

**Technical visit 2: Nurturing the hidden champions of medium-sized cities,
 case Regiopolis Rostock
 INTA42 Congress – 20 September 2018 – 14h30**



contact: stefan.krause@rostock.de

technical visit 2
 TRANSFORMING INNOVATION - INNOVATIVE QUARTERS; HIDDEN CHAMPIONS & CO

OVERVIEW MAP

shipyard hall 207-concert hall
 Mau - cultural centre
 stage 602-theatre
 Centogene - biotec world wide
 competence centre - sustainable building and construction
 institute for new media education
 projekt.space / creative industry grass root association
 highschool for music and theatre

quarter for growth and innovation

To Rostock's main structure for the innovation related ecosystem belongs beyond others: Rostock University, divers University related private institutes; High School for Music and Theatre, 2 technology / business incubators, 2 existing Fraunhofer research institutes (a 3rd under development), 2 Leibnitz institutes, central states office for shipping and hydrography and a lot more.

INTA
 ROSTOCK
 ROSTOCK

INTA42 WORLD CONGRESS
 19. - 21. 09.2018

visit led by:
 Mr. Stefan Krause, Rostock

Städtebauliches Konzept für das Wohn- und Sondergebiet Am Südring „Groter Pohl“

4 | Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligung Blestow
 Hansestadt Rostock | November 2016

Technical visit Rostock 2: Nurturing the hidden champions of Regiopolis Rostock; urban quarters and areas under development for social, economic and technical innovation

How Regiopolis Rostock can become more successful in the competition for talents, experts and high potentials? First steps towards a strategy: Living close to the city center and working on "high potentials with entrepreneurial affinity" fare from usual "technology center approach" and the usual middle class' individual solutions: Constitution and settlement of a metropolitan city milieu in the Regiopole Rostock; living and working preferences of pioneers of new urban living, dwelling and working styles; functions, structures and processes, tools ...

Situation 2018

The Hanseatic city of Rostock used the years after 1989 to develop into a prosperous Regiopole. Now the situation is better than expected, but: the increasing prosperity of Rostock, cause a housing "shortage" combined with increased willingness to pay more for the same; grown popularity of the residential and business location Rostock instead of sub urb middle class settlements; as well as in favor of urbanity, changing time spirit and its new lifestyles, lead to a sustainable and differentiated demand of residential and commercial spaces, a new urban mix.

Rostock was planned in the 1980s as a city of 250.000 inhabitants. So Rostock has still its own land potentials for urban growth. For this reason, living and working locations for the next generation should first and foremost be tailor made and presented with the highest common benefit. One family houses on 500 m2 plots cannot be the solution, but what kind of building and ownership meets the needs?

Rostock has neither a complete and steered innovative eco-(nomy)system, nor an established hidden champion milieu, nor a concept (San Sebastian), but starting aiming and strengthen with a key factor for competitiveness: the competition for pioneers, front runners, trendsetter, influencer of social, economic and technical innovation.

One of the lessons of successful community development of the last 30 years is: in particular "high potentials", that means highly qualified younger people above the social average with a high degree of -beyond others- autarky, empathy, further and deeper network-relationships, thus high social and economic innovation capacity, are increasingly the driving force of municipal-community development. It can also be observed: particularly young "high potentials" (as pioneers of new ways of life, dwelling and work) leave Rostock after their higher training and education phases, because –some short before or most already in family start up phases- a lack of appealing offers for both is in Rostock not given. Approximately 75% of university graduates leave the city because they - usually already in a solid partnership or enjoy well established social bonds and appreciate the special urban location qualities- do not find any offers corresponding to their life planning, their living- and working style on the housing and job market in Rostock. Most of them would like to stay in better perspective (for both).

A high degree of individuality, community, neighborhood and collegiality in spatial proximity is increasingly demanded by "high potentials" – the future hidden champions. This pioneers lives quality, uniqueness but also (highest possible) autonomy and low hierarchies. We

assume that tailor made living and working conditions in the Regiopole than in metropolitan areas could be offered. They shall reduce the exodus of young "high potentials" in favor of the Regiopole Rostock; motivate selective immigration from metropolises.

Standard solutions do not need special attention, but those privileged locations on which the interplay of living and working in a particular community –enjoying an appealing and integrating urbanity. How to deal with this (nearly) black box?

From muddling through into a professional approach

We would like to discuss planning and process control methods under discussion in favor of the Rostock Future Plan in order to keep pioneers of a local "high potential" milieu in Rostock on a permanent basis; thus, to prevent the excessive emigration of in Rostock trained potential key persons, respectively, to promote immigration of highly trained future key persons.

How to create an innovative eco(nomy) and socio-system for the Regiopole Rostock?

On the one hand is the existing hypothesis that well defined physical locations, as well as clear social and institutional structures and corresponding business models play an important anchor function for such a system/environment; on the other hand: only under (participation, even activation), places get their own appeal if they addressed by representatives of the target milieu itself and social, spatial and institutional structures for sustainable social milieu creation and for upgrading and strengthening the community as a whole given, maintained and well managed in general; even running do not happens for this development target.

New practical and theoretical knowledge, examples are required; this not least against the background of new value structures of young "high potential" milieus with their unique new ways of life and work.

Such municipal development challenges can be responded not only to conventional construction and planning standards and object promotion. No longer disadvantaged groups of people - even milieus - but young and gifted "high potential" pioneers are to be networked, located and addressed in their own way of life and work. The challenge is: with the least amount of municipal support, the critical mass for a young –and the whole local community influencing - regiopol' front runner milieu (of e.g. high potentials, startups, spin offs, free lancers, creatives - and complementary (social) innovation related bodies) is to generate. A subject and object related support program has to be focused to social milieu and location specifics. In this regard, it is already clear, -with reference to initial preliminary investigations for building and investment plan obligations- that it is absolutely not aimed a new technology center, but very likely the innovative proximity of living and working in a specific collective environment of an almost self-chosen informal neighborhood and collegiality. How to foster the potentials of still not so assertive non-technical and non-medical business talents?

Location options for growth process

a) Groter Pohl; B-plan Südring (start of investment approx. 2020)

In 2019 ff., the minimum requirements for commercial space, living and special needs of "high potentials / talents" will be created on the 30ha site between the main railway station track, the technical University campus and large housing estate. Essentially, Rostocks technology-related companies will satisfy their own growing space requirements at the new location. Correspondingly, Rostock's housing cooperatives want to offer attractive apartments at moderate prices. For the target group of high potentials, startups, spin offs, talents, creatives stands a local anchor investor (non-profit) "gun at foot". A Rostockian nonprofit and public weal managed nonpublic "private" university is intended to bring about site synergies between the innovation building and the new commercial and residential investments, especially from the proximity to the state's university campus.

b) **Beading:** Peter Weiss House (culture Centre; Project Space (grass route initiative creative business), Company de Comedy (NGO, free theatre initiative), Institute for New Media (NGO-education body), University of Music and Theater (leading world level; state), Campus Altkarshof (local architects offices with open doors for coworker and partners), Warnow Campus in Osthafen (ideas searched for, suggestion for central states gardener fair 2025)

Since the 1990s, the University of Music and theatre and the Institute for New Media have been –as anchor investors- located and were developed into institutions that are indispensable for the establishment of aimed top performers and key persons.

Questions to our guests:

1. Which key elements of economic ecosystems are needed (yet) to speak of an innovative ecosystem in Rostock? High potentials/talents and co: How to create the critical mass for self-sustaining growth? How much lead and support demand does self-development for this young milieu?
2. All kinds of innovation in the regiopolis city; how do we induce social and economic innovation in correspondence with technological innovation? How can municipal projects contribute to this?
3. Emigration / immigration of potential key persons; where is the optimum? Can these coveted target groups only be tied to locations through subsidies? How should we plan and manage self-sustaining milieu development in an optimal way?
4. What analogies and differences of "social city" projects exist to innovation milieu/ecosystem projects? How should object and subject funding be organized by the city?
5. How to communicate goals of and costs for "tailor-made exclusivity" to make it inviting for groups above the social mid on the one hand in relation to the overall objective of "social cohesion in the community" to become majority? Which kind of approach seems to tackle both aims?