always easy to produce. Most structures did not match existing definitions of the historic. The character of small, compact historic areas was relatively easy to define, but that of large industrial estates was very different. The conservation process was itself uncertain. One of the arts of large-scale conservation was to know when to allow demolition and when to fight for preservation.

More intransigent were the legal problems of liability that arose when land or buildings were transferred or their uses changed. A century or more of the industrial management of the harbors and their associated industrial estates had created complex boundaries and responsibilities. The harbor authorities were often organizations that had not come to terms with the decline of their industry and wanted to preserve the area as a working dock with rights of access that were no longer appropriate. Alternatively the various industrial owners saw an opportunity to make money out of assets they had previously seen as valueless. By waiting and doing nothing they stood to profit from the general improvement. But by not allowing development they could reduce the impact of those schemes that were able to start, and by continuing with low-value uses they could detract from area-wide change.

It required a considerable rise in the value of land to give a financial return that could cover the cost of retention and restoration. The established development industry was risk-averse, preferring to demolish what was there and to replace it with new construction. In many cases the local building industry lacked the skill required to work with old structures on so large a scale. Many of the early successes relied on a few farsighted individuals with the skills and tenacity to bring about their vision, such as Rouse in Baltimore and Boston, or Wadsworth in London.

## Four generations of urban waterfront development

The progenitors for first-generation Baltimore emerged from relatively wealthy cities that had retained much of their historic fabric. The successful initial transformations of industrial buildings in prominent waterfronts were sensitive and, for their time, radical restorations of fabric which was often scheduled for demolition. In 1965, in San Francisco, Lawrence Halprin & Associates, working with urban designers Bernardi and Emmons, created Ghiradelli Square, a new public space facing the bay against the backdrop of a former chocolate factory with the adjacent former cannery building forming a sophisticated retailing facility. The restoration of Faneuil Hall Marketplace reversed the decline of Boston's downtown area. London's Covent Garden, although not on the waterfront, was another landmark in conservation brought about by public pressure led by radical professionals.

These schemes marked a revival of urbanism after the postwar decades of flight from the city. They were also the beginning of a rejection of what was seen as orthodox modern architecture that had failed to create a sense of place and failed to pay sufficient creative attention to the design of the urban fabric. There was a growing awareness of the value and usefulness of heritage and a reaffirmation of local and national identity in the face of the challenges of globalization.

It is twenty years since what is generally recognized as the first of the