the Port of Oslo and PBE were by many seen as a fundamental breach of the competition’s preconditions. Jury member Dag Hotvedt pointed out that the competition prospectus planned for PBE and the Port of Oslo to unify and nominate a single winner to be presented to the City Council. Instead, they had favored one project each, simplifying the discussion of Tjuvholmen to a question of “for” or “against” Fjordparken or Utsyn.17

The nomination of two projects and subsequent selection of Utsyn also made the Fjordparken team consider a lawsuit due to breach of competition conditions, and demand a NOK665 million compensation.18 Per-Håvard Lindqvist, CEO of Lindstow Eiendom, stated that it was not the City Council’s decision he criticized, but the role of the harbor authorities in the process: “We definitely had the best project. But a lot of things happened – both politically and economically, and there were strong individuals with a lot of power behind the final decision.”19 Stilluf Karlsen, on the other hand, dismissed any critique from the media or organizations such as NAL, whose president Kjetil Kiran questioned both the format of the competition, and of how parts of the legal contracts were exempted from public access. Karlsen explained that he regarded the Tjuvholmen development as a private contract between two commercial actors, and that the alternative was to leave the harbor as it was.20 Karlsen argued that as property owner, the Port of Oslo could just have sold Tjuvholmen, displaying a confidence based on the autonomy the Port of Oslo has managed to retain, in spite of in essence being a municipal enterprise.21 As client, jury member, chairman of a board of influential politicians, leading a semi-independent organization, Karlsen saw no reason to involve PBE more than necessary. Thus, in the competition, the

---

18 The “Letter of preconditions” (“premissbrevet) states “a jury will be appointed and evaluate the proposal, with the aim of nominating one of the proposals as winner. The winner will be presented the city government as a separate affair.” Kjetil Olsen, “Tror ikke Tjuvholmen tapper vinner frem,” Aftenposten Aften, 2 October 2003, 10.
21 Lauritz, Tjuvholmen, 37.
primary role of the planning authorities was to be a consultant, whose conclusive assessment was overruled by the City Council. CEO of Aspelin Ramm Peter Groth agreed:

The competition format was unique. Why was it good for Tjuvholmen? And why has it not been used since? Was it maybe because it was such a big success? In a way, it neutralized the planning authorities that normally want to “micromanage” such a development.22

The attitude towards PBE as inflexible and detail-oriented, without the ability to obtain the momentum necessary to sustain efficient urban development, reflects how the facilitator role obtained by PBE within new governance made developers see the agency as an administrative necessity, within an inherently private urban development model best catered for by private forces, not only in terms of economy and development efficiency, but also in terms of strategies applied to ensure quality within the project. Soon, Selvaag and Aspelin Ramm CEO’s Olav Selvaag and Peter Groth self-titled themselves as “City Builders,” a title that not only was to show off, but also actually reflected the responsibility granted their corporate developer mandate.23

**Contract agreements**

After the competition deadline and the process in which *Utsyn* prevailed over *Fjordparken*, Selvaag/Aspelin Ramm and Niels Torp+ Architects AS emerged as winners (From now on referred to as “the owner group”), buying the plot from the Port of Oslo through a subsidiary firm called KS Utsyn. This contract of agreements preceded the zoning plan, and made out the economic and political foundation of the zoning process.24 In the contract, several paragraphs dealt with the economic responsibilities in the event of unforeseen circumstances, with particular attention to the “Gift to the City of Oslo” (Gaven til Oslo by), the cultural amenity defined in the competition program as mandatory and estimated to cost NOK430 million, financed by the purchaser, in addition to the 456 million “cash part” of the transaction.25 The clause was meant to secure that Tjuvholmen became as a destination on the waterfront, as the figurehead of the new “Fjordbyen” development plan.

---

22 Ibid., 212.
24 The City Council ratified the contract in April 2003.
In the reworked Utsyn scheme, Astrup Fearnley museum, the Tjuvtitten tower and the sculpture park.\(^{26}\)

According to Gunnar Bøyum, the expenses of constructing the buildings and its surroundings far exceeded the contract’s economic obligations, reaching a sum of around NOK one billion – twice the original sum. Still, he claims the price was fair, given the building volume permitted.\(^{27}\)

The interests of the owner group were also secured in the contract, where they had the right to demand a deduction on the 456 million “cash part” of the transaction, depending on costs related to the zoning, pollution or infrastructure. The juridical framework also specified that the developer was responsible for all technical infrastructure and supply roads. The owner group was also granted flexibility in terms of development speed, and allowed to postpone the development up to four years in case of unforeseen changes in the real estate market. Additionally, the contract stated that one third of the apartments built should be rentals for a minimum of 10 years, in accordance with PBE’s demands. In the closing statement in their “recommendation for approval,” the City Council remarked that they perceived Tjuvholmen as a good basis for the initiation of the Fjordbyen development. The City Government approved the contract on 27 May 2003.

---

\(^{26}\) If the owner group failed in fulfilling these requirements, the cash part would increase proportionally.

\(^{27}\) Gunnar Bøyum, interview by author. Tape recording, Oslo, 5 December 2011.
SUMMARIZING REMARKS
There were several irregularities around the competition evaluation process that led media to question its legitimacy, and the City Council decision made some whisper of corruption and camaraderie. In this context, however, the result can also be regarded as a consequence of strategic craftsmanship as well as the competition’s format: Representing what political scientist Erling Dokk Holm has called “sub-contractive” democratic planning, it envisaged how project-based urban development in the Tjuvholmen case almost in its entirety was outsourced, where traditional development tools were flanked by different communication strategies, of which illustration, strategic advertisement and lobbyism were substantial parts.

Project narration
While Snøhetta, in partner Kjetil Trædal Thorsen’s eyes, lost due to Utsyn team’s lobbying strategy, the Fjordparken team at the time also e.g. noted on

---

28 First of all, Selvaag’s last-minute advertisement in Aftenposten was accused for breaking the deadline set for commercial announcements related to the competition. Secondly, Peter Butenshøn had published an article critical of Fjordparken without mentioning his role in the Utsyn project. Furthermore, the Conservative Party were accused of being biased by the fact that board member Jonas Ramm was a long time benefactor of the party. Finally, the relation between Mayor Per Ditlev-Simonsen of the Conservative Party and Niels Torp was problematized, but this never developed to a media scandal. See e.g. Simen Sunde Slette, “Krisemøte etter TV-innslag om Tjuholmen Høyre beskylder Ap. for å plante sladder,” Aftenposten Aften, 1 August 2003, 3.

29 Erling Døkk Holm, “Does the old models for planning make sense anymore,” in Voices of the Fjord City, 71.
how the Utsyn Plexi-glass model outshined Snøhetta’s wooden-model that was made in accordance with the competition guidelines, and that while Fjordparken was mediated towards professionals, the graphics of the *Utsyn* boards were more accessible for laymen.\(^{30}\) The competition format envisaged processes long in the making, and that had rendered visible with Aker Brygge 17 years earlier: A well-narrated scenario with the ability to evoke sentiment among non-professionals and politicians, combined with the strategic footwork, that in the Utsyn case both got it nominated in the first place, and eventually prevail over Fjordparken through lobbying and political goodwill. Furthermore, the competition format also meant that there were no feasibility studies conducted in the area before the competition was initiated, meaning that the program did not contribute with a framework of sitespecific knowledge or references that could guide the designs. Rather, the competition draft’s relatively simple list of concrete criteria was flanked by aphorisms such as “diversity” and “accessibility,” and the ability of large-scale attractions to provide character and identity to the district.\(^{31}\) Ultimately, the question rises whether what in reality was called for on Tjuvholmen, was not a masterplan scheme for urban development, but a master narrative that could evoke the necessary enthusiasm to secure the swift and effective realization of real estate.

**Shifting public roles**

The pages above expose the limited role of PBE in the planning and implementation of Tjuvholmen. Not only was the role of the agency strictly consultative in the competition process, it was also competing with the Port of Oslo in terms of giving political advice to the municipality. In terms of influence and power, it was at best equal to the property owner, who, as a Municipal Enterprise (Kommunalt foretak) and in accordance to new governance principles, acted as a private stakeholder in a conflict of interest. The distribution of responsibility from municipal agencies to private actors was a familiar concept inherited from the project-based urban development Aker Brygge was based upon. At Tjuvholmen, however, the reciprocity between planning and real estate resulting from the practical execution of new governance principles in urban policy became a municipal strategy for real estate development. While the legitimacy of the competition can be questioned, the efficiency of the competition model chosen is undisputed. Nevertheless, it also implied a challenging task for Selvaag and Aspelin Ramm, based on a demanding contract that not only involved a complex and


\(^{31}\) For excerpts from the competition draft, see http://www.allgromn.org/tjuvholmen.html.
building site, but also included the responsibility to develop and build a large scale museum-attraction. The high commercial stakes also demanded swift development. The competition set-up thus not only was based on transferring responsibility of urban development from public to private actors, it also promoted a particular economic model for realization of property calibrated through marked calculus and high utilization. This will be discussed in the following chapter.

Fig. 42 Sketch, Utsyn illustration project, 28 May 2003. (Source: NTA)
Chapter eight is divided in three sections, whereas the first, “Juridical frameworks” looks into the process where *Utsyn* was translated from a competition scheme, to a legally binding development scenario. The second section, “Strategic frameworks,” looks into the real estate development strategy applied by the owner group, and the financial dispositions involved. The third section, “the urban environment as development strategy” approach the urban environment as rendered visible in the *Utsyn* scheme, and scrutinize how it was conceptualized as part of the real estate development scenario applied on Tjuvholmen.

**JURIDICAL FRAMEWORKS**

The Tjuvholmen area was encompassed by several preceding municipal plans, including the Fjord City plan, founded on the Fjord City Decision.\(^{32}\) As discussed above, Tjuvholmen played a key role in the realization of Fjord City, and in the document “Urban development and sale of Tjuvholmen – Framework Program for Competition of Urban Development,” it is stated that “The sale of Tjuvholmen will be the initiation of a larger restructuring of the Oslo harbor, and the first of several transactions of harbor areas to be sold for urban development.”\(^{33}\) The zoning of Tjuvholmen was thus the zoning of a “Flagship project,” and a reference for future developments on the waterfront.


Zoning strategy

The Tjuvholmen zoning plan and rules were based on the reworked competition proposal and the sales contracts established between the Port of Oslo, the municipality and the owner group.34 Niels Torp Architects AS and the planning consultancy Civitas AS developed the document, which constituted the juridical basis for the eight subdivided development areas within Tjuvholmen (Here referred to as areas F1 to F8). Preceding the approval of the plan, a municipal document from 2004 stated that the area was to be an example of future urban developments in Oslo:

The area should become the city’s window to the future when it concerns urban architecture, public spaces, living environment qualities, urban life forms and recreation, cultural content and the relation between the city and nature, with the water as dominating element.35

This listing of potential qualities associated with urban development on Tjuvholmen seem to be meant to inspire more than to impose specific demands in regard to its urban spaces, revealing that the politicians at large were satisfied with Utsyn’s urban environment. In the City Government Proposition addressing the Tjuvholmen zoning plan proposal, the planning authorities similarly embraced the proposal’s accentuation of water as well as its formal and functional diversity:

Urban spaces of various characters both ashore and in the water will contribute to Tjuvholmen as a diverse environment both for the inhabitants and visitors to the area. The waterways are thought to generate ‘bustling activities’ during summer months.36

The report included an assessment of sun conditions and sightlines, and concluded that Akerodden in general seem unresolved in terms of light and urban spaces. A retail analysis from the owner group was also commented upon, where the suggestion to diverge from the pre-existing focus of retail in the area towards “antiques, art, design and interior design” was approved, as these might “impose new qualities and contribute to a diverse and complete downtown area with functions that interact and complement each other. In the document, the density and proximity of housing programs and mixed-use ground floor with activity-oriented urban spaces were accepted by the

presumption that families will be few: “The area is targeted towards a broad audience and is very urban with the turmoil ("uromomenter") this implies, and thus lacks the private, protective and tranquil neighborliness of traditional housing areas.” This also meant that apartments could be smaller although family apartments with integrated rental units were encouraged.37

Fig. 43. Overview, zoning plan S-4097. Lower left: Holmen. Centered: Akerodden. Below: Tjuvholmen Icon Complex, encompassed by the zoning plan S-4435, 2011. (Source: PBE)

37 Ibid., 15–19.
Zoning plan

The zoning plan S-4097 encompassed quantitative measures for development as well as qualitative goals for architecture and public space (§5), the composition and number of programs and functions (§6) and order provisions (rekkefolgebestemmelser, §14). The regulation plan translated Torp’s tentative competition proposal Utsyn to a valid juridical document, comprising building heights, street widths and dimensions for arcades, cantilevers, elevator towers and balconies. Where specific design features were deemed crucial, more detailed restrictions for construction were given. The regulations were meant to secure design intention in terms of scales, proportions and functionality, but also to encompass limits for programs and their distribution, as well as guidelines for aesthetic expressions and architectural value. For example, §5 states that architectural quality and diversity in terms of material use and aesthetic expressions throughout the development is compulsory: “The building mass should be of high architectural quality, with variations in facade sequences as well as dimensions, material and color.” Further, §6 gave an account for scales, sizes and proportions within each building zone.38

As the construction of Tjuvholmen commenced, alterations of programs and buildings led to revisions and additions to the original regulation plan. The most important of these changes were found in the area F1South, where the removal of the hotel in F1S on Akerodden to F8 on Holmen led to reprogramming the area for housing.39 Another significant alteration from the 2004 regulation plan emerged as “the gift to the city of Oslo” developed, and Renzo Piano’s proposal integrated to the plan.40 The most significant change was F5 on Skjæret, now part of the new “Icon Complex.” In Torp’s original competition entry, the museum was dug into a park landscape through a “geometric alternation of the landscape form.”41 Piano’s project altered Torp’s initial idea of preserving the southward axis from Aker Brygge’s promenade, leading to a vista where Aker Brygge’s harbor-front promenade terminates in the complex’s northern façade, with the museum canal in the middle framed by the building’s curved roof. These modifications were made possible by the “stripe zoning” (referring to the striped graphics of multipurpose areas on the regulation plan) of the original regulation plan, enabling

38 PBE, Zoning plan S-4097 Tjuvholmen, 2004. In terms of housing, 60 percent were to be two-room apartments or smaller, with no more than 10 percent studio apartments, in an attempt by PBE to secure a diverse housing pool within the urban core. Also included was regulation of parking (§12), infrastructure and recreational areas (§8 & 9). The document further stated that all parts of the development should be in accordance with the design program for the area, described in five reference manuals that were mandatory for acquiring the general permission from the building authorities, comprising materiality, lighting, urban furniture, outdoor cafes and signs/advertisements.


40 The museum and museum park area were extracted from the plan and in its own zoning plan.

41 Selvaag Group, Aspelin Ramm and Niels Torp Architects AS, Illustration project Utsyn (Illustrasjonsprosjekt Utsyn,) 2003.
the change of functions, their amounts and location within the juridical framework of the project.

The flexibility of zoning did not, however, enable the owner group to remove programs entirely. So when the owner group decided that the original “experience center” proposed in the competition submission was difficult to realize as part of their museum concept package, they were forced to appeal to the municipality and offer an extended museum program instead, which was granted. The development from winning the concept competition to creating a binding agreement took only six months, and the final regulation plan was complete one year later. The entire project was completed in ten years.

Fig. 44 Tjuvholmen Icon Complex, model. Year unknown. (Source: Renzo Piano Building Workshop)

**The gift to Oslo**

The Tjuvholmen Icon Complex was initially part of the “Gift to Oslo.” The wish for a building drawn by a renowned architect and harboring a famous museum brand was the point of departure. Cooperation with the Danish museum Louisiana had been a sale asset in the competition, but as the project evolved, the Louisiana director Poul Erik Tøjner had proposed that Tjuvholmen would need more than a branch of a Danish museum. Instead, Tjuvholmen should boast an art collection, and its own curator environment,
preferably in an iconographic building drawn by a renowned architect. Tøjner was at the time planning a Renzo Piano Building Workshop exhibition, and helped convince Piano to meet Selvaag’s Olav H. Selvaag, as well as introducing Astrup Fearnley as a potential partner in the project. Piano’s proposal was a building consisting of three volumes gathered beneath one overarching roof structure, spanning between Skjæret and Holmen and integrating Tjuvholmen allé as part of its structure. The first meetings took place in 2002, and the museum was completed in 2012.

The Astrup Fearnley Museum had been a political and economic tool throughout the different stages of the process. According to Gunnar Bøyum, the gift to Oslo can be regarded an alternative dividend to the Oslo populace in the form of cultural and architectural attraction and symbolism from the inherently public agency Port of Oslo. For the Utsyn group, the museum concept was a tool to win the Tjuvholmen competition, and a part of the Tjuvholmen branding strategy to create anticipation among potential investors’ investment will. Furthermore, today, the building is Tjuvholmen’s main attraction and image, and although its 130,000 visitors (2014), is lower than its original estimates, it is similar to the Munch Museum in Tøyen, that had 125,000 visitors in the same period.

**STRATEGIC FRAMEWORKS**

The development of Tjuvholmen was divided in several stages, with different contracts, contractors and models for execution. The first stage encompassed the F2, constructed by Selvaag’s subsidiary Selvaagbygg between 2005 and 2007. The second stage was F1N and F3 2005–2008. The third stage included the two buildings constituting F1S from 2008–2010. Next was the Icon Complex encompassing F4, F5 and F6 completed October 2012 and the northernmost part of F7. F7’s harbor-front linear block was completed in 2012/2013, parallel to the northern part of F8, including the hotel that opened early 2013. The two southern linear block and towers of F8 constitute the seventh and final stage of Tjuvholmen and were completed in 2014. Tjuvholmen KS initiated and controlled the entire building process.

---

42 Bøyum, interview, 2011. The reasoning behind this transaction was that since dividend from the harbor’s earnings to its “owner” was illegal, the complex could be regarded as a bonus to the Oslo Municipality and its population.

43 Ibid.

44 Ole Christian Apeland, interview by author. Tape recording, Oslo, 2 December 2011.
Project Economy

After purchasing Tjuvholmen, Aspelin Ramm and Selvaag created Tjuvholmen KS (TKS) led by Gunnar Bøyum to administrate the development, administration and sale of Tjuvholmen’s properties. Tjuvholmen KS was to function as what Bøyum called an “A to Z” clientele that facilitated management and administration, real estate transactions, project development and production, project economy and communication.45

We organized the development in a slightly unusual way: We set up a complete organization, with everything from finance and management control, planning and construction management, to handling marketing and the sale of apartments. We established some views on how people would discover an area like Tjuvholmen given time, and how the brand and a strong understanding of place would develop over time. The population of Oslo, as well as visitors, will become conscious of the area.46

Buildings were sold as condominiums, through prospectus and built when reaching a sale percentage of at least 40 percent. The project was developed southwards and in accordance with the order provisions that demanded common areas to be completed before operation permit (brukstillatelse) was given, including the bridge between Akerodden and Holmen. Ten years after purchasing the Tjuvholmen area, the development has been a financial success for its owners.47 Several price records were set during the sales period, most notably when Tjuvholmen KS in 2011 sold four apartments that were merged to a single 700m² unit, for NOK119 million. The square meter price of 170,000 was a Nordic record. “We are not exactly selling student apartments” was Gunnar Bøyum’s laconic answer when asked for a comment by newspaper Dagens Næringsliv.48

In terms of office space, Tjuvholmen KS owns and facilitates several buildings with long-term tenants such as the bank Handelsbanken and the BA-HR law office that occupy 7000 m² within the Icon Complex. While some of the office buildings are seen as long-term investments for the owner group, others have been sold successively after their completion.49 Tjuvholmen KS also owns the building that houses the Thief Hotel, but by a different strategy: With a rent based on the hotel’s turnover, future yield is

45 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
46 My translation. Jenssen, Tjuvholmen, 57.
47 In 2010, TKS traded apartments for NOK950 million. In 2011, the number reached NOK750 million. By the end of 2011, a total of 600 apartments were sold. By the end of 2013, only 67 of 912 apartments remained unsold, one year before the entire project was completed. Aspelin Ramm, Annual Report, 2009-2013.
49 Among these are Tjuvholmen Allé 11, sold for an estimated price of NOK70 000 per square meter in 2011.
based on the success of “The Thief” in the years to come. Bøyum says that while the hotel in itself has a low return rate, its investment must be seen in context of Tjuvholmen as a whole. According to Bøyum, offices have been more profitable than housing on Tjuvholmen, also due to the gross-net factor that provides offices with more marketable square meters. Finally, Bøyum regards mixed-use programming as an economic asset, as a more homogeneous real estate portfolio could have unforeseeable effects in a market fueled by scarcity.50

Financial model applied

Tjuvholmen KS’ “Buck stops here” philosophy meant that ownership implied the right to develop the area based on the owner group’s strategy. Bøyum accentuates that the main importance for Aspelin Ramm is long-term economic thinking, where the legacy of the firm is a crucial part of its business model. Thus, the owner group was not willing to sacrifice quality to gain short-term profits: “In the end, we could have built it for one billion less, but over time, high quality means high gains.” Bøyum also notes that while their learning curve has been “as high as their ambitions,” they also have become less bold after the financial turmoil of 2008-2009.51 Former Aspelin Ramm CEO Peter Groth says that well-established bank connections, reserve capital and elasticity in terms of development speed was the secret for tackling the financial crisis: Flexible contracts and lucrative agreements with bank institutions provided a good economic framework, where the access to capital was crucial for realizing Tjuvholmen within an unstable financial market: In a worst-case scenario, sufficient cash flow could enable owners to buy their own property, thus avoiding forced sales in low-conjecture periods.52 Together with a contract that allowed for extending (or shortening) the pace of the development, the owners could conduct “A gradual development matching market conjuncture and sales pace.” Bøyum describes this model as “bespoke, not made to measure” (“målsøm, ikke skreddersøm”) where the buildings became adapted to the stakeholders need throughout the production process.53

The development was subdivided into several independent stages, with separate economies and contractors. By letting each stage be financed separately, the owner group managed to reduce financial risks and secured project viability and flexibility in case of an intermediate crisis in the market. As Bøyum said in a seminar held by the bank DNB: “We risk 500-800

50 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
51 Ibid.
53 Bøyum, interview, 2011. To avoid excessive speculation of real estate objects, TKS also raised the initial ten-percent deposit of apartments to twenty percent, and the apartments had to be transferred to the buyer through a contract before further real estate transactions could commence by the buyer him/herself.
million at the time. It’s like your mother told you; you need to eat your cake before you can have another. We have no risk models.”

In spite of the setbacks of 2009, the Norwegian real estate market has been booming, and the owner’s development strategy has proved economically viable. The frame of investment was estimated to reach a total of NOK8 billion for the entire development, including the “gift to the city of Oslo,” twice the sum of the original estimate. The gross profit is thought to be around 9.5 billion, setting the return of investment to 1.5 billion. Considering that Tjuvholmen KS’ equity was a moderate 300 million, where the strategy was to realize income during the production period, the project can be seen as both a financial and strategic success. According to Bøyum, this is also somewhat of a lucky strike, as the realty market rose proportionally with the building costs, both exceeding the estimates for investment.

Administration of Tjuvholmen

Although Tjuvholmen is privately owned, general public access was secured by zoning its opens spaces as “Public Traffic Areas,” meaning that the owners are responsible for securing public access and facilitating any public service normally provided for by the municipality. This form of zoning, that limited maneuverability for the owner group simultaneously as they were granted the responsibility of e.g. municipal renovation services, was in Bøyum’s eyes an unfair burden for the owner group.

The cultural programs are generally sponsored by the owner group, either as a result of the legal agreements with the municipality, or as subsidies initiated by Tjuvholmen KS themselves: A principal aspect of the Tjuvholmen development strategy was for the owners to remain in control of the ground floor areas through ownership, enabling Tjuvholmen KS to curate a specific urban environment based on programming. The owner group thus functions as property owners, tenants and landlords, selling and acquiring real estate (both office and housing projects), renting out apartments, having ownership of crucial functions such as the hotel, as well as providing janitor services and management of Tjuvholmen’s urban spaces. Ground floor retail functions have presented a challenge for Tjuvholmen KS, and Bøyum claims

---

55 The cost of the Icon Complex was close to NOK650 mill. http://www.ohv.oslo.no/no/fjordbyen/tjuvholmen/.
57 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
58 “Offentlig trafikkområde.” Statutory land use term and regulatory category of the zoning plan and the building development plan. Tjuvholmen has several different companies that facilitate the administration of the area. The urban spaces are managed by the firm “Tjuvholmen Infrastruktur” and financed by the tenants. Tjuvholmen Drift” is owned by Selvaag and executes any odd jobs on Tjuvholmen, including renovation, safety, gardening and fire.
59 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
60 The ownership and administration of commercial areas is conducted through Tjuvholmen Butikk og Restaurant Holding AS, were tenure is divided between Selvaags SealBay AS and Aspelin Ramm Eiendom.
it is nearly impossible to have commercial retail programs on Tjuvholmen. The only truly profitable programs are those related to “beer and liquor”, sponsoring the various art and culture functions. In 2013, Boyum estimated the turnover of restaurants and bars to reach around NOK400 million.\textsuperscript{61} The broad investments in Tjuvholmen are in accordance with Boyum’s claim that the owner group perceives Tjuvholmen as a long-term venture more than a short-term spec project and that they wish to stay in control of the area’s assets. This also includes the 300 rental apartments. These are described in the regulation prescripts as compulsory on Tjuvholmen for at least ten years after completion. Not only do future prospects of sale make it worthwhile keeping them within the owner group, they can also be part of the owner group’s apparatus for running the area. Besides owning and consequently controlling the cost of renting Tjuvholmen ground floor areas, a special subsidization strategy was tailored to enable the Astrup Fearnley Museum to establish itself in the Icon Complex. They dispose their areas for free on a long-term contract, but are responsible for the museum’s yearly expenditures, estimated at approximately NOK20 million.

The strategic and economic success of Tjuvholmen is found in both the control held by the owner group not only in the development phases, but also after its completion, where the ownership and administration of ground floor areas is managed by the owner group’s subsidiary organizations. The two-party owner group configuration also kept the development organization compact and with overview of all expenses, any transaction of property as well as the ability to curate and select a configuration of programs that could be implemented during the realization period. This also included the sale of apartments, all accessible for acquisition from the Tjuvholmen website and controlled by the owner group as they were sold. Tjuvholmen, thus, is managed like a single property, where shifting tenants buy or rent themselves into the development of a large-scale building, not unlike what is practice in large building complexes in general.

THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT AS DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

While the owner group had a clear real estate strategy in terms of financial dispositions, and dealt with programming both within and outside the development’s different buildings, they were also engaged in the physical design and architectural expressions of Tjuvholmen. While Torp’s imprint on the Tjuvholmen development as design scheme is nearly omnipresent in the project, the owner group both embraced and actively took part in the architectural evolution of the \textit{Utsyn} project. Most evidently, after the
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competition was won, it was decided to involve a broad fan of architects to secure an aesthetically more heterogeneous environment. Olav Selvaag introduced the idea that further diversity could be achieved by keeping the individual designs secret, avoiding any form of aesthetic calibration. Øyvind Neslein of Niels Torp Architects criticizes this vision of Tjuvholmen as a collage of ideas and expression:

For Selvaag senior, the city emerged through the individual works of its different master builders; we would do the same here. But Berlin had its clear rules for form, ornaments, and floor heights, etcetera. Here, however, it became very differentiated.62

Nonetheless, while the museum was moved and Renzo Piano introduced, they largely remained faithful and enthusiastic towards the fundamental ideas of Utsyn, and the built result is in essence similar to the competition proposal. Gunnar Bøyum, when reflecting on the project, admits that he thinks the diagonal Tjuvholmen allé is a bit “over the top”: “It’s not Champs-Élysées that is the most charming part of Paris.”63 While Bøyum labels the secrecy of the individual designs as “overkill”, he takes great pride in Tjuvholmen’s urban spaces, referring to the exclusivity of its materials and the general tidiness of the development due to their zero tolerance for garbage. According to Bøyum, this tidiness is representative of the privately-run public spaces of the city.64 He links safety to the orderly, and accentuates that the real attraction of Tjuvholmen are the spaces themselves, that something happens there and that people experience the area as clean and “nice”:

We have a zero tolerance policy for garbage. Ok, so then we have to do it. That is unfair, but on the other side, people like that it is clean. Picking up garbage is important. It is linked to Norwegian salary levels and society’s attitude towards aesthetics, whether it is in the classrooms or in urban space. It is conspicuous. Oslo Havn runs Rådhusplassen, and we are running ours: It’s tidy and nice, safe and clean.” It is not necessary that all attractions are placed here, but that the area is opened up – that’s the attraction, that something happens and that people think it is nice. That’s important.65

---

63 My translation, Bøyum, interview, 2011.
64 Ibid.
65 My translation. Ibid.
Building a borough

In an interview in the owner group’s publication *Tjuvholmen*, Bøyum claims that “Tjuvholmen is built the way cities were built in the olden days, based on a masterplan with both retail and housing […] But the urban spaces have been of even more importance. This is the difference between urban development and real estate development.” 66 By arguing that “people shape the city, but its urban spaces also shape how people want to live”, Bøyum accentuates their humility as developers, saying that over NOK one billion could have been saved if they were to lower the overall quality of the project. Instead, he says, they did everything in their power to articulate a platform where “people could dance their lives.” It seems important for Bøyum to underline that the two kilometers of harbor front granted Oslo’s population on Tjuvholmen in other places might be developed to become a privatized “gated community” area instead. 67 Peter Groth as well as CEO of Selvaag Gruppen Olav Hindahl Selvaag, similarly underlines the value of Torp’s control over the area masterplan, accentuating “what happens between the buildings” and how the project relates to the “city web and its filigree.” 68 With reference both to Torp’s design plan and the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen’s ground floor areas by the owner group, Groth claims, “we attempt to create complete, city boroughs.” 69 Groth and Selvaag, however, regret the predominance of housing on the southernmost Holmen area, missing storefronts and offices on the first two floors. They blame this on not being “sharp” enough towards the project’s completion. 70 But they hold that ownership has enabled a focus on quality rather than maximum profit, and that local ownership by different patrons would lead to the optimization of rent and ultimately, a milieu dominated by commercial chains. 71

The urban environment as development strategy

The move of the hotel from Odden to Holmen, and the addition of the Astrup Fearnley museum, were the two main alterations of the original, reworked scheme presented by the Aspelin Ramm/Selvaag Group owners. That the project to such an extent remained “intact” points both to the quality of Torp’s initial design, the development framework that his project was produced within, as well as the zoning and development plans that “froze” the *Utsyn* design within a juridical framework. Nevertheless, opposed to Snøhetta’s “Fjordparken”, Torp’s design was more vulnerable for alteration and reorganization of volumes, meaning that the few changes that took place

67 Ibid., 59.
69 Ibid.
71 Ibid., 212.
had repercussions, such as the iconicity of the oval building, that was meant to play a more involved role in the revised scheme allowed for.

Overall, however, the juridical framework developed to facilitate the production of Tjuvholmen with few exceptions proved both sturdy and flexible. With the complete ownership and control over a flagship development, administered through a flexible contract, zoning plan and flanked by positive market response, the owner group secured a robust platform for development. Finally, the mandatory “gift to Oslo” proved to be a blessing for the developers. Although far exceeding the initial budget posed by the Port of Oslo, this juridical injunction became Tjuvholmen’s biggest brand asset and identity-builder before, during and after the area was completed. Author Hugo Lauritz Jenssen notes that the gift to Oslo By was a particularly clever maneuver by the Port of Oslo, as it contributed to dampening the inherent conflict level embedded in a governmental agency’s management of what in essence was the sale of public property: The “gift to the city of Oslo” was inherently paid by the city’s inhabitants themselves, but without any formal political approval. It further removed focus from the Port of Oslo’s disposition of what inherently was public property, towards the owner group and their cultural investments. Additionally, the culture program spearheaded the urban environment itself, as a long sought-after attraction in one form or another often associated with Tjuvholmen.

SUMMARIZING REMARKS
Two aspects render visible when approaching Tjuvholmen strategic and juridical framework. The first is the overlapping vision from the agents involved, and their approach to articulating a new district, what this entailed, and how best to represent it. The second aspect regards the different and intentional demarcation strategies for emphasizing Tjuvholmen as urban environment in the city.

Tjuvholmen as a “complete and traditional district”
The owner group conceived Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as a “complete urban district”, by referencing what was perceived as “traditional” forms of urbanity. It was conceptualized as a delineated and independent area, primed with all “ingredients” necessary to create a rich and diverse spatial environment with a diverse set of activities and attractions. This involved being in control of, as well as curating the content of ground floor areas, that through strategic programming secure a calibrated diversity flanking Torp’s differentiated spaces and Tjuvholmen’s various aesthetic expressions. The owner group accentuated the aesthetic relation between the masterplan level

72 Ibid., 47.
and the individual building, and understood the city as composed by components that, working together, could provide an “urban” atmosphere. The owners saw this as a task and responsibility handed to them by the municipality to be handled correctly, stressing that profits have not been their sole motive for commencing on the project. The owner group’s vision for Tjuvholmen’s urban environment thus entailed the projection of specific aesthetic references, patterns of use and the establishment of atmospheres associated with a perception of an ideal urban condition, identified in selected historical urban areas and interpreted through Torp’s masterplan design. Regarding the city as a slate were sets of “ingredients” can “complete” an urban district, Tjuvholmen’s urban environment is by Bøyum contrasted by the idea of the “gated community.” In light of the physical and conceptual isolation of the urban environment from its adjacent areas and the nearly 200 cameras that the owner group uses to monitor the area, however, this contrast might be more vague than the owner group likes to think.  

Demarcation strategies

The above displays how urban development policy can be seen to have direct implications for urban form: First, the demarcation of the area for development set in the competition resulted in clearly defined borders between Tjuvholmen and Aker Brygge, first by the Port of Oslo’s demands for a distinct area in the city, and secondly through Niels Torp and the owner group’s own development strategy. Conceived as autonomous projects, these areas came to be regarded as district with legal, spatial, aesthetic and administrative borders dividing them. Such delineation strategies have obvious strategic and commercial purposes. They are strategic in terms of how property delineation enables efficient real estate development by private actors, and to emphasize its “brand” as destination within the city. But market consideration and economic return are only one of several considerations affecting the spatial result: The examples of Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen also reveal that, beyond the visions of their architects, the client/developer configuration of these areas involved actors that took take great pride and were deeply engaged in the urban visions they attempted to create. This apparent genuine feeling of responsibility towards Tjuvholmen by the owner group engaged them in defining their own ideal urban environment based on personal and normative conceptions of what this entailed. Thus, it is not only in terms of juridical ownership that the Tjuvholmen project share kinship with traditional private building commissions. They are also alike in terms of client-architect relationships, and they way architectural projects evolve within such relationships.

9 Niels Torp and Utsyn

While the pages above revolved around how Tjuvholmen’s urban environment was conceptualized as real estate development strategy, it also revealed how the owner group both interpreted and projected their own conceptions of the city upon Torp’s scheme Utsyn. Below, I explore the competition proposal Utsyn and its evolution as architectural project, in the section “Utsyn as conceptualized urban environment.” This account is followed by a review of the architectural “legacy” of Niels Torp and Niels Torp Architects AS, scrutinizing some of their former, large-scale architectural projects for private contractors, undertaken by the office parallel to the development of Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen. Here, I look into and discuss Torp’s office buildings as organization, and the similarities between his “headquarter” buildings and his large-scale urban development schemes.

UTSYN AS CONCEPTUALIZED URBAN ENVIRONMENT

The Tjuvholmen competition entry Utsyn, was as a process developed without a traditional project envelope. For Torp, long hours in the model shop of the office laid the foundations of the final result, where the actual volume was calculated in the final phase before deadline. To be granted “free hands” to form a project without regard to its volume lay inherent in the competition framework, where the utilization of Tjuvholmen was to be explored and tested by the competitors instead of being predefined by PBE. The realization of Torp’s vision based on a legible infrastructure but spatial complexity was, according to Torp, achieved by “carving out” voids in the urban fabric. Forming these into recognizable urban elements - streets, squares and paths, led to an urban environment of interlinked, contrasting spaces strongly connected to their orientation, programming and location within the project. The urban spaces of Tjuvholmen thus directly emanated from this subtracted mass, resulting in an extruded figure plan where all voids were publicly accessible areas. According to Torp, it also provided the

74 N. Torp, interview, 2011.
area with a packed, programmed and maneuverable environment of “urban interiors”: “Envision a city building as a large building that you enter, like in a room. The squares and streets become your interior.”\textsuperscript{75} According to Torp, the two-kilometer long waterfront promenade was of particular importance, as “the idea was to build the ultimate harbor promenade project,” contrasting it with the new developments in Bjørvika and their lack of attention to their common spaces: “At Sørenga they build buildings. What we are trying to do is to build the backdrop for the public.”\textsuperscript{76} For Torp, this meant creating a hierarchy of streets and squares that could “express different forms of urban life and places of different sizes and meaning.”\textsuperscript{77}

Fig. 45 Sketch 2, Utsyn illustration project, 28 May 2003. (Source: NTA)

\textsuperscript{75} My translation. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
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**Utsyn as development scenario**

Torp’s describes Tjuvholmen as a “raft of stone” with a “city building” set on top of it, where cutouts define streets and squares: “So, you take this city building and place it on the raft. Then you cut through it, establishing streets, and squares.”78 Within the city building, different architectural motifs were utilized to strengthen sight lines, while various public functions were strategically dispersed throughout the project to attract visitors to specific areas. Thus, while *Utsyn* could be regarded as naturally delimited by the building envelope granted the owner group, Torp’s consciously accentuated the isolation of the area through its design: It was never intended to integrate into the existing city, rather, it was meant to be a part of the fjord itself, referential to the many islands and islets in the Oslo fjord. For Torp, Tjuvholmen was a “water property” where the architects were “free to form. He regarded the area as a “island kingdom” with its own logic of form and movement.79

As the project developed, half of the area’s square meters were reserved for housing within a scheme that also in Torp’s eyes was “good, but somewhat over-utilized.”80 The scheme’s northern area, called Akerodden, was formed with a density and spatial organization reminiscent of Aker Brygge, but more expressive:

> Where Aker Brygge’s firm, stone-clad building walls stand straight as an arrow along the linear quay front, the expression is more plastic at Akerodden. The urban blocks have a freer form, the buildings transparent and open.81

Further south was Holmen, an artificial island flanked by the small, green islet “Skjæret.” The division of the project in three main areas opened for “introducing a new language of form, accentuating lightness, openness and transparency.”82 The volumes were also described in relation to the waterfront: “The buildings should cantilever over the waterfront promenade, so that the community can use the beach and quay areas without being experienced as intrusive.”83 One of Akerodden’s most notable buildings was its oval hotel, located towards the west side canal to avoid it becoming the project’s “backside.” A glass-cased diagonal street was meant to lead visitors

78 Ibid.
80 Ibid., XX.
82 Ibid.
83 My translation. Ibid.
along Tjuvholmen and into the hotel foyer. The foyer was described as a common space “with its feet in the water,” that would create a particular, maritime experience on Tjuvholmen:

I was sure the location would be perfect for a hotel – I wanted it to stand knee-high in the water, with pillars in the water, with an interior influenced by water. You would be able to fish the moment you left your hotel room. And there would be Italian “Riva” boats moored right beneath the hotel.\(^{84}\)

A glass-covered arcade was also supposed to lead from a “Covent Garden-like” market opposite Bryggetorget, to the hotel, and continue on Tjuvholmen south of the bridge to the attraction that preceded the Icon Complex in the same location, called the “Extreme North Science Center.” Its entry point was “Tårnplassen”, (later Albert Nordengens Plass) emphasized by the Tjuvholmen tower located here:

At the very south, bold like an arrow tip towards the world, lays the science center Extreme North. Here, the Norwegian wanderlust and will to explore is utilized as a portal to experience and understanding of the resources, possibilities and vulnerability of nature.\(^{85}\)

The center would function as an attractor indented to draw people southwards on Tjuvholmen, and seen in context of the museums at Bygdøy across the Fjord, linked through a ferry service. One of Utsyn’s most notable features was its continuation of Aker Brygge’s Stranden; the waterfront promenade. By locating the main bulk of building mass west of the axis, a new harbor promenade was established:

“The facades in the continuation of Aker Brygge follow a line that steps down towards the water surface. This line provides the project with its special character. Larger volumes reside behind this line. This effect is evident when passing Skjæret [is] by boat…”\(^{86}\)

The exception in Utsyn was the museum area on Skjæret, placed east of the axis: The art program and sculpture park was detached from Torp’s urban

\(^{84}\) My translation. Jenssen, Tjuvholmen, 155.
\(^{86}\) My translation. Ibid.
form as a “homage to the Pipervika Bay.” It was designed partly on, partly within the islet, meant to blend with the landscape. 87

Skjærret and its art museum were not thoroughly articulated in the competition material, beyond being illustrated and described as a “landscape building.” 88 Thus, an icon building as such was thus not part of Torp’s competition material. Instead, the iconicity lay in the Tjuvholmen architectural scheme itself, with the viewing tower as its main landmark.

The Utsyn project was thoroughly designed through an elaborated narrative of spatial and programmatic features, including sketches of potential office and apartment solutions, and the possible facades these solutions could lead to. Utsyn thus rendered visible as a complete architectural scheme for urban development, where its urban environment was backdropped by elaborated architectural designs.

Fig. 46 Perspectives, Utsyn illustration project, 28 May 2003. (Source: NTA)

87 Ibid.
88 My translation. Ibid.
Fig. 47 Concept sketch: Streets, squares and sight-lines. Utsyn illustration project, 28 May 2003. (Source: NTA)
**Utsyn reworked**

In the reworked scheme, several alterations were applied. Most notably was Renzo Piano’s Icon Complex that unified Skjæret with Akerodden through a curved roof structure. The roof and building volume were somehow reminiscent of Torp’s science center “Extreme North”, but Piano’s double-curved structure was oriented eastwards, integrating the Holmen volume and museum island in one volume. The building changed the terms in which Utsyn was developed, and introduced a new scale through the large and curved roof structure: Piano created new iconicity at the building level, overriding Torp’s spatial and volumetric hierarchy.\(^8^9\) Torp’s landmark tower now became subordinate to the museum complex’s large form.\(^9^0\) Further, as the main entrance to the museum was moved eastwards in the reworked scheme, the portico leading upwards from Skjæret to the original “experience center” was inverted: You now walk down from Albert Nordengen’s plazz towards the museum entrance. Still, Tjuvholmen Icon Complex seem to be designed in accordance with Torp’s intention of a sloping landscape of buildings towards the south, and as such can be seen as a collegial gesture to Torp’s design intention.

Utsyn was conceived and designed as a whole, through a diverse but aesthetically calibrated architectural expression, where the individual buildings were aesthetically themed to strengthen its large-scale character. In the built result, however, Tjuvholmen’s masterplan design competed with the iconicity of the expressive facades of its individual buildings, rendering the area less legible than Torp might have intended. Here, the idea of aesthetic diversity through a collage of “architectures” imposed by the owner group, trumped Torp’s conception of the master design’s prevalence over the individual buildings of the scheme. In the built result, Torp only designed a handful of buildings, and it was Renzo Piano’s building that became its set piece.

---

\(^8^9\) By iconicity, I refer to how the building’s size and form were meant to stand out as a recognizable object with specific meaning and exceptional program within the development, as well as along the city’s waterfront. Original meaning: A term referring to correspondence between form and meaning http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/iconicity.

\(^9^0\) That the complex reinterpreted Utsyn’s facades eastwards can be seen as a severe blow to Torp’s initial vision: “The west side was supposed to be a homage to the harbor and provide Piperviken with a park, then the town hall would be visible, but Piano found it amusing to make a bigger building than I preferred so…it is clarified towards Akershus, you see it through the building, I am sure it is going to be nice.” My translation. N. Torp, interview, 2011.
TORP’S ARCHITECTURAL LEGACY

Torp was educated at the Polytechnic University in Trondheim and spent his formative years in Rome in the late 1960s. Niels Torp Architects AS is in a league of its own in Norwegian architecture, with several large-scale office complexes developed abroad, a rich portfolio of residential and commercial architecture, and consisting of more than one hundred employees. After university, Torp inherited the family firm and established a practice that included the “Viking Ship” stadium built for the Winter Olympics of 1994, the acclaimed Giskehagen housing complex in Oslo (1983), and Oslo Airport at Gardermoen (1998, with Aviaplan). Still, it is Torp’s offices that have given him international acclaim. Utbygning was a concept that shared
characteristics with these office complexes, and especially the British Airways Headquarters Waterside (BA) completed in 1989 was influential. This 114,000m² headquarters outside London is both in volume and structure comparable to that of Utsyn: The structure is divided into six separate volumes with an internal street connecting them through several squares through the building. In his description of BA, Torp accentuates the link between inside and outside, a street “designed to promote social interaction and informal meeting” and architectural elements such as sight lines and stepped rooflines.91

Another seminal project in the same category was Scandinavian Airline’s (SAS) headquarters outside Stockholm (completed 1987). The 65,000m² development was conceived as a “village structure”, organized along an “informal main street” where the different office pavilions had “their own characteristics, carrying out a dialogue and addressing each other across the street from their terraces, galleries, balconies and pedestrian bridges.”92 The street terminated at a small lake, where an excavated pond together with a restaurant was meant to function as a “backdrop motif.” Frank Duffy describes this atrium axis as a space that possesses a scenographic quality, “replicating, internally at least, a really satisfying and complete urban experience.” By lining the street with different destinations, set in an architectural scenography, SAS’s atrium street differed from the myriads of vacant atria that dominate many office buildings.93

Fig. 49 Model image, British Airways Building, Niels Torp Architects AS, 1989. (Source: Niels Torp Architects AS)

91 Frank Duffy and Ingvar Mikkelsen Niels Torp (Oslo: Pax Forlag, 2011), 182. Torp describes the relation between inside and outside as “the link between the internal and external environment.” Øyvind Neslein led the development of the building form Torp’s intermediate office in London.
92 Duffy and Mikkelsen, Niels Torp, 164.
93 Ibid. 75.
Structure versus form

The interpretation of SAS as revolving around a street of different “destinations” was not arbitrary. For Niels Torp, the “Noiseless” building (1983) was a “primal form for office development,” where he for the first time explored the potential of shaping common spaces to facilitate informal meeting spaces and arbitrary encounters between employees of different departments. Torp was not the first architect to implement the street as a theme and structuring device in large-scale buildings. Of the earliest built projects that applied glass-clad interior streets as instruments for the organization of large-scale building complexes was in the Norwegian context conducted by Danish Henning Larsen architects, whose 1968 Dragvoll University in Trondheim consisted of a glass-covered infrastructural streetscape grid between the different departments of the university. Dragvoll

94 Duffy and Mikkelsen, Niels Torp, 158.
was akin to Structuralist approaches representing a “syntactic” approach to
the city as system, where the building mass would expand over time by the
addition of modules. The design philosophy was not only conceptual, but
implied the development of everything from small-scale building
components, to large-scale organizational schemes. 95 But the structuralist
approach of Henning Larsen differs from how Torp approached the
“common spaces” of a building: While dealing with scales by atomizing
units linked by common infrastructural space, he adapted his building to fit
particular organizational needs: “While Dragvoll was structure, SAS was
hierarchy.”96 Torp’s conceptualize his buildings around the “flows” and
“nodes” of its common spaces, emerging through the distribution of program
and articulated through “syntactic” blending and juxtaposition, (the
organization and articulation of spaces and spatial sequence), as well as
through a “semantic,” approach: the projections and use of motifs and
elements of symbolic meaning.97 Such motifs are typically “the street” and
“the square,” applied to areas of infrastructure and common functions. Other
motifs include the framing of views that accentuate the relation between
inside and outside, or bring a particular view into focus of certain spaces in
the building. The “staging” of bridges and staircases, openings, streets or
other prominent elements similarly becomes motifs, often accentuated by the
build-up of mass.

The building as urban environment
Most of Torp’s larger building structures seem to be based on this conceptual
reading of the city as an amalgam of spatial organization, facilitating on one
side flows and systems, and on the other, social congregation. While the
former makes up the organizational structure of a city, the latter is what
defines the city’s common spaces, and is understood as a multilayered and
diverse environment of uses, users and spatial conditions. 98 Torp’s hierarchy
of common spaces is thus enabled by the underlying structure of the
project.99 Torp links this dynamic between infrastructural clarity and the

2016. In terms of structuralism in architecture, Karl Otto Ellefsen provides an overview in Karl Otto
Ellefsen,”Strukturalismen,” in Arkitekturteoriernas historia, ed Claes Caldenby and Erik Nygaard,
(Stockholm: Forskningsrådet Formas, 2011), 307–403
96 Torhild Gausereide, interview by author, Oslo 15 September 2011.
97 The terms syntactic and semantic are terms inherited from semiotics. See e.g. Michael Chapman, Michael J.
Ostwald and Chris Tucker, “On the role Semiotics, interpretation and political resistance in architecture” The 38th
International Conference of Architectural Science Association, Launceston, Tasmania, November 2004,
98 Referring to his travels to Rome, Torp says: “I experienced another form of urban generation, a different
mode of urban thinking than I had seen before. To impose functions on top of each other and use arbitrary
meetings to create a stage in the city has followed me since. What makes the city interesting is that it on one
side, it is clear and simple in terms of communication and logistics, and so complex in terms of its common
meeting places on the other.” My translation. N. Torp, interview, 2011.
99 In an interview in Morgenbladet, Torp refers to people as ants that cannot escape the Tjuvholmen islands.
complexity of common spaces to the Renaissance Italian town, whose urban spaces are interpreted as potential stage sets for “theatrical experiences:”

The city can be a theatrical experience, a cabaret – You can see it in old paintings, what you did in the city, where you slaughter a pig one day, that the next is replaced by riots, then a party – its adventurous! If you manage to create a framework for this, with a hierarchy of streets that can express different forms of urban life and places of different sizes and meaning, then you facilitate the continuation of a good city.\(^{100}\)

It is within this frame of reference that Torp’s description of his Tjuvholmen competition entry *Utsyn* as built up of “fragments of a Venetian reality” or as influenced by Norwegian villages such as Kragerø, can be understood: As metaphors of an ideal structure enriched by the overlay of changing functions and occurrences. For Torp, such allegories are part of his conceptual framework in which spaces are formed, but his Italian, Norwegian or English references do not only provide symbolic content or rhetoric support, but also contribute to the volumetric build-up of a structure: A recurring reference at the Torp office is the English village, whose “close” (meaning square), tower, and lanes can be traced in Torp’s project portfolio.\(^{101}\)

Torp explains that he is particularly interested in the polarity between what is inside and what is outside, referring to the palaces of Italy, where a calm exterior is contrasted by the interior, whose complexity is experienced through spatial sequences. Urban spaces are regarded as interconnected, “outdoor rooms,” meaning that the city is interpreted as an architectural object. Vice versa, the architectural object as a “miniature city” echoes Leon Battista Alberti’s famous credo that “The city is like some large house, and the house is in turn some small city,” a quote not only appropriated by Torp, but also expressed through his projects.\(^{102}\)

In spite of these architectural aphorisms, Torp’s disciplinary toolbox envisages a sophisticated ability for spatial organization, where the urban environment of his buildings is conceptualized through patterns of movement and congregation. But on the one hand, while “syntacs” evidently is what structure Torp’s projects and his architectural expressions draws on his modernist heritage, his scenographies of motifs, spatial effects and urban imagery is akin to the discourses of post-modern architectural discourse.

\(^{100}\) N. Torp, interview, 2011.
\(^{101}\) Øyvind Neslein refers to the English village as an inspiration an reoccurring reference in Torp’s work. Neslein, Interview, 2011.
Frank Duffy, on the other hand, uses terms such as “theater director” or even “renaissance prince” to describe Torp as architect and “scenographer.”

**The office and the city**

Frank Duffy, Torp’s biographer is particularly interested in the evolution of the office building, and sees Torp’s works as highly innovative in terms of working environment design. He identifies three areas in which the office building has evolved the last decades, and discusses Torp’s work with regard to these: First of all, technology has allowed for new forms of mobile working, where different working units and personnel to a lesser extent are dependent on sharing office space. Secondly, the scale of office building developments has introduced new building forms and organization models for office architecture. And thirdly, the emergence of rapidly changing, demanding and sophisticated clients with specific needs have redefined commercial architectural production in the last decades. According to Duffy, Torp developed his “choreographed spaces” parallel to this evolution, enhancing the typology of shared, informal common spaces he explored in his earlier office buildings, to become projections of complete streetscapes, with volumes adapted to specific organizational units and functions. To use the SAS building as an example, its atomized organization would, from a developer perspective, seem severely inefficient. Nevertheless, this strategic distribution of volume and programs instead functioned as a managerial instrument, tailored for the needs of the client.

This was achieved by synthesizing the SAS organization with the building’s volumetric build-up, breaking its volume down to smaller units, becoming animated through the movement provided by distributed functions and Torp’s scenographic designs. A few years later, when Torp translated the SAS model for the program of the much larger British Airways Waterside building, the increased scales, evolution of communication technologies and client demands identified by Duffy merged in an architectural scheme that unified the different administrative units that made out the British Airways organization.

The point of departure for Duffy’s discussion on Torp’s architecture, is the innovative “combi-office” typology articulated by Swedish Tengbom Architects for Canon in Sättra, 1976, as the start of a new era for office architecture, that Torp’s work relates to. Duffy describes how Torp

---

103 Duffy and Mikkelsen, *Niels Torp*, 79
104 Ibid., 75.
105 Ibid.
106 The Swedish combi-office is a response to the idea that cellular offices are an obstacle to interaction. Tengbom architects designed the first combi-office in 1977, following the failure of the office landscape in Sweden. Juriaan van Meel, *The European office: Office Design and National Context* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers), 2001, 99.
evolved and refined his ideas in the project “Norsk Data” in Newbury (1986), through the SAS and British Airways buildings, as well as in the Oslo Business School in Oslo from 2008.\textsuperscript{107} Addressing the latter, Duffy argues, it is “impossible to trace the boundaries between working, learning, socializing and studying. The office has become the city and the city has become the office.”\textsuperscript{108} The city analogy applied by Duffy thus refer to the superimposition of functions and activities found in Torp’s large-scale buildings, where Torp’s “theatrical imagination” is the common denominator between Torp’s buildings and his urban designs, through “principles of accommodating permeability, mobility and fluidity.” In an area such as Aker Brygge, these designs work together with the “scenographic blending of function,” Duffy continues: “Mixed, and indeed mixing and ever more mixable uses can be made in to complement each other at the urban scale.”\textsuperscript{109} The “scenographic blending of function” points to how programming in Torp’s work gains an iconographic dimension, which in the context of Torp’s spatial design attains a condition comparable to those found in mixed-use urban environments. But while Duffy points to Torp’s “theatrical imagination” to link his office buildings and his urban designs, a more striking parallel might be to see the evolution of the office building in context of project-based urban development commissions such as Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen: Returning to Duffy’s identification of the increasing importance and involvement of the client in commercial architectural production, the connection between Torp’s architectural works and urban designs are not only located in his conceptual approach, but also in the commercial strategy of its “demanding and sophisticated clients.” From this point of view, Utsyn envisages how trajectories from respectively the evolution of the office “type,” and the evolution of models for urban development attain parallel lines within the post-Fordist forms of production, to the degree that both development strategy and spatial and functional configuration of the projects bear striking similarities.

\textsuperscript{107} The combi-office was the hybrid between the “burolaschaft”, developed in Germany as a more democratic alternative to the effective and rational “Taylorist” office spaces found in the Anglo-American tradition, and the “cellularisation” of the working space from the mid-1970s. Duffy and Mikkelsen, \textit{Niels Torp}, 67.

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 73.

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 64–80.
SUMMARIZING REMARKS

Architects influenced by structuralism and structuralist thought accentuated infrastructure and movement as a societal “invariant” and a representation of patterns linked to social behavior. The street became an omnipresent tool for spatial organization, both through its value as a representation and design instrument. While Torp’s enthusiasm for the street and street systems are akin to such perspectives, he did not approach the street as an invariant, but rather as a spatial condition, an atmosphere to be staged and structured with experience in mind. The normative and socially-oriented practice of e.g. Team 10 is in Torp’s spatial scenarios oriented towards output and effect. And while the models evolved by the Smithsons faded with the dissolution of the welfare state’s grand housing schemes, Torp’s models were instead tailored for the emerging regime of flexible accumulation within the post-Fordist economy: Like Torp’s previous project, the articulation of Utsyn was both in organization and its language of form akin to Torp’s earlier large-scale projects, simultaneously as it was made-to-measure the owner group, a particular building program and development scenario.

The review of Torp’s legacy above envisages how autonomous architectural practice blends with client demands and strategies for real estate development. As in Utsyn, the urban environment was conceptualized by Torp through seamlessly appropriating demands by the property owner, the client and the building economy within his own disciplinary framework. In context of the development model applied on Tjuvholmen, Alberti’s notion of the “building as the city and the city as a building” is not only a question of composition and conceptual approach, but an actual development scenario: The large scale development of Tjuvholmen has both in terms of development strategy and its economic and legal framework resemblances with traditional building commissions. In the perspective of the entrepreneurialist city, the blending of previously separated concepts for organization and structure, like commercial offices and new urban environments, envisage the entangled relationship between means of production and the conceptualization of different spatial environments when conducted within similar sets of political economic practices as “commissions.” Here, Duffy’s description of the broken boundaries between studying, working or socializing underlines Aureli’s argument above when addressing the production logic of the post-Fordist city.

---

IV Tjuvholmen as Urban Environment

Part four addresses Tjuvholmen as a physical realm and urban morphology. It consists of three analyzes, that discussed Tjuvholmen as urban environment from three different angles of approach. As introduced in part one, these chapters are based on the “analytical topics” sections, which identified three main research perspectives to be addressed: Tjuvholmen as built, Tjuvholmen as symbolic realm, and Tjuvholmen disseminated.

Chapter 10, “Tjuvholmen as built,” is a morphological analysis that addresses Tjuvholmen as built environment. It approaches Tjuvholmen’s built environment through four sections that scrutinize aspects of Tjuvholmen’s design and organization.

Chapter 11 addresses Tjuvholmen as symbolic realm, iconography, through an iconographic analysis. The analysis is based on Tjuvholmen as a conceived whole, addressing Torp’s master design, and the relations between Tjuvholmen as a designed totality and its individual parts, in a symbolic perspective.

Chapter 12 is an analysis of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment seen in context of its mediation. “The dissemination of Tjuvholmen” analyzes Tjuvholmen as “image-text” from the perspective of its communication strategy, its sales-prospectuses and use of different media. The three chapters are meant to provide an analytical scope of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment that can be seen in context of the preceding parts of the thesis, that rendered visible how Tjuvholmen is related both to a set of preconditioning political economic practices that provide the project with a distinct framework, and a development strategy, where the urban environment are assigned a specific performance in relation to a real estate development scenario.
Fig. 51 Rendering of Tjuvholmen, 2005. (Source: Niels Torp / Tjuvholmen KS)
10 Tjuvholmen as built

This chapter conducts an analysis of Tjuvholmen *as built*. It’s method of approach is based on identifying a set of characteristics Tjuvholmen as urban environment can be discussed in context of, namely the urban landscape it partakes in, its masterplan, its building structure and its programming. The aim of the chapter is to provide a broad reading of Tjuvholmen as built form, that unveils its organizational structure, the interplay between form and programming, and the role and effect external architectural projections like the Icon Complex have inflicted on Torp’s *Utsyn*.

First, Tjuvholmen is discussed as part of an urban landscape in Pipervika and in the Oslo Fjord. This includes addressing its formal faculties as urban landscape, the infrastructural frameworks it partakes in, the urban fabric it relates to, and land ownership in its adjacent areas. This section display the immediate context Tjuvholmen is set within, and how it affects, and is affected by its surroundings.

Secondly, Tjuvholmen is addressed as masterplan, in terms of how the area is organized, its disposition of volumes and access-points. This section provides a basic understanding for Tjuvholmen’s internal infrastructure and volumetric build up in terms of streets and pathways, entrances, topography and dimensions.

The third segment looks into Tjuvholmen’s complex array of building structures, as single standing volumes or part of larger building-segments, divided on Tjuvholmen’s three main areas and eight building zones. It provides a compact account for Tjuvholmen’s architecture conducted as single building elements within Tjuvholmen’s urban environment.

The final section addresses Tjuvholmen’s programming in regards to type and location, and how Tjuvholmen’s urban environment is conceptualized as program.
The Tjuvholmen development is set on reclaimed land southwest of Aker Brygge. It is separated from this development by the preserved dock of this area, itself set above a two-story parking garage. Both developments boast a prominent location in the Oslo harbor basin, in an area that attracts more visitors than any other tourist attraction in Norway.\textsuperscript{111} The predominant spatial feature of the area is the Pipervika bay itself, that as infrastructure and space facilitate a wide range of water-based activities. As architect Fredrik Torp notes, the harbor basin of Pipervika can be viewed as one large public space, which preconditions any major intervention in the area.\textsuperscript{112} Thus, Tjuvholmen’s most prominent feature is its location on the waterfront, which provides a unique spatial setting in Oslo and a visual, functional and spatial resource in the city.

South and southwest of Tjuvholmen we find the green recreational areas Frognerkilen and Bygdøy, with Nesoddlandet peninsula framing the area from the east. Within the harbor basin, there are several public accessible islands, whose parks and beach areas are serviced by ferry services during the summer months. Local and international ferries dominate the western part of the fjord (“Vestløpet”), together with recreational maritime activities. Most Oslo-bound cargo traffic arrives at Lohavn, east of the Island Hovedøya, making “Østløpet” the main access route for freight traffic. This partition of infrastructure function dividing the fjord is characteristic of the ongoing restructuring of the Oslo harbor-front areas where the industrial harbor is relocated and condensed in the northeast part of the harbor. The Oslo topography is defined by its sloping landscape, descending from surrounding hills towards the two bays Pipervika and Bjørvika, set on each side of the ridge “Akersryggen.”\textsuperscript{113}

\textbf{Barriers and connections}

The Oslo road and rail system have been a physical barrier between the city and the harbor front for decades. The cargo rail station of Filipstad is now closed, and the twenty tracks (currently used for storage and maintenance by the Norwegian National Railway) will be removed when a suitable alternative is located and the development of Filipstad is initiated. Due to this extensive infrastructure, the connections to Skillebekk and the surrounding neighborhoods are limited. A pedestrian bridge links the Hjortneskaia road junction (Hjortneskrysset) with the small park “Tinkern” in Skillebekk, while the Munkedamsveien connection at Munkedamskrysset is closed for traffic.

\textsuperscript{111} Aker Brygge attracts more than 12 million visitors every year. Akerbrygge.no.
\textsuperscript{112} F. Torp, interview, 2011.
\textsuperscript{113} The ridge runs though the center of Oslo, turning northwards to peak at St. Hanshaugen, 83 meters above the water level.
This applies to most roads and bridges that connect the area with the boroughs Skillebekk, Observatorie Terrasse and Ruseløkka over the former railroad tracks. In practice, the only car connection is Løkkeveien, as Cort Adelers gate is reserved for public transport only. Both the Tjuvholmen and Aker Brygge parking garages are accessed from Munkedamsveien through respectively Filipstadveien and Sjøgata. As most of the harbor-front areas are pedestrianized, the garages and their street-level connections are the main access points for arrivals by car. The future development of Filipstad contains a proposal to extend Operatunnelen to Hjortneskrysset. This will open for a spatial and infrastructural integration of the adjacent boroughs into the Filipstad development, although Munkedamsveien will continue to be an important transport vein through the area. This restructuring will further increase the area’s development potential while maintaining efficient infrastructural connections.

Fig. 50. Overview Pipervika, 2016. Tjuvholmen centered. Filipstad left, Bygdøy far left, Frognerkilen top left. Akershus Fortress low right. (Source: Finn.no)

**Infrastructure**

Oslo’s main infrastructures consist of three ring roads linking the east and west sides of the city, connected by a tunnel system. The innermost system, Ring 1, traverses the city core and connects with E18 on the west and east sides of the city. Ramps to E18 descend from Dronning Mauds gate north of Aker Brygge, to the Festningstunnelen junction system below. The road reemerges at Munkedamskryssen, where access ramps connect E18 to Munkedamsveien, and where Tjuvholmen is accessed through Trafikkplassen at Filipstad. Munkedamsveien comprise the main surface road connection in the area, connecting Munkedamskryssen directly with Ring
1. The tunnel system has approximately 70,000 cars passing each day and is the main connection between the E6 and E18 national road systems. The large junctions at Hjortneskrysset and beneath Aker Brygge in practice make the area among the easiest accessible in the Oslo metropolitan area.

The 25,000m² Rådhusplassen and its connecting streets and seaside promenades are part of a network of pedestrianized or partly pedestrianized streets and plazas, including Karl Johans Gate and the Nasjonaltheatret metro and train station area. Olav Vs Gate and its strip of cinemas and cafés, the park, fortifications and museums programs around “Kontraskjæret” and the restaurant-filled square Christiania Torv are situated as attractively programmed recreational-oriented spaces within this network. The area encompasses several larger institutions and attractions, including the Oslo Concert Hall and the National Theatre of Oslo, with the castle and Parliament in walking distance. This pedestrian-based infrastructure is serviced by an extensive public transport system. The system includes buses, trams, and metro along with train connections providing local, regional and international connections. Main hubs are found along Munkedamsveien from Nasjonaltheatret Station to Vika Atrium, while boat, tram and taxi transport connects at Vestbaneplassen. Tourist buses and “hop-on-hop-off” services stop at Fritjof Nansens Plass behind the town hall, while cruise tourists arrive from Vippetangen cruise terminal a few hundred meters east. Together with the road system and parking garage facilities, this system constitutes an extensive infrastructural body servicing the city core pedestrian areas. This means that Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen are facilitated not only by their individual access ramps and parking garages, but also are easily accessed through the pedestrian network and public transport services, as well as the system of downtown parking facilities linked to Ring 1. A third infrastructural network comprises Pipervika Bay itself. The transformation of brownfield/industrial areas to sites for urban development has led to a restructuring of the fjord’s traffic. This was initiated by the shutdown of the Shipyard Nyland/Akers Verft in 1982 and completed recently when cargo traffic in its entirety was moved eastwards to the main industrial harbor on Sjursøya. Today, local, regional and international passenger traffic dominates Pipervika, including the Nesodden ferries, the two daily departures to Denmark and the seasonal cruise liners. Recently (2014), the ferry shuttles to the main island of the Oslo Fjord were relocated to Rådhusplassen, making the area the primary hub for public maritime traffic in Oslo.

114 Important local roads are Cort Adelers Gate/Dokkveien that terminates at Aker Brygge, its parallel Løkkeveien and the more distant Huitfelds Gate.

115 For example, the National Theatre Station, where metro, local and regional trains and the airport express service connect in the same sub-terrain hub.
The reorganization and redevelopment of road, rail, and industrial infrastructural systems, constitute a core factor in relation to morphological changes along Oslo’s harbor front, both in terms of urban space, urban development policy and real estate development. In the thirty-year perspective of this thesis, the immense cost and gains from the restructuring of infrastructures places it at the core of urban development politics in Oslo, and preconditions the developments of Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen, as well as the entire Fjord City vision.

Urban fabric

In the early 20th century, Pipervika was the location for the slum Vika, infamous for its prostitution and poverty. The local entertainment hub Circus lay at its center, since replaced by Arneberg/Poulsson’s town hall “Rådhuset” and the masterplan supporting it. After its construction in 1936–1950, Rådhuset and its adjacent plazas became a monumental link between the main street Karl Johan area and Studenterlunden, Universitetsplassen, the National Theatre and the harbor front. Rådhuset was for a long time the city’s main landmark building for arrivals to Oslo by sea, rail and road. Today, the developments in Bjørvika and Bispevika increasingly challenge this conception. The monumentality of Rådhusplassen, Rådhuset and Akershus Festning define a spatial hierarchy in the Pipervika bay, addressed by Niels Torp in both Aker Brygge phase II documentation from 1986 and
the Tjuvholmen project 18 years later. In terms of infrastructure, Aker Brygge’s promenade, Rådhusgata from the east, Universitetsgata in the north and the streets Løkkeveien and Dokkveien stretching westwards, all connect at Rådhusplassen. Northbound streets link the area to the residing city, while the east- and west-oriented roads link Rådhusplassen to the larger infrastructural hubs of the city. The congested traffic system that for decades dominated the area has moved underground, and Rådhusplassen of today is a largely pedestrianized space crossed by tramlines.

The future development area Filipstad is located on the west side of Tjuvholmen and Filipstadkilen. The area was a container harbor and former terminal for goods such as coal and coffee to Oslo. Munkedamsveien divides Aker Brygge from the adjacent housing area Ruseløkka. Ruseløkka is part of the late nineteenth century gridiron of Oslo, referred to as “Murbyen” – Bricktown – due to the urban blocks developed here in the second half of the nineteenth century. The housing area Skillebekk is located west of the railroad tracks from Filipstad. The extensive infrastructure has until now kept Skillebekk largely unaffected by the harbor front developments of the last century, but as existing road and rail infrastructures become removed, this is about to change. This means that while Aker Brygge was developed largely independent of its neighboring boroughs, Tjuvholmen emerges in the context of a restructuring process that will unite until now isolated areas in the city with the waterfront.

Tjuvholmen’s connection to the pedestrian areas of the inner city and the harbor front promenade that link it with Rådhusplassen, the cruise terminal at Vippetangen as well as Bjørvika, situates Tjuvholmen within a pedestrianized network of downtown attractions. Its direct infrastructural connections, including Norway’s main road infrastructure and the airport express train service in walking distance also contribute to its value as site in Oslo. The future development of Filipstad and future infrastructural investments in the area will further enhance Tjuvholmen’s position within the Oslo region.

116 In 1986, Torp stated: “We approach Aker Brygge as a counterpart to the Akershus ridge with the town hall quarter as motif. My translation. Niels Torp Architects AS, Aker Brygge Byggetrinn II, (1986): 350. In his description of Tjuvholmen, Torp writes “One flank was supposed to be a homage to the harbor, give a park to Piperviken, while the town hall should remain visible.” Torp further states that “The added built mass will appear homogeneous both from the sea and from the fortifications, with the tower as a landmark. Skjæret will have a park-like character in the forefront of the town hall. The higher mass in the background is in harmony with the building heights found on Aker Brygge.” My translation. Tjuvholmen: Zoning plan, 2004.

117 St. Olavsgate, Rosenkrantzgate and Haakon den VIIIs gate also conclude here.

118 The coming development of this area is currently set to 450,000m² on a 320,000m² large plot of reclaimed land. Filipstad will consist of 2000–3000 housing units, 9000 work places, a large cruise ship terminal, a school, kindergarten and large recreational areas.
Land ownership

Land ownership of the harbor front consists of both private and public actors. Aspelín Ramm AS and Selvaag Gruppen AS own Tjuvholmen. Norwegian Property owns sixty percent of the Aker Brygge area, and owns and manages all outdoor areas. Vestbanen and Rådhusplassen are municipal properties administered by respectively the municipal property department Agency for Real Estate and Urban Renewal (Eiendoms- og Byfornyelsesetaten) and the
harbor authorities, that also own most of Filipstad. The road infrastructure is partly governmental, partly municipal depending on the road status, while all infrastructures including the access roads belonging to the developments Tjuvholmen and Aker Brygge are private. Municipal responsibility of publicly accessible areas thus concludes at Vestbaneplassen: The extensive areas of promenades and plazas south of this point are the result of private undertakings in their entirety, meaning that Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen legally differ from most of the Oslo harbor front areas, both in terms of how they are administered and used as urban spaces in the city.

**MASTER PLAN**

Tjuvholmen is located on former industrial harbor areas developed between 1925 and 1958. During this period, the area grew from 5000 to around 33,000m². The current development plan expanded the area to 51,000m², increasing the site by nearly 60 percent. Using Tjuvholmen’s current Floor Area Ratio of 254, these additional 18,000m² increased the development potential with 50,000m²². Its urban design also increased the former 800-meter long harbor front, now measuring over two kilometers. Tjuvholmen’s zoning plan allows for a total of 148,600m², not including parking garages (30,000m²) and sub-terrain technical installations. The buildings on Tjuvholmen range from 2 to 13 stories, peaking at 35.5 meters.

**Figure plan**

The Tjuvholmen figure plan is shaped as one peninsula and two islands connected by bridges: The northern peninsula “Akerodden” is located between Aker Brygge’s “Bryggetorget, and the future developments on Filipstad. Holmen is located south of Akerodden, while “Skjæret” is an islet east of Holmen, hosting the Icon Complex and Astrup Fearnley art museum, plus recreational beach and park areas.120 Adjacent to Bryggetorget, the square “Dokkplassen” instigates Tjuholvermen Allé. From here, the avenue leads to the central square Olav Selvaags Plass, encompassed by the four main building areas of Akerodden. From here, east- and west-oriented streets and alleys connect with the exterior promenades: “Sjøgangen” is a passage

---

119 In the Framework program for Tjuvholmen by PBE and the Port of Oslo, there was a set FAR 2.7–3 based on the existing 33,000 square meter plot. Increasing the utilization would be possible “if distinctive qualities of urban space and form are secured.” In “City Government Proposition 329”, 2002, it is written that if the utilization value of Utsyn was compared to the original plot size, it would have a FAR 4.3. Its adversary Fjordparken would have a FAR of 3.5. PBE and the Port of Oslo, Byutvikling og salg av Tjuvholmen. Rammeprogram for konkurranse om byutvikling, 2002.

120 The highest utilization is found on the 21000m² Akerodden. According to the zoning-plan, its density is meant to mediate between the more spacious Holmen neighborhood and the compact Aker Brygge. However, an estimated FAR of 3.65 for Akerodden far exceeds the FAR of 3.1 found in the Aker Brygge area. All though only comprising 40 percent of the total area of Tjuvholmen, Akerodden contains more than half of the total square meters built. Developments on Skjæret encompass building F5’s 3 000m², in addition to a 9000m² park- and beach area. Holmen holds roughly 65 000 m² divided on 2,3 hectares, with an estimated FAR 2.8.
penetrating the building mass west of the avenue, leading to the promenade “Bryggegangen”, while a similar path leads eastwards to “Strandpromenade.” The street Tjuvholmen allé runs like a diagonal ridge that rises and descends throughout the development, as Tjuvholmen’s formal and logistical spine. From the northernmost areas of Akerodden, the streetscape inclines two meters towards the square Olav Selvaags Plass, before descending towards the canal or the harbor-front promenades. Across the canal at Holmen, the street ascends towards Albert Nordengens plass, nearly seven meters above sea level. From Albert Nordengens plass, the street and landscape descends towards the southwest and the fjord. The square is defined by the Icon Complex and articulated as a fan-shaped amphitheater. Its terraces terminate at the museum canal promenade four meters below, where a bridge directs visitors towards Skjæret and the Astrup Fearnley Museum’s main entrance. The entrance takes the form of a wedge-shaped glass box, allowing views to the museum park and the fjord beyond. Each corner of the plaza marks access points to the building’s interior. Three are directly related to the museum and museum administration, while the fourth makes a second entrance for the law office BA-HR.

Albert Nordengens Plass marks a pinnacle in the Tjuvholmen topography, from where the streetscape descends in four directions: The amphitheater to the east, Tjuvholmen Allé in the north-south axis and a westbound passage connecting with Kobbernagelen to the west. The west part of the square is occupied by the 84-meter tall viewing tower Tjuvtitten. Southwards, Tjuvholmen Allé contracts as it spills down towards the fjord and terminates at Fjordpiren. West and south of Albert Nordengens Plass lays the development areas F7 and F8. These areas comprise a fan-shaped, southwest-sloping topography consisting of lamella structures divided by three cone-shaped plazas. These spaces – Kavringen Brygge, Fru Kroghs Brygge and Dyna Brygge - and are plaited together by paths, streets and quays, intersecting at junctions and overlapping underneath cantilevered buildings. The chosen typology provides the area with fjord views and light conditions in a tranquil setting, ideal for its housing programs. Akerodden differs from Holmen both in terms of density and volumetric disposition. Holmen, on the other hand, is defined by a topography on which five linear blocks are spaced and arranged southwards along the slope, a configuration that both allows southward sight lines and that facilitate the organization of the predominant housing program of this area. Flanked by the Icon Complex to the east and the L-shaped hotel, kindergarten and apartment volume to the north, the Akerodden housing areas make up the most luxurious, spacious and expensive apartments on Tjuvholmen.

The waterfront promenade encompasses the entire Tjuvholmen area. The programmatic and spatial configurations of the promenade and quay areas
vary in accordance to location: While the narrow paths along the north side of the canal are defined by the proximity to (and integration with) the adjacent buildings, the south side is outlined by a narrow but coherent passageway along the water. While spacious areas of pathways and greenery define the harbor front towards Pipervika, the west-faced Bryggegangen’s concentration of restaurants and bars in the evenings transforms this promenade into a densely programmed entertainment and recreation area. Across the canal southwards, a Y-shaped junction marks the hotel and parking garage entrance areas. From here, the promenade Landgangen leads towards the Filipstad pedestrian bridge in the west, while connecting with the Icon Complex and museum park areas to the east. Northwards, the street Kobbernagelen, a succession of squares, splits from Tjuvholmen Allé to connect with Fru Kroghs Brygge and Salmaker Janzens Plass.

Access
Tjuvholmen is a pedestrianized urban area with restricted car access. It is serviced through two separate sub-terrain parking garage systems, from which visitors and tenants resurface through vertical access points. Purposely under-dimensioned, the 950-lot garage emphasizes the use of carpools and public transit. There is, however, no public transport system within the development. Taxi services are available outside the hotel on the north end of Holmen. By car, Tjuvholmen is reached through Munkedamsveien through Trafikkplassen, directly connected to the large infrastructural road networks of Oslo. Here, public transit by bus and taxi is located next to the access ramp, while the closest tram stop is found on Rådhusplassen and in Cort Adelers gate, both 5-10 minute walks from Olav Selvaags plass. Pedestrians access Tjuvholmen from Aker Brygge by two bridges, one connecting Bryggetorget with Tjuvholmen Allé, the other linking Aker Brygge’s seaside promenade to the street/plaza “Lille Stranden.” A third pedestrian bridge access Tjuvholmen from Filipstad on Holmen. At surface level, all areas are publicly accessible. A few restricted zones do occur on some first floor common or service areas for the apartments. An exception is the kindergarten, whose outdoor areas are confined within a fence. Private and semi-private outdoor areas are all articulated as private terraces, common roof terraces and gardens/entrance areas set above ground level: It is the division between voids and solids that define publicly-accessible space from the private sphere, accentuating the ground floor figure plan in the development.

121 Except for emergency or delivery service. The latter is restricted to specific hours. Surface access for cars is restricted to goods delivery and emergencies.
122 On Akerodden, each building area (F1-F3) contains a one-story garage level that is connected by an access way submerging from Trafikkplassen at Filipstad. Inbound cars then resurface at the Holmen Bridge in Tjuvholmen Allé, in order to access the second system, a submerged, four-level parking.
Fig 55 (Left): View southwards from Aker Brygge towards F2, 2010. (Source: NTA)
Fig 56 (Right): Selvaags plass seen from east, 2012. (Source: Knut Ramstad)

Fig. 57 (Right): F1S Akerodden, 2015. Fig. 58 (Right) F2, Akerooden, 2015. (Source: HWE)
Volumes
The urban spaces of Tjuvholmen constitute a constellation of differentiated and contrasting spaces, resulting from a complex arrangement of voids and volumes that make up Torp’s urban design. Great care is invested in controlling the dimensions of the area, from the dimensioning of heights and widths, as well as the varying topographic elevations throughout the development. But its most striking feature in terms of urban form is its delineation as a finite area with defined thresholds of access that harbor a hierarchy of self-referential urban spaces and buildings. Although the building heights in general are relatively low, the density of the northernmost areas of the development is substantial. While opinions may differ as to whether this density exceeds the capacity of the area, both architect and developer agree that the building mass allowed in the zoning plan was challenging to implement, while simultaneously obtaining the quality sought. Niels Torp says he tried to convince the owner group of a lower utilization value without success: “We had a close collaboration with Selvaag and Aspelin Ramm, I wanted one floor lower, but they trumped me. That was a mistake, if you ask me.” Tjuvholmen KS CEO Bøyum shrugs:

I won’t deny the fact that the floor area ratio allowed gives relatively challenging volumes in relation to length of facades and hence, the quality of the apartments. We might have been better off by narrowing the building by 3–5 meters. It’s often about money.

Building Structures
On Tjuvholmen, the basic volumetric articulation of the building mass to a large extent pre-defined in the revised competition proposal Utsyn. The development scenario included densities and the articulation of urban form, as well as most programs and their distribution. Nonetheless, nineteen additional architectural offices contributed to realizing this vision, through one or several building designs. These building segments are part of different development areas with separate building strategies, numbered 1-8. During the different construction phases, some of these were either subdivided (F1N and F1S) or merged (F4, 5 and 6) as a result of the different contracts and contractors involved, strategic choices based on market opportunity or changes to the masterplan configuration and content. In addition, separate contracts were made on the less evident but exceedingly costly physical rudiments of the project. The area consists of 12 different main structures, many of which are subdivided in multiple building designs built upon a common foundation scheme.

123 N. Torp, interview, 2011.
124 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
Akerodden building structure

Akerodden is divided into three main building zones (F1S and F1N, F2 and F3), constituting four urban blocks situated around Olav Selvaags Plass. F2 consists of an urban block of six individual designs (B21-B26), by four different architect firms. A path linking Tjuvholmen Allé to Bolette Brygge breaches the volume. A narrow courtyard is set on the first floor, securing basic light and logistic requirements. Since F2 is a large volume with a narrow triangular footprint, unorthodox architectural solutions were required to secure basic qualities in the project, most evident in Kristin

Fig. 59 Akerodden aerial photo, 2016. (Source: Finn.no)

125 HRTB Architects, MAD Architects, Kristin Jarmund Architects AS, Arkitektkontoret Kristin Brodtkorp AS. It contains in total 162 apartments plus 3300m² offices and 2900m² retail (2900m²). The plot has a development frame of 20,400m² and a FAR of over 6, divided over 11 floors.

126 The general permission (rammetillatelse) of F2’s 1-story 6635m² cellar of access way, parking and storage room was applied for separately. On top of this scheme, each building was applied for independently.
Brodtkorp’s building towards Olav Selvaags plass: The structure is designed as two interlaced buildings whose joints are flanked by openings towards the interior courtyard. The building is accessed from Lille Stranden.\textsuperscript{127} Opposite, Kristin Jarmund Architect’s office building outlines the corner of F2 towards Dokkplassen. The F2 buildings makes up a dense urban block with a tight semi-courttyard, that in scale relates to the adjacent volume on Aker Brygge. The north part of F1 (F1N) consists of a mixed-use structure drawn by Niels Torp Architects AS, which descends from nine to five floors towards Bryggetorget.\textsuperscript{128} The narrow alley Sjøgangen divides F1N from its southern part F1S, connecting Bryggegangen with Olav Selvaags Plass. Schmidt Hammer Lassen’s L-shaped office and residential building lays south of Sjøgangen (B16/17). Its design is twofold, and consists of a white rugged rental apartment structure and a copper-plated office building along Tjuvholmen Allé. The structure opens on the ground floor in a passage towards Niels Torp’s eleven-story, 8800m\textsuperscript{2} oval apartment tower (B18 that cantilevers over the harbor promenade and its ground floor restaurant. The shaft-like space carved out between the tower and Schmidt Hammer Lassen’s building serves as entrance area to the apartments and as a passage to Bryggegangen. These spaces are not integrated into the main flow of public-accessible areas, but exist as spatial access points and non-programmed logistic communication areas.\textsuperscript{129}

The 19,300m\textsuperscript{2} F3 is the last building zone on Akerodden, divided into four buildings. A private garden is set on top of storefront shops and offices, defined by a curved facade of terraces. The main volume is a double-fed apartment block and tower, designed by Niels Torp. F3’s curved structure is U-formed, enabling Torp to maximize fjord views for southeast facing apartments, while simultaneously articulating a courtyard on the first floor. F3 exemplifies the efficient and dense building structures on Akerodden, with three vertical cores and up to 12 apartments per vertical circulation point. The ground floor plinth contains a mixed-use program consisting of exhibition spaces, cafés and offices, pierced by a passage leading from Olav Selvaags Plass towards the harbor front. Southwards, the ground floor descends towards the canal, creating a terrace underneath the building, which cantilevers over the harbor front path.

\textsuperscript{127} Brodtkorp’s second project B25 lays adjacent to her 25,000m\textsuperscript{2} acclaimed building Stranden 2 (1990) on Aker Brygge. The projects are similar both in term of material use and context, framing the old dock that divides Tjuvholmen and Aker Brygge.

\textsuperscript{128} The 18,000m\textsuperscript{2} building peaks at 35.5 meters.

\textsuperscript{129} F1S is the only area within the Tjuvholmen development where PBE demanded a building development plan (bebyggelsesplan) before the general permission could be permitted. This was due to concerns regarding whether the area’s qualities could be sustained within the proposed volumes.
Akerodden buildings
The most striking with Akerodden’s building assembly is its density and how this is solved within its urban design: While the F1 buildings are compact volumes accessed from the street, the apartments of blocks F2 and F3 are reached from passages that penetrate their interior courtyards, which in both structures are set on the first floor. In F2, this inner space seems cramped and dark serving only basic, logistical functions. While sharing characteristics with the perimeter block, its scale and articulation seem less than optimal to fulfill the inherent potential this typology potentially allows for.\textsuperscript{130} Also F3’s first floor semi-private common space seems both under-dimensioned and overly exposed, functioning more as a focal point for the building’s curved balconies. On the opposite side of the development, Torp’s oval building seems to struggle to fulfill the obvious qualities a free-standing, albeit wide,

\textsuperscript{130} For example, inner courtyard, common spaces with access to cores and two-sided apartments.
residential tower allows for, partly due to the geometry of the building.\textsuperscript{131} The building’s entrance areas, set in the narrow spaces and flanked by a tiny playground set in the northernmost corner, also seem cramped and unarticulated. In general, the lack of spatially compelling outdoor areas for the Akerodden apartment buildings, combined with cramped vertical cores, leave the overlap between the public and private realm unmediated, lacking the semi-private zones that normally serve such purposes. A similar inarticulation of private and public spheres is concretized in the location and articulation of apartment balconies, which several places are set at first-floor levels, literally on top of restaurant and café program.

The Tjuvholmen Icon Complex

The Icon Complex comprises three volumes (F4, F5 and F6) on Holmen and Skjæret, arched by its large transparent double-curved roof structure. Towards Holmen canal, F4 is a five-story office building with ground floor exhibition spaces stretching beneath Albert Nordengens Plass, connecting to F6. F6 consists of two exhibition floors and two additional office levels above for the Astrup Fearnley administration. The exhibition spaces are accessed from both corners of the square. F5 and F6 cover 3833m\textsuperscript{2}, with an additional 1528m\textsuperscript{2} set underneath Albert Nordengens Plass, containing wardrobes and technical spaces. While F4 and F6 contain the permanent collection, F5 on Skjæret hosts the temporary exhibitions, and the main entrance of the museum defined by a transparent atrium that allows views through the building. With its centerpiece court, the Icon Complex constitutes Tjuvholmen allé’s topographical and programmatic apex, manifesting both the symbolic and spatial nucleus of the development, flanked by the tower “Tjuvtiten.”\textsuperscript{132} The volumetric dispositions of its three volumes define the museum plaza (“Piazza” in Pianos words), with terraces descending eastwards towards the main entrance area.

Albert Nordengen’s Plass oscillates between on one side being part of the sequence of spaces initiated at Dokkplassen, and on the other, functioning as an integrated part of the institutional program it harbors. The distinction between the Icon Complex and Tjuvholmen as figure plan similarly dissolves on Skjæret and along the paths of the museum canal: Here, the eastern harbor promenade from Aker Brygge is inverted, forming a body of water between the museum building that maintains the axis defined by the Aker Brygge promenade. The resulting sight line is framed by the museum and its northern facade, flanked by the neon-lit Astrup Fearnley logo and advertisements of

\textsuperscript{131} “We moved the hotel to the other side of the channel, the reason being that building a hotel in a round house was a shitty idea in terms of administration, and its a shitty idea to build apartments that way as well, we won’t do that again!” My translation. Bøyum, interview, 2011.

\textsuperscript{132} The 50 meter tower was designed by Narud Stokke Wiig. They were also the Norwegian collaborators chosen by Renzo Piano for the Icon Complex.
the building’s current expositions. The Icon Complex, in terms of program, is first and foremost an office building, whereas its largest volume consists of over 6,000 square meters of office space. Seen in context of Torp’s scheme, the museum not only conceptually redefined its premises, but also, from a morphological point of view, seems to out-scale its surrounding building mass. This was not the result of the owner group’s vanity, but a premise set by Piano to accept the commission: In his eyes, a larger museum would be a task “more suited” for the Piano office.133

Fig. 57 The Icon Complex seen from Akerodden, 2012 (Source: Ivan Brodey)

**Holmen building structure**

In addition to the Icon Complex, the Holmen areas F7 and F8 consist of in total six volumes.134 Two comprise the west wall of Tjuvholmen Allé and Albert Nordengens Plass, mediating between the tranquil housing areas set around Fru Kroghs Brygge and the tourist bustle around Tjuvholmen Allé and the Icon Complex.135 Southwards on Kavringen Brygge lays a condominium by Lund Hagem Architects, eastwards flanked by a similar volume designed by Torstein Ramberg defining the Kavringen Brygge quay area. In F8, Schmidt Hammer Lassen’s linear block consists of six floors,

134 The 23,700m² development F7 has a one-story cellar linking the entire complex internally and connecting it to the large submerged parking system underneath Holmen.
135 At its northern edge, Mir Arkitektur AS designed a 4200m² office building, entramed by an arcade linking Albert Nordengens Plass and Kobbernagelen. The curved mid-section (B72) is designed by Hansen/Bjørndal Architects, and is an eight-floor building with 50 apartments. The southern segment (B73) is a residential project designed by Jensen & Skodvin Architects, with commercial ground floor areas and a common roof terrace on the eight floor. Adjacent westwards lay their second project B74.
partly set on pillars and cantilevering over the quay. North, towards Salmaker Janzens Plass, an eight-story tower by the same office has a spa and fitness center on its ground floor and cellar areas, connected to the Thief hotel. Together, the two buildings house 71 apartments, as parts of the “Selvaag Pluss” concept that provide tenants with common areas and extensive optional concierge services run by Selvaag subsidiary Selvaag Pluss Bolig AS. On Holmen’s southwestern tip lays Torstein Ramberg’s second building. Its adjoining house is drawn by Narud Stokke Wiig and consists of 58 rental apartments divided on eleven floors, serviced by an internal gallery. The glass clad ground and first floors contain retail programs. The northern edge of Holmen is comprised of a structure divided into three building segments dominated by “The Thief” hotel. Alongside the hotel, a smaller, 10-story volume by HRTB harbors a kindergarten in its ground floors. LOF Architects designed the final condominium westwards.

Holmen’s clear separation between office, culture and housing makes its outdoor areas calmer and more open than those found on Akerodden. The spacing between the southernmost lamellas, the vegetation and lack of additional programming underline the predominant housing program, while the main public passageways are primarily oriented towards visitors. Also, there is evidently more time and money invested in the buildings themselves, an architectural detailing, building width and outdoor areas seem more articulated: While Akerodden’s buildings seem shaped to articulate its successions of various urban spaces, the buildings located at the southern tip of Holmen instead appear to be designed to optimize the conditions for the housing programs they harbor.

---

136 F8 has a framework of 35,700m² T-BRA of which 75 percent is housing.
137 It comprises 51 apartments from 61 to 207m².
138 The original scheme was reworked when the hotel concept evolved to be more formal and exclusive than originally intended. The building now has two floors with a reception and restaurant/bar area, forming a glass plinth with six floors on top. The ninth floor services a green roof garden and terrace. The hotel has 120 rooms and a 1000m² spa.
139 It consists of 30 apartments ranging from 40 to 131m² with a common roof terrace on top of the eight-floor structure. The ground and first floors are partly set on pillars and contain entrance areas and commercial programs. The kindergarten outdoor areas are set on top of the ground floor areas of the adjacent buildings.
Fig. 62 F7 seen from south pier, 2012. (Source: Schmidt Hammer Lassen Architects)

Fig. 63 F3 seen from Lille Stranden, 2009. (Source: NTA)
Construction

Bøyum points out that although Tjuvholmen’s architecture is expensive, the biggest investment is hidden below the water surface: Nearly one billion Norwegian crowns were invested in the concrete structure on which Tjuvholmen was built.140 The original Tjuvholmen islet and its added landfills only comprise a small part of the development, mainly in the Akerodden and Skjæret area. The one-story cellar level of Akerodden is more or less identical with the footprint of each building zone. The buildings here have water-resistant base plates set on pillars. Since these constructions reach three meters below the water levels, high performance fiber-armored concrete with stainless steel armoring was used to secure a theoretical warranty of 300 years. Even more challenging was the task of providing the Holmen area with a suitable foundation that would facilitate parking and function as a base for construction: Holmen was built on a concrete plinth, consisting of five concrete cases that house parking and technical spaces.141

After being constructed in Fredrikstad south of Oslo and towed to the Oslo harbor, the five cases were mounted on 250 50 meter long steel pillars fixed to the bedrock below. A concrete platform spans between each casket, with a meter-thick concrete slab mounted on top.142 Together, these structures define the 21,000m² foundation of Tjuvholmen, as well as its basic topography.

The construction method chosen solved several problems for the Tjuvholmen developers: How to deal with building in deep water, how to provide sufficient parking, and protect it against hazards represented by ocean-going traffic. Beneath the plinth, 40cm of sand and different devices aimed to encourage marine life forms cover the muddy seabed. This attempt to clean the waters and create a new marine ecology has so far proved successful.143 The construction technology utilized on the plinth of Tjuvholmen provided the developers with an efficient but costly solution. According to Gunnar Bøyum, the expenses connected to realizing the foundation far exceeded their calculations, and it was only due to the unforeseen rise in real estate prices in the early 2000s that kept the project economically viable. The expensive land reclaiming strategy that involved

140 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
141 The largest of these is 90x30 meters, and is a four-story structure traversing F8, named “Kasse 1.” From here, three additional twenty-four-meter wide and four-story high “caskets” spread southwards, connecting to the cellar level of F7. The parking decks are all located west of Tjuvholmen Allé. Lastly, a detached 13-meter wide case is located on the southern tip of the development, functioning as a buffer against the large ships trafficking the fjord.
142 The platform terminates 1.7 meters above sea level on the south side of Holmen, while reaching 3.7 meters on “Casket 1” in the north. Over 60,000 cubic meters of concrete was used, and the entire construction was budgeted to NOK800 million.
143 The artificial reef beneath Tjuvholmen was a part of “the gift to Oslo,” estimated to cost NOK10 million, completed in 2012 for 12 million. Port of Oslo, Tjuvholmen: Marine biological measures, (Tjuvholmen – Marine tiltak) 2012.
high-tech offshore technology was thus enabled by market demands in downtown Oslo. It is also interesting to see how the technological achievement of its pillar-mounted, pre-cast concrete plinth preconditioned the land-reclaiming strategy necessary to realize the Tjuvholmen vision:

While Niels Torp conceptually conceived Tjuvholmen as a building, it is more or less constructed as one as well.

PROGRAMMING
The implementation and weighting of different programs have been an important strategy for the Tjuvholmen owners, both in terms of finding the right combination to supply market demands for office and housing, as well as attracting residents and investors. The Tjuvholmen’s real estate development strategy thus focused on a calibrated mix of office and housing, supported by a collection of service, retail and culture programs where some were meant to support the day-to-day life of its tenants, while others were established to provide an identity and attract visitors to the area.

Housing and office
While the competition entry Utsyn had a 50/50 division between housing and other programs, the revised project had an estimate of 20,000m² office space. This initial number was, after market surveys, increased to 40,000. Gunnar Boyum explains that through the entire process, the housing market was their prime target at Tjuvholmen, due to its viability as investment, including VAT deduction and the gross-net factor of housing that today exceeds 20 percent. Together, these factors amounted to as much as 45 percent of the cost.

Housing amounts to 84,000m², divided into 912 housing-units. This is close to 60 percent of the built project. Roughly 400 of these units are rental apartments owned by Selvaag Eiendom AS. 492 apartments are situated on Akerodden, while 420 are located on Holmen. A different type of housing program is found in F3, which houses Selvaag Eiendom’s apartment hotel “Tjuvholmen Executive Suites” with thirty apartments ranging from thirty-seven to one hundred square meters. Akerodden contains the main bulk of offices (25,000m²), the largest amount of smaller housing units and rental

---

144 Boyum says: “The municipality has managed to secure the content, time and money, but in the end its people that creates things.” He further accentuated that the mix of housing and office also had an urban dimension in terms of activities in urban space: “With our prices, offices would have been more profitable that housing. But it would be a shame only to build office space, and we do not know how a 100,000m² of additional square meters would have affected the price, there is something about resource scarcity. But the interaction is positive to achieve activities 24-7.” My translation. Boyum, interview, 2011.
145 Boyum, interview, 2011
146 Tjuvholmen was originally planned to room 950 units, but due to the merging apartments by single clients, the apartments are now fewer and larger.
147 This is based on a set minimum percentage of 45 percent on Akerodden and 67 percent on Holmen in the regulation plan. The apartment sizes range from less than 30m² to over 700m². PBE, Zoning plan S-4097 Tjuvholmen, 2004.
apartments (492 apartments in total), and the most restaurant/café programs (8000m² restaurant and retail). Holmen contains the largest amount of housing in terms of square meters, the Icon Complex, the 8000m² hotel and the kindergarten. Tjuvholmen can be regarded as part of the Vika and Aker Brygge Central Business District, (CBD) an area developed for this purpose since the mid-eighties and only recently facing competition by rival developments in Bjørvika. Tjuvholmen is the workplace for 1500 office employees sharing a total of 40,000m² distributed within five office buildings. In 2016, square meter prices for renting the most exclusive offices on Tjuvholmen were set to NOK4500. This amounts to a sale of NOK80,000 per square meter, if including a five percent dividend. In comparison, the prices of CBD Bjørvika are 3200, and in the central city outside the CBD, NOK3000.

Service, retail and culture programs
Various service programs are scattered around the entire development to support the needs of the residents, and the garage also contains a car wash and carpool service. Most of the smaller ground floor programs are located on Akerodden facing the canal or Tjuvholmen Allé, while most restaurants and cafés are scattered around the exterior harbor promenade. The west-facing Bryggegangen is especially dense in terms of such functions, and established itself as a popular recreational area of bars and restaurants only months after Akerodden was opened to the public. In addition to its restaurant and bar scene, Tjuvholmen KS has strived to create an “art cluster” on Tjuvholmen, in accordance with the overall strategy to create a specific Tjuvholmen identity and brand. The “gallery district” has five galleries spaced along Tjuvholmen Allé, and several others in its close vicinity, in addition to the Astrup Fearnley collection. The various retail and restaurant programs add up to around 10,000m².

The 4200m² Astrup Fearnley Museum includes a bookstore, café, and temporary exhibition spaces situated on Skjæret, while an additional 2000m² are located on ground floor areas on Holmen hosting the permanent collection. Supplementary programs include an auditorium and learning center. The public art program consists of a sculpture garden on Skjæret,

148 The Bank “Handelsbanken” and the Selmer and BA-HR lawyer firms are currently the largest tenants. BA-HR inhabits the 7000m² F3 building of the Icon Complex, while Handelsbanken have leased B16 on a 10-year contract. Other offices present include Bassæ Offshore (offshore brokers), EGL Nordic (energy trading), Lindstow as (property development) and Union Gruppen (This information is from 2014. Ownership may have changes since.)


150 Bøyum, interview, 2011.

151 Galleri Brandstrup, Pushwagner Gallery, Peder Lund, Café De Concert and Galleri Semmingsen. Galleri Haaken and Galleri Gerhardsen Gerner are located on Dyna Brygge, while the galleries Fineart and Galleri Riis are located close by on Filipstad.
which comprises seven sculptures by internationally acclaimed artists.\(^{152}\)

These are either in the collection of Selvaag Gruppen AS or bought by Tjuvholmen KS on behalf of its owners. Adjacent to the Icon Complex lays the 8000m\(^2\) “The Thief” hotel and kindergarten.

In addition to the commercial and cultural programs in the area, the promenades, parks and quays function as attractors for recreational use during the summer months. The protected, shallow water beach area appeals to families, while the viewing tower on Albert Nordengens Plass simultaneously functions as a symbol, landmark and entertainment program. Parts of Tjuvholmen’s long harbor front promenade also function as guest jetties for visitors arriving by boat. Renting space by the dock is by regulation limited to one year to avoid permanent privatization and secure vacancies.\(^{153}\) Further, Fjordpiren contains a floating harbor bath and tourist ferry service stop. The promenades, patches of parks, quay areas and avenue and alleys are designed to provide inhabitants and visitors with a wide array of free leisure alternatives, including greenery for picnics, quays for bathing, wooden benches and stone carved lounge chairs, and a water-themed art program, all set in various patterns of stone, wood and vegetation.

Since the completion of Tjuvholmen, several of its initial tenants have been replaced, and while restaurants and cafés thrive, commercial stores and outlets have to a lesser extent succeeded. “It is difficult, not to say impossible to conduct retail on Tjuvholmen,” Gunnar Bøyum admitted at a bank seminar in 2013, and today, only basic support programs survive.\(^{154}\) At the time of writing, a hairdresser, florist, a menswear store, a tailor and shoe repair shop chiropractor/physiotherapist, and small supermarket are the only commercial programs not based on food, drink or culture consumption.

In contrast, nine various art venues and 15 restaurants and bars areas scattered around the development.\(^{155}\) The Astrup Fearnley museum further highlights Tjuvholmen as a culture and experience destination, in contrast to Aker Brygge, that in spite of its former commitment to various culture programs and an extensive art program today exclusively brands itself as a shopping and leisure destination. The different choices of strategy between two seemingly similar developments have several reasons, related to their different locations, as well as their basic organizational setup: While Aker Brygge was conceptualized with a retail-dominated ground floor as a precondition for development, Tjuvholmen’s more remote location and larger


\(^{153}\) Tjuvholmen KS opposes this, claiming that short-term contracts make both financing and maintenance of the quays difficult. Bøyum, interview, 2011.

\(^{154}\) Jan Revfem, “Umulig med handel på Tjuvholmen” NE Nyheter, 30 September 2013.

\(^{155}\) 2015.
housing program meant that conventional retail was not likely to succeed, nor necessary to achieve development of the area. At their core, however, they correspond in terms of how mixed-use is meant to contribute to create an atmosphere that can attract crowds and brand the areas with an identity as destinations and distinct districts in the city.

SUMMARIZING REMARKS
The summary here addresses three specific questions regarding Tjuvholmen’s morphology. The first section addresses Tjuvholmen as urban design, the second discussed this urban design in relation to its programming, while the third reflect on the similarities and differences of the function mix of Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen.

Tjuvholmen as urban design
The self-contained pedestrian landscape envisaged by Torp as “ants on an island,” is part of the business and leisure district of Vika, next to Aker Brygge and other central tourist attractions in the city, and part of an extensive network of more or less pedestrianized urban space of downtown Oslo. The translation from Utsyn to Tjuvholmen is direct, pointing both to the sturdiness of Torp’s design scheme, but also the development model that cemented Utsyn as design scheme through the sales competition and subsequent negotiation phase: The formal faculties of Utsyn’s streetscape, volumes and voids are realized much in coherence to the competition proposal. The urban environment of Tjuvholmen is easily legible, where the connections to surroundings areas are accentuated as access points to the area. The convex form of the Akerodden “platform” and the inclination initiated at Holmen provides an overview and perspective to Tjuvholmen allé, and the location of the Icon Complex and its park and beach programs is a strong attractor that leads visitors through most of the area’s commercial functions. Great care has been put into realizing this streetscape, and substantial effort is invested in providing the “right” combination of functions, activities and spaces, enabled by the ownership of ground floor areas. The promenades on each side are articulated and programmed in accordance with sun conditions, both immediately appropriated by visiting audiences. As means for attracting crowds through entertainment, leisure and diverse experience, the environment of Tjuvholmen is performing well. It is hard to envision how a development process with multiple stakeholders.

157 It is also important to note that Tjuvholmen is the first area along the waterfront that to such an extent provides access not only to the waterfront, but to the Fjord landscape itself, where vistas include not only the water, but the opportunity to experience the Pipervika bay and Akershus Fortress from afar. The geographic situation of Tjuvholmen thus grants the area qualities, an advantage bestowed on few other locations in Oslo.
within the Tjuvholmen area would similarly be capable of creating such a calibrated, designed and managed urban environment.

Nevertheless, Bøyum and Torp agree that the density is higher than optimal, and that the project would gain from a lower and narrower building mass. Torp’s urban design envisioned a slightly lower plot-ratio, and Tjuvholmen allé in places becomes dark and closed, while spaces between and within buildings get a shaft-like character that contrasts the earliest representations of the *Utsyn* project: In spite of the prominence and design-focus of the sales-competition, quality of space also here was secondary to project economy, and a result, according to Bøyum, of the price demanded by the Port of Oslo.¹⁵⁸

### Urban design versus urban function

The Akerodden configuration of three urban blocks might best be approached through the critique presented in *urban form* regarding the faculties often applied to the urban block as typology. For Castex et al., the block is a delineated area of independent building plots, connected to the street network, not an architectural form:

> [To generalize the urban block] without questioning the issue of internal subdivisions, risks showing the outward appearance of urbanity without ensuring the conditions to allow it to happen. It brings to urban planning an attitude comparable to that of architectural post-modernism, which replaces history with references and uses by symbols.¹⁵⁹

Castex et al.’s point is that the application of particular forms without regards to their inherent performance as building types, risks becoming a mere formal projection: A morphological reference, but without its structural performance.¹⁶⁰ At Aker Brygge, Torp replaced the perimeter block courtyard with semi-climatized commercial spaces, but substituted them with a horizontal network of semi-private spaces on the top floors. This reconceptualization of the urban block between public and private spaces enabled him to cultivate the high degree of social centrality on street level, catered for by the large Bryggetorget. At Akerodden, this horizontal division of program is replaced by morphological complexity: The conceptualization of its urban environment as a streetscape defined by voids and volumes sometimes trump the expediency of urban form. Here, neither the courtyard of F2, nor the turf in front of F3 (The volumes on the east side of Akerooden)

---

¹⁵⁸ Bøyum, interview, 2011.
¹⁵⁹ Castex et al., *Urban forms*, 162–164.
¹⁶⁰ Ibid.
seems to accommodate for other activities than at best, their basic logistic (F2) or aesthetic (F3) purposes.

The lack of mediation between private and public areas is to a lesser extent present on Holmen, whose linear block, clearer zoning of programs and first floor balconies at large render this as a residential neighborhood. The combination of relatively small urban spaces with first floor apartments, restaurants occupying ground floor areas and benches facing the waterfront limits use to a selected amount of predefined activities. Exceptions include the larger sculpture and beach area to the east, and the opposite Bryggegangen to the west, whose restaurants, bars and offices facilitates for larger crowds and late night activity.

The sometimes conflicting interests of residential and public programs in Tjuvholmen might best render visible where private areas, as balconies, are set within meters of public programs, like cafés and restaurants. Here, a private amenity whose “pre-accepted performance” increases property value independent of whether these elements contribute of conflicts with the urban environment sought for. Whereas Aker Brygge provides a distinct division between housing and the public urban environment, Tjuvholmen nurses a narrative of blending public and residential functions with little mediation. However, the built result envisage the conflicts that arises by a focus that predominantly have been on the design of a complex and varied streetscape, but without the semi-private courtyards articulated entrance areas and other spatial specificities that Castex identifies as the true faculties of the urban block.\textsuperscript{161}

\textbf{The functional mix of Tjuvholmen}

Although both Tjuvholmen’s Gunnar Bøyum, and Aker Brygge’s Kjell Wester place the user as both goal and means to create a well-functioning urban environment, Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen contrast on several levels: While Aker Brygge’s (originally) complex arrangement of indoor and outdoor spaces was composed through the stacking and juxtaposition of programs, Tjuvholmen has clear spatial hierarchies and distribution of programs. On Aker Brygge, the focus of its early phases lay on curating personnel and institutions that could generate particular forms of social centrality, including education and culture institutions, meant to contrast the “unadventurous” office programs of the area. On Tjuvholmen, such attempts

\textsuperscript{161} There are few examples that this seemingly paradoxical situation between providing the community sought for and cultivating a bustling urban environment are conflicting on Tjuvholmen. This might to an extent also be attributed TKS control and administration of ground floor programs. Furthermore, architect Lin Skaufel, former collaborator with Jan Gehl, provides positive reviews of Tjuvholmen in a report ordered by Aspelin Ramm evaluating the Tjuvholmen environment. She concludes that residents and visitors to Tjuvholmen are pleased with the result. This points to how TKS has managed to attract their target groups and provide the amenities promised in their prospectuses. Lin Skaufel, \textit{Tjuvholmen, Evaluation}, 2014, Aspelin Ramm, 2014.
for friction is replaced by synergetic relationships between expensive housing, culture attractions and office areas: While in principle similar in program, their streamlining points towards what Craik called the “convergence between patterns of consumption, leisure and tourism” discussed above.162 The conceptualization of the urban environment as diverse seems among the owner group to be more founded in formal aesthetic references and qualities: The references to Paris and Berlin accentuate the formal, “urbane” and bourgeois, while the Astrup Fearnley museum’s iconicity and culture program connotes a very different narrative that the art academy and theatre groups of Aker Brygge.163

While Aker Brygge at least partly focused on different life forms, and Tjuvholmen to a larger extent caters to different life styles, these differences should be seen in context of how Aker Brygge’s inherently novel approach over decades evolved to become the streamlined real estate model that emerged at Tjuvholmen.164

---

163 Still, Aker Brygge did not have its own share of decadence, e.g. in terms of its luxurious rooftop housing areas. But it also might just be this excess that provided it with an edge deprived Tjuvholmen, in spite of its billion-crown museum.
164 It is telling that the adversary CBD area the Opera quarter (“Barcode”) across town in Bjørvika currently also is being introduced as “Oslo’s new art district,” fronted by the Munch museum and Oslo Kunsthall, located with subsidized rent in one of the “Barcode” buildings. Heidi Borud, ”Galleriene kommer – Barcode på vei til å bli Oslo’s nye kunstbydel,” Aftenposten, 25 October 2016.
11 Tjuvholmen as symbolic realm

The iconographic analysis below accentuates specific aspects of the Tjuvholmen development, discussed as elements with particular symbolic meaning or connotative potential. This means that while traditional iconographic features often are delimited to regarding particular architectural features or a specific build-up of mass, the point of departure here is the urban environment and how it is conceptualized to convey forms of symbolic meaning. The point of reference for this analysis is both Torp’s disciplinary backdrop and the conceptions and strategies applied by the owner group to create a specific urban environment on Tjuvholmen within the framework of the Tjuvholmen development model. As introduced in the introductory theoretical chapter, the iconographic analysis is built up by three categories that distinguish between different forms of iconography:

First, the “basic form” category (defined as “main architectural idea” above) inherited from Sinding-Larsen discusses Tjuvholmen as architectural form and expression. Here, I discuss the form and composition of the area’s urban spaces and how its squares and streets can be interpreted. Further, I address Tjuvholmen as program and the role targeted and strategic programming contribute to the iconographic discussion on Tjuvholmen.

The next category addresses how certain elements act as cues to strengthen the interpretation potential of Tjuvholmen, based on Sinding-Larsen’s second category. (This was defined as “illustrative elements” that strengthen the interpretation potential). Here, I survey the design guidelines and their impact on the area, address the role of architectural expressions within the area, and discuss the implication the different symbolic layers of Tjuvholmen entail through the example of the Icon Complex.

Finally, the iconographic “context” is discussed, here understood as a broad reflection of how Tjuvholmen in terms of “meaning” can be interpreted as part of a larger whole. (In the introduction, this was referred to as contextual elements that may color or define interpretation.) The elements addressed here are Tjuvholmen’s spatial context, historical-geographical context, and its “context of kinship.”
BASIC FORM ICONOGRAPHY

Within Tjuvholmen, the elements that render clearest in terms of spatial intention are the encompassing waterfront promenade and the interior main street Tjuvholmen allé. These elements are assigned different spatial “tasks”, interlinked through the many smaller streets, paths and corridors throughout the area. As an urban design, the two can be regarded as Tjuvholmen’s two primary motifs, and are discussed accordingly.

Main Street and promenade

While Tjuvholmen consist of three areas separated by water, Tjuvholmen allé ties its individual elements together. Its assigned role as primary structural element is underlined by the monumentality of its central axis, constituted by façade heights, slightly elevated streetscape and sight lines. On Akerodden, the street is 15-meters wide with three-meter sidewalks, which in general are appropriated by retail and restaurant programs. This contrasts the street on Holmen, where the contraction of the street accentuates the ascension towards Albert Nordengens Plass and descent southwards, where the Icon Complex narrows the avenue to a passage, barely four meters wide. This shift in scales and topography secludes the area from the residing city, where Holmen’s southbound slope of paths and green zones strengthen the focus on the fjord waterscape and islands beyond.

This shift of character is both in accordance with Torp’s conception of Holmen as part of the fjord waterscape, as the slope becomes a motif that
frames the view, inclining towards Albert Nordengens Plass and continuing into infinity. The ascension and contraction of Tjuvholmen allé here also gives a “trompe-l’œil” effect, implying that the finite-ness of Torp’s renaissance ideals here is replaced with a baroque sense for temptation and trickery.

A similar framing is found in the staircase of Torp’s SAS building, which as motif creates closure, but implicitly also expectations of what resides beyond. Both streets thus introduce a feature that mediate between the cultivated interior and the natural exterior, translating the rigid, formal sequence of space towards an open and informal area south of the pinnacle at Albert Nordengens Plass. The primary status of Tjuvholmen allé is thus not only its function as a structuring device or its appropriation of the “main street” motif underlined by the straight facades and spaced vegetation between two main squares. It is also based on the narrative it provides as a spatial sequence throughout the development. It is, iconographically speaking, Tjuvholmen Allé as storyline as much as the structure that ties Akerodden and Holmen together.

The waterfront promenade is a different story: Due to the obvious qualities connoted by the waterfront promenade as a concept, it became a central narrative for the “Fjord city” vision as it emerged in the 1990s, and a mandatory element on Tjuvholmen.\(^\text{165}\) The spaces that make up the promenade contrast the Tjuvholmen interior, as it varies in scale, articulation, material uses and programming throughout the development. This articulation differs from the original guidelines imposed by PBE’s demand for a specific promenade width (an injunction typical for how the planning authorities utilize common spaces as a planning tool and security measure in this type of development process). In Torp’s eyes, however, such an imposition limited the openings of creating more differentiating and interesting spaces.\(^\text{166}\) The experience of the promenade is therefore not that of a continuous spatial flow, but rather broken up spatial sequences of varying width, length and elevation with smaller spatial “situations” dispersed throughout. The small green turf Strandhagen on Akerodden’s east side contributes to form a patio in front of Torp’s F3 building. Adjacent, Lille Stranden forms a square opening northeast, providing a vista towards

\(^{165}\) The term “waterfront promenade” was introduced in In’by’s proposal for Vippetangen in 1986. In 2002, an intermediate path along the waterfront, through the use of red paint was the first manifestation of the idea of a continuous public space towards the water. When the Fjord City Plan was sent for approval in the city council late 2006, to be ratified in 2007, the continuous waterfront promenade across the city made out the main narrative and feature of the plan. Kahrs Ditmar, “Havsenteret til Vippetangen?” Aftenposten Aften, 4 March 1984, 4.

\(^{166}\) “The idea was to make the ideal harbor walk project, two kilometers, with variations in between the narrow waterfront edge and the more prominent areas, the Agency [PBE] wanted a twenty-meter wide promenade around the entire development, they didn’t get it; a hierarchy of streets where some are narrow our point five meters and nine floors high, and the main street which is sixteen point five meters, and the buildings that descends in height outwards.” My translation. N. Torp, interview, 2011.
Rådhuset and Akershus Fortress. Opposite, wooden terraces towards Filipstad facilitate for mooring boats and sunbathing on summer evenings. The south edge of Holmen is articulated as a small harbor bath and ferry stop. And finally, the sculpture park in front of the Icon Complex is differentiated as a spatial situation delineated by the Astrup Fearnley Museum and identified through its art and beach program.

Fig. 66 Olav Selvaags plass, 2016 (Source: Krogsvleen.no)

**Symbolic message versus utilitarian function**

There are two features of iconographic relevance that play out between Tjuvholmen allé and the waterfront promenade. The first regards the contrast between the formality (understood as spatial rigor and system) of the avenue and the informality of the promenade (understood as contrasting and overlapping situations). The second regards how this crisscrossing of spaces between the promenade and avenue make up informal spatial sequences for movement; reminiscent of spatialities characteristic of the superimposed spatial layers of historical European cities: The dichotomy constituted by the street and the promenade (representing inside and outside, the formal versus the informal, and culture versus nature) creates a spatial dynamic for serendipity to occur, or at least spatially be represented. This dynamic constitutes a closed, self-referential system within Torp’s “city-building.” To use an analogy, Torp’s urban environment seems to result from the projection of several superimposed spatial systems, with a simultaneous reference to both the vernacular townscape and Baron Haussmann’s
dissection of it. 167 Outside this system, Skjæret became a site where culture and nature merge (in Torp’s Utsyn scheme, also in a literal term). By this, the city seems ascribed certain faculties that are contrasted by those attributed natural landscapes. Hence, cultural programs were linked with the recreational activities offered by the Skjæret beach and waterscape.

To take a small detour: A similar take on the urban is found in TTA’s scheme for Aker Brygge: For Fredrik Torp, Tingvallakaia was conceptualized as a promenade for the city, but where water-related activities such as recreational swimming were foreign. These were instead confined in the proposed bathhouse, or situated in the more informal park areas at the tip of the development. 168 The iconographies derived from these normative conceptions of what an urban environment entails in terms of use in both cases became decisive for how the projects were interpreted and understood as development schemes. While Aker Brygge’s Bryggetorget had rhetoric and programming similar to that of Tjuvholmen, however, urban forms were not utilized to underscore particular formal references to historical urban environments. Tjuvholmen, nonetheless, makes up an inventory of squares, streets and quay motives that become spatial references to other locations, in a manner reminiscent of architectural post-modernism’s appropriation of historical elements to both reconstitute and generate new expressions. 169 In Torp’s architectural work, forms of symbolic meaning conveyed through iconography flank his instrumental use of organization, flow and social encounter for design. Torp himself refers to this as “blurring” the structure. Hence, the square as function is strengthened or “explained” by the square as symbol. 170 These spatial narratives are further strengthened by the project’s rhetoric, where the avenue and the paths are primed with reference to Italian as well as Norwegian environments. Thus, the more abstract conceptualization of the urban environment found in Aker Brygge was in Tjuvholmen “popularized” through easily legible iconographies related to broadly accessible conventions’ relation to the streets and squares of the historical city. 171

167 The reference to Haussmann’s renovation of Paris is based on the reading of Tjuvholmen as a organizational hierarchy where the main axis is contrasted by the intricacy of its smaller streets and alleys.
168 For Fredrik Torp, such activities belonged outside the city’s core mix of harbor-industry; retail and housing that Aker Brygge’s promenade would facilitate the experience of F. Torp, interview, 2011.
169 Examples of such post-modern approaches include Charles Jencks’ accounts for architecture and semiotics, who argues that form and content have no natural and unbreakable relationships, but sees semiotics as a tool for architectural design on the semantic level. Jencks’ approach was shaped as a critique towards the modernist avant-garde’s “denial of connotations.” Charles Jencks and George Baird, Meaning in Architecture (London: Barrie & Rockliff: The Cresset Press, 1969), 16–22.
170 This structural and symbolic organization of spaces, that can be denoted as spatial sequence and consisting of differentiated urban elements, was above referred to as a “syntactic” and “semantic” approach. Chapman, Ostwald and Tucker, “On the role Semiotics, interpretation and political resistance in architecture,” 2004.
171 I use the term “academic” to convey how Aker Brygge’s horizontal layering of program was architecturally conceptualized with few obvious semantic interpretations that appeal to convention. Tjuvholmen, on the other hand, utilizes semantic references extensively throughout the development.
Strategic programming and social centrality

The programming of Tjuvholmen was an integral part of Torp’s design process, and a substantial part of his focus on user interplay is found in the dynamic between form and program. In terms of organization, this was also a tool in Torp’s former, large office developments, and a defining factor at neighboring Aker Brygge phase II. Except for the strategic location of the museum at Holmen, it is at Akerodden that Torp and the owner group’s strategic function mix is most evident. The western promenade Bryggegangen was the first area of Tjuvholmen to be appropriated by both visitors and people working in the area; a clientele of predominantly wealthy, young professionals. The promenade has since become a congested waterfront walk facilitating the outdoor restaurants, flanked by the adjacent granite benches and wooden terraces towards the water. Torp foresaw the potential of this area, and divided the facade of FIN into several sections, articulated through large window frames meant to display the tenants inside and to expose what Torp perceived as the day-to-day dramas taking place in a lawyer’s office.172

While the restaurant and café programs are especially numerous in this area and more evenly distributed elsewhere on Akerodden, they are representative of how such functions not only provide the economic foundations for the streetscape of Tjuvholmen, but also constitute a core strategy for social centrality to occur: Intentionally unhindered by fences or other dividers, the café and restaurants are programs whose users constitute the biggest attractors themselves. This fact has been made into somewhat of a credo for Aspelin Ramm CEO Gunnar Bøyum, appropriating Walt Disney’s famous quote: “You can design and create and build the most wonderful place in the world. But it takes people to make the dream a reality.”173 Walt Disney knew both that the symbolic effect of crowds in themselves exceeds any material form of symbolism, and that environments that trigger emotion and community between people surpasses an object’s entertainment value; hence the presence of “Main Streets” and castle motif that recur in his developments globally.174 This has two meanings of iconographic significance: First, as crowds attract crowds: The creation of socially central sites are attractions in themselves, partaking in the iconography of the urban environment through forms of socio-spatial interplay. And secondly, that

---

172 According to Niels Torp, it was the TV series’ “Ally McBeal” use of the office unisex restrooms as stage and scenography that inspired him to articulate a design based on a wish for creating a programmatic transparency seldom present in office buildings. N. Torp, interview, 2011.
173 Bøyum, interview, 2011
social centrality further can be represented through elements like the “main street,” as a form of “symbolic social centrality” based on connotation and convention.

Strategic programming and “vernissage urbanism”
Tjuvholmen, as a relatively remote area compared to other destinations in the city core, needed not only individual attractions, but also programs that provide specific identity, character and a sense of community. This was both a necessity of its development model, as well as a prerequisite of the Tjuvholmen competition. Thus, while many programs of Tjuvholmen were strategically located due to their attraction value, others were curated and subsidized to provide a specific atmosphere, activity or identity. Here, the Astrup Fearnley Museum was a decisive factor. Originally fulfilling the task of being the mandatory, large-scale attractor of the area, the owner group ended up investing in a substantially larger amount beyond what their contract demanded. Bases on Astrup Fearnley’s art collection, the owner group decided to conceptualize the urban environment through the gallery program. Today, the Astrup Fearnley Museum is the flagship in a fleet of exhibition spaces on Tjuvholmen.175 According to CEO Gunnar Bøyum, the

175 Considering the amount of money that was invested as part of the “Gift to Oslo” obligations, it is not surprising that the developer group aimed for a “Bilbao effect” on Tjuvholmen. Indeed, Olav H. Selvaag visited both the Guggenheim in New York and their branch in Bilbao when looking for a suitable partner for establishing a museum. However, being the largest exponent of global, iconic museum buildings, their limited interest in the Tjuvholmen project was a not a question of prestige alone, but also that of building budgets. After brief meetings, Selvaag and the owner group would look elsewhere, landing a deal with Oslo’s only high
idea of creating an “art cluster” was compliant with the “urban experience” the owner group wanted to convey. 176 This strategy had several benefits: First of all, the gallery programs were not reliant on a large day-to-day turnover, which is an advantage in an area where prospects of conventional retail are limited. Secondly, opening hours were often extended due to gallery openings, attracting evening crowds from the city. Finally, they addressed an affluent, culturally conscious audience with a narrative of cultural surplus fronted by the Astrup Fearnley Museum.

The art cluster thus played a role in Tjuvholmen’s overall iconography part of a “themed diversity,” both through the users they could attract, when they were used, and the high-brow culture they represented, as parts of the urban environment of Tjuvholmen. They made a sophisticated “loss leader strategy,” where a product is sold below market value (in this case, subsidization) to stimulate the sale of other commodities (to strengthen the Tjuvholmen brand and experience as urban environment). 177

The direct appropriation of the most explicit expressions of high-brow culture, namely that of art, the art gallery and even the “vernissage” as tool for invigorating the urban environment (further enhanced by the fact that most of Tjuvholmen’s restaurants are inclined towards the “fine dining” segment) becomes examples of how specific forms of social centrality tied to social capital in terms of lifestyles is catered to, beyond the crude division of traditional user groups, to create a distinct and distinguished urban environment.

CUES AND ILLUSTRATIVE ELEMENTS
Sinding-Larsen’s third category is what he labels as “illustrative elements;” cues based on a convention that strengthens an object’s interpretation potential. This category is here seen to include specific features of architecture or landscape architecture that are parts of the urban environment on Tjuvholmen. A quick survey of Tjuvholmen’s landscape, meaning the surfaces and the articulation and conceptualization of these surfaces, shows that while much of the promenade is set in wood, the general streetscape is paved with stone, set in various configurations and patterns across the

---

176 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
development. Vegetation is relatively sparse, due to the parking cellars below, marking parts of the areas somewhat barren. Where smaller trees and patches of green occur, these are often raised above street level as slightly elevated landscapes, as in the open areas of Dyna Brygge south on Holmen. Its harbor bath and beach areas are the only areas of Tjuvholmen where the direct interaction with water is encouraged. The materiality and detailing of the streetscape is elaborate, while the diversity of architecture creates a visual mix of expressions that border on the chaotic. Characteristic for the large blocks that constitute most of Akerodden is the use of wood frames and cladding in brick, copper or other distinctive materials. Thus, the many situations within Torp’s urban design are in various ways augmented and interpreted, adding another layer to Torp’s narrative from Utsyn. The roles of these cues are explored below.

**Tjuvholmen’s urban environment conceptualized as design program**

While Utsyn provided the fundament on which Tjuvholmen was articulated, a design program for the area was created in 2004. In’by developed the program for Tjuvholmen KS to fulfill several purposes: Firstly, it was intended to safeguard the original intentions of the project. This included a “principal intention of creating a master plan benchmark with smaller units than found on Aker Brygge,” but where Akerodden was to be a continuation of Aker Brygge’s “masterplan pattern.” Holmen’s volumes were to be built around open urban spaces that open towards “the large Oslo fjord space.”

Skjæret was associated with the natural islands and islets, “ennobled to an urban situation.” Torp’s conceptualization of Utsyn’s main areas was thus emphasized as three different “places” within the design program. The program also highlighted the importance of the project’s sight lines and its differentiated urban spaces. Tjuvholmen Allé, in 2004 still called “Diagonalgaten,” was defined as the area’s main axis, consisting of different space sequences. It was emphasized that this street should have designated zoned for bicycles, pedestrians and cars. Additionally, all squares and plazas were conceptualized as spaces and granted guidelines meant to secure the specific spatial potentials derived from the masterplan: “Holmenhagen should constitute a park-like contrast to Fjordtorget. On the plaza’s sunny side, outdoor serving and dining is an important contribution to its character.”

For Tjuvholmen as a whole, it was stated that “Tjuvholmen should have its own character, but with a recognizable differentiation between its three main areas.” In terms of architecture, “the building mass

---

179 Ibid., 5.
180 Ibid., 11.
181 Ibid., 14.
should have a light expression. The buildings should be diverse, and the area should appear as a district of individual buildings inside an overarching identity. There should be variation in facades and their build-up, in material and in the uses of color.”

In’by’s work thus comprised an enhancement of some of Torp’s ideas, but also attempts at clarification: The accentuation of variation between Tjuvholmen’s different areas and contrast between squares built on Torp’s architectural process, but was also a rather direct translation of architectural ideas into spatial narratives. The process is representative of how Torp’s conceptual approaches were appropriated as “facts” by architects and developers, as well as politicians.

Fig. 68 Detail from Tjuvholmen allé, 2010. (Source: BLA)

**Manuals of intention**

On basis of In’by’s design program, five thematic manuals were developed. These focused on the functional and aesthetic qualities of Tjuvholmen’s urban spaces, and the spatial experienced they were meant to convey to their users. The manuals were developed by Bjørbekk & Lindheim landscape architects, and comprised materiality, lighting, urban furniture, regulations for outdoor cafes as well as the uses of signs and advertisements. According to Manual 1, the urban spaces of Tjuvholmen were meant to unify the eclectic architectural expression of the development to a whole, through material finishes, lighting systems and urban furniture. Basic materials such

---

182 Ibid.

183 There was also established a consultant team meant to function as a advisory unit in regard to architecture and landscape design. The team, called RED team, had no formal power and was, according to Bøyum, of less relevance compared to the involvement of the owners, board and different ad-hoc group formed throughout the development. Bøyum, interview, 2011.
as wood, rustic stone, and concrete set with steel formed a material palette supposed to reflect the maritime history of Tjuvholmen and communicate “traditional city life.” The manuals also provided descriptions for outdoor spaces for each part of the development, including their main plazas, gardens and streets, in order and secure spatial qualities perceived as important. Materials were thus meant to support spatial functions, e.g. by underlining the prominent Olav Selvaag’s Plass through the use of expensive materials, accentuating the diagonal Tjuvholmen allé through the use of water, supporting the harbor-front promenades by using wood for seating, or articulating the quaysides. The use of “exclusive” materials reflected the ideas that specific materials evoke specific connotations for the users: “In pedestrian areas, more noble and solid materials are used.” In the streets and squares, trees should be characteristic, luxuriant elements that contribute to the multiplicity and vitality of the borough; “There is a long tradition for using trees in urban space.” Landscape architects Bjørbekk & Lindheim were also responsible for articulating the different urban spaces based on their interpretation of Utsyn as scheme: “to underline the contrast to Tjuvholmen Allé, Kobbernagelen’s section is divided asymmetrically.”

In addition to manuals on materials and lighting, pamphlets addressing urban furniture, outdoor seating, signs and advertisements were developed, supporting the vision for an “unified diversity:” The manual for urban furniture stated that the urban furniture was meant to contribute to informal meeting spaces and add a personal touch to the spaces they occur in, with a “positive visual quality” also when not in use, with a reference to “forms and materials from the maritime environment and industrial history of the area.” The manual for signs and advertisement similarly accentuated the uniqueness of each of the common spaces. The manual underlined the importance of Tjuvholmen’s hierarchy and scales, where the zone in front of each building was meant to mediate between the building and street, as an area where various intermediate installations for commercial purposes were placed. Any advertisement board was supposed to be downplayed and subdued in form, expression and location. Finally, the manual for outdoor seating marked the importance of avoiding physical dividers between outdoor restaurants and the street, to “strengthen the urban community and environment.” Neighboring restaurants should also aspire to a certain visual kinship. It is further stressed that equipment (furniture, parasols) outside

---

184 For example: “Wood is a characteristic material in places with maritime connections,” “Natural stone is a material traditionally used in urban spaces,” and “Concrete with steel beams and stone in stripes were used at the Tjuvholmen harbor fronts.” My translation. PBE, Thematic folder 1 Tjuvholmen: Material Use, 2008.
185 Ibid. My translation.
186 Ibid.
188 PBE, Thematic Folder 3: Signs and advertisement (Temahefte 3 skilt og reklame), 4th revision 2009
storefronts should harmonize with the facades to convey a “discrete and tidy” aesthetic expression that “simultaneously contribute to the diversity” of the streetscape.  

Fig. 69 Urban furniture and café, Akerorden, 2012. (Source: BLA)

**Manuals applied**

The design manuals, as well as the built environment, show that there was a clear intention of creating an aesthetic totality that unified the visual diversity provided by the multitude of forms, scales and expressions within the development. This variety of shapes, styles and expressions, seems like an attempt to reenact, or at least represent the multiplicity associated with historical European cities, by simulating an “organic” form of growth. The landscaping and surface treatment attempted to create a unifying narrative, and both inform and induce potential use. Scrutinizing the urban environment of Tjuvholmen as an iconography of cues further points to how aesthetics, materials and organization of urban space as an interior also might serve a “didactic” purpose, guiding both the interpretation of Tjuvholmen’s urban spaces and forms of socio-spatial interplay. But the detailed account for uses and aesthetics, meant to enhance experience, also limited the potential of “unscheduled” use.
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189 PBE, *Thematic Folder 5: Outdoor Dining (Temahefte 5 Uteservering)*, 3rd revision 2009
190 Socio-spatial interplay here refers to the interrelations between the built environment and activities of use. See e.g. Haslum, *Reading socio-spatial interplay*.  
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The trust in designed objects or surface treatments to cultivate a set of associations projected on Utsyn, or the tree’s ability to convey multiplicity, might partly be excused by it being a rhetoric applied by the landscape architects to create conceptual framework and legitimation strategy for the task at hand. Still, there seems to be an intrinsic conflict between the idea of the “discrete and tidy” and the encouragement of informal meetings and multiplicity. Such antagonisms seem representative of much of the rhetoric surrounding Tjuvholmen’s urban environment, supported by the various forms of “enhancements” described above.

The manuals and landscaping of Tjuvholmen introduced a new symbolic projection upon the architectural conceptualization provided by Torp and the owner group, where the nursing of detail and harmonization of the aesthetic expression of everything from chairs to parasols cemented the area both in use and expression. While the landscaping and detailing of street furniture are visually pleasing, they quietly contribute to the “contrived and controlled diversity” of Tjuvholmen, more than encouraging for creative and interactive use.191

Fig. 70 Stone terraces towards the water, Bryggegangen 2010. (Source: BLA)

The symbolic role of buildings

Akerodden and Holmen were granted different identities from the start. The density of Akerodden, its smaller apartments, relatively varied retail, blocks, streets and squares and juxtaposition of architectural expression is on Holmen replaced by a downplayed language of form, also enabled by the larger apartments and slimmer volumes of the area. Akerodden’s southernmost buildings are freestanding linear blocks that lend from the

191 Don Mitchell, Right to the City, 140.
modernist frame of reference, both in terms of the green platform on which they reside and their whitewashed facades.

Within the urban environment, singular buildings also stand out as structures of specific symbolic value or importance. In addition to their architectural intentions and frames of reference, they also play a larger role in the symbolic realm of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment, as particular locations contributing to the overall narration of Tjuvholmen. Kristin Jarmund’s white stone-clad office structure set on a glass plinth “contributes with continuity and representativeness” as one of Tjuvholmen’s “cornerstones.” Its prominent location and architectural expression has become a symbol of Tjuvholmen as a cutting edge business district, if taking the frequent use of the building in media. A similar cornerstone building on Holmen is drawn by MIR Architects. Set in an equally prominent location, the building is clad in white limestone with seemingly alternating floors. Its location next to the Icon Complex has made “Tjuvholmen allé 19” into Tjuvholmen’s most expensive offices. The Icon Complex similarly has exclusive office areas within its perimeters, inhabited by the high-profile law office BA-HR. While other office buildings within Tjuvholmen around the development have higher capacity, the symbolic effect of these bureau buildings set at specific locations around the development is linked to their exclusivity as sales objects. If regarding Tjuvholmen as a site where the formal diversity called for by the owner group crystalizes through a self-referrential system of projected, urban imagery, such buildings become iconic referential points in the collage of architectures that emerges.

The “signal building” as iconography

While most participating architects of Tjuvholmen were granted a strict building envelope to articulate, Renzo Piano Building Workshop altered the spatial configuration of Tjuvholmen altogether. The scope of the building far exceeded the requirements of the Astrup Fearnley museum, meaning that the exhibition program only comprises a smaller part of the actual building structure. According to Piano, the Icon Complex form was conceived from the sea and derived from maritime references, in particular the connotations provided by the wharf analogy where the roof structure is paralleled with a boat’s hull. The Icon Complex name is descriptive of the building’s
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192 Jenssen, Tjuvholmen, 72.
193 By “bureau,” I refer to iconic office buildings such as Adolf Loos’ Goldman & Salatsch Building in Vienna, or Daniel Burnham’s Fuller Building in New York, whose symbolic roles as “cornerstone buildings” in their respective settings are mimicked in Tjuvholmen.
194 Jenssen, Tjuvholmen, 148. That the building’s iconic roof structure is most striking from the seaside is not a surprise, taking in to account the wish for a landmark building in the area. Piano’s earlier sketches, supposedly drawn after a boat trip around Tjuvholmen, strengthen this impression. Compared to how the complex is articulated towards the sea, the north façade towards the city is foremost dominated by the main entrance of its largest tenant, the BA-HR lawyer office.
iconography, where the relatively small museum program it harbors seems secondary to the object itself. The owner group’s strategy for harboring an autonomous art collection on Tjuvholmen, within an iconic building, drawn by a renowned architect, envisages how the iconography of a building is linked both with the connotations provided by the program in harbors and the brand represented by its designer: The signature of the building, the institution it represents and its expressive form merges as part of the overall iconography of the structure. This iconography is provided an additional “cue” through the symbolic meaning provided by the icon building typology: The small Astrup Fearnley collection gains the momentum of a structure with the same iconic capacity reserved for much larger and more prominent institutions.

While Piano remains true to Torp’s basic volumetric dispositions, the Icon Complex departs with Torp’s conceptual approach to Tjuvholmen as a “city building.” This unresolved relation recurs in several locations around Tjuvholmen, where the imposed aesthetic diversity does not concur with the iconography of the master design. This superimposition of different iconographic “systems” points to how the urban environment has been conceptualized through different architectural ideologies that are superimposed: Torp’s vision, the owner group’s re-vision, Piano’s reinterpretation, and the design manuals and landscape architect’s attempts at consolidation, of design intention envisage how a common, but vague conceptual backdrop lead to differential, and sometimes conflicting, manifestations as urban form.

This also shows that it was the Utsyn proposal, and not Torp’s philosophy on the city that became the basis for this conceptualization. In this process, certain features with potential symbolic significance were lost, including Torp’s hotel lobby vision, replaced by the vamped The Thief hotel.

ICONOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Sinding-Larsen’s final category entails any context an object can be interpreted within, independent of the “basic form” or “illustrative elements” discussed above. Sinding-Larsen’s thesis is that any object of scrutiny is framed within a spatial context that comprises an independent “medium level.” Tjuvholmen is here divided in a spatial context, historical geographic context and context of kinship, meaning how Tjuvholmen can be regarded as a genre environment. While this section is less comprehensive than the former sections of the chapter, it anticipates discussion that will be continued in the mediation chapter below.
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195 As e.g. the Guggenheim Foundation buildings referred to above.
196 N. Torp, interview, 2011.
Spatial context

Tjuvholmen is located in a prominent area, both in terms of proximity to infrastructure and central parts of Oslo, location in the southwestern part of the city, partly on the edge of, and partly within the Oslo fjord-scape. Situated next to Rådhusplassen and the pedestrianized areas of the city, and in walking distance to the more affluent housing areas of Oslo, the spatial context of Tjuvholmen contributes to its image of exclusivity. Its Vika location equals high real estate value, attracting particular branches of business: While the labor-intensive branches such as banking and revision firms establishing themselves in the spacious Operakvartalet in Bjørvika further east, trading, juridical services and shipping gather around the Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen area. The spatial context of Tjuvholmen is thus both associated with financial surplus and business efficiency, as well as experience and recreation. Here, the fjord context, framed by Pipervika, the Town Hall and the Akershus Fortress, provides the physical setting as iconographic backdrop of Tjuvholmen’s scenography. But more than anything, the iconography of Tjuvholmen is linked to its immediate maritime surroundings. On the city-scale, Tjuvholmen’s iconography is influenced by its role as spearhead in the “Fjordbyen vision,” as part of its promenade system and as destination on the waterfront. As the first project realized within the Fjord City Vision, its symbolic impact is significant.

Historical-geographical context

Historically, the infrastructural barriers and industrial harbor installations made most of the waterfront inaccessible for most of Oslo’s inhabitants, and while the Town Hall opened in the 1950, road, rail and ferry traffic kept the waterfront regulated by its functional purposes more than its recreational potential. The industrial past of Tjuvholmen is, however, referred to with a nostalgic touch both in the design manuals, as well as in the media material produced by the owner group, enacting what PBE refers to as the “historical depth” (“tidsdybde”) of the urban morphology.

Notwithstanding, a more evident reference is to Tjuvholmen’s pre-industrial past, where it can be seen in context of the Bygdøy Park, and the recreate water-based programs of Frognerkilen in the early 20th century. The Bygdøy peninsula has been held by the Norwegian royalty since the 14th century and been utilized as a recreational forest area since the late 16th century.
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197 Bøyum, interview, 2011.
198 The exclusive quality of direct water access can be exemplified by how international performers are shipped from The Thief hotel by boat to the stadium “Telenor Arena” in Fornebu across the fjord. Owner and hotel billionaire Peter Stordalen is known for lending out his private boats and cars as part of the concierge service to his most exclusive clientele.
199 Historical depth is a term used in relation to cultural heritage and preservation strategies to describe the presence of different historical layers in the urban morphology. See e.g. Agency of Planning and Building Services, Kommunedelplan for byutvikling og bevaring i indre Oslo 2005–2020, 2005, 15.
century. In 1840, King Karl Johan officially preserved it as Oslo’s first “people’s park” inspired by French ideals.\textsuperscript{200} This formally established Bygdøy as a recreational area in Pipervika in near vicinity to the city. Throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, various public-oriented programs have been added, including Folkesmuseet, the Fram Museum, the Kon Tiki Museum and finally, the Viking Ship Museum. Additionally, it hosts Oslo’s most popular beaches and several boat clubs. The area is easily reached by ferry, and the “hop-on hop-off” fjord city tourist service includes Tjuvholmen as a stop along the way.

Frognerkilen’s topographic formation as a cove and its vicinity to the housing areas of Frogner and Skillebekk made it a popular harbor and location for maritime recreation, for festivals and even winter sports events in Oslo. It still remains Oslo’s most important recreational harbor area. The recreational urban environments of Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen resonated with the beaches, forests, estates and museums of across the water southwards. The historical geographic review of Tjuvholmen thus shows that while the re-discovery of the waterfront is of relatively recent date and tied to a specific historical period, the utilization of the waterfront as recreational area has a long tradition. And although the harbor front remained inaccessible in most of the inner city throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the seashore and islands outside the city have continuously been used by the Oslo population.

\section*{Context of kinship}

Regarding Tjuvholmen in context of its adjacent areas display how the immediate surroundings inflict symbolic meaning, whether grounded in property prices, programming or the urban fabric that facilitates the pedestrian system of movement downtown Oslo. Here, the immediacy to water plays a particularly important role. Nevertheless, a final form of context remains to be addressed that Tjuvholmen can be seen in relation to: The global context of waterfront redevelopments and entertainment areas Tjuvholmen shares kinship in terms of form, programming and branding strategy. As part of a \textit{genre} of developments produced within a similar mode of conduct and a similar frame of political economic practice, Tjuvholmen and Aker Brygge relate to similar locations globally, that throughout the last two decades are found in numerous locations in medium and larger cities across the world.

\textsuperscript{200} King Karl Johan was inspired by Boulogne and Vincennes outside Paris, and would buy back parcels that over the years had been sold in order to rebuild the estate, a process he completed around 1880. The idea of preserving the forest had emerged as early as the 16th century.

http://www.allgronn.org/kongsgaarden/kongsgaarden.html. Accessed 10 June 2016,
These attraction-based, recreation-oriented harbor front developments offer similar urban environments, often fronted by a large attractor and a diverse building environment, accentuating design and offering commodities that convey symbolic forms of capital. They are also frequently located in proximity to cruise harbors, and flanked by up-scale office developments. The frame of reference that in this context constitutes such urban environments is not their reference to the traditional market place or their formal “nods” to past morphologies of the historical city. Rather, it is their internal systems of symbolic references that make visitors identify and relate, through associations to similar developments elsewhere: Through mass tourism, information technology and the global competition of cities, the socio-spatial interplay in waterfront developments has become convention. And as we shall see in the media section below, the owner group consciously also attempts to place Tjuvholmen in such a context.

SUMMARIZING REMARKS
The discussion on the iconography of Tjuvholmen revolves around two main perspectives: First, the references, narratives and ideas translated to form by Niels Torp, and how these are manifested as symbolic form. The second perspective regards the projection of ideas, concepts and references by the other involved actors mentioned above, which through appropriation of Torp’s narratives and design manifest forms of iconographic meaning (owner group, PBE, landscape architects and participating architects). Whilst the first perspective is encompassed by iconography as “basic form,” the second revolves around iconography as “cues” and “context.”

Iconography as basic form
Torp’s conceptualization of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as iconography emerges through the interplay between the symbolic and social dimension of his architectural practice. Articulated through an inventory of references and motifs, the symbolic realm of his work is always interwoven with its utilitarian function: Utilizing “common space” as a point of departure and design tool, such references are assigned forms that facilitate both symbolic interpretation as well as a utilization purpose within the structural fundament of his schemes. The narratives of spatial sequence and volumetric build-up, the analogies to other morphologies or the architectural motifs are integral parts of the performance of his urban environment design.

The cues retrieved from Torp’s personal arsenal of architectural motifs are personal references, but often rooted in architecture culture and theory. For instance, Tjuvholmen as design bears resemblance to urban design concepts that accentuate the visual and physical experience of urbanity as basis for both understanding and designing cities. Most noticeable is the kinship with
Gordon Cullen’s concept of “serial vision,” recognizable in Torp’s narration of spaces.\textsuperscript{201} Kevin Lynch’s “melodic sequence,” a metaphor describing the sequential and composed variation of scales, colors, heights and articulation of facades also finds resonance within Tjuvholmen, present in both the visual material of \textit{Utsyn}, the rhetoric of Torp and in the formal diversity of the built environment. Furthermore, Lynch’s concept of imageability also finds resonance in Tjuvholmen’s language of form.\textsuperscript{202}

With reference to Castex et al.’s account for the evolution and distribution of architectural models, the Torp office’s use of the English village or their imposition of formal spatial sequences, can also be interpreted both in context of references such as Camillo Sitte’s Garden City, Haussmann’s Paris, or seminal works by H.J. Stübben, O. Wagner or H.P’s Berlage:

Taking Berlage’s extension plan for Hague, the build-up of a sequence initiated by a bridge, followed by an avenue, square and monument are in practice descriptive of Tjuvholmen allé’s staged arrival sequence.\textsuperscript{203} It illustrates how architectural references and methods drawn from architectural history are (consciously or not) implemented by Torp and attributed utilitarian and symbolic functions. The application of symbolic and utilitarian elements that structure and narrate Torp’s common spaces in Torp’s urban design is a consistent example of iconographic conceptualization of the urban environment as “basic form.”

\textbf{Iconography as cues and context}

The various forms of iconographic cues that strengthen the interpretation potential mapped above are by no means coherent and aligned, but display how different and distinct elements of symbolic significance contribute to a complex array of symbolic meanings, which, through connotation and convention, can be broadly interpreted. What I focus on here, however, is how targeted and strategic programming were used to provide identity, reach a specific clientele and convey a particular form of social centrality based on selected cultural expressions tied to symbolic forms of capital: Bøyum e.g. argued for a kind of “vernissage urbanism” where the galleries provided both a brand, and attraction and a means to activate ground floor areas.

The icon complex envisaged how the iconography of the museum both can be attributed connotations related both to form, program and creator, where the \textit{size} and \textit{name} of the building can be regarded as cues them selves. I also deducted that sites of social centrality apparently fulfill two symbolic functions: First, as something with symbolic significance in itself, through

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\itemsep-2pt
\item Legibility, or imageability refers to how an object can evoke mental images Kevin Lynch, \textit{The Image of the City} (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1960), 9 and 107.
\item Castex et al., \textit{Urban Forms}, 140. The relation between Berlage’s and Torp’s plan is not direct. A more probable link is their common reference to the English Garden city.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the attraction value of social congregation, and secondly, through the
symbolic use of social centrality that e.g. a museum or other civic institutions
allow for. Other cues involved how the design manual’s interpretation and
cementation of the Utsyn scheme into rules and designs, involving a process
of symbolic interpretation in itself. The outcome seemed to be that Torp’s
narrated voids and sequences became exceedingly rigid and regulated in
terms of use, through rules and design elements. However, to what extent
symbolic meaning can impose and regulate social behavior is more difficult
to answer based on the analysis conducted here.

Fig. 71 Holmen aerial photo. (Source: Sigurd Fandango)
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204 This refers back to Franck and Stevens’ account for “loose” versus “tight” space in urban environments. Franck and Stevens, “Tying Down Loose Space,” 2-34.
12 Tjuvholmen disseminated

The two preceding analytical perspectives, that first approached how Tjuvholmen’s urban environment was conceptualized as form, followed by how it was conceptualized as iconography, were both discussed in context of Torp’s architectural practice, Tjuvholmen’s development scenario and implementation strategies, and the political economic practices that primed the Tjuvholmen model. Similarly, “Tjuvholmen disseminated” is based on the observation that the urban environment of Tjuvholmen should be seen in context of the development scenario’s accentuation of the communication, branding and transaction of property. The discussion of Aker Brygge in Part 1 also displayed that already in the early 1980s, development strategies for the urban waterfront took use of media as a tool to gain momentum, attract investors and mediate Aker Brygge as brand. Here, it is relevant to question the role architecture and urban environment plays in such mediation processes. As architect Beatrice Colomina writes; “It is no longer possible to ignore how much of modern architecture is produced both in the media and as media, and how much of architectural practice today consists in the production of images.”205 Below, I approach the dissemination of Tjuvholmen from two perspectives, respectively as “image-text” and “unreal estate.” The first analyzes image-text in relation to the development of Tjuvholmen as urban environment, while the second address how this urban environment was conceptualized through different commercial channels of communication as “unreal estate.”

T J U V H O L M E N A S I M A G E - T E X T

In addition to Niels Torp+ Architect AS, the Utsyn competition entry encompassed several external consultants, including the London-based event bureau Event Communication that conceptualized the exhibition spaces, accentuating them as part of the harbor front’s diverse portfolio of culture
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The cooperation with the Danish museum institution Louisiana was presented through a letter of agreement, while architect Peter Butenschøn contributed with a conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as part of Oslo’s waterfront. Most importantly however, was Ole Christian Apeland from the communications agency Apeland Consulting AS, who was responsible for public relations and the project’s communication strategy.

**Image-text as communication strategy**

Ole Christian Apeland was first contacted by Selvaag CEO Olav Selvaag in 2001–2002 to facilitate Selvaag’s first entry to the Tjuvholmen competition named “Sjøen for Alle.” This project was based on the legacy of the Selvaag family: Efficient and economic large-scale housing complexes. Their second entry was called *Utsyn* due to its sight line southwards along Aker Brygge. *Utsyn* contrasted Sjøen for Alle through its sophistication and focus on culture, a deliberate differentiation meant to underscore both projects.

Apeland’s strategy was to give a “strong first impression” and create a “favorite” as early in the process as possible, something achieved by an appendix published in the newspaper *Aftenposten* on the exhibition’s opening day. When at the opening Oslo Mayor Per Ditlev Simonsen told Selvaag: “Well, I woke up with you in bed this morning,” the *Utsyn* team knew the strategy had been a success. According to Apeland, the communication strategy was based on teamwork with both the future owner group and their architect: “We did not influence the drawing material but selected those we found most effective. Then it is the ‘mood boards,’ of suited men that have removed their shoes, that made up the ‘emotional packaging’ for *Utsyn*.”

The only challenge was the architect’s own frame of reference, which Apeland feared might seem unfamiliar for most people.

Apeland’s first priority was to communicate that the owner group had the resources necessary for such a large endeavor, that the appendix defined the premises for the two projects, and that their different attributes were accentuated. *Utsyn*’s islands and its playful relation to the water were obvious arguments. Niels Torp’s legacy as architect was another: His former projects for British Airways and the Olympic stadium in Hamar, along with Aker Brygge were strong references. Selvaag’s philanthropic undertakings, that included over 500 sculptures placed around the city, the letter of
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206 Through references to the water taxies of Venice, the document exposed the potential for a ferry service linking the waterfront attractions (Bygdøy, Nobel Peace Center Museum, City Hall, Oslo Opera) with the future attractions of Tjuvholmen, including the Louisiana museum and the “Extreme North Science Center.” Selvaag Group, Aspelin Ramm and Niels Torp Architects AS, *Illustration Project Utsyn*, 2003.
207 The scheme was drawn by Narud Stokke Wiig, led by partner Gunnar Stokke, baptized *Everyone’s Water (Sjøen for Alle)* by Apeland, who by this underscored the “common man” to communicate the project. *Everyone’s Water* was meant to be an inclusive and low-brow project, with reference to the social democratic tradition of mass housing represented by the Selvaag Group. Apeland, interview, 2011.
208 Ibid.
209 Ibid.
agreement with Louisiana, and the collaboration with Event Communication gave weight to Utsyn as a culture destination. Apeland argues that this provided Utsyn with more credibility than its competitors.

But the communication strategy’s most central strategy was to partake in direct and personal communication on several different arenas: “It’s about being consistent in your message and expose what people are preoccupied with, whether it is financing, production or culture.” Announcements in the media were based on the analysis of the decision makers’ opinions, whom Apeland also provided material tailored to support the different sentiments of relevant politicians. Apeland asserted that the scale of the project involved so much documentation that the involved politicians would lose overview. The strategy was therefore to identify the strongest arguments and provide them in “bullet-point” form through personal contact: “If a politician were worried about privatization, for example, we would underscore the public accessibility to the waterfront. Our communication was trimmed in relation to the wishes of the city and its politicians.” Apeland stresses that by providing politicians with the right frame of reference, it was possible to override actors such as PBE.

Other interest groups were also confronted directly and at an early stage, as the inhabitants of Aker Brygge. For Apeland, this involved providing facts, information and arguments, and to “terminate resistance” at an early stage, before it reached the press. As Fjordparken became the only real competitor, a new strategy was articulated: Utsyn was branded as the “common man’s choice” and Niels Torp, Louisiana and Selvaag as a family-run enterprise was accentuated. When Utsyn finally prevailed, it was, according to Apeland, not only due to their architectural solutions and communication strategy, but also due to Fjordparken investor Linstow’s ownership of Aker Brygge: “While we had a Louisiana museum, they had a closed down IMAX theatre.” Further, Snøhetta’s disciplinary-specific Dutch references (such as waterfront Borneo Sporenburg in Amsterdam) did not appeal to the politicians. Torp’s Venetian references were far more graspable for the decision makers: “In the end, maybe the investors behind Fjordparken had too much trust in Snøhetta? You know, politicians are far more preoccupied in not making mistakes than achieving great things.”

The communication strategy if Apeland displays how forms of image-text, from newspaper ads, selection of specific architectural imagery, to the use of the architect himself as figurehead, was embedded in the Utsyn project from day one. Even the articulation and presentation of Selvaag’s second entries partook in this strategy. Apeland’s strategy also displays how the

\[^{210}\]Ibid.
\[^{211}\]Ibid.
competition format itself led to the projection of specific, urban narratives upon Tjuvholmen as part of their sales pitch.

*Utsyn as image-text*

The competition material was introduced with an aerial view of Tjuvholmen from the south, in the form of a hand-drawn illustration showing Dyna Brygge and the fan-shaped Holmen area. The drawing displayed the continuation of Aker Brygge and the canal that link the western Filipstad area with Pipervika, where the west-facing building facades contrasted Skjæret’s green landscape. The revised illustration included the Icon Complex. The two representations are, regarded as respectively a preliminary and an adjusted design scheme, strikingly similar. Some differences do, however, occur: The revised scheme displayed a more correct representation, not only in terms of the architecture of the development, but also in terms of its density and mass. Especially the Akerodden area renders denser than the original scheme. The competition material also featured before and after images, illustrating “important urban spaces,” “internal sightlines” and “important edges,” flanked by a map of the fjord landscape. In relation to an image that displayed “urban structure/green structure,” it is written “a network of streets and squares binds the new urban area together in a natural way.”

It was argued that the use of materials and colors “follows a masterplan for variation and multiplicity.” Finally, Aker Brygge’s promenade was seen a “dead end” both in terms of program and infrastructure, as well as being deprived of a “pinnacle of experience” (opplevelseshøydepunkt) due to the Tjuvholmen warehouses blocking the view southwards.

A central image in the material was a north-south section that visualized Tjuvholmen as a continuous mass, initiated with Aker Brygge and concluding at the southern Fjordpiren. The illustration was flanked by technical drawings illustrating parking alternatives above water. But also here, the section narrated the movement throughout the project as a continuous experience. The material also argued for implementing glass atriums that would accommodate movement during cold winter months. Here, references to Covent Garden, a “spectacular hotel” and an international art museum with a “surprisingly challenging location” is presented. Finally, the viewing tower is accounted for, as a signal structure, with reference to the lighthouses, viewing platforms and various monuments it could be associated with. The material was dominated by the characteristic drawings from the Torp office, flanked by a collage of references and sketches of lively urban spaces. In the final pages, it is written that “the area should be a
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composition,” simultaneously as the different parts should be given “different languages of form,” that “underline their distinctiveness and express their attractions.”

Fig. 72 Night view illustration of Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen. Utsyn illustration project, 28 May 2003. (Source: NTA)

**Utsyn versus Fjordparken**

In the description of the Tjuvholmen competition, it was established that the visual material representing Torp’s *Utsyn* was perceived as superior to most of Snohetta’s material, both in terms of its graphic representations and Plexiglass model. Studying the drawing material, it can also be noted that while Torp provided a clear narrative consisting of “hand-made” drawings that with ease depicted its urban spaces, Snohetta’s renderings had a professional, but “abstract” character. While the differences between the two may well be granted to Torp’s visualization skills and the communication strategy, it also seems like Torp’s vision for the urban environment and methods for representing them outperformed Snohetta’s more conceptual approach: While the former visualized and facilitated for experiences, the latter might demand certain disciplinary insights to reveal its intrinsic qualities. It can be tempting to ask whether Snohetta’s proposal for thematic diversity, the continuation of Bryggetorget southwards, a proposed “arena function” for the park, or the idea to integrate their island with Tingvalla-ustikkeren (A small pier extruding from the Aker Brygge promenade) became sufficiently communicated in the material. Granted that the two adversaries at an early stage distanced their combatants in the competition, the representational material of Torp was not only “better” in terms of quality, but also better adapted to the competition format itself, and ultimately, the development strategy for the harbor front: Only parts of the jury were trained architects, and taken into account the massive media coverage of the competition, Fjordparken’s communication strategy failed on several accounts.

While visual image-text dominated the competition material, text accentuated the drawings through references and allegories. The value of
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Torp’s townscape metaphors was exemplified on how it first was part of Torp’s conceptual framework to conceptualize Tjuvholmen, subsequently becoming a conceptual framework the owner group and consultants framed their development scenario within, before becoming part of a communication strategy towards politicians. But also Niels Torp himself played a role in the mediated narrative of Tjuvholmen, where a playful attitude combined with authority provided by his legacy as architect made the Utsyn rhetoric shine.

Fig. 73 Revised (2005) and original (2003) visualization of Utsyn. (Source: NTA)

Juridical image-text and urban form

The transition from Utsyn as concept to Utsyn as zoning plan meant that the urban environment envisaged by Torp was conceptualized into a set of binding zoning rules to secure the spatial qualities in the production phase. While multiple aesthetic, functional and spatial issues were addressed, the nature of the urban environment’s role as privately owned, public accessible area was not problematized. As discussed above, the competition developed into a polarized struggle between two combatants, where the conflict revolved around whether the jury decision to nominate two projects for evaluation by the city government was in accordance with jury rules. As a technical document, the jury’s evaluation became overshadowed by media controversies, the “people’s opinion” vote, and various political maneuvers. The critique bled out in the aftermath of the competition, and it was in 2014 that the recently-completed Tjuvholmen area suffered its first explicitly negative media controversy. The small harbor bath situated at Fjordpiren had drawn a crowd from all over the city that spent the long summer evenings at Kavringen Brygge. While open for all, the capacity of the area was far from
sufficient in terms of facilitating the many visitors. When the Tjuvholmen administration, through their security service, worried about the residents living adjacent to the waterfront and attempted to close the harbor bath at 8pm, the atmosphere became tense. To resolve the conflict, a local resident intervened and convinced the guards to reopen the premises. Visitors also experienced being expelled from the area, with the explanation that certain parts were restricted in terms of use after 11pm. A public outrage ensued, and newspaper *Aftenposten* wrote how the general audience was denied access to its long sought-after for harbor front, to the benefit of the affluent populace of Tjuvholmen. The controversy strengthened Tjuvholmen’s reputation as an exclusive and restricted enclave in the city. Gunnar Bøyum explained to the media that the area was private property, and that the residents had the right to be protected from unnecessary noise.\(^{214}\)

The core dispute was whether the fact that the area was a privately-owned residential area trumped the zoning of Tjuvholmen as “Public accessible traffic area” (Offentlig trafikkområde), and more importantly, the Norwegian “Public Right of Access” that secures access to privately-owned natural landscapes. Jurist Marianne Reusch said to *Aftenposten* that the Public Right of Access, as part of “Friluftsloven,” preceded the planning and building act, and was not adjusted to dense, urban environments.\(^{215}\) According to Reusch, the landowner could establish rules of conduct, as long as they are kept within the designated purpose of the area, but that ultimately, the municipality had the final say. The controversy opened for different interpretations, where the most obvious was that the zoning of Tjuvholmen as “public accessible traffic area” seemed insufficient when it came to securing public interest in privately-owned urban areas. While the legal documentation of Tjuvholmen revealed attempts by the planning authorities to alter and enhance the spatial qualities inherent in the regulation proposal submitted by Tjuvholmen KS, potential friction or conflict between private and public interests resulting from the juridical model chosen was, much like in the case of Aker Brygge, largely absent. (Only in one sentence, mentioned above, did PBE seem to address the potential conflict inherent in a dense, housing-based heavily programmed urban area, making it less attractive for families with small children).\(^{216}\) This leads to the question of whether the juridical tools for zoning were inadequate to secure public interest when

\(^{214}\) Olav Eggesvik “Er ikke klokken 8 litt tidlig?” *Aftenposten*, 26 July 2014.

\(^{215}\) Ibid.

\(^{216}\) The planning authorities had a particular focus on the quality of spaces in terms of volumetric build up, sight lines and dimensions of space, while the City Government for Urban Development comments on the “diversity and multiplicity,” of Tjuvholmen, and that it was a “window outwards.” Oslo Municipality, *Tjuvholmen. Zoning plan. Housing, retail, office, hotel, culture and recreation area. City Government Proposition 108/04* (Tjuvholmen. Reguleringsplan. Bolig, kontor, hotel, kultur og frisområde. Byrådssak 108/04), 2004.
applied to privately-owned, public accessible areas of the Fjord City: The focus on quality was not supported by an account of Tjuvholmen’s performativity as urban environment, and the latent conflict inherent in its private ownership model with a diffuse legal framework. There are, however, also other potential directions for this discussion to take: While there are several examples of public accessible areas that have rules of conduct, the zoning of Tjuvholmen’s common spaces seemed to spark a particular outrage among the public. The harbor baths of Copenhagen, for example, all keep similar opening hours without being subject to similar critiques, as with other restricted activities in dense housing areas (ball courts, etc.). This either pointed towards Tjuvholmen Sjøbad as a novelty in Oslo that both visitors and residents had to adapt to over time, or that Tjuvholmen itself is attributed specific connotations as a posh neighborhood that renders it especially vulnerable to such critique in media.

A third option, however, might be traceable in the urban morphology of Tjuvholmen itself: Unlike most beaches and baths along the Oslo fjord, the residents of Tjuvholmen dwell only meters from Sjøpiren, making such forms of interest conflict inherent in its urban design. From this perspective, attractions rendered visible through representations in the competition format applied, is not quality checked in terms of their spatial performance; in this case, the immediate balconies and residences surrounding the bathing facilities. Thus, the pier bath performs particularly well as atmosphere and image-text, but in practice renders vulnerable for any form of use that transcend the pre-programmed and limited forms of use.

Fig. 74  Tjuvholmen Fjord Bath, 2014. (Source: BLA)
T J U V H O L M E N A S U N R E A L E S T A T E

In the mediation of Tjuvholmen, architectural design intention was mixed with strategic intentions for design: Tjuvholmen’s preliminary scheme was an autonomous design, which facilitated the various technical, infrastructural and functional aspects of a large-scale urban development. But its urban environment was also conceptualized to win a competition and gain goodwill from a professional jury and several governmental institutions, and later, to be situated within a real estate market. Here, various design and communication tools, through different means conceptualized Tjuvholmen’s urban environment to commercially disseminate it within the real estate market.

Web mediation

While the media strategy of Tjuvholmen is reminiscent of the branding and launching of Aker Brygge, Tjuvholmen differs on a crucial level: While the Aker Group had DNC as a main investor and economic guarantor, they built the entire phase two before commencing with sales, worsened by the fact that their sales strategy with a list of potential patrons that soon proved unviable. Tjuvholmen, on the other hand, was sold and built as individual developments successively, utilizing the efficient media channels provided by the main portal for private real estate exchange in Norway, “Finn.no” and the development of individual and unique prospectuses for each building project.

Both projects, however, depended on utilizing media as part of a place-making strategy, and to identify and address specific target groups through different marketing management tools, several of which are described above. These target groups included investors and other potential patrons, tenants and tourists, but the marketing strategy also involved addressing decision-makers to politically legitimize their respective development scenarios.

As part of such strategies, different forms of image-text played a crucial role as mediator of Tjuvholmen as an urban environment in Oslo. That the mediation of Tjuvholmen was closely linked to the commercial products the area offered primarily in terms of real estate, has in the Tjuvholmen context been explored by Andrew Morrison and Synne Skjulstad. In the article “Waterfront Development with Web Mediation,” they coined the phrase “unreal estate” to describe online mediations of developments with Tjuvholmen as case.217 Discussing webpages linked to the Tjuvholmen

development, they explored how content is mediated through “coordinated artifacts and assembled persuasion.” By “artifacts” they referred to how the various design representations of sales objects were linked to marketed views in the Fjord city development and “a variety of visual and verbal representations.” The digital artifacts are seen as “intermediaries in the transition between actual physical worlds and imagined, projected ones.”

Tjuvholmen’s property marketing strategy was enabled by digital media, that allowed for an amalgam of interior catalogues, apartment prospectus sheets, event calendars, advertisements and practical information to be collected on one single webpage, that also contained links to external webpages. The page Tjuvholmen.no also became a tool facilitating the Tjuvholmen owner group’s wish for control over the initial real estate transactions, avoiding intermediary property brokers: The prospect for direct, online purchase straight from the developer on their official page opened for swift transactions and hence a further strengthening for the Tjuvholmen brand. Tjuvholmen.no was initially the site dedicated to present Snøhetta’s winning project Fjordparken (the Utsyn group did not go online before “Tjuvholmen.com” was launched in March 2003). In 2004, the Tjuvholmen webpage was updated and targeted towards potential patrons, and offered a registry for potential stakeholders to sign up. The sale started in 2005 and included 47 apartments in phase I. From now, apartments could in principle be bought online with the “push of a button.” During the sales and building period, the webpage was dominated by “coordinated artifacts and assembled persuasion:” Graphics framing the emerging opportunities in reality as new apartment projects were opened for sale. Here, online prospectuses provided an efficient introduction to the vacant sale objects as they were launched online with set prices. The interactive illustrations and images of the future urban landscape of Tjuvholmen provided an easy review of each apartment and apartment complex. As the areas gradually were sold and eventually completed, the webpage acquired a make-over where the sale of apartments was granted less exposure, towards a magazine-like interface where visitors choose between “food and drink,” “leisure and shopping,” “art and culture,” “real estate” and “events.” The webpage Tjuvholmen.no has the character of a visitor’s guide through an urban area, more than the commercial front page and bulletin board it made out during its years of production. In 2015, the it stated that: “Tjuvholmen is not like other districts. Nothing happens here without it being a plan behind it. And we do what we
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218 Ibid., 2.
219 Tjuvholmen.no was registered May 2001.
220 Tjuvholmen.com was registered in January 2003. The page that introduced Utsyn was in the beginning dominated by the job posting for CEO of Tjuvholmen KS.
can to grant you, the visitor, a good experience.” Tjuvholmen was now communicated not as an opportunity or reference, but as a quality-controlled urban environment with a distinct and cared-for identity, that performed as accounted for. And through web mediation, visitors also knew what they were “expected to expect.”

![Web-based apartment prospectus Tjuvholmen, 2012. The urban environment mediated as “prospectus.” (Source: TKS)](image)

At the core of the Tjuvholmen model lays the production, branding and sale of property, meaning that the urban environment is conceptualized through its different sale prospectuses. Two main prospectuses were developed, aimed respectively towards offices and housing. In the discussion conducted here, the main focus is on housing, that differs from real estate prospectuses in the sense that these are more pronounced in regards to defining the Tjuvholmen urban environment as area: In contrast to the official Tjuvholmen magazine, where, as Apeland referred to, office employees were depicted with their naked feet set in the local fountain, office prospectuses primarily focus on accessibility (infrastructure), secondly on opportunity (hotel, conference, facilities) and thirdly on the urban environment Tjuvholmen could offer. The sale and rental of apartments on Tjuvholmen were, and still are, facilitated by Tjuvholmen KS and their hired property brokers. This has given the owner group the opportunity to calibrate their
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222 Tjuvholmen.no, 2015. In 2016, a slightly more humble approach has been selected. Now, you are welcomed to “Our Island Kingdom of three islets.” Tjuvholmen.no, 2016.
223 Apeland, interview by author, 2011.
advertisement material to convey specific spatial and programmatic qualities linked to their apartment prospectuses. Here, the lingo of Tjuvholmen is distilled and calibrated towards the real estate segment meaning that the urban diversity accentuated in general image-text is in the prospectus material focused on the range of differentiated activities facilitated by the Tjuvholmen area. Reoccurring provisions include the common pool facility of the workout center, as well as the ever-present Astrup Fearnley Museum. From the prospectus of “Dyna Brygge,” it is written that:

We create the framework for a home you will thrive in. We’ve got the location, the housing plans, and we have created a vibrant neighborhood, that among other things include the finest art museum in the Nordics!224

Most thoroughly repeated, though, were the island feeling and the access to water, combined with the proximity to urban functions. As the prime quality of the area, fjord views are also a substantial economic constituent in realty management. Of Jensen and Skodvin’s apartment building, it was written that: “The Oslo fjord glimmers and the location secures proximity to everything. Five minutes to the town hall, direct ramp access to “E18” and the “Kavringen” lighthouse within swimming distance.”225 This mix of respectively representational (the town hall), practical (E18) and recreational (Kavringen) qualities of location is descriptive of how location also accommodated and connoted particular lifestyles. The focus on the vicinity to the fjord, and the activities linked to the sea shore of Tjuvholmen were also evident in the prospectus for the project Kavringen 1: “[...] The sound of rippling water and the Nesodden ferry is unavoidable on Tjuvholmen. No matter where you turn, it is water and nearness to the city.”226 At Landgangen 3, in their prospectus for 38 apartments “with cleat and balcony,” they obtained a slightly smugger attitude to appeal to potential sailors among potential patrons: “You can’t have your family closer to your boat.”227

The prospectuses of Tjuvholmen to a large extent make use of the same formulations to communicate outwards. Differences occur when the individual buildings areas are described. Here, the individual architects play a significant role in branding each building, through interviews with

reference to former work and media exposure: Of Kavringen 2–4 it is written that: “Torstein Ramberg’s style cannot be categorized, but his playfulness with geometry and care for quality is unprecedented. He shapes.” The prospectuses are by no account modest in their descriptions of Tjuvholmen’s architecture, as exemplified by “Lille Stranden 4:”

The materials of the facade are green, corroded copper, lacquered mahogany-colored wood and large amounts of glass. The glass and the mahogany reflect the light-play in the water and give the facade a glimmering nuance. The copper has references to the domes and spires of the city, and the corroded bronze and copper fittings of boats. The mahogany wood is associated with prominent ship interiors and elegant yachts. 228

Thus, like the amenities of its urban environment and waterfront facilities, the architecture of Tjuvholmen is also utilized as a branding tool. The transaction of apartments on “Finn.no,” however, focused more on the spatial quality, views and the urban condition of Tjuvholmen:

Oslo’s new borough Tjuvholmen emerges as an exciting, tranquil oasis by the sea. Unique architecture and magnificent outdoor areas are representative of the area. Its nearness to both nature and culture makes Tjuvholmen the ideal place if you prefer living by the sea - in the middle of the city. 229

The same advertisement also displayed knowledge of the groups targeted, and where they move from: “The apartment is unique. A villa on the fjord with an abundance of everything; we dare to claim that you won’t miss the single-family house.” 230 The reference to the villa hints towards how Tjuvholmen is to a lesser extent competing with similar urban environments around the city. Instead, its housing real estate draws patrons from upscale single family housing areas south and west of central Oslo, meaning that the narratives sold must be explicit and explanatory, as There are good chances that the future inhabitants of Tjuvholmen’s larger apartments are unfamiliar with dense city living. While Bøyum has insisted that Tjuvholmen is far more diverse in terms of population than people think, the prospectuses cement the notion that primary target groups were similar to other recent

228 My translation. Tjuvholmen KS, Lille Stranden 4 - Drawings and Prospectus, (Lille Stranden, 4 – Tegninger og prospekt), 2011. The formulation is representative of how a reference is established as narrative throughout the description: The product “mahogany-colored wood” is referred to as “mahogany” for the remaining part of the paragraph, as a reference rather than a physical material.
230 Ibid.
redevelopments along the urban waterfront: the upper middleclass “young-old.” Taking into consideration how the articulation and programming of the urban environment to a large extent also seem conceptualized to facilitate for these groups, the conformity often ascribed to Tjuvholmen can partly be attributed the references and priorities of this specific target group.

Fig. 76 Sales-prospectus “Kavringen Brygge 3,” 2010. (Source: TKS)

**Tjuvholmen as media**

The owner group produced three books related to the Tjuvholmen development, two of which were launched while Tjuvholmen was under development. The third volume was printed in larger format and displays the area “as built.” While the two others were, in spite of their book format, strictly promotional material, the last volume was set in a “coffee table” design, and sold in the architecture section of bookstores. The volumes, all written by Hugo Lauritz Jenssen and with images by Sigurd Fandango, narrated the story of Tjuvholmen, rich with interviews of the owner group, and central actors of urban development, including CEO Ellen De Vibe of PBE. Critical voices were also interviewed, such as Snøhetta’s Kjetil Thorsen and political scientist Erling Dokk Holm. While this final volume to a large extent consisted of material collected in the former two, it additionally had compelling drone-captured aerial photos of the
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231 The term is used by Deane Simpson to describe a growing segment of active elderly people of good health, congregating in enclaves in North American cities. Deane Simpson, *Urban Utopias of an Aging Society* (Zurich: Lars Müller Publishers), 2015.
development. While presenting Tjuvholmen in a book format is a natural manifestation of the effort behind and prestige of the development, the two earlier publications also can be seen as part of a sophisticated media strategy to consolidate meaning, internalize critique and gain the power of definition over their own development. These volumes can thus be seen as yet an instrument for nursing a narrative of Tjuvholmen before and during its production phases.

Parallel to the individual prospectuses, Tjuvholmen KS also launched advertisement material in the format of a magazine called “Tjuvholmen, life by the seashore, in the middle of the city” where, among others, architect Jan Olav Jensen was interviewed. Jensen was introduced by his idea for a “Leatherman architecture,” used to describe Tjuvholmen’s “least conventional housing project.” The interview also provided a setting for displaying the acclaimed buildings of Jensen and Skodvin Architects. The magazine further contained an inserted pamphlet that depicted a graphic abstraction of Oslo and Tjuvholmen, next to Paris’ Centre Pompidou, London’s Tate Modern and New York’s MOMA. Labeled as “the art borough” with the slogan “Let’s go art!” it framed Tjuvholmen among the most famed cultural institutions in the world. After articles about art and fashion, Hamburg’s HafenCity was visited in an enthusiastic article that explored similar European urban redevelopments. Before the magazine concluded with revisiting history and the former tower of Tjuvholmen and the “Vi Kan” exhibition of 1938, Renzo Piano is interviewed on the Tjuvholmen Icon Complex:

I think of a white color, so the roof becomes lit, like roofs with snow. Light light! I am still thinking. At night I like the thought of this building, this place, is like a sleeping being. The buildings belong to the sea – I hope children come here and exclaim, ‘Oh this is where boats area made.’ But it is always dangerous with metaphors. They catch you. We did not use the wharf metaphor in the beginning, but talked about a protective construction.

Illustrated by sketches, a portrait and an image of Piano’s well-staged office, the myth of the artistic, enthusiastic and slightly eccentric architect is cemented, utilizing the Piano architecture brand in association with Tjuvholmen. The use of architects as figureheads in advertisement strategies also reveals that the instrumental use of image-text is confined to “traditional” media.
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232 Tjuvholmen, Livet ved Sjøen, midt i byen, 01 2010.
The Tjuvholmen magazine is an example of a designed and “streetwise” channel of “infotainment” thought to evoke familiar references for a targeted and sophisticated audience. The magazine format is itself inscribed as part of the lifestyles linked to Tjuvholmen, where references to big names of big cities are less a question of comparison than of connotation.

**Tjuvholmen in media**

The general media coverage of Tjuvholmen has with few exceptions been favorable. The only truly negatively angled article series was the 2014 controversy on the use of “Fjordpiren” discussed above. And while the sales competition evoked numerous critical voices within architecture and academia that expressed skepticism to both the model for development and the process that led to Utsyn’s victory, the media focus has since primarily been on property. Tjuvholmen’s real estate prices soon became a media attraction in itself, further contributing to cement the exclusivity of the Tjuvholmen area. As an example, the newspaper *Dagbladet* in 2011 featured an article about “the country’s most expensive apartment” under the heading “For 38 million, you can go fishing on your balcony.” The headline’s kinship to the prospectuses and advertisement campaigns of Tjuvholmen are evident, and reveal how the transition of information across mixed media platforms underlined Tjuvholmen as an extraordinary area within the city. In this respect, media coverage has largely been favorable of Tjuvholmen, as reports on high sales and profits only seem to strengthen the Tjuvholmen brand from a real estate perspective.

In terms of Tjuvholmen’s culture programs, media has been favorable, and at the opening of the Astrup Fearnley Museum in 2012, few critical voices were heard. In the Norwegian context, the exception was from the credible but obscure art site Kunstkritikk.no, representing artists whose relation to Astrup Fearnley was already strained, and from Norwegian architectural magazine *Arkitektur N*, where the author of this thesis contributed with a critique of the building. In international media, the reception was mixed, and Icon Magazine labeled Piano’s building “bland,” writing that “Piano’s building is a tired and familiar formula: an internationally renowned architect and a city authority salivating at the


prospect of a new Guggenheim or Pompidou.” Olivier Wainwright of The Guardian was more forgiving about Piano’s architecture, but stated that “A place for art makes the city a better place to be,” Renzo Piano told me. But his pristine, finely-crafted Astrup Fearnley Museum conceals a corporate world of lobby art.” The authority the Astrup Fearnley gave Tjuvholmen among its target groups was less evident abroad, where the mix of iconic buildings and wealthy institutions focusing on art stars was less credible, and what is worse, represented an outdated strategy for urban development.

Still, the museum represents the only Norwegian private collection with an international reputation, and one can assume that bad reviews are better than no reviews, also in the context of Tjuvholmen. Astrup Fearnley’s biggest challenge at the time of writing however, (2015) is that only half of the estimated 250,000 yearly visitors have entered the museum, that despite its NOK100 ticket and symbolic lease fee proves more costly to run than accounted for. The resulting subsidies granted from the municipality have not been well received among the non-profit galleries of Oslo.

Fig. 77 Tjuvholmen as magazine, 2010 and “coffe table” book, 2014. (Source: TKS)

SUMMARIZING REMARKS:
From the BOF2000 competition to the prospectuses of Tjuvholmen, different forms of image-text have played crucial role to support, accentuate, focus,
describe or envision urban development processes. In the Tjuvholmen case, image-text was a central role throughout the entire development, and continues to be so in the daily management of Tjuvholmen. The discussion on Tjuvholmen as image text is here distilled to comprise two perspectives respectively addressing image-text as “intermediate” site, and as a “supplementary system” for the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen as urban environment.

**Image-text as “temporary site” for urban development**

The first section above exposed the strategic means of communication supporting the *Utsyn* project, where selected features were used to “spin” the project towards media and decision makers. Here, Fjordparken rendered inferior to the communication strategy, and the connotations provided by Torp’s illustrations.” It further envisaged the strategic role and impact of how Tjuvholmen’s urban environment was conceptualized as place in the competition material, contributing to ease the transition from vision to zoning plan with few alterations from the planning authorities. The image-text of *Utsyn* provided what can be defined as a “temporary site” for development: the media representations of Tjuvholmen helped establish the area not only as idea, but also as a future destination that could be attuned to a broad set of connotations and conventions, as well as political and economic goals. For the developers, this temporary site also was an opportunity for establishing a common set of ideals, goals and strategies for development. The account above for the use and function of various forms of image-text on Tjuvholmen further displays how architectural conceptualization, visualization and articulation becomes obtained as part of a marketing framework by the development group, utilized for promotional purposes. References, analogies and narratives developed “within” the project as part of an architectural development process thus became utilized as a “descriptive” account of the urban environment or a building’s attributes. By this, different forms of image-text blend, where the distinctions between the representational or promotional material merge. This parallel use of specific representations for disciplinary, political and commercial purposes is descriptive of the impact of image-text as “temporary site” in urban development scenarios such as Tjuvholmen.

The prospectuses of Tjuvholmen also rendered visible that while “unreal estate” accentuated aspects of the urban environment, this environment was also primed towards facilitating for “unreal estate.” It envisages how intertwined the real estate development model of Tjuvholmen and
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239 Richard Sommer labels urban design representations as potential temporary sites in a projects development processes. Sommer, “Beyond Centers,” 151.
Tjuvholmen as development scheme were, throughout the entire development project. In contrast to Aker Brygge, Tjuvholmen illustrated how image-text was integrated and utilized in all parts of a development process. Still, Aker Brygge’s intermediate events and programs marked a watershed in Norwegian planning, largely driven by Kjell Wester’s enthusiasm, that maintained James Rouse’s legacy in terms of charismatic leadership. Through Wester’s branding strategy, the industrial function of Nyland became an industrial image at Aker Brygge. But while the area’s historical buildings motivated this narrative, Tjuvholmen lacked the “hardware” to provide such an image. Historical awareness was instead conveyed through references to the former tower of 1938’s “Vi Kan” exhibition, and strategies, including naming its streetscape after historical places, lie Kavringen Brygge, maritime objects, like Kobbernagelen, (“the Copper Nail”) or Landgangen, (“the Gangplank”) and people vaguely related to the area like Salmakersvenn Marius Jantzens Plass. (“The saddler-apprentice Marius Jantzen’s Square”)

**Image-text as “supplementary system” for the urban environment**

Image-text as “temporary site” thus constitutes a platform that can generate debate, create expectation, attract investors and prime public opinion. But forms of image-texts also constitute tools, as “intermediaries in the transition between actual physical worlds and imagined, projected ones,” as Morrison and Skjulstad argue above. The use of image-text can accentuate specific qualities or atmospheres through various architectural representations, written narratives or other associative imagery. In this perspective, image-text attains the role of a “supplementary system” to the urban environment it refers to. The idea of “supplementary systems” in architecture was introduced by Francois Choay, who saw it as an antidote to what she perceived as the “semantic loss” of modern architecture. Choay argued that advertisements had become supplementary systems to architecture, which relied to an increasing degree on signs and symbols to communicate meaning. While not necessarily sharing Choay’s analysis of a “semantic loss,” in architecture, the concept is descriptive of how image-text supplements, strengthens or projects symbolic meaning on built environments, and can be in a continuous dialogue with the experience of physical urban space. This especially applies to digital media allowing for various forms of “augmented realities” or parallel use of multiple media while residing within the urban environment of reference. Building on the assertion of Gottdiener and Lagopoulos, that connotation precedes denotation, image-text participates in priming urban experiences, thus
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rendering the target groups of project-based urban developments crucial to identify. While advertisement campaigns and the material produced by Tjuvholmen KS might be overstated and glossy, the subtler messages implemented throughout the history of Tjuvholmen’s development constitute a coherent orchestration. Here, image-text acts as a “supplementary systems” that accentuates and facilitates particular experiences that ultimately affect and contribute to defining how urban environments are experienced. As stated on the Tjuvholmen magazine, “Nothing happens here without there being a plan behind it.”241 This supposedly reassuringly intended statement seems to distill Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as a tailored experience, where nothing is serendipitous. Here, image-text, as supplementary system seems to play a particularly important role as a tool for providing an enhanced cognitive experience: The curatorial work conducted by the owner group provides an almost didactic approach in terms of conveying the faculties of its urban environment and the experiences it caters to.

241 From Tjuvholmen webpage, Tjuvholmen.no, in 2015.
V Conclusions

Reflecting on the golf courses of Scotland, the protagonist of Hari Kunzru’s novel *Transmission* reflects that the course represents “environmental memory abstracted into universal signs.” The golf course envisaged a tendency towards the generic, stripped of content beyond its rules of use and the common connotations provided. Similar critiques are often aimed at urban environments such as Tjuvholmen, where industrial production processes, global trend towards spectacular forms of recreation and calibrated consumerism render waterfronts alike the world over: Legible, but inherently place-less. Such critiques also suggest that the private sphere colonizes the public to varying degrees. The thesis displays, however, how the interplay between private and public forces in urban environments cannot be simplified to such dichotomies. In context of this, the thesis’ account for the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen’s urban environment has rendered visible the intricacies and interrelations of architecture, urban development, political economic practice and new urban environments in the city.

The following pages attempt to distill the findings and discussions of the summarizing remarks into a coherent whole, based on four sections that each assess a central aspect of how Tjuvholmen was conceptualized and realized as an urban environment, and development model on Tjuvholmen.

First, I provide a short reflection on research material, methodology and process of the thesis, and some benefits and drawbacks with the research design of the thesis.

The second section, “The Tjuvholmen model,” defines Tjuvholmen as a development model in the larger framework of entrepreneurialist political economic practices of the post-Fordist economy.

The third section, “Reflections and refractions” condenses the findings of the thesis to five reflections, respectively discusses Tjuvholmen’s urban environment in context of its architecture, as and asset management strategy, as a site for (symbolic forms of) social centrality, as a narrative, and finally, as “community-prospectus.”

The fourth section, “The map and the terrain” examines the findings in context of urban theory on the entrepreneurial city and neoliberalism, before concluding with a remark on how Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen might constitute an epoch in Norwegian planning and urban development.

---

METHODS AND APPROACHES

The quest for finding an angle of research that both allowed me to address the public realm of cities within an architectural disciplinary perspective on urban form, led me to define and approach “urban environments” as sites representing the synthesis of architectural practice, real estate and urban policy. Choosing a morphological approach to urban form was coherent with this focus. Here, the “entrepreneurial city” provided me with a context for the morphological analysis to be developed within. But where French morphologists Castex et al. isolated their architectural models through disciplinary demarcation, Tjuvholmen and Aker Brygge were regarded within their framework of production, to envisage the reciprocity between architectural representations, forms and practice, and the development model applied in contemporary project-based urban developments.

In terms of iconography, providing a context beyond architectural practice forms and ideologies was also particular important: Traditionally, architectural iconography research has dealt with medieval architecture. This provided the studies with a context of reference for analysis. In this thesis, the entrepreneurial city became such a reference, for contextual interpretation. Iconography also became the link between built form and image-text in the morphological analysis, creating a discourse on the symbolic in context of the massive dissemination of Tjuvholmen. Here, Lefebvre and Castells also provided theoretical support for addressing “representational space” and the forces constituting it, delineating the study towards a focus on relations between form and the production of form.

The analytical topics of form, symbolic meaning and dissemination as method were also highly informative, albeit being somewhat challenging to operationalize: The often ideological framework of urban morphological research, the underlying, contested semiotic/semiological debates inherent in symbolic forms of meaning, or the less explored field of image-text are related, but originates and represents different fields. However, these categories, within the framework of the thesis, enabled me to approach and discuss architecture and urban development schemes in relation to the development model and political economic framework they were embedded in.

The somewhat eclectic theoretical framework of the thesis also represented a challenge in regard to focus and academic rigor. Thus, while the themes of this thesis discuss three decades of development through two projects, whereas one is the thesis’ main case study, further research on theses issues might benefit from being pursued within a narrower research framework: While highly informative for its discourse, the juxtaposition of
the one side diachronic perspective and subsequent historically founded analysis, and on the other; the synchronic analysis of urban morphology, has been challenging: While reaching for a historical coherence and overview in my outlines of thirty years of urban development, I simultaneously have been focusing on its fringes and details, where many of my findings reside.

Conversely, when addressing large-scale architecture and urban developments such as Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen, the broad-brush approach of this thesis might just also have provided insight otherwise lost within in a more narrow academic approach. Here, I especially refer to the reciprocities between urban development policy and ideology, how a development model is articulated, and architectural forms of practice that the thesis render visible on different levels. I also hope that from the perspective of urban morphological research, the study of the impact and nature of large-scale developments that encompass entire neighborhoods, can inform and expand traditions that historically have focused on analyzing the urban fabric through types and their formal characteristics. Uniting urban form with its development model is, in this regard, both a continuation and expansion of the field of urban morphological research.

THE TJUVHOLMEN MODEL

The three decades explored in this thesis are better described by continuous development and change, more than paradigmatic shifts: The successive unfolding of events that tie Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen together, reflects a time frame in urban planning defined by agents of change more than regimes of permanence: The years discussed, from Telje-Torp-Aasen’s initial proposals for Vestbanen in 1978 to the completion of Tjuvholmen 30 years later, showed how entrepreneurialist urban development policies were established through a chain of interlinked events related to new political reform, private initiatives and economic modes of conduct. Interlaced with these events were new models for urban development, and new forms of urban environments.

This thesis has attempted to render visible how an analysis of Tjuvholmen as urban environment can be inscribed within, and seen in perspective of such a model: The urban environment was as much a means as a goal for urban development at Tjuvholmen. The research also shows that while such a model was introduced and evolved at Aker Brygge, political reform and the “growing expertise of corporate developers” consolidated and streamlined this model on Tjuvholmen. The interrelations between the urban environment and its development model reflect Castell’s account for how societal forces create urban meaning, that is reflected by urban form, e.g.

---

how Aker Brygge or Tjuvholmen answers to specific aspects of the post-Fordist economy. The development model of these projects make out what Castells defines as “the symbolic attempt to express an accepted urban meaning in certain urban form.” As development model, they represent “systems of spatial symbolization,” where development policy, real estate development strategy and architectural expression coexist and interrelate.

The evolution of the Tjuvholmen model
What impressed Kjell Wester the most with the North American waterfront redevelopments was that they were “extremely compact compared to their turnover.”244 But where Harborplace drew investment to its adjacent areas as part of a larger redevelopment strategy, Aker Brygge was a stand-alone venture combining culture, education, commerce, retail, recreation and housing into one, large development scenario. Parallel to the development of Aker Brygge, the implementation of entrepreneurialist management strategies demounted comprehensive forms of urban planning, in essence translating the Aker Brygge development strategy to a municipal reference of practice. Throughout the 1980s, new planning practices placed the architectural project and the architectural rendering in the center for urban development. In a booming real estate market, the role of architectural representations as triggers for development became both a real estate legitimation strategy, and an instrument for urban regeneration.

A note of historical relevance here is that the redevelopment of the Oslo waterfront, unlike waterfronts in other cities, was motivated by the “frictional” vacancy of real estate, meaning that it was not the surplus of vacant land, but the political wish for reprogramming of active areas that enticed development and sparked the long-term conflict between the sector interests of the Port of Oslo and the political administration. This conflict of land use arose from the municipal needs to accommodate for a growing population. It could further be seen as emerging from the increasing disproportion between land value and land use, thus increasing the potential land pressure for commercial real estate development to take place. Furthermore, it can be seen in context of place-making strategies, the “culture economy” and the growing competition between cities. Common to these was that they could be regarded as inherent parts of a shift towards post-Fordist forms of production in which the change from material to immaterial forms of production, new production strategies (project-based urban development) and production sites (new mixed-use urban environments in the city) was the backdrop for both Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen.

244 Wester, interview, 2011.
Tjuvholmen’s urban environment and development model

There were few and relatively vague mandatory prerequisites imposed by the municipality in terms of how Tjuvholmen should perform as urban environment: It was the Port of Oslo that set the agenda for development, defined its goals, articulated the competition draft (admittedly in collaboration with PBE) and negotiated the price. Beyond the guidelines and injunctions found here, the competitors of the sales competition were free to articulate the scale and scope of their proposals. The goal of the Tjuvholmen competition can be seen as providing a development narrative that envisaged the political ambition for the area, which crystallized in either vague formulations of diversity and hierarchy, or directions in terms of apartment types. Lacking clear ambitions beyond developing the waterfront for commercial and recreational purposes, the City Government politicians clung to a strategy where large-scale attractions conditioned urban development. Through “the gift to the city of Oslo,” the Port of Oslo cleverly instrumentalized this “culture-urbanism” approach for its own strategic purposes.

The Tjuvholmen model provided an efficient and profitable development with little public expenditure and that relatively instantly established new arenas for production (offices) and consumption (recreation), revolving around an elaborately designed and programmed urban environment. The model allowed private actors to gain access to former public property, which was expanded, developed and managed as a private development. This implied a set of strategies that would ensure swift development, and create an appealing urban environment from day one. At the core of these strategies was the creation of an urban environment that was conceptualized to facilitate a series of strategic dispositions throughout the process of defining, winning, producing, selling and managing the Tjuvholmen area.

Reflections and Refractions

Utsyn provided the owner group with a legible project suited the competition format, the subsequent production phases and the dissemination and branding of the project as destination in Oslo, where its street-based narrative of squares, promenades and paths easily was appropriated by its users. As a scenario for a new and distinct urban environment by the waterfront, its architectural representations set estimates for both building volume and footprint in the zoning phases.

The urban environment as architecture

The most striking aspect of Utsyn as proposal and Utsyn as built is their similarity. At large, with a few modifications, Tjuvholmen was realized much in coherence of what was anticipated, with a few exceptions: First, the
Icon Complex introduced a new scale and conceptual approach to Utsyn that challenged Torp’s design concept. Secondly, the replacement of the Akerodden Hotel deprived Utsyn of a central conceptual feature in terms of organization, programming and iconicity. Thirdly, the owner group’s projection of aesthetic multiplicity overrode Utsyn’s “unified diversity.” Finally, added building volume challenged its urban design, making Utsyn more crammed than Torp ideally preferred. In spite of these changes; the legibility of Utsyn remained intact, much to the credit of the competition framework, and how the project was articulated parallel to, and in context of, the owner group’s own assessments that participated in its development. And much like Torp’s previous large-scale schemes, it evolved through an autonomous architectural process implementing client demands en route. This resonates with Duffy’s account for how blending functions display kinship between the office and the city, but also their similarities as development models. Thus, the kinship between large commissions in the city is not only driven by commodification processes but is as much about the organization and strategies for application, as it is about the “applications” them selves.

The urban environment as real estate

The conceptualization of Tjuvholmen’s urban environments as real estate builds on this premise. But where Wester’s initial curating of both material and human resources on Aker Brygge was an attempt at place-making by means of the city’s social fabric, the urban environment of Tjuvholmen (and today’s Aker Brygge) consists of largely streamlined and predefined amenities and experiences set to brand Tjuvholmen as destination and autonomous district in Oslo. Here, Torp’s design framework became the fundament for a wide set of “cues” that, through different means, contributed to the totality sought after, further strengthened by owner group’s calibration and control the urban environment through programming and branding strategies. It was these ideas that made the corporate developers of the owner groups call themselves “city builders.” This conceptualization of the urban environment as inherently a real estate asset management strategy characterizes the Tjuvholmen development. It balances what Florida labels “territorial assets” to an increasingly the destination-conscious audience, and Sassen’s “city-ness;” The conscious consumers’ wish for serendipity, diversity and unpredictability.

While the owner group seems genuinely interested in the project they created, pleased by how their ideas manifested as urban environment, and

---

245 It is telling that Norwegian Property, after the refurbishment of Aker Brygge, hired an “destination manager,” whose task was to “make it into a district more than a mall” Wasim K. Riaz, ”Skal pusse opp Aker brygge for 2 milliarder,” Aftenposten, 13 June 2013.
open-minded towards how it could have been done differently, asset management demands predictability and growth. So while the potential of large-scale private development such as Tjuvholmen resides in the owners’ capacity to subsidize and curate their urban environment, its Achilles heel can be found in the question of how to maintain equilibrium, and nurse its destination brand. While this top-down approach ensures that certain well-established norms concerning urban form (e.g. walkability and mixed-use), and are fulfilled within the area, the development lacks the structural backdrop of organic growth and multiple ownership Jane Jacobs argued for. Instead, attempts are made to construct the ideal outcome of such processes. Nevertheless, as Bøyum stated, the alternative to strategic programming on Tjuvholmen would be generic chain stores. In context of the political economic practices Tjuvholmen was conceived within, its art-cluster concept is perhaps the best one can hope for.

**Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as (symbolic) socially centrality**

The research also envisaged that the political, architectural as well as commercial approach to Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen’s urban environments revolved around concepts for social interaction and congregation. As a prevailing ideal within the planning and development of Oslo’s Fjord City, forms and expressions of social centrality converge within political and economic goals of development. While social centrality (meeting places, attractions, promenades, retail) was a pre-defined political goal, an objective defined by the architect and owner group, as well as a strong incentive for increasing real estate value, symbolic social centrality describes those features, forms and function that accentuate, represent or narrate the urban experience through convention. In Torp’s articulation of Tjuvholmen, forms of social centrality were catered for through spatial arrangements and sequence tied to conventions of use visitors could identify and associate with. Another example is the Icon complex, which convey symbolic social centrality linked to symbolic capital. As a landmark and culture institution, the Icon Complex merges forms of social congregation with art and international art-culture symbolizing a sophisticated form of social centrality. Symbolic forms of social centrality are embedded both as part of Tjuvholmen’s physical iconography, or through the various “supplementary systems” that encourage, narrate or control forms of social interaction.

---

Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as narrative

The resonance between commercial and political rhetoric found in project based urban developments with regards to the urban environment have, in the case of Tjuvholmen, tended to abridge discussions on what social centrality entails in privately-operated urban environments. In stead, the focus have been on the general and beneficial amenities offered the public that approach Social centrality from the perspective of recreation and entertainment more than social addressing how to cater for e.g. different social groups. However, the research also points to how the simplifications of otherwise complex discussion on forms of “socio-spatial interplay” can be regarded as inherent in the development model and its framework: The competition format both imparted and required a simple narrative, as did the subsequent lobbying period. The illustrated, spatial narrative supported by the project rhetoric also became the basis of political approval and zoning. Finally, the conceptualization of Tjuvholmen’s spatial and programmatic amenities into a curated experience targeting towards specific sets of users similarly condenses potential multiplicities of use and expressions to a balanced and calibrated scheme. Furthermore, the lack of municipal involvement from both politicians and planning authorities beyond consultancy and juridical control did not challenge the scheme as urban environment.

It is not Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as current day experience that necessitate critique, but its performance as strategy: The potential lack of performativity to obtain economic, political and social shifts and changes was exemplified in Aker Brygge’s development, that went from representing structural diversity of program and inclusive social strategies that involved students and artists, to the generic mix-use of its current day shopping center configuration 20 years later. In the perspective of large scale ownership and transaction of properties between corporate developers, the responsibility granted and felt by agents like Gunnar Boyum and former Aspelin Ramm CEO Peter Groth is less relevant, notwithstanding their ambition and competence as developers.

Tjuvholmen’s urban environment as community prospectus

Where the Aker Brygge presentations in 1984 sketched the outlines of a lucrative real estate development venture, similar illustrations of Tjuvholmen actually produced property: A substantial part of Tjuvholmen was built on reclaimed land, and Utsyn was the “temporary site” of which the zoning plan was based. Utsyn’s seamless integration of architectural design, development scenario and communication strategy made out a sophisticated real estate development strategy, may best be illustrated by its apartment prospectuses that condensed the urban environment into targeted messages on glossy paper: Here, the Tjuvholmen narrative was slightly tweaked from referring to
spectacles and congregation, towards accentuating community and belonging. The prospectuses rendered Tjuvholmen as a community within reach of the amenities of the city center, but with the tranquil qualities of living in a tranquil waterfront neighborhood. Such “best of both worlds” scenarios can be criticized for inducing privatization, where attaining a “fulfilling balance between privacy and social life” motivates patrons. Here, community becomes a “seductive substitute for public life,” stripped of the “discomforts of the unfamiliar,” where private and public merges by combining familiarity, identity and control, leading to an “embourgeoisement” of civic life.247 The point here, however, is to point to the potential impact of housing prospectuses on new urban environments: Regarding Tjuvholmen as an inherently prospectus-driven development strategy, its prospectuses does not only trade apartments, but implicitly also the urban environment they reside in. As seen above, such prospectuses need to convey a pre-accepted performance: Particular amenities or functions whose value finds consensus in the market. In terms of housing, this is typically the balcony, whose market value is nearly context independent. While urban environments are more difficult to place within such categories, the configuration and calibration of the Tjuvholmen area might just exemplify such forms of pre-accepted performance conditions an area under development, as part of a “prospectus-driven urban development.”

THE MAP AND THE TERRAIN

An important aspect of the research has been to identify agents, and their roles and goals within urban development processes. Here, Wester and Stilluf Karlsen were influential and visionary individuals whose impact on the politics of the urban waterfront was substantial. Niels Torp and partners showed how personal architectural ambition was linked with professional conduct in areas such as Aker Brygge, exemplifying the impact and relevance of architectural designs in urban development processes: Tjuvholmen illustrated that while maneuverability was limited by demands of revenue and the economic prerequisites set by the Port of Oslo, Selvaag and Aspelin Ramm developed an ambitious scheme where every detail was catered to. They launched a watertight development scenario that became an indisputable success, measured by the political criteria set by the municipality and Port of Oslo, the economic criteria of real estate development, and the satisfaction of its target groups.248 As a privately managed enclave, Tjuvholmen has nursed a brand where the population and its affluent inhabitants have appropriated the urban environment as a

recreational destination in the city. Thus, as corporate developers, the owner group enthusiastically seized the mandate and responsibility deprived the sidelined planners at the planning and Building Services in Oslo. Hence, the delineation of Tjuvholmen as a private development venture involved the owner group in a manner reminiscent of private building commissions. But Utsyn also provided a narrative that gained political backing, not only rooted in the will for urban renewal, but also seemingly in a genuine support for the urban environment Tjuvholmen represented.

This points to an apparent inverse proportionality between increased political power of control and definition of content: As the reforms in urban development policy in Oslo were guided by new governance management principles that called for political “steering” and market “rowing,” the political resources released could hypothetically have been invested in a focus on specific goals or strategies for urban development. I find little evidence that this has been the case with regards to the Tjuvholmen development: Neither political ambition nor public debate resulted in defined visions for what regeneration of the urban waterfront could entail for the city, beyond its obvious economical and recreational values.

**Entrepreneurialist theory and research practice**

The thesis was introduced by a quote from Phil Hubbard addressing the “myths and meanings” of the entrepreneurial city. The quote was a critique of the lack of site-specific research within urban theory, projecting theoretical models on urban developments with disregard to the specificities of the contexts discussed. With Tim Hall, Hubbard emphasized that place promotion and branding strategies rather should be seen in context of local reception and interpretations, and obtain a more elaborate understanding of the relations between economy and culture. For Hall and Hubbard, a more in-depth study of the urban environment as space would contribute and nuance the critique of the entrepreneurial city.

The thesis has followed this call, and rendered visible a more multifaceted image of the entrepreneurial city than often portrayed, as in the case of David Harvey, introduced in the first chapters of this thesis. Theoretical knowledge of entrepreneurialism and the neo-liberal city have informed case-specific, morphological research on the urban environment, providing a backdrop for theoretical reflection and problematisation. While many of the findings are coherent with entrepreneurialist theories on the city, it also displays how these theories benefit from being informed and balanced by case-specific knowledge and regarded through context-specific chains of events: The research shows that while “traditional” dichotomies between public interest and private demands for revenue are relevant conflicts to be explored, the in-depth analysis of entrepreneurial strategies on Tjuvholmen unveil a set of
mechanisms that provide a “higher resolution” for articulating critique of the entrepreneurial city, and ultimately, discussing remedies for its flaws: While the ideological framework of entrepreneurialism is global, the thesis envisages the specificities of local context, where abstract political economical systems of practice crystalize in concrete events, agents of change and architectural forms of practice that become inherently diverse.

This reflect Hubbard’s claim that new urban environments must be regarded as more than mere spatial manifestations of entrepreneurialism. While such projections risk fitting the terrain to the map, the case specific research conducted here discussed how such environments, inscribed in a particular development model, can unveil a set of mechanisms presents within the “systems of spatial symbolization” of urban development in the entrepreneurialist city.

At the end of the line?
The development of Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen covers three decades of urban planning, initiated by large economic and structural societal shifts in the 1970s. The inauguration of this epoch might best be represented by 1978: This was the year of comprehensive Norwegian fiscal reform, where deficits led to large-scale layoffs and effectively shut down the Nyland wharf. It was also when Telje-Torp-Aasen Arkitektkontor AS did their first sketches for Aker Brygge. Throughout the years to come, the reforms discussed above transformed the building sector. The demounting of public housing as welfare provision was from the mid-1990s contrasted by the growth within real estate in general, and the housing sector in particular, that, due to tax rules, was, and still is, a particularly beneficial investment. New management strategies and affiliated ideologies meant the municipality largely retracted from interweaving urban development beyond strategic plans and visions.

In recent years, however, we see a possible change of approach both in planning and politics, including the recent political shift in Oslo, where a Labour Party-led City Government is supported by the Green Party and Socialist Party, after 17 years with conservative rule. The discharge of Chairman Bernt Stilluf Karlsen also might envisage a new political attitude towards how the waterfront is developed in the future. Preliminary development plans for Hovinbyen northeast of the city core also indicates an increased will to explore alternative planning tools, including municipal acquisition of property for strategic use in urban development processes.

249 I select a specific year for the sake of argument. It could also be 1973, where the OPEC oil crisis and global recession finalized what is called the post-war period in Norwegian Politics, or 1985, where, according to Harvey, “Entrepreneurialism” become a global phenomenon and ideology for political economic practice.

250 Most evidently exposed by the sale of municipal property to private developers successively the last 20 years. In spite of what often is argued, the Oslo politicians have both the power and latitude to control urban development in the city.
In the context of the larger backdrop of sustainability and an unstable economy, such indicia might point towards a revision of traditional entrepreneurialist strategies, within a new “post-liberalist” frame of political economic practice.251 With this in mind, Tjuvholmen might represent the last truly private, project-based development project. From this perspective, the waterfront redevelopments Aker Brygge and Tjuvholmen manifest the initiation and conclusion of an epoch in Norwegian planning and urban policy, resulting from privately-operated, prospectus driven, culture-oriented commercial real estate, revolving around particular forms of urban environments in the city.
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