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Greek port cities find themselves in a profound and encompassing change as they try to improve their image and confront the competition for advanced port services and facilities and the need for urban revitalization. As port functions are increasingly relocated towards the outskirts of port cities, disadvantaged neighbourhoods and docks are turned into modern housing and commercial areas or cultural quarters that reinforce the identity, the appeal and the competitiveness of the city. Policies and practices that consider the regeneration of derelict areas and seafronts are at the top of local agendas with culture and leisure resources (cultural infrastructure, mega-events, tourist facilities, etc.) holding the key role. The main goal is the creation of new city images and environments that are attractive for residents, investors and visitors. Hence, these new policies have various spatial and economic effects, leading to prestigious waterfront developments, cultural clustering (e.g., Wit de Wittestraat in Rotterdam, Ladadika in Thessaloniki), increase of tourism, etc. On the other hand, regeneration projects affect the traditional spatial urban hierarchies and often lead to the displacement of activities and residents. So the main issue is how port cities can avoid the negative effects and in which way these strategies affect the economic and portal services.

The paper intends to present the most important policy changes of the major Greek port cities and to evaluate the role of culture and leisure within these policies. Characteristic examples of European port cities redevelopments based on culture, such as the ones of Bilbao, Rotterdam and Hamburg, will be compared to the efforts of Greek port cities. Special emphasis will be given to the Cultural Capital of Europe event that has had a great impact on Thessaloniki (1997) and is expected to have a long term effect on Patras (2006).

The main research questions that are being addressed are the following: Which are the spatial, economic, social and environmental effects of the new port city strategies and which role do cultural and tourist resources hold? Is an effective cultural and leisure policy a panacea for port cities in order to adjust to the contemporary competition? How are Greek port cities responding to these new circumstances?
A1. Port Cities in Transition

Port cities form a separate and unique category regarding the issue of urban regeneration policy (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993, Verwijnen J., Lehtovuori P 1998). The development of ports is directly connected with the development of the surrounding cities, while in most cases the position and the characteristics of the port determined the urban and developmental route of the city. Historically, the relation of the city and the port became vital during the industrial revolution and the import of steam in boats, when ports and cities developed rapidly at the same time, with relations of interdependence, conflict and competition (Kotea 1995). Thus on one hand the port supplies and is supplied by the city (work positions, exported products) and on the other it causes traffic and environmental problems to the city and receives problems from the city (traffic, harbour area extension inability, restrictions in the hours and types of harbour work).

As an urban geography concept, we are referring to an urban system, in which we consider the city and the port as two contacting systems. It is obvious that ports and cities are supposed to coexist in favour of inhabitants and enterprises, as the supply of the port with workforce is very important. This element has lost, at least to some extent, its importance nowadays, at least regarding the actual dockworkers because of automation, however the side-harbour, shipping and side-shipping activities keep increasing and seek natural presence next to and/or inside the port (ESPO 2005).

The relation between the port and the city has followed various phases: from absolute tightening up to absolute isolation and hostility. The last decades, in most cases, a “wall” has been placed between the port and the city, while the change of structure of trade and production has left abandoned industrial – depot buildings, outdated jetties and mechanized installations, in most ports of world.

A2. Contemporary Greek Port Policy

It can be claimed that Greece is a special case regarding both the characteristics of port cities and the policy problems that haven’t been confronted efficiently until today. The extent of Greece is roughly 131.95 2222 10:33 7 km² and 15.021 km is coast line (the 40% of which belongs to 3.053 Greek islands), meaning that for each land km² there are 113 m. of coast, when the for the rest of the world the proportion is just 4,5 m. (Beriatos, 2001). According to the Ministry of Merchant Marine (2002) the Greek port system includes 1.250 ports, marinas, piscatorial shelters, small harbours, registered in the 188 Central Coast Guard Offices and Stations. Moreover, according to the data of European Sea Ports Organisation (ESPO, 2005), Greece is the country with most active ports between the 25 members-states of the EU¹.

The property and the management of port areas in Greece is a a quite complicated theme, since the coastal space (seashore and coast line) belongs to the state according to the Constitution (special Law 2971/2001) but there are hundreds of private port ship-service installations (for cargo ships, yachts etc.). A great number of them belong to coastal industries/factories for their exclusive service or to construction companies. However, Greece doesn’t have, until today, purely private port services and only in one case a Private Industrial Area with a Port was founded in Platigiali Astakos (Western Greece).

¹ It allocates 205 active ports on total 1.116 European.
At the two largest ports of the country, Piraeus and Thessaloniki, from 2001-2002 the port authorities have entered the Stock Market of Athens and the administration and the board of the administrative councils are appointed from the Minister of Merchant Marine. Then, the next ten most important port authorities of the country were transformed into Anonymous Enterprises with the state being the only shareholder\(^2\), a decision which was not accepted by the local communities\(^3\). The administrations of these Organizations are appointed directly by the Ministry of Merchant Marine as well.

Finally, there are smaller ports, the Port Fund Bodies that are managed by Committees with the participation of the State, the Local Government and the users of the ports. The situation in this case is very complex as there are 39 Port Fund Bodies controlled directly by the Ministry of Merchant Marine, 32 Municipal Port Funds Bodies (from which the 15 are inter – municipal bodies) and one Prefectural Port Fund Body, which is controlled by the Local Government and the Ministry as well. The administrative complexity and the participation of many actors (Institutions, Ministries and Organisations) on issues of port management and development limits the possibility of planning and applying programmes of waterfront development (Kyriazopoulos, 2006). The mayor of Mykonos Mr. Veronis in the 3rd Pan-Hellenic Congress for Port Constructions (2003) characteristically reported that: "for the signature of any programming contract of the new Municipal Port Fund Body, while with the old procedure it was simple, now the form of the contract is drawn up by the Regional Government, and must be approved by 3 Ministries. Then, the final contract, after it is approved by the Municipal Council and the Council of Board of Directors of Municipal Port Fund Body, should again be approved by the Region and by two Ministries. This lasts 6 months –with lots of luck...".

The monitoring of ports is a responsibility of the Ministry of Merchant Marine. Greece is the only country in the world that has a Ministry exclusively for maritime and port matters. Within the Ministry, a General Secretariat for Ports and Port Policy was created (Law 2932/2001) aiming to integrate planning of national port policy, the co-ordination of action between the Ministries etc. Meanwhile a Committee for Planning and Development of Ports (Law 2932/2001 article 19) was created, with representatives from nine (9) Ministries of (Merchant Marine, Development, National Economy, Transport, Aegean, Internal Affairs, Culture, Agriculture, Defense and the Ministry for the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works). The work of this Committee is the general planning of port programs, the distribution of funds, the determination of specifications of implementation of port constructions and the adaptation of port infrastructures to the new technologies, the follow-up of implementation of port constructions and the approval of development programs in the ports and coastal areas. The operation of this Committee could have decreased the administrative processes, however the actual time that is required for the construction of port infrastructures remains roughly the same as before the creation of the Committee. According to the Community Support Framework Management Organisation Unit (1999) 2 – 3 years are needed from the date that the project will be decided until the date that will be ready for tendering.

According to a research of the Athens Polytechnic (Moutzouris, 2001) in 111 Greek ports which developed ferry ships activity it occurs that all of them face considerable problems in their operation with 85% facing crucial problems in basic sectors of their

\(^2\) Alexandroupoli, Volos, Eleusis, Heraklion, Igoumenitsa, Kavala, Corfu, Lavrion, Patras and Rafina

\(^3\) One example are the reactions from the local community of Igoumenitsa, (Nauteboriki Newspaper, 2003)
infrastructure for the safety of ships, the protection of mooring area, the quality of services that they are provided to ships and passengers, the facilitations that they provide in the port land area etc. This research concludes that Greece has a very large number of port installations of different quality, size, range and aim, “too many for a country of 11 million inhabitants and 13 million tourist annually, leading to the highest correspondence of port installations per inhabitant”. Similar are the conclusions of the elaboration of data of "Greek Registry of Ports of National Importance and Prefecture Level" that has been conducted by Ministry for the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works (see Kyriazopoulos, 2006).

A3. Waterfront Development and Regeneration

Nowadays port functions are increasingly relocated towards the outskirts of port cities and old docklands are turned into to brownfield areas. Port cities try to regenerate their city life and urban image, by turning these areas into modern housing and commercial areas or cultural quarters in an attempt to reinforce the identity, the appeal and the competitiveness of the city. Policies and practices that consider the regeneration of derelict areas and seafronts are at the top of local agendas with culture and tourism resources (cultural infrastructure, mega-events, tourist facilities, etc.) holding the key role (Verwijnen and Lehtuvori 1996).

It is generally acknowledged that the waterfront is of vital environmental and aesthetic importance and that it faces many problems (intense land pressures, environmental pollution, conflicts of uses etc.) especially when it is part of an urban conglomeration (Coccosis 1999). Effective waterfront development can defuse urban conflicts, create better and qualitative conditions of urban existence and function as an investments attractor. Waterfront regeneration is a subject that doesn’t only concern the port authorities (which in most cases are landholders of extensive coastal urban areas) but also local, regional, national administration since the waterfront holds a key role in any regeneration effort. The international examples vary a lot, with the well-known regenerated areas "Baltimore’s Inner Harbour" and "London Docklands" being the pioneers (from the 1960’s).

Since 1960 until today the practices in regeneration of water fronts can be presented through four generations (Marshall 2001, Panagopoulos and Argyriadis, 2003):

i. **1960s-1970s.** The basic element of port cities in this period was the revitalisation of their historical identity with the simultaneous rejection of what was then considered "orthodox architecture". London, Liverpool, Rotterdam in Europe, Seattle, Oakland, San Francisco in the U.S.A., invest in their waterfronts, however the most distinguished case is the port of Baltimore. "Baltimore’s Inner Harbour", the first modern waterfront project, transformed an inaccessible and isolated area into one of the most attractive destinations of the U.S.A within a period of 25 years. It must be pointed out, that beyond the technical projects, the collaboration of the local business community with the dynamic local authorities and the port was a success factor that established Baltimore as a best practice even in the next decades.

ii. **1980s.** After Baltimore, a second generation of successfully planned waterfront projects characterized by prestigious architectural, urban planning were implemented affecting the whole city and not only the waterfront. The cases of Boston’s Charleston Harbour, Sydney’s Darling Harbour, and Cape Town in the South Africa are characteristic, however for various reasons this decade is characterised by the cases of the London Docklands and Barcelona’s Port Vell.
iii. 1990s. The basic characteristics of this decade were the turn towards the notion of the “cultural city”, the exploitation of heritage assets, environmental planning and sustainability. Smaller cities such as Cardiff, Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, Amsterdam, Vancouver, Shanghai and others are activated towards waterfront developments. Larger cities, that had been active in the previous generations, intensify their efforts (eg. London)

iv. 2000 until today. The basic characteristics of this generation do not differ much from the previous; the "knowledge economy" and "information society" though have affected contemporary urban planning in various ways. The regeneration of waterfronts present vague and dimmed elements resulting in that the basic characteristics of this generation are not yet clarified. Amsterdam, Genova and Hamburg are interesting innovate cases within this generation.

A4. The role of cultural and tourism resources

Urban strategies where culture is employed as a driver for urban economic growth have become increasingly popular and form part of the new orthodoxy by which cities seek to enhance their competitive position (Miles and Paddison 2005). Richard Florida’s work, which also emphasises the role of culture and the importance of the relationship between culture, creativity and the city has had a significant role in underpinning the assertion that cultural inputs translate into social and economic outputs for cities. Florida argues that cities and regions should focus on promoting creativity, and on attracting creative people, not least through their creative assets. In short, for Florida, the clustering of human capital is the critical factor in regional economic growth and is the key to the successful regeneration of cities (Florida 2002).

Within this context, urban cultural strategies are evolving around new ideas and notions. Hans Mommaas describes how the past 10–15 years, the creation and support of cultural clusters has been increasingly taken up as a new policy tool for urban cultural development. Mixtures of cultural functions and activities, from production to presentation and consumption and from theatre and the visual arts to pop music and the new media, are grouped together in a great variety of spatial forms. Projects may restrict themselves to standalone buildings or larger building complexes, or they may include entire quarters or networks of locations (Mommaas 2004). In port cities former warehouses districts or “red-light districts” offer great opportunities for cultural and leisure enterprises due to the large, cheap spaces and the historical atmosphere. The Cable Factory in Helsinki forms a very interesting example of a seaside industrial building that has been transformed in a cultural venue which hosts a large number of cultural enterprises.

Urban tourism has gained importance as tourists tend to travel more times for fewer days. City breaks have become an important source of income for many port cities as people seek for authentic urban experiences in cities that have not been associated with tourism until nowadays (Van der Berg et al 1995).

B1 Best practices and examples in Europe

Policies and practices that consider the re-use of industrial space for cultural purposes and waterfront developments for the regeneration – rehabilitation of harbour seafronts are priorities in many urban seaside areas in the world. Port cities are often presented
as the most successful stories of culture-led regeneration (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993, Garcia 2005). Bilbao forms a unique example of a declined harbour city that succeeded to change its image by a visionary strategy regarding its brownfield areas. The Guggenheim museum is the flagship project of this strategy, but it was not the only important project. Many other spatial interventions pointed out the role of architecture, which has led cities around the globe to seek for “star architects” in order to have their signature brand (Evans 2004).

Rotterdam is a characteristic example of a harbour city where there is no evidence anymore within the city that it is a harbour – the biggest in the world. The regeneration strategy of the city has been mainly based on cultural consumption and housing, but also on the notion of industrial tourism. The Kop van Zuid development is considered as a best practice and has been reviewed in many articles, book chapters, etc. It was not a simple regeneration project with neighborhood upgrading and housing improvements but an extensive strategic plan with strong participation schemes and prestigious projects (Pasveer 1996). The Wit de Wittstraat area is a relatively new development in the city and forms a very interesting example of a cultural cluster that links the Museum Park (which hosts the Kunsthall, the Boymans van Beuningen Modern Art Museum and the Netherlands Architecture Center) to the old Harbour. According to Hitters and Richards its development has been quite successful due to the support of the local authority, the number and size of the cultural enterprises and the “creative milieu” that has been established and promoted.

Amsterdam’s Eastern Docklands also form a characteristic example of waterfront development with the emphasis on real estate. Near the center of Amsterdam, a neighborhood has been developed on several islands and peninsulas in the IJ-lake. The former docklands have been changed into a new, attractive living area. The neighborhood has an interesting mix of innovative, internationally renowned modern architecture and stylish historical buildings related to the maritime history of the area. Nowadays, the Eastern Docklands district is a highly urbanized and cosmopolitan living quarter situated along Amsterdam's waterfront. The neighborhood has a creative and innovative atmosphere and many small businesses, mainly creative ones, have settled here.

Hamburg, Barcelona, Glasgow, Porto and Genova are other characteristic examples of harbour cities that have been successfully regenerated. Cultural and leisure assets are promoted in all the above cases as port-cities try to get associated to “clean”, middle class, cultural images as opposed to “dirty”, working class ones. Industrial culture still holds a very important role. Moving into a post-industrial provides significant and cheap space that can be used very flexibly due to its high ceilings, big windows, elevators and solid structure. While these elements favour reuse, they also imply various costs of refurbishing the building, cleaning up remains and bringing it up to municipal standards. The districts in which these buildings are found are usually disadvantaged. The buildings often lack utility services, the potential users often have no money, and they may be indifferent to what they see as elitist cultural pursuits. In many cases, it is not always easy to strike up local partnerships, especially with the authorities, who will not always be convinced that a regeneration based on culture can help upgrade the neighbourhood. Cultural institutions and enterprises might only attract “trendy” individuals who think it is fun to go slumming. To overcome these effects, they have to offer low or even symbolic ticket prices or user fees, but this can pose a risk for their management (Greffé 2005).
Very often the turning point for a city is the organisation of a mega event either with a cultural or sport character (e.g. Olympics, European Capital of Culture, Football World Cup) or with a commercial character (e.g. EXPOS). The European Cultural Capital event and its successful organisation has particularly helped out port cities. Glasgow and Antwerp are still considered to be two of the most successful organisers of the event regarding the impact on the city and the legacy that the event left behind (Palmer/Rae 2004, Garcia 2005). Thessaloniki in 1997, Porto and Rotterdam in 2001, Genoa in 2004 and Patras in 2006 add up to the number of port cities that hosted the event. In most cases many infrastructure projects were not initiated specifically for the event, but had already been planned before. Many such projects nevertheless benefited from the catalytic effect of the European Capital and its focus on culture, extra funding, joint publicity and programming in cooperation with the organization of the event and from the optimism and ambition that surrounded many Cultural Capitals. In most of the cities infrastructure was not managed by the Cultural Capital organisers, but by government authorities and other bodies (Palmer/Rae 2004). Still, often the results of such events are not that extensive as cities would like to and the costs are very high. Cities tend to overestimate the results and their evaluation reports are too positive. The evidential grounds for arguing, for example, that Patras will be established as a worldwide conference center or that Liverpool’s cultural sector will expand rapidly with investments of 2 billion pounds from public and private sources and that employment in the cultural sector will grow by at least 14 000 jobs as a result of the award of the Capital of Culture 2008 title, remains at best limited (Miles and Paddison 2005).

C1 Greek port cities and the role of culture in regeneration strategies

Hence, throughout Europe the tendency towards the rehabilitation of deactivated riverside and waterfront areas is still growing in an attempt to redesign and regenerate port cities. Therefore, as this tendency continues to spread and as new and increasingly high standards continue to be set by the projects and measures being implemented, many specialists now speak of the proximity to the water as a new model of spatial intervention, on the logic of waterfront redevelopment. In Greece, despite the academic interest and the fact that many urban centres are situated beside the sea, there are only a few examples of waterfront development, with the redesign of the central pier of Thessaloniki being the most characteristic one. Four Greek harbour cities (Patras, Alexandroupoli, Kavala and Volos) have recently conducted studies in order to regenerate abandoned parts of their harbour sites. Some years ago an architectural contest including ten harbour cities was conducted without though having practical results. Generally, in all these cases derelict industrial space holds the key role in the planning, without though being treated in most cases as a cultural or tourism asset (Gospodini 2004).

Piraeus, the largest Greek port city offers many opportunities for waterfront development and redesign that haven’t been implemented until today. Nikos Bellavilas describes the problems that are being faced at the Zea district, Neo Faliro and Lipasmata (Belavilas 2005). There is no clear vision or policy strategy for the recommodification industrial heritage of port cities and this is more than evident in the main port city of the country, Piraeus. The city has always been associated with the city of Athens as part of a wider metropolitan area and hasn’t got an autonomous political, economic, cultural or tourist image. Until today almost all the city promotion

---

4 According to the interviews of the manager of the Organisation Committee at www.patras 2006.gr
strategies are based on the promotion of the port services and the maritime community, neglecting the multiethnic urban community with many social problems and having many different actors are involved in the policy making procedures (municipal authority, port authority, university, cultural organisations). The only effort for the waterfront development of Piraeus city was planned for the Olympic Games of 2004. The Ministry for the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works assigned a special study which included infrastructures and plans for the improvement of the city image round the cruise terminal, the streets of access to the Olympic premises of Athens and Faliro area and the creation of a coastal walking route (MEAS et al, 2003). The Ministry, after receiving the study and considering its time schedule, the available funds and technical matters, decided to implement only a few of the suggestions: the regeneration of a square next to Zeas’ Marina, the upgrading of the neighbouring beach and the re-construction of pavements. At the same time the Master Plan of the Piraeus Port Authority for the Olympic Games (see also the Port Authority’s Acceptance Proposal by Athens Stock Exchange), included a number of ambitious projects as the construction of hotels, the creation of a cultural park etc. without any of these projects being realized until today. In the Port of Piraeus the Maritime Tradition Museum\(^5\) is the only active cultural institution at this moment (Karachalis, Kyriazopoulos and Lourandos 2005).

Thessaloniki, being the European Cultural Capital in 1997, transformed one of the docks that was not in use in a cultural axis and used the industrial buildings for new creative uses. The displacement of port facilities to the southwest\(^6\) Dock, created a derelict area in an important part of the port, especially the one which is close to the city’s centre (1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) docks). The decision to deliver the part to the city, despite the many complaints at first, created a space which hosts national and international cultural events and happenings, bringing the city dwellers closer to the port and brought new revenues to the port (Papaoannou A. & Taskaris S., 2003). In the old warehouses the Greek Museum of Cinema (1,100 m\(^2\)) was founded and halls for multiple uses were created that hosted various cultural events\(^6\). Still, the development potential is not fully exploited and the cultural spaces are not fully integrated into the center of the city and the lively public open spaces. Most of the time, the redeveloped site remains ‘dark’ and underused only attracting certain groups of visitors when cultural events are hosted (Gospodini 2001).

A more recent plan conducted by the Thessaloniki Port Authority (2002) emphasized on the role of culture and leisure with a focus on the waterfront area and the cultural identity of Thessaloniki and included actions for the exploitation of open spaces for periodical fairs and cultural events in the open areas at B’ Dock, cinemas and cinema production studios, an aquarium, hotels, a marina, and the operation of Training Institute for Specialists in Ports and Combined Transport. Until today this study has not been implemented and the city hasn’t been able to attract urban or cultural tourists. One of the most interesting aspects here is the creation of the cultural quarter of Ladadika, a quarter that holds the same role as Wit de Wittestraat in Rotterdam.

In the case of Patras the European Capital of Culture event cannot be evaluated yet; its spatial interventions have not been fully delivered although the event is already being implemented. Patras keeps its port services in the city and only some of its abandoned

---

5 The Museum is a private cultural organization which has hosted thousands of visitors in his halls because of its collection and the organization of cultural events
6 e.g the International Film Festival of Thessaloniki, educational programs for students (programme “Games of Culture” at Warehouse C, Nauteboriki, 2003).
Industrial buildings are being re-used (Ladopoulou factory, Bari building, Ag, Georgios miles). Once again the lack of a single planning strategy is evident; the case of Patras Port Authority (PPA) is characteristic, which appointed and received a study under the title: “Reform of the zoning – traffic organization of land areas and improvement of the port infrastructure of the Patras port”. The proposed plan aroused complaints by the local community, not because of its proposals, but because the citizens were not properly informed on such a grand scale interference project that concerned them directly. Particular proposals of the study refer to “many recreational areas” that probably come into conflict with other out-of-the-port ones. The parallel development of multiplexes-conference centres by the Municipality and the PPA in short distance between them and both in the port area it has also received criticism. Meanwhile, at the port, due to safety matters, the PPA has placed extra barriers and barbed wire (that were put up because of the Olympic Games) that didn’t allow walking and access to fishing areas. This caused reactions to the local community and already many citizens of Patras have turned against the PPA to remove these as the waterfront has lost its public status (PELOPONISSOS, 2005).

The rest of the Greek port cities present different characteristics. Many of them are still seeking a new role either as modern port-city or as a post-industrial service city. Eleusis is a characteristic example of a city where the waterfront development plans have been abandoned despite the strong potentials and the very important heritage assets of the city (the ancient city, Kronos factory). According to Tsalkandra D. & Tsolaki P (2003), who investigated the possibility of re-development of the Eleusis Port Authority waterfront area, the waterfront regeneration policy needs to rely on a wider strategic plan for the whole district. The last years four different studies (one by the University of Thessaly, one by the Athens Polytechnic University, one by the Port Authority Organisation and one for the revision of urban plan of entire city) have been conducted for Eleusis, showing once again the lack of coordination. The results and the proposals were different and in every case the waterfront development project depends on the transfer or no of the port to another neighbouring area.

The city of Lavrion, on the other hand, after a long period of decline is trying to be established as modern tourist port city with a good transport system to the airport and the city of Athens and a center of scientific excellence due to the operation of the technological center of the Athens Polytechnic University at the old mining site. The port of Lavrion (roughly 50 km from the center of Athens) is included in a master plan for the development of the metropolitan region of Athens. As an old industrial region, with an extensive reserve of industrial buildings and important urban regeneration interventions, it is trying to be established as a city of culture. The new port infrastructures that are planned will serve a great number of ferries with destination to Cyclades, Dodekanisa and Crete as well as all the cruise ships (direct relation with the neighbouring International Airport El. Venizelos). The priority of the future regeneration of the waterfront area is the preservation of scale of the city and the cultural character of city that already has been achieved up today.

The port area of Alexandroupoli is not considering a waterfront development project anymore, because of the recent construction of the oil pipeline Bourgas - Alexandroupoli. The construction of an oil station in the port and the increasing volume of tankers do not allow the port for any planning for waterfront development with a cultural or tourist character.

---

7 The center also hosts important cultural events, e.g. Synch festival.
Finally, the port of Volos, is a characteristic example of a declined port because of the deindustrialization of the region. The few cargos that it manage to overload the already heavy traffic road network of the city. The spaces of the port have not developed many cultural activities, but mostly mixed uses that serve the city, such as spaces for parking of private cars. However, the wider coastal region of the city of Volos has been regenerated and has upgraded the physiognomy – image of the city. Important element in this intervention was the installation in a particularly beautiful building of coastal area of University of Thessaly and the re-use of many other industrial buildings. The presence of students and tourists from cruise ships have changed the coastal uses and upgraded the quality of tourist services and services of leisure and culture (Gospodini 2001).

D1. Conclusions

Many of the conditions that are being faced by the port-cities are common to most port cities worldwide as part of their search for a new local identity. The examples of Greek cities reflect the problems and the particular characteristics of the regeneration strategies, especially regarding brownfield areas.

The competition with global maritime centres makes the situation for Greek port cities quite hard, since there hasn’t been a comprehensive waterfront development programme or framework. The believe that modern office blocks will attract modern shipping and shipping related companies and businesses, while neglecting the ancient, neoclassical or industry-related history is still quite strong (Bellavilas 2005). Generally, Greek port cities face certain limitations regarding their efforts to revitalise their waterfronts (Gospodini 2001, Kyriazopoulos 2006):

1. Housing developments haven’t been promoted in most cases, a fact that is partly connected to the lack of social housing schemes or private real estate initiatives. Fashionable living is not associated with port cities and luxury apartments are offered only in a few parts of Thessaloniki and Piraeus.

2. Greek cultural policy has failed to decentralise cultural activities and there are only a few examples of best practices of smaller cities that have created viable cultural institutions or events (Konsola and Ioannides 2005). Therefore it is difficult for smaller cities to support a cultural scene since the majority of cultural institutions and enterprises are situated in Athens and this fact undermines the efforts for the creation of cultural scenes or districts in smaller port cities.

3. It is obvious that the many actors that are involved in the policy making procedures can’t cooperate. In other European cities this problem has been solved by the creation of special organisations with a particular objective e.g., the Bilbao Ria 2000 initiative. The fact that in many Greek port cities many different studies have been delivered by different actors regarding the waterfront development characterises the co-ordination problems. Many times initiatives don’t receive the support by the municipal and port authorities

---

8 The International Dance Festival of Kalamata and the International Music Theater Festival of Volos are the most characteristic examples.

9 The port city of Piraeus is a unique case as it belongs to the metropolitan area of Athens.

10 The company BILBAO Ría 2000 was created on 19 November 1992 with the intention of recovering former industrial space around the city. It is a non-profitmaking entity, the product of a cooperation commitment on the part of all public authorities in a common task to transform the metropolitan area of Bilbao.
4. The absence of a general urban tourism plan for port cities is a key problem. Cities such as Patras and Igoumenitsa are transport nodes with thousands of passengers passing from them daily who could be potential city tourists if the tourist planning procedures (city branding, event management, cultural routes, marketing tools, etc.) were more efficient. Especially the capacity of cultural tourism to create direct employment should become a common element for Greek port cities.

5. Heritage assets from different time periods (ancient, neoclassical, industrial) are not always treated and protected in the same way. Mostly, there is unwillingness to promote and re-use industrial heritage sites as part of the modern city. Original, innovating and imaginative architectural interventions, compatible with the tradition and the scale of city, can impose the construction and the emergence of important landmarks.

6. The uses and activities must attract, on a 24 hour basis, the residents and visitors to the city and increase the percentage of communal and public gathering spaces. Therefore safety issues, lighting, urban furniture, etc. are key factors for the planning procedures. On the other hand, the danger of a “museum-city” where the port and the sea are transformed into a “tourist attraction” and the danger of homogenisation of ports with the loss of their regional and local characteristics is quite strong; Greek port cities should build their new images on traditional motives and with respect to the local history.

7. Many cities in Greece have an increasingly diverse local population and many social problems that have to be faced within a regeneration policy. Unless this is done efficiently the regeneration projects will fail to accomplish many of their objectives. In many cases port cities are facing conflicts regarding new uses of post-industrial space. These permanent conflicts can lead to serious problems if there a strategic planning process isn’t followed.

8. Cultural clusters seem to hold a distinct role in port cities, as they tend to link the harbour to the city, a role that can be of vital importance in cases where this connection has been lost or weakened. Wit de Wittestraat in Rotterdam, St. Pauli in Hamburg and Ladadika in Thessaloniki present three unique cases of cultural clustering near port cities.

Since the requirements in space and equipment of ports will be even more intense in the following years, the harbour economy should develop functions, abilities but also urban services, in order to be able to compete and win a share from the global circulation of goods, ventures and visitors between the areas of production and consumption. Based on the above, most ports must struggle to maintain and/or improve their waterfront and attract high quality expertise, increase their direct foreign investments, upgrade the value of their real assets, apply Total Quality and Corporate Responsibility and schedule a complete regeneration program that respects both the ordinary operation of port usage(s) the and the urban character of space, strengthen the interference of land use inside the coastal area, respect the safety of human life and environment protection and invest in technologies and processes of protection of the marine and coastal environment, maintain institutions and organisations that aim to the protection and the advance of culture, education, research, environment etc.,

A lot of big ports coexist harmoniously with the cities that surround them especially after their “prestigious” redevelopment. Of course, examples such as Bilbao or Rotterdam deserve particular attention and form as best practices for many similar
cities. However, this doesn’t mean that there is a model or a toolkit that can be used in greek or other cities that are now planning their development. There is undoubtedly a danger of exaggerating the potential impact of cultural investment. Using architecture and design as leisure and tourism resource seems to have positive effects but it can also create certain dilemmas regarding the creation of a safe, “fake” environment, a “Disneyfication” of public space (Zukin 1995). Waterfront developments can exclude certain social groups from the redeveloped area and attract residents and visitors of a higher educational, cultural or economic status, who get attracted in the area for experiencing new forms of urban space. The challenge for port cities nowadays is to plan its development in order to balance its different interest groups and aspects and become "a port that functions in a city that lives".
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