

Conran. The area contained an assortment of structures, of which seventeen were listed. Buildings of poor quality were demolished to allow for new development. The approach required flexibility, in part because it was argued that new development was required to provide financial support for the restoration of large difficult structures. Car parking was required in the area, and this was provided in spaces under the new buildings.

The uses could not be restored. The streets were too narrow for modern lorries, and with a few lingering exceptions, such as a delightfully fragrant spice mill, the uses became primarily residential and commercial. Mixed use is notoriously difficult to achieve with new development. The Butlers Wharf area was more successful than most in that it offered a wide variety of types of space, and, at least initially as the area was emerging, some variation in rental cost. A flexible approach was adopted to planning use consents, allowing some areas to change their use a number of times, oscillating between residential, commercial or retailing until such time as the area developed its own sense of place, about ten years after the first structures were converted. This at times controversial mix of new and old resulted in an area that has overwhelmingly retained its historic character while at the same time becoming a lively new city quarter known for its restaurants and creative industries.

The process of regeneration as it emerged in the Docklands was unusual in that it was superimposed on the local authorities, who were given a very limited say in what it did. Overall London produced a somewhat controversial development, elements of which were seen as a model to avoid as much as copy. Local opposition to the new waterfronts was a characteristic of the post-industrial nature of these projects, but it was particularly bitter in London. It succeeded, however, in transforming the approach to regeneration planning in the UK; in helping the development of a new approach to conservation; and by demonstrating that large-scale planning was economically viable.

Barcelona, in contrast to London, was architect-led and plan-led. It made full use of the opportunity presented by the 1992 Olympic Games being held in the city to develop a long-term integrated planning strategy. The first of its four basic objectives was the application of an urban structure aimed at creating a new area that was not alien in character or divorced from adjoining neighborhoods (Gili, 1988). The main contribution to the second generation of waterfront planning was the approach to infrastructure and the very clear support given not only to infrastructure-led development but also to rethinking the mistakes of the past. Rotterdam was also a pathfinding second-generation development, characterized most strongly by a well-led approach to community development and adventurous architecture.

### **Cardiff, Liverpool, Salford, Berlin**

It is a characteristic of the third generation that the ideas are tried and accepted and capable of being applied to smaller waterfront cities and towns as they are to the big cities. This generation is marked by the acceptance into the mainstream of development practice all the elements