

the historical associations as a form of brand image. The architecture of these new building types developed out of pioneering conservation projects that successfully adapted former industrial buildings to commercial use. Projects such as Boston's Faneuil Market Place and San Francisco's Ghiradelli Square had highlighted public sentiment for their local heritage, in contrast to the prevailing neutral internationalism of city development.

The projects were created at city scale, large enough to have an impact on a big derelict area. They became a unifying symbol for city dwellers, who were able to identify with the new/old neighborhoods rather than the declining whole. The underlying aim was to lift the self-image of areas of cities formally associated with decay and failure and to underpin a fresh optimism with popular new development. The waterfront was recognized as "the missing ingredient" which made it all work as one. Instead of a series of attractions there was the continuity of the waterfront shoreline with a rich history of development and association.

Historic preservation and waterfront development

With hindsight the challenges look much less daunting than they were to the pioneers of waterfront redevelopment. In the 1970s nobody knew how to go about protecting large bodies of water and big industrial complexes. The conservation of a large-scale landscape of dock buildings and industrial waterscapes required new development strategies. The physical challenges of individual structures were difficult to assess as the sites were often developed on marsh or reclaimed land with foundations that were not to contemporary standards. Harbor walls and service infrastructures had been designed for different purposes and were in many cases time-expired. The historic waterfront comprised not only buildings, but also structures, dock walls, historic artifacts and signs of different materials and periods. Below ground was an infrastructure assembled in a way that reflected former work practices and original topographical features. Hidden from view were the legal issues, such as rights of access, and liabilities of many sorts. There were often complex patterns of division with multiple leases and assemblies of small parcels of land and property in different ownerships. The potential for new use was affected by changing standards of safety in the workplace, of what constituted a hazard or a pollutant and the physical ability of the original structures to take change.

There was the need to find new uses appropriate to buildings designated as historic structures. Accommodating the car, together with access for modern services, was a major problem. More generally there was a need to assemble a range of facilities to attract and service the new users. New uses brought with them their own standards and regulations ranging from levels of natural light to fire protection and means of escape. The financial uncertainty of not knowing exactly what would be found when a structure was altered was increased by the difficulty of predicting the level of demand for a type of property that had not previously been marketed. The marketability of the location was affected by the provision of new infrastructure and services that were the responsibility of other service providers, often with their own budget problems and priorities.

A clear view of what constituted historic fabric or a historic area was not