Purpose
This study aims to investigate the attitude towards shared space in an urban context with a particular focus on meeting facilities. The Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge is used as a case, as this organisation has a vision of sharing facilities to stimulate regional development.

Design/methodology/approach
The attitude towards shared space in the Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge is studied in a three-step qualitative research process. An initial survey investigated the City of Knowledge’s members’ attitude towards shared space in general, a workshop further explored motivations and practical needs and a second survey investigated the attitude towards shared meeting facilities. The Brinkø Typology of Shared Use of Space and Facilities is used as the theoretical framework for the study (Brinkø et al., 2015).

Findings
This study shows that the respondents are very positive towards the concept of shared space but more reluctant when it comes to sharing own facilities. A majority of the informants are often using externally owned facilities for meetings and events and prefer professional meeting facilities to schools, universities and sports facilities. This points to a need for developing relevant service concepts, if a shared space strategy with focus on meeting facilities were to be used to increase the use rate of existing buildings not already intended for this use.

Originality/value
This study adds to the so far limited amount of scientific knowledge on the topic of shared space, by investigating the attitude towards shared space among a specific group of people, in relation to the use of external meeting facilities.
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