Waterfront
Sines
Waterfront revitalisation from local to regional perspectives in Hamburg and Barcelona

The EWWU-Workshop 2012 took place in Sines, south of Lisbon. In a way this offers a perspective of dealing with waterfronts not only on a project-based scale but also on a regional scale. While waterfront redevelopment started often on a small scale, project-oriented, incremental basis nowadays it is integrated into a regional more sustainable perspective. Two examples of this extending dimension will be discussed here.

Seaports are not only vital economic drivers, but also provide great urban settings. They are important image makers and offer unique features in the context of competition between cities. No two seaports are alike. All cities on waterfronts, coasts, rivers, canals and lakes have their own face, distinct character and individual history. They have different geographical conditions, technical possibilities, historical development, access to the hinterland, property ownership and constellations of stakeholders (Schubert 2008: 29). The seaports themselves have specialised land uses. Ferry ports, fisheries, shipbuilding, ship repairing, transhipment, seaport industries, navy and military all have specific location requirements and relate to their urban contexts in different ways.

Changes in (seaport) cities are taking place at a faster pace than we can perceive, appraise or analyse. These transformations are less the result of planning and design than the expression of (global) social and economic processes. Cities reflect the complexity of modern society. Discontinuity and inconsistencies are a chief constant, and cities are becoming increasingly amorphous, unordered, illogical accumulations of people and buildings. Geographer David Harvey developed the term "fixity and flow" as a paradigm to characterise relationships and contradictions, the spatial flow and motion on the one hand and more static elements such as the urban fabric and the built environment on the other (Harvey 2005). Waterfronts offer perfect empirical case studies for this theoretical concept.

Waterfronts and embankments are places where these inconsistencies become evident. Rapid succession of industrialisation, deindustrialisation and post-industrialisation can be paradigmatically analysed in this context. These zones in particular mark the built spatial and social shifts from industrialisation to the knowledge-based economies and post-industrial society (Marshall 2001: 5).
After a period when derelict areas were negated and neglected, they now represent unique opportunities (often close to the city centre) to advance the process of transforming cities for post-modern society. Rivers, ports and cities have many points of interaction, are often the hub of the local economy and an important factor influencing socio-cultural changes and spatial restructuring processes. Seaports have always occupied an important role in the economic and cultural life of nations; they were, and still are, fascinating culmination points of history, economy, society and culture.

The transformation process of ports and waterfronts can only be understood in the context of world-wide economic restructuring, changes in dock labour and the urban spatial frameworks of cities and ports (Hoyle 1989: 430). During the late 1960s, the formerly close functional and spatial relationship between ports and cities began to loosen. The type of work in ports has changed (de-casualisation) and often the ports have moved seawards away from the city centre. Changing conditions for port logistics and containerisation of the transhipment of goods (Witthoff 2000: 14) have advanced the rationalisation of handling activities and the spatial relocation of functions formerly linked to the harbour (Löbe 1979: 268). The interfaces between ports and cities show significant changes in land uses, economic activities and in the building stock (i.e., from ships to chips).

A shift in attitude and the new value attached to (derelict) port and waterfront zones has recently become evident in the change of public opinion and positive media coverage. Some decades ago, harbour areas still had negative connotations of being dangerous and noisy places for the handling of cargo (Priebs 1998: 20). Some sections of the ports were privatised and inaccessible customs areas or security zones cut off others from the city with fences and walls. Consequently, harbours were set apart from the daily life of the urban population. Port areas, waterfronts and access to the water’s edge have become highly desirable (Bruttomesso 1999). Harbour areas had not been addressed by urban planning for many decades and were perceived as “no-go areas”, dangerous unsafe zones, “facades of ugliness” but as well as diasporas and stepping stones for newcomers. The discourse on appropriate strategies for handling such potential development areas has stirred controversial debate on the theory and practice of planning goals and priorities. Gordon stated that “the definitive book on waterfront has not yet been written” (Gordon 1998: 96).

Cycles of transformation and (re)development

The term “re”-vitalisation of ports and waterfronts straddles a range of meanings attached to very diverse processes and plans. While port planning includes (internal) port development measures such as the reorganisation and relocation of port uses, urban planning is now concentrating on changing former port economies to activities such as services, tourism, leisure and housing. Terms like quay, waterside and embankment describe areas, buildings and facilities formerly associated with ports. Revitalisation, however, has no precise definition, but embraces a complex field of changing uses, rejuvenation and regeneration, redesign and remodelling at the intersection of diverse interests that are connected at the interface of city/country - port/water. Hence, the terms revitalisation, change of use and development are often used synonymously.

The cycle of dereliction, neglect, planning, implementation and revitalisation of old harbour areas as well as the necessary construction of port infrastructures are part of a complex network of stakeholders and interests. Derelict waterfront sites offer opportunities for new sustainable uses that no longer require sites close to the water. New waterfronts in particular mirror globalisation processes and have become locations for work, housing and recreation favoured by the “creative class” (Florida 2005, Peck 2005) in knowledge-based societies.

Everywhere efforts are being made to compensate structural changes in cargo handling, ship building and seaport industries, as well as the consequential loss of employment by way of revitalisation projects that exploit structural changes in an attempt to modernise the urban economies. Although there are is a great variety of influences as size of the project, local and regional office and housing market, timeframe of planning and implementation, approaches and targets chosen for regeneration and context of governance and planning cultures roughly a similar sequence of developments can be noted:

- dereliction, relocation of terminals and port uses
- neglect of derelict areas
- planning, concepts and designs for sub—optimally used former port areas
implementation, construction

revitalisation and enhancement of port areas and along waterfronts.

Generally, transformation began in the oldest parts of the ports and cities, with small projects such as converted warehouses, and slowly moved to more peripheral areas that were redeveloped later. Initially, a step-by-step approach was often taken, beginning with the most attractive sites, but not integrating developments in a sustainable urban or regional (re)development strategy. The thesis of this paper that defines this process as a new cycle is examined in comparative studies, while reflecting the complex problems at the macro, meso and micro levels. In the context of stronger competition between seaports and the challenges of globalisation, waterfront redevelopment has to be integrated into a city-wide and regional research perspective.

Much experience of transforming central urban waterfronts has been gained in the meantime. However, the targets of the projects are not adequately defined and it is not clear what the indicators are for best practice and “success stories” (Breen and Rigby 1994; Breen and Rigby 1996). Often this kind of project-based “research” is done with local studies and merely comparing the situation before and after revitalisation. As not much trans-disciplinary comparative research in this field is available so far, such studies offer opportunities for identifying different structures of decision-making processes, different types of urban (re)development and diverse socio-cultural conditions (Wolman and Ford III and Hill 1994: 838).

The dereliction of older port areas and waterfronts, often dramatised in Europe and implemented much quicker in Asia (Schubert, 2007b), is part of a “normal” process that will, at best, lead to their rapid re-utilisation. But in Europe the revitalisation of ports and waterfronts often takes several decades, from the time of disuse to the start of redevelopment. However, water sites have specific features that can delay swift regeneration.

Contamination, difficult sub-soil conditions, existing maritime architectural heritage or industrial conservation sites and pioneer vegetation that has grown since the site has fallen derelict, are but a few factors that may delay or hamper construction and add to the costs. During this period the constellation of stakeholders, (party) political constellations, governance structures and the market can (repeatedly) change. Designing for “end users” who are not known at the time, or who will emerge or change at a later stage, makes the planning and implementation of such projects more complex.

World-wide waterfront revitalisation projects can be distinguished into different phases (“generations”). The “first generation” emerged in the mid-1960s in the North American cities Baltimore, Boston and San Francisco, where problems of derelict, underused port areas first became apparent. The new planning task meant that a “learning by doing” or “project-led” approach was frequently adopted. New uses often included tourist facilities, hotels and offices (Harvey 1990: 93). At the beginning of the 1980s, when dramatic changes occurred as containerisation took hold, more seaports started waterfront revitalisation projects in a “second generation.” These projects were commonly larger in scale and dimension, again providing a mix of offices and leisure facilities along the waterfronts. This period of deregulation often resulted in a “sameness” of sites from Sydney to Toronto. Similar architects, planners and developers dominated the scene; developments were repeatedly criticised for resembling “concrete curtains” along the waterfront.

By the beginning of the 1990s, a “third generation” had evolved adopting a different approach. In European seaport cities such as Oslo or Gothenburg, a participatory planning culture was used and the local population integrated into the planning process. A step-by-step process involving design competitions and masterplans was introduced to lead the way in restructuring former port areas. Events like the Olympics or cultural and leisure facilities such as aquariums or museums (Bilbao) helped to promote the redevelopments. At the beginning of the new millennium, the “fourth generation” of projects emerged. Private-public-partnerships and professional planning management dominated the global competition between waterfront revitalisation projects. These projects were exploited for new city-marketing strategies which were founded on their unique seaport heritage. During this phase (luxury) housing and mixed-used developments became more widespread. Although the boundaries between the four generations overlap, they still provide useful categories for different waterfront revitalisation strategies.

With the dereliction of port and waterfront areas new future-oriented uses were introduced that no longer required water-related sites. Apart from offices and mixed-use projects, housing was put up as refurbishments or new builds. Housing development, if possible catering for a mix of different market segments, appears to have a long-term stabilising effect on regeneration efforts along the waterfronts, since it does not rely on events, seasonal or daily fluctuation of visitor numbers but has permanent residents. Many of the restructured waterfronts were developed as recreational facilities with tourist attractions that draw in large visitor numbers.
Meanwhile a lot of experience dealing with waterfront revitalisation has been collected worldwide. Often the central waterfront areas, with older and sometimes listed buildings, most attractive for tourists as well as for developers have been re-used and sometimes (several times) been redeveloped again and again. As this task is more or less done in many seaport cities and taken as an exercise now other more peripheral areas are waiting to be redeveloped in the future. Often these areas are larger and heavily contaminated, the sites tailored different, buildings are of low-grade and these zones offer no public transport.

In this article these perspectives are described for two important European seaport cities. Although there is a great diversity of implementation, results, planning cultures and future planning strategies in European seaport cities similar developments into a more regional perspective of waterfront redevelopment can be verified.

### Comparative Statistical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Seaport</th>
<th>Inhabitants city</th>
<th>Inhabitants region</th>
<th>Containers handled TEU</th>
<th>Start of project ca.</th>
<th>Spatial strategy dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1,578,546</td>
<td>4,233,638</td>
<td>2,610,037</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>1,777,373</td>
<td>4,266,000</td>
<td>9,889,792</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>part of city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Barcelona

Catalonia’s capital is the second largest city in Spain, with a population of 1.5 million and a region of around 4.2 million – similar to Hamburg. The port handles approximately one quarter of the containers of Hamburg and Rotterdam. In the mid-1980s, it experienced a remarkable boom. Without benefiting from the "capital city bonus", Barcelona transformed from an industrial town into one of the most important cities for the service sector in the western Mediterranean region and one of the major destinations for city tourism. It has rediscovered its maritime side after building numerous new parks and reclaiming its beaches, and now offers an exceptionally high quality of life for a large city. In 1986, Barcelona won the bid for the Olympic Games 1992, which acted as a catalyst for urban transformation and simultaneously provided a stage for self-representation. This gave the city a contemporary image that would redefine its position on the map of increasing competition between cities. A new metropolitan self-conception emerged with the urban planning of Barcelona (Meyer 1999: 128). The concept of a
compact and mixed city (predominantly infill) was combined with large-scale urban development components.

Like in many other seaport cities, restructuring measures in Barcelona started in the oldest district close to the centre. In between the old town and the oldest part of the harbour the fourteen-lane Passeig de Colom formed a large barrier. After port operations and transhipment had been relocated away from the mole, the opportunity arose in the context of plans for the Olympics to convert the Moll de la Fusta into a promenade. The proposals envisaged the segregation of traffic into a lower level for through traffic with parking decks and bus and taxi lanes delineated with rows of palm trees, plus a level for local traffic. An elevated viewing terrace with kiosks and a promenade formed the heart of the new scheme. It was designed as a pedestrian area covering traffic lanes for long-distance transport and a multi-storey car park. A system of bridges and steps provided pedestrian links from the old town to the port.

The development was the first and most spectacular project of Barcelona’s opening towards the sea, which since has been followed by other projects in addition to the complete redevelopment of the old harbour Port Vell (including an aquarium, Rambla de Mar, IMAX-cinema, Palau del Mar and the leisure centre Maremagnum and myriad restaurants). This “island” is reached via a footbridge in the south and has vehicular access through an underground car park in the north. The redevelopment of Port Vell gave up the former harbour character in favour of consumerism, attracting predominantly international visitors. This “fun city” was modelled on the festival market places in the USA. A busy promenade now leads from Placa Catalunya along the Ramblas to Port Vell. The construction of the World Trade Center, an office complex in the southern section of Port Vell, and a modern cruise and ferry terminal completed the reconstruction of the inner city section of the harbour.

“[…] restructuring measures in Barcelona started in the oldest district close to the centre […] a system of bridges and steps provided pedestrian links from the old town to the port.”

The (sometimes controversial, urban design-dominated) debate on Port Vell and single buildings near the city centre pushed other important regional redevelopments into the background (Busquets, 2005: 413). Commercial zones and cargo handling were relocated south, away from the centre, and together with the trade fair, wholesale markets and the airport are now part of a logistics centre in the estuary of the River Llobregat. With good rail and road links between the port and airport, the intermodal transhipment hub for cars, oil, chemical products and containers could not be better positioned.

Redevelopment was continued at the northern beachfront. Barceloneta, to the north of Port Vell, was included in the improvements. It is a densely built-up area of former fisherman’s and dockers’ housing that was for a long time associated with crime and prostitution. The (partly) illegal shacks (chiriñiquitos) and fish stalls were replaced during the reorganisation of the beach zone (Calbet i Laura 2006: 370). The reasonably priced fish shops were driven out by the new “gentrified” gastronomy. The marina at the Olympic Port further to the north is used to capacity, but the shops and restaurants around the harbour are not very busy. Access to Poblenou, located further inland, is not easy and links between the beach and residential and commercial areas difficult due to heavy traffic on the coastal road.

The redevelopment of the waterfront is paradigmatic of urban development policy in Barcelona. The perspective of “cleansing” and “sanitizing” combined with new attractive public spaces (“positive mestases”) and so called “acupunctures” soon became a model for other European cities (Wüstenrot Stiftung Hg. 2008). The transformation is based on small-scale interventions and infill integrated in a long-term urban and regional development strategy.

The focus is now realigned on brownfield sites in the “second row”. The district Poblenou (once called the Catalan Manchester) has turned into a modern place for high-tech enterprises. The neglected and/or sub-optimally used areas and buildings are here now transformed into an innovation centre. The large site is subdivided into several blocks that extend from the inner city up to the north-eastern districts. It is earmarked for redevelopment and improvements comprising single blocks and block clusters between the Rambla Prim in the north and Gran Via de les Corts Catalan in the west, the street Marta in the south and the sea in the east and is bisected by the Avinguda Diagonal. The alignment of the ring road will reduce through-traffic in Poblenou and reveal new development potentials. The privileged location opens special opportunities for redevelopment; from all parts of Poblenou the beach and the sea are within walking distance.

The River Besos on the northern periphery of the city was renaturalised. The transformation of Barcelona’s waterfront ends exactly at the city boundary, where another large-scale project, the Forum 2004, has been completed. The large
The urban regional and spatial redevelopment of Barcelona is part of a specific “design culture” that has architectural and design ambitions.

Diagonal alignment (“Diagonal Mar”) through the chequerboard pattern of the Cerdà Plan from 1859 has now been “finalised” at the seafront and the Besos estuary. The “Forum Universel de les Cultures” forms an end point in a new sub-centre which comprises another marina, an amusement park, residential and office buildings as well as hotels. In contrast to Port Vell, and despite its peripheral location, the development is less commercial and more culture-oriented. A five-kilometre long promenade extends from Port Vell via the Olympic Port to the “Forum”, drawing the city towards the sea. The water quality has significantly improved and Barcelona can now advertise assets not commonly found in large cities – sun, sandy beaches and the sea.

The economic structural change towards service industries and knowledge-based societies forms the economic background of the urban redevelopment. Barcelona has strong historical design roots to build upon, from Ildefons Cerdà to Antoni Gaudi. Being unique and distinctive was always a part of the Catalan identity amidst Spain (Landry 2006: 263). With a string of new projects Barcelona has repositioned itself as an international location for post-industrial urban renewal (“city not suburb”) in the competition between cities (Marshall 2004: 19).

The fostering of economic structural change through urban development policies sets an example for other regions and metropolitan areas. It attracts large scale investment and is integrated in long-term innovative urban development policies. The urban regional and spatial redevelopment of Barcelona is part of a specific “design culture” that has architectural and design ambitions. The combination of urban design together with big events became a successful strategy for city-marketing. Based on new management structures and a new “urban regime” which embraces a broad elite of social groupings, a “private sector-led style” has emerged in urban governance. Commercial demeanour, economic approaches and professional urban marketing of the “entrepreneurial city” have given Barcelona location advantages (“Barcelona model”) in the exacerbated competition between cities. As being the capital of Catalonia Barcelona brings together diverging interests and unite them to larger regional goals, “city between two rivers” which includes the whole urban waterfront.

Hamburg – from “String of Pearls” to “Leap across the Elbe”

This comparative perspective looks at Hamburg, Europe’s second largest port with a population similar to that of the Barcelona region and about one third of the London region. Like in other seaport cities, the oldest facilities and infrastructures from the mid-19th century near the city centre became vacant or underused in the 1980s and the port moved seawards where new container terminals were built.

Hamburg is a tidal seaport city on the estuary of the River Elbe, one hundred kilometres upstream from the North Sea. Its specific topography is shaped by the confluence of the smaller River Alster and its tributaries into the Elbe. The city is characterised by the Lake Alster in its middle and the port with ocean liners on the Elbe. Germany has a rather short coastline. Its few ports, and Hamburg in particular, have a gateway function to a large hinterland. After the end of Cold War Hamburg regained its central position as the most eastern port on the North Sea and as a gateway to the Baltic Sea. Most of the port is owned by the city of Hamburg and governed by the Hamburg Port Authority (HPA). It is perceived as part of the urban infrastructure, and the capital investments in quays and harbour basins, the maintenance of the shipping channel and its dredging are transactions accounted for in the city’s budget.

The waterfront along the northern shore of the Elbe, with splendid views towards the shipyards and ocean liners, plays a special role in Hamburg. When its port-related activities declined, public attention became increasingly focused on new uses. In the early 1980s, the northern shore of the Elbe comprised a heterogeneous mix of land uses with buildings from the mid-19th century (“black spots”) to the post-war period. The upgrading of this waterfront area raised high expectations. New uses had to be found, identification points created and attractions for citizens, visitors and tourists established. Revitalising measures on the waterfront were expected to have a positive impact on the city. The best locations were attractively presented to companies and investors looking for new sites. A catchy name was found for the site between Neumühlen and the Speicherstadt: “String of Pearls”. It was assumed that applying a coherent strategy for the whole area would be difficult, but that several spectacular projects based on a market-led approach would generate enough thrust and, consequently, higher land values which would upgrade the area.

Since then, a number of building projects have significantly enhanced the northern Elbe bank in the past two decades. The long periods of time that pass from riverfront sites falling derelict to surveys, designs and implementation works, are due to different reasons specific to each project. They might be structural problems (district authority, senate), hierarchical decision-making (top-down-hierarchies), diverging interests (urban development – port development), lack of acceptance (interest groups – investors), relationship conflicts (administration – citizens) and party political conflicts. The enhancement and restructuring of the northern Elbe bank is a success, although the establishment of different types of uses and mixed neighbourhoods could not be achieved (Schubert and Harms 1993, 150). The implementation of the projects
was not strictly governed by planning requirements, but by the availability of plots and developers' interests as well as investment considerations. Buildings have a great variety of uses and the architectural designs stem from different periods and planning contexts. The metaphor of the "string of pearls" suggests that there had been an urban planning concept, but it was not coined until the project was already under way.

HafenCity differs from the "string of pearls" in that it is the most important urban redevelopment project in Hamburg – the most significant "reclamation" of the (outer) city centre for housing in Germany – and one of the largest projects of its kind in Europe. The HafenCity re-establishes the connection between the River Elbe and the city centre, giving Hamburg a new direction of growth, down to and along the river. HafenCity extends from the Speicherstadt (Warehouse District) to the Elbbrücken, the bridges across the river. For the first time, a large area will be taken from the port and put to other than port-related industrial uses. The borders and gates of the customs in the free port had to be relocated elsewhere in HafenCity. The existing site covers approximately 155 hectares, without any housing, but both old and new operational port facilities. It is surrounded by several neglected housing estates, the wholesale market, industry, port facilities and railway lines. Hamburg has adopted a plan-led, mixed-use approach for HafenCity. Following a competition for a masterplan, specific districts were designed with a focus on offices, housing, shopping, recreation, etc. In a way, HafenCity is a latecomer project, where planners tried to avoid the mistakes of other waterfront revitalisation projects, such as London Docklands.”
infrastructure are based on these figures. The area is within the Elbe flood plain, making built and organisational solutions for the protection of people and buildings indispensable.

The Masterplan specifies the phased implementation of developments in sub-districts. It lays down the principle development sequence from west to east, avoiding uncontrolled construction activities throughout the development area. A zoning plan for HafenCity’s first phase was already drawn up in 2000, and land sales started in 2001. A development agency was devised in 2002 and the first buildings completed by 2004. The newly founded GHS (Port Area Development Corporation, later HafenCity GmbH) is responsible for the area and the implementation of its projects. A typical quango (quasi autonomous non-governmental organisation) was set up in order to speed up the development which soon owned most of the land.

The federal state government fosters opportunities for growth in Hamburg and its metropolitan region ("Metropolis Hamburg – a Growing City"). HafenCity being its flagship project. In 2006, plans for the future centre (Überseequartier) of HafenCity were finalised. Construction of the characterist mixed use development began in 2007, starting with a new metro line. In 2008, the Maritime Museum was opened in Speicher B. Most spectacular is the project of a concert hall (Elbphilharmonie) on top of Speicher A. The landmark project will be completed by 2011, but has already attracted a good deal of international attention.

A new strategy was started with a more regional perspective. “Leap across the Elbe”. The Elbe island Wilhelmsburg is the centre of a large-scale urban redevelopment strategy for improving the housing and living conditions within the area. The International Building Exhibition (IBA) and International Garden Show (IGS) will be held here in 2013, and speed up the step-by-step approach to regeneration.

Another development axis and urban connection is planned from the city centre via HafenCity across the Elbe to Wilhelmsburg and Harburger Binnenhafen (Harburg Riverport). Wilhelmsburg, Europe’s largest river island, will become the focus of iconic urban design projects. The Elbe island, which in the past had to bear the burden of urban development, should now be enhanced with waterfront sites between the rivers Norderelbe and Süderelbe. Amidst these poles and bridge heads, Wilhelmsburg Mitte should develop into a new centre. But most importantly, the Reiherstieg, canals and the watercourses in Wilhelmsburg should become its new “life veins”.

In the context of the political key concept “Metropolis Hamburg – Growing City”, the “Leap across the Elbe” in conjunction with the International Building Exhibition and the International Garden Show take on a central role (FHH 2003). For more than 60 years, the proposition of Hamburg’s chief planner Fritz Schumacher had been followed in allocating sites for housing on the higher grounds of the gaest and port-related or industrial uses on marshland. This paradigm had defined Wilhelmsburg (central work area) as a place for port extensions and industrialisation prior to the Groß-Hamburg-Gesetz 1937 (Greater Hamburg Act 1937). The traditional urban development axis in an east-west direction along the Elbe was now complemented by a north-south axis.

Ranges along Reiherstieg and the southern banks of the Norderelbe are (still) mainly occupied with port-related and industrial uses, while the eastern side has a range of different residential neighbourhoods. Flood control structures and the noisy transport arteries crossing Wilhelmsburg lend it the character of a transit space. Conflicts between port uses, new terminals, the relocation of the dock railway, the cross-harbour link (Hafenquerspange) and new residential areas are inevitable. It is assumed that the “Leap across the Elbe” is a task that will span one century, occupying at least two generations.

Plans for the transformation of derelict waterfront sites in Hamburg started with a project and architecture-led incremental approach along the northern river bank. Conflicts arising between urban and port development were dealt with case by case, among the authorities and stakeholders. Rapid implementation of building projects was the prime goal. HafenCity implied a jump in scale and a more complex implementation strategy formulated with one developer and a project embedded in (part) urban perspectives of inner development. The implementation phase was predicted to last about 20 years. The “Leap across the Elbe”, on the other hand, reorganised the urban perspectives for the entire city. Using architectural projects, the geographical centre of Hamburg should be moved from the periphery into a new centre by means of a diverse range of projects and plans that are part of a long-term strategy. Initially, the existing building stock will be selectively enhanced and distinct innovative projects incorporated into an overall urban design concept (“perspective incrementalism”) which will restructure the interface between port and city.

“The postulate to stop thinking in terms of “city or port”, but of “city and port” instead, incorporating aspects of sectoral and comprehensive regional planning, collides with harsh reality.”

| Waterfront revitalisation from local to regional perspectives in Hamburg and Barcelona | Paper |
Conclusion

When more than 30 years ago discussions began on the redevelopment of derelict and sub-optimally used harbour sites, it was assumed that this would be a specific and unique planning task. Using experiences from Boston and Baltimore the new post-industrial waterfront was imbedded in a re-invention of the city image. Especially the waterfront was the place where the transformation from the industrial and fordist city to the post-industrial and science based city could be recognized, in a way the shift from ships to chips. Baltimore Harborplace and the “invention” of the “festival marketplace” (1979) by the developer James Rouse (“Rousification”) was seen as a model, the “global prototype of waterfront regeneration” (Ward 2002: 342). In the 1980s a lack of experience in Europe, unclear responsibilities, a bad image and wait for possible future uses allowed “pioneers” to exploit niches for their own purposes. Soon this was followed by single redevelopments of (often listed) warehouses and the conversion of the architectural heritage dating back to early industrialisation into lofts and expensive private apartments. Soon it became clear that standardised regeneration models (“do a Baltimore”) are not delivering the best local solutions. The partly mono-functional and small-scale approach to redevelopment of central port and derelict waterfront sites has now been integrated in large-scale strategic perspectives. Waterfront sites are “only” used for the development of important components in comprehensive urban and regional concepts. The examples discussed in this article illustrate this. Although waterfronts are important elements for redevelopment and unique image factors for urban marketing they are now often integrated in Europe in a sustainable medium-term and long-term perspective of regeneration together with other brownfields, transport and landscape planning.

The distribution of resources and power between terminal operators and logistics enterprises as “global players” and the cities and ports as “local actors” has become more and more unbalanced. Whilst the attention of large logistics companies is increasingly concentrated on investment returns and global optimisation strategies, (seaport) cities must consider local medium to long-term perspectives for the development of their ports and urban areas. Today, the flow of goods is managed from business locations far from the ports. Important terminal operators such as the Port of Singapore (PSA) or Dubai Ports World act globally with a focus on horizontal and vertical integration, offering their customers bespoke logistics services. The part of global terminal operators (transnational terminal operating companies TTOs) has significantly increased during past years (Juhe 2001: 143). This has led to more short-sea transport being handled in terminals that are also owned by the shipping companies.

The postulate to stop thinking in terms of “city or port”, but of “city and port” instead, incorporating aspects of sectoral and comprehensive regional planning, collides with harsh reality. Merging the terms competition and cooperation into co-optation signifies a joint approach that is, however, still wishful thinking. It is important to leave behind romanticising and nostalgic views as the planning of cities and ports will increasingly follow different development parameters. The future development in coastal regions and seaport cities is thus dependant on the interaction and development of the global economy, transport and ship building, nature and the environment as well as climate change and, ultimately, the citizens’ interests. The conflicts of interest in costal regions are similar all over the world – amplified by global development trends in the field of logistics – and are expected to grow rather than lessen in the future. Architects’ visions as well as the covetousness of the real estate industry and urban developers, egged on by the media to convert harbour and waterfront sites into promenades and attractive housing, offices and cultural facilities, clash with the requirements of port logistics and economies.

The largely automated terminal operation and the ISPS Code (International Ship and Port Facility Security Code) have made ports into high-security zones, strictly controlled and with limited access. This in turn implies the reversal of centuries of development: cities need their ports, but modern container ports no longer need cities; its outdated structure has become a hindrance to future development. The perception of port cities as one organisational and spatial unit consisting of city and port is replaced through decoupling and spatial specialisation.

The flagship projects described above are the mega projects of Europe. They were, and still are, an integral part of their respective national planning cultures, urban regional housing and office markets and globally established real estate and project management structures. At the same time they document perspectives of European urban development from monocentric to polycentric (regional) cities (Saitel 2008: 2344). Although the ambivalence, fragmentation and social
polarisation continue to be significant at a small-scale, they are embedded in large spatial contexts. This new strategic orientation can be identified by the status attached of the projects: they no longer are local-led, but regional or government-led.

Spatial planning has thus gained in significance. Although city marketing is primarily concerned with landmark projects by “star” architects, they are now something more than important components within the whole city. The implementation of integrated and sustainable regional and spatial planning policies on the other hand is linked to different political traditions and planning cultures in Europe. Mostly the countries that have anticipated the increasing competition between seaport cities and, in response, adopted forward-looking regional strategies and new governance structures involving the relevant private and public stakeholders will succeed in the long-term.
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