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ABSTRACT. Messages for a new urban development policy were given since the beginning of the present century, focusing the attention much more on the urban transformation than the urban growth. At the same time, the concept of Territorial Capital was undergoing a transformation, from spatially immobile factors of development into the competitive potential of the territory. The cognitive evolution of Territorial Capital, referring it's outcomes to the city, brings that concept close to the urban genius loci. How does the innovative concept of Territorial Capital refer to the contemporary practice in spatial planning and the waterfront’s revitalization, conducted by the public sector in cities? Does it reflect the transformation in urban governance, which Harvey describes as the path from managerism to entrepreneurism? The paper presents the outcomes of a limited research, starting from the taxonomy of the components of territorial capital, proposed by Camagni, concentrating on the center of his innovative cross. The research study analyzes selected waterfronts’ revitalization strategies and their outcomes, along with the urban spatial policies and their recognized practice on elaborating patterns of design for waterfronts. The paper summarizes the results of conducted analysis and finally brings conclusions of the study, submitting preliminary responses to the research questions.

Introduction

Attractiveness and local competitiveness are qualities of a vital, vibrant and livable urban space (Couch et al., 2003; Wagner & Caves, 2012). On the basis of the classical theoretical model of competitiveness by Porter (1990) as well on the results of the application of that theory to urban environment, presented by Storper (1997), Malecki (2002), and Kitson (Kitson et al., 2012), attractiveness is the crucial determinant to induce the revitalization’ process in a declined urban space.

Attractiveness and local competitiveness depend on factors, which are not only found in the material world but also in the relational capital and the learning capacity, both expressed by the territory (Camagni, 2002). Results of research and analysis of the determinants of urban competitiveness, focused on integrally generated determinants, give a reliable base to build on the strengths, bottom up, reaching up to the endogenous capital. That approach is widely recommended for the revitalizing strategies (Birch, 2012).

Territorial Capital - the innovative approach

The concept of Territorial Capital was proposed by OECD in the first Territorial Outlook (2001:15). Notion of territory accents the active role of space. Notion of capital highlights the
role of assets (and supply). The concept of *Territorial Capital* that proceeded from spatially immobile factors of development into the competitive potential of the territory is based originally also on the idea of *milieu innovateur* (Bramanti, 1998).

As argued by Bramanti with Miglierina (1995) and by Malecki (2000), the territorial organization is an essential component of the process of techno-economic creation, whatever the specific kind of *innovative milieu* would be. That local approach (*bottom up*, grassroots or endogenous development) opens the perspective to reproduce the concept to any geographically delimitated urban proximity (urban place). The spatial analysis that incorporated the concept of endogenous development was the theoretical basis for the concepts of social capital (Putnam, 1993) and relational capital (Camagni, 1999). The urban context and the urban dynamics were the objects of researchers exploration on the specific territorial assets (Crevoisier & Camagni, 2000). Territorial understanding of the placed based urban economy, that described Crevoisier (2004) was supplemented by the research on milieus and local development cultural resources (Camagni *et al.*, 2004). The evolution of the concept was enriched by Camagni (2008). He proposed taxonomy of *Territorial Capital* consisting 9 groups of assets. The five of them, marked by *b, e, i, h, g* form the *innovative cross* (Fig.1).

![Figure 1: The theoretical taxonomy of the components of Territorial Capital, after Camagni (2008:34).](image)

The concept of *Territorial Capital* expanded widely including more intangible and mixed assets. The beauty of a townscape, the quality of urban design, local synergy, informal networks, governance factors, operational schemes and interdependencies have been recognized as territorial dependent. This assets are intangible but evident perceptible, for example by the quality of the spatial organization and architecture (Rykwert, 2000) or city’ livability (Wagner & Caves, 2012).

That comprehensive approach to territory’s capital is close to the urban *genius loci* as well to the classical 4. personalized recollection and engagement with a geographic location, also known as *the spirit of place*, that is described by Gordon Cullen (1971). The proposed
The discussion on *Territorial Capital* flows parallel to the transformation in the urban governance. That change, predicted and described by Harvey (1989a) as the shift from *managerism to entrepreneurism*, is evidently noticeable in the socio-economic urban structures of the late, Post-Fordist capitalism. Entrepreneurial approach to the urban development, whatever to think about it, is consistent with the territorial outlook, presented by OECD (2001) and the territorial approach of the European Union (2011). Competitive advantage of a city, analyzed and evaluated according to the concept of *Territorial Capital*, besides the strengths of long-term accumulation, reveals the weaknesses caused by the *spatial myopia* and by inability to capitalize the intangible assets. Looking from the perspective of the post-structural approach of new economic geography, the waterfront’s spatial complexity and the exceptional economic attractiveness of a waterfront form a conceptual and managerial gap. That was already noticed in the study of Tallin’ waterfront transformation delivered by Feldman (2000). Similar critical conclusions on municipal waterfront management in the Post-Fordism phase were given in the report edited by Moretti (2013).

**Waterfront – paradoxes of the phenomenon**

Indisputably, urban waterfront has a unique value and poses an intangible emotional power, coming from the metaphysics of the water-land interface. That was deeply analyzed and inspiring described by Paulet (2006, 2007).

The waterfront is a major factor in the development of a city. Spatial organization of a waterfront steers the space production on the water’s edges, according to the main features: connection to the water and complexity (Marshall, 2001). But that unique realm for urban development *retrieved frontier of conventional development process* (Malone, 2013:2).

Re-organized waterfront changes the image of the city. Best and well known example in Europe is Bilbao, where the new waterfront’s spatial organization transformed the city bringing a durable revival. Boston city renewals, started by large public-private waterfront transformation, Liverpool Merseyside, London Docklands or Shanghai are the largest and most spectacular, hence best known examples of top-down approach (Marshall, 2001). Examples show that revitalization could be the long term result of the spatial waterfront re-development, but as well a new spatial organization of a waterfront may deliver new urban space bereft of *urbanity*. ‘*New spaces old problems*’ that concise remark placed in “Devil’s star”, a book by Jo Nosbø, the internationally acclaimed Norwegian crime novelist, refers to the transformation of Oslo’ waterfront district of Bjørvika. That top-down, property-led transformation, conducted under emblem of revitalization has been criticized thought the evident momentum of the architectural concept of the new Opera & Ballet house, ingeniously located by the sea.

However waterfront revitalization often occurs at the problematic interface *in-between*: private/public, port function/urban environment, heritage/new investments etc., there are ‘*a lot of evidence collected in diverse cultural, political and economic settings*
to proof the revitalizing phenomenon of waterfronts’ (Hoyle, 2000). Regarding the results of the comparative report edited by Moretti (2013), projects of smaller scale or less attractive for the international capital, like revitalizing of the river banks area in Bratislava or Pärnu, seem to be an approachable vehicle to collect the innovative territorial capital for the city, by the urban knowledge accumulation (Camagni, 2002). The municipal authority is confronted with the demand for conducting the complex transformation of the waterfront. As well the urban community is. Then, theoretically, the process of collective learning and accumulation of the relational capital may start (Camagni, 1991; Maggioni & Nosvelli, 2005).

But yet, how Feldman (2000) argues and Moretti (2013) supports, the short–term public operation on waterfront is preferred, following short-term interests, from one election to the next. Municipal authorities do not wish to engage in visionary projects, usually long term. Revitalizing effect of the waterfront re-development may be gained preparing very wise spatial planning to avoid the homogeneity, keeping the waterfront as the space of flow, by reaching out to the bottom-top approach that brings public interest and involvement, at the same time upgrading the social capital (Davoudi & Strange, 2008). But in post-socialist cities the relatively long separation from the water befell a different context of spatial planning for waterfronts in compare to western cities. That difference has been recognized by Feldman (2000). Upon that she argues on a non-economic basic precondition to waterfronts revitalization in post-socialist cities. No economic temptation? Considering the explanation of motifs underlying the re-organizing (re-development) of waterfront in western cities, that ware given by Harvey (1989b), Marshall (2001) and Malone (2013) her presumptions seem paradoxically relevant: waterfront’s regeneration projects have focused basically on the great scale, for ‘Blue business, related to water, is a tempting alternative to Green business, referred to new golf court’ (Marshall, 2001).

Revitalization – innovative urban scheme?

Since the beginning of the present century, messages for a new urban development policy were given, focusing the attention much more on the urban transformation than on the urban growth (Hall & Pfeiffer, 2000; European Union, 2004). Transformation by renewal of the urban fabric or place-recycling has been integrated with the process of social transformation, formatting the western cities of late capitalism as well as the post-socialist cities of central Europe (Węclawowicz, 2002).

Propriety-based (placed based) and people-based strategies of revitalization form a contemporary set of schemes, which are creatively adapted and developed, according to local urban culture, challenges, capabilities (potentials, assets), local governance and available, adopted urban know-how (Węclawowicz, 2013). Revitalization may be considered as a holistic and participative approach to urban renewal, derived from a long evolution of urban transformation’s concepts. By the term it is called ‘the third phase of urban renewal’ (Carmon, 1999).

Process of learning is crucial in that approach to planned urban revitalization. Assuming innovation is a function of learning and creativity, model schemes of urban revitalization have to be taken as a base, not for replication but as a capital of knowledge, to be utilized to develop the endogenous, unique capital of a city. Hence, considering the implemented
urban revitalization program as the learning process’ result, it is an innovative local scheme. By that, it may be not only regarded as a component of the relational capital of a city, but primarily as a mixed good - asset indicated in the center of the innovative cross, which Camagni proposed. Crevoisier argues a city always tends to be a privileged place for creating something new (2004:375). Innovation, what was noticed by Bramanti (1998) is synonymous with overcoming and change. Therefore an evident experience in revitalization proven by achieved change (transformation) of a declined urban space into a livable and vivid urban space, which has been successfully planned by the municipal authority, should be evaluated and recognized as territorial asset of the city. According to the theory and practice of urban regeneration (Couch, 2000; Couch et al., 2003) these operations of enormous complexity may be classified as partnerships in schemes and governance on land and cultural resources, therefore be placed in the center of the innovative cross of the Territorial Capital. Assuming, the theoretically examined specificity of waterfront results with its extraordinary ‘sensitivity’, capability to reflect the local approach to spatial re-organization and urbanity, the development of intangible and mixed assets of Territorial Capital may be evaluated by the quality of the waterfront’ revitalization scheme.

Presented result of the limited theoretical studies is the base of putting a general question about the applicability of the innovative Territorial Capital concept as a perspective to the research on process of revitalization in cities. Attractiveness and competitiveness are desired attributes of revitalized urban structures as well the cognitive categories of studies on the geography of innovative economic territories. Although the similarities seem promising, especially for the prospect to enrich the methodology of urban planning and evaluation, the innovative concept of Territorial Capital is relatively recent. That brings to the question about the reception of an academic theory. How does the innovative concept of Territorial Capital refer to the contemporary practice in spatial planning and waterfront’s revitalization, conducted by the public sector in cities? Does it reflect the transformation in urban governance, which Harvey (1989a) describes as the path from managerism to entrepreneurism?

Empirical research studies

The research was conducted by studies on two cities, that have been chosen to the criteria of: geographical location by main Polish rivers (Vistula and Odra), with a relatively easy access to urban know-how (capital city of a region, with an experience in international cooperation in planning) and respected experience in planned revitalization of urban areas in decline, that could have been accumulated by the municipal authorities. According to those criteria Cracow (capital of Lesser Poland region, located by the Vistula River) and Szczecin (capital of Western Pomerania region, located by the Odra River) have been chosen.

The reception and the practical implementation of the concept of Territorial Capital were examined by the analysis of two, currently valid plans:

- the development’ strategy of the city,
- the study of the conditions and directions of spatial development, which is, according to the Polish legislation, the only obligatory spatial plan of the city’s territory.
Additionally, a survey addressed to planning officials on the municipal and regional level has been conducted. The main intention was to investigate the Territorial Capital concept’ position in the spatial planning practice of the urban planning professionals. It was also designed to research on the waterfront’ spatial re-organization planning utilities of the intangible, innovative elements of that concept. Therefore a set of 4 waterfront’ revitalizing samples has been prepared, to be analyzed and evaluated by the responders, in order to demonstrate the assigned level of importance of the innovative cross’ assets. Waterfront revitalization strategies in both cities were analyzed by the operations planned and by observation of the results of implemented plans. Therein revitalization programs for both cities were analyzed theoretically and practically (by field work), from the perspective of waterfront spatial re-organization.

Case: Cracow

Experience in integrated urban renewal of deprived areas, followed by programmed revitalization has been gained since 1993, when the Kazimierz Action Plan was started, as a European Union, ECOS Founded Project, carried out by the Cities of Cracow, Edinburgh and Berlin (Mühlbauer, 2007).

The valid Revitalization Program for Cracow (RPC 2005) contains 8 declined areas of interventions as well 3 ‘global tasks’. 3 of them are located along the river Vistula’s embankments. One of the global task (River Parks) is virtually connected with re-organization of the waterfront of the city that, including the main Vistula River, focuses on the five smaller rivers. Hence, the opening the urban life to the water (RPC 2005:64) is an important objective of the program, which was prepared using the comparative utility analysis and SWOT analysis. Although no one of the numerous ‘flagship project’ is focused on revitalization by utilizing all the assets capitalized in the complex space of the city’s extensive waterfront, the renewal of Vistula embankments is progressing, step-by-step (Fig.2).

Cracow Development Strategy was adopted in 2005 and steered in 2013 to be up-dated. The concept of capital - social, relational or territorial, was not used, the asset management as well. Analysis of the plan does not confirm that it was built on already gained and foreseen to be developed urban know-how, experience in programming of revitalization, local governance etc. Revitalization is one of the development tasks, addressed to deprived areas and historical heritage (part. IV, p.17). The re-organization of waterfront is planned.
to develop the river transport (par. V, p. 19), improve flood protection and the revitalization (economic revival) of 4 districts. The revitalization of the Vistula River banks (part V, p.24) is foreseen to be achieved by implementing a metropolitan project: *Revitalisation and management of the River Vistula’s embankments*.

The Study of the conditions and directions of spatial development for Cracow (Study for Cracow, 2003/2010) delivers no evidence of application of the territorial capital concept. The idea of revitalizing of declined urban environment is recognized, but expressed by the wording, for the revitalization of declined areas is implemented in that plan as an instrument of physical regeneration of the urban fabric.

Case: Szczecin

Experience in integrated urban renewal of deprived areas that was later on followed by programmed revitalization, has been gained in Szczecin since 1991, when the programming of the complex renovation started. It was conducted by a team, supported via ‘Umbrella’ UN project, by an experienced Dutch volunteering consultant (Kulpa-Jarocka & Mliczyńska-Hajda, 2006).

The valid Revitalization Program for Szczecin (RPS 2010/2014) was prepared utilizing also the SWOT analysis. Revitalization is planned in 15 declined areas. The waterfront revitalization is objective of the transformation of Śródomrze area, and partly the objective of Dąbie and Columbus Street areas. However the widely recognized in Poland results of urban renewal that had been achieved in Szczecin in late 90. of the 20c hardly seem to form a distinct local approach to the urban revitalization, the spatial reorganization of waterfront is in progress, partly by the public operations and partly by the investments of the private sector (Fig. 3).

Szczecin Development Strategy (to the year 2025), was adopted in 2011. Analysis of the Strategy shows a limited but noticeable influence of the territorial capital concept, by references to the intellectual capital of the city and the assets of urban relational capital. Also the social capital, as asset to enhance the cooperation of actors on variety of fields and goals, has been included, for utilizing it to *break the stereotypes about inability to act creatively in Szczecin* (p.52). Revitalization is noticed as an important task that should be addressed to the problem of brownfields. Waterfront or riverbank spatial re-organization is considered as (preliminary) material asset for tourism development and recreation. However the material historical heritage, valuated as an asset together with the location
by the river and nearby the sea, is expressed when the mission of the urban development is defined (p.41), the quality of landscape (townscape) is not directly noticed in the Strategy. The Strategy is built up with no noticeable correlation to the accumulated urban know-how and experience gained in programming of revitalization, co-operation in urban governance etc.

The Study of the conditions and directions of spatial development of Szczecin (Study for Szczecin 2005/2012) uses the element of the concept of territorial capital – social capital, in the analysis of the spatial development conditions of the city (Vol. I, p. 55). The concept of revitalizing of the declined urban environment is recognized and incorporated as a ‘challenge’ for the ‘possibility of limiting downtown nuisance related to pathologies of social life, and the increase of touristic attractiveness and the sense of personal security’ (p.5). The presented approach is relatively far from ‘building on the strength’ or assets development. Concentration on deficits to limit the gaps or damages (nuisances) is the leading purpose. That is even more obvious, when analyzing the applicable part of the Study, dedicated to the directions of spatial development (Vol. II, sec.5), nevertheless that the waterfront of Odra’s islands has been there planned to be ‘revitalized’.

The survey addressed to planning officials employed on the municipal and regional level has been conducted in May 2014, with the intention to investigate the Territorial Capital concept’ position in the spatial planning practice of the urban (Szczecin) and regional (Western Pomerania) professionals. The survey was carried out in parallel, in the two public offices of planning, urban and regional level, using the same electronic questionnaire. The numbers of survey responders in both groups of professionals are the same.

The acquaintance with the concept of Territorial Capital was declared by 12% of responders in the urban planning office and by 87% in the regional planning office. In both groups the concept was most of all indicated as useful for analysis and evaluation. The application in conceptual planning was assessed as moderate, while in programming as the least useful.

The survey included question on the issues of waterfront spatial organization, explored from the cognitive perspective defined by the innovative concept of Territorial Capital. Responders, according to the innovations in taxonomy proposed by Camagni (Fig.1) were asked to indicate not more than 4 key groups of assets (total 9), that are crucial factors of different, sample spatial operations at the waterfront. The result in two groups of professionals appeared different. In regional planning office, the average indication of a group of asset consisting the classical box of territorial capital (in the taxonomy marked by a, c, f, d) was 4 times higher than the average of the group that consists the goods of innovative cross of mixed goods (in the taxonomy marked by: b, e, g, h, i). In urban planning office, the average indication in both groups appeared to be the same. Assets located in the center of the innovative cross (h) - cooperation networks, PPP in schemes (for instance urban revitalization), governance on land resources – were indicated as always crucial for spatial operations at the waterfront. While in the regional planning office that group of assets was indicated for that 2 of 4 spatial re-organization of waterfront’ 4 samples that obviously needs intra-regional co-operation according to the legislation.
Conclusions, preliminary answers and remarks for future research

Waterfront’ revitalization schemes are recognized more as vehicle of spatial re-organization and instrument of urban marketing than as the induction of process of coherent economic urban revival by asset’ valuation and development. Limited practical recognition of the innovative concept of Territorial Capital that was evidenced during the survey may be one of the reasons.

The practical recognition of the utility of the Territorial Capital concept was noticed in one of the two analyzed urban development strategies. However according to the result of the survey it may be assumed that the methodology of that strategy has a minor influence on the local practice of the urban planning.

Although the space for innovation in urban spatial planning is limited by legal regulations, the analytical and diagnostic component of a plan may implement available and useful ideas (notions). Coming from that perspective to the results of a comparative analysis of the survey and both Studies, the concept of Territorial Capital may be seen as of margin influence on urban planning. The process of urban spatial planning self-restraint to land use planning, that has been noticed by Davoudi & Strange (2008) should be taken into account in further studies.

Analyzed revitalization programs show no direct linkage to the concept of Territorial Capital neither by treating the declined urban areas as assets nor by assuming the evident (observed) achievements in revitalization as intangible assets (urban know-how) available to be developed and used for future operations.

The evidenced approach to revitalization is much more the ‘problem to solve’ than ‘assets to develop’. In terms of the conducted empirical research there is no enough evidence to proof the pre-assumed innovative aspect of these revitalization schemes. In that context the waterfront revitalization should be further examined, possibly by investigation on factors involving the spatial integration of the stressed by Hoyle (2000:415) attributes: the sense of place, the scale and an appreciation of interdependences.

The result of the survey supports the positive preliminary answer to question about the applicability of the innovative Territorial Capital concept as a promising perspective to the research on process of revitalization in cities. The further empirical studies should take into consideration the evidenced minor practical reception of that concept. Adjustment of the methodology will be the precondition for further empirical research on how the innovative concept of Territorial Capital refer to the contemporary practice in spatial planning and waterfront’s revitalization. Already gained results of the research lead to the conclusion of irrelevance or separation (from both practical perspectives). Assuming the shift in urban governance, from managerism to entrepreneurism, has not been already executed in the post-socialist cities, the irrelevance may be explicable. But to evaluate that hypothesis, a further empirical research is necessary.
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