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What is the potential for differences of views between local priorities and national considerations when developing Gateway and Corridors with particular reference to land use planning?
The rise and fall of urban mega-projects

“It is much easier to site new buildings—even stadiums, convention centres, and shopping malls—away from sensitive neighbours than airports, highways, or rapid transit systems because they require neither mammoth sites nor continuous corridors”

(Altshuler and Luberoff, 2003: 230)
Global logistics and local dilemmas

1. Gateways, corridors and ports inhabit cities…
   - A history of disconnection
   - Infrastructure, Networks, Economics & Institutions

2. Impacts vary by scale…
   - Local pain, global gain
   - Local = Neighbourhood to Metropolitan

3. Respecting urban sustainability…
   - Efficiency, Equity, Environment
Disconnection - four ways of thinking about ports and port-cities

• Port-infrastructure

• Port-networks

• Port-economies

• Port-institutions
Port-infrastructure

- **Containerization:**
  - McLean, Sealand and the Ideal X, 1956
  - Wheels to boxes
  - Bigger, cellular ships

- **Port infrastructure:**
  - Migration downstream
  - Dredging
  - Cranes and terminals

- **Urban interface:**
  - Truck and rail corridors
  - Localized noise and air pollution
  - Barrier effects
The Port of Baltimore: migration away from the city center
The Port of Durban: some ports can’t escape their cities...
Durban auto terminal – the urban interface
Port-networks

• Shipping economies of scale
  • Deregulation and intermodalism
  • Larger hinterlands

• Consolidation of flows
  • Gateways, hubs and feeders
  • Localized congestion

• The rise of logistics
  • Metropolitan land use impacts
Port-economies

• De-localisation of benefits of trade

• Abandonment of old industrial waterfront
  • The diversified waterfront

• Waterfront technology and employment
  • Job quantity, quality and skill content
Competing land uses on the diversified waterfront

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maritime</th>
<th>Non-maritime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Cargo, Ship services, Fishing</td>
<td>Heavy industry, Toll / ferry crossings, Commuter rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Cruise ships, Recreational boating, Habitat restoration</td>
<td>Real estate, Tourism, Public access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Employment Growth in US West Coast States, 1983-5 to 2000-2

- Railroads: -14,210
- Water Transport: -10,800
- Warehouse: +16,103
- Transport Services: +33,668
- Trucking: +129,637
Relative annual earnings of US West Coast transport workers, 1970-2005
Port-institutions

- Changed role of public authorities
  - Port competition and over-investment
  - Retreat to landlord / planner role
  - Regionalization and co-operation

- Changed role of private sector actors
  - Privatization and terminalization of ports
  - Maritime industry mergers and consolidations
Global terminal ownership and market share restructuring among leading actors, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating body</th>
<th>Share of global terminal ownership</th>
<th>Share of global container port throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global terminal operators</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean carriers</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public port authorities</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Figures have been rounded-off for readability. Global terminal operators and carriers are defined as those firms having terminal operations in more than one region. Others are defined as non-global terminal operators and public port authorities. Source: Drewry, 2002 via Olivier & Slack, 2006.
Global logistics and local dilemmas

1. Gateways, corridors and ports inhabit cities
2. Impacts vary by scale
3. Respecting urban sustainability
   • From optimizing one goal to satisfying many
   • Efficiency – achieve desired and legitimate goods movements with lowest possible inputs
   • Equity – ensure that the benefits and costs of goods movement are proportionately distributed among individuals, groups and localities
   • Environment – ensure that the movement of goods is compatible with natural ecosystem health
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