

ABSTRACT

Port cities are known for their special relationships due to the interfaces between city and port, historically sustained when both city and port continue to grow and develop together, fostering their interdependence through creation of identities and cultural aspects that reflect their common trajectory. There are cases in which city and port follow different courses of development and the connections that sustain the port city as one single unit are retained only in the memory and nostalgic feelings of its inhabitants. This paper is the result of field research which studied the trajectory of the port city of Vitória, Espírito Santo State, Brazil and how the perception of being a port city has been lost by its inhabitants.



How locals perceive the urban port: the City-Port Interface in Vitória/Brazil

Flavia Nico Vasconcelos

Economist, PhD in Social Science

Coordinator of Cityport Observatory, Vila Velha University (UVV-ES), Brazil

Rua Fortunato Ramos, 433/1602, Praia do Canto, Vitória, Brasil

flavia.nico@uvv.br

KEYWORDS

City-port; City-port interfaces; Urban port; Vitória; Brazil

How locals perceive the urban port: the City-Port Interface in Vitória/Brazil

Introduction

There is traditionally a historic, complex relationship of interdependency between a city and its port. In some cases, ports which have lost their competitive capacity and whose areas are unused or degraded are subject to recuperation of such spaces for urban use through projects in which their waterfronts are revamped – such as in Boston, Baltimore, Lisbon, Buenos Aires and Belém, among others.

In other cases, cities coexist with their former urban port only due to their location at central sites, with no symbiotic relationship, direct economic bond or historic-heritage identity maintained, as is the case in Barcelona, Antwerp, Rio de Janeiro and Santos, where at some stage the port function has distanced itself from urban activities and continues as an element of the logistical chain still located in the urban dynamic centre. Recognition as a port city is commonly lost – necessary interactions with the urban port tend to be played out in a conflictive manner, and a community's perception of the presence of the port is biased towards the negative aspects - lack of security, a focus of prostitution, a visual barrier to the sea, unpleasant aesthetics and so on.

In Vitória, capital of Espírito Santo State, the presence of a port complex confers little relative value on its first port – the Port of Vitória. A lack of public policies recognising Vitória as a port city and strengthening the identity of the urban port as a cultural and heritage asset has led to the Port being viewed as a mere gateway for ingress and egress of merchandise or as an isolated place where economically-gearred activities take place.

Situated in what is today the city's historical centre ("*Centro*"), in times past the focus point for economic development, the Port of Vitória occupies an urban area along the bay which forms the city's natural island, a stretch used as a thoroughfare for a significant volume of vehicles commuting between the neighbouring municipalities of Vitória/Cariacica/Vila Velha, passing in front of the historical area housing the state government headquarters - Palácio Anchieta.

Is Vitória still a port city? We answer this question on the basis of perceptions of those for whom the Port of Vitória constitutes daily life – the residents and traders of the port surroundings¹. This analytical study was conducted using hypothetico-deductive methodology, primary and secondary bibliographical study of Vitória and literature specialising in port cities. Its primary contribution originates from a field study using structured questionnaires which give a voice to residents and traders around the Port of Vitória Commercial Docks².

Historical evolution of the city-port interface in Vitória/ES

The port city concept is not consensual, characterised as it is by syncretism (Ducruet, 2005; Wang; Olivier, 2003). On the difficulty in identifying a point which provides specificity of a port city and which singles out what is peculiar to it, Ducruet (undated) deals with that which distinguishes it: ports without cities and cities without a port. Clearly not all ports are associated to a city and not every city maintains a relationship of proximity with its port.

¹ Research financed by the National Foundation for the Development of Private University Study - FUNADESP (2012). Scientific initiation students Roberta Ferro, Patricia Canci, Ana Luiza Pena and Romilson Neto participated in the field study.
² In addition to the Commercial Docks and Flexibrás/Technip (oil and gas solutions company) Terminal on the Vitória side of the bay, the Port of Vitória has six docks or terminals on the side of neighbouring city Vila Velha.

The term port city (or *ville portuaire*) refers to a port city where there once was a port, now no longer present, or defunct, or which retains traces of a port presence without maintaining a relationship of proximity with it (Henry, 2006). The term cityport (or *ville port*) defines a city with a functioning urban port. The former suggests juxtaposition and overlap; the latter interaction, complementarity and interconnection.

Brian Hoyle (1997/98) states that the notion of a cityport derives from the traditional, intimate association between city and port – its greatest component. Hoyle (1989) proposes a model of evolution for the western industrial cityport comprising five phases of modifications in interaction, complementarity and interconnection between city and port. We can use this model, with some adjustments to historical periods, to illustrate the evolution of the city and urban port in Vitória, Espírito Santo.

The history of Vitória blended with the history of its port in the long period between the 16th Century and 1930/40. Throughout this period, the city and port developed side-by-side in a symbiotic relationship which may be identified by what Hoyle (1989) classified as the Primitive Cityport stage, the first of his model.

A historical retrospective enables us to state that the city originated in 1535 with the intention of being a cityport. One of the reasons for choosing the then village of Vitória as headquarters for the Espírito Santo State Port Authority were the ideal conditions of its bay for development of port operations. Port organisation went hand-in-hand with the city's growth and urban development. Accounts by presidents of the province in the 19th Century mention port construction works associated to development and urbanisation of the city (Vasconcelos, 2011). From the city's foundation until 1928, the Port was among public administration plans for construction of the physical infrastructure-installation of avenues, urban development and improvements in quality of life (Siqueira, Vasconcelos, 2012).

The port also functioned in line with urban economic activities. The various docks, which would later give rise to the organised port, were linked to the activities of local society, such as the Great Docks, constructed for commercial purposes and the Port of the Padres, servicing the Jesuits and those bringing crops from the interior. The relevance of the Port was strategic in the 19th Century for local development for distribution of products from Minas Gerais - a neighbouring, landlocked state - and in the 20th Century for consolidation of the city as state capital. For decades, coffee production for export formed the basis of the local economy and was therefore directly associated to the Port for its distribution.

Official commercial projection of the Port of Vitória took place in 1940, with conclusion of its fit-out among plans for the increase in sea and land transportation systems. Until that stage, to think of the city was to think of the port and vice-versa.

It was during the intervening government of Punaro Bley (1930/43) that the first signs became apparent that the city's concerns, now focused on the social necessities of its inhabitants, moved away from construction of the Port, in turn increasingly associated with exports, diversification of operations and the demands of maritime transport. The profile of the Port changed with transformation of the primary exporting economic base into an industrial urban economy and the perspective of iron-ore exports led to a course of expansion of the port hinterland and physical structure (Siqueira, 1995).

The Port of Vitória is seen less and less as part of the urban area; its growth is not linked to that of the city, nor is it seen as an instrument to achieve targets associated to local interests. We now look at the second stage of Hoyle's model (1989), Cityport in Expansion. The model addresses rapid commercial/industrial growth of the city and forces which provide impetus for the port to develop beyond the city limits, with linear docks and break bulk industries.

Physical expansion of the port into the mainland, on the other side of Vitória bay in neighbouring city Vila Velha, occurred in the 1950s, with new docks located at the base of Atalaia Hill and three terminals for unloading and storage of bulk petroleum derivatives. The docks at Paul, Vila Velha came next, situated in an area already serviced by a rail link to handle the flow of fine ore (Campos, 2004). In this way, the Port's physical interface with the city began to grow in the direction of the mainland.

To service the steel industry and large-scale industrial projects arriving in Espírito Santo, port facilities were progressively transferred outside of the state capital's urban centre, such as the Ports of Tubarão (1966) and Praia Mole (1984), and later completely distanced from the metropolitan conurbation, such as Portocel/Aracruz (1978) and Ponta de Ubu/Ubu Port (1977).

Physical expansion of the new port complex is a reflection of Espírito Santo's definitive insertion into the industrialisation process and that of a shifting urban and economic dynamic in Vitória. The period between the 1970s and 1990s is when the city and Port of Vitória really became distanced - at that moment, the city began to hinder the Port and vice-versa.

At this point we identify an overlap of the third and fourth phases of Hoyle's model (1989). In the third phase, growing industry and the introduction of containerisation lead to the requirement for more port spaces - Modern Industrial Cityport. In the fourth phase on Maritime Waterfronts, changes in maritime technology brought about growth of industrial and maritime development areas separated from the city.

The detachment of port operations from economic activities in the city of Vitória is noteworthy. The Port of Vitória began to diversify its international trade portfolio in such a manner that many products passing through the port neither originated in, nor were destined for the state of Espírito Santo. The city became urbanised, with economic growth and an increasing population, while the Port developed its activities and grew physically - industrialisation leading both elements towards growth, sowing the seed for urban and port expansion in the state. As a result of industrialisation, Vitória became a central point of the Greater Vitória Metropolitan Region and the Port of Vitória came to be part of a group of ports of similar or greater significance. The dynamism of such urban growth widened the scale of the city and brought it into a greater whole, and the same occurred with the urban port, now part of a state port complex.

The presence of an urban port associated shipping with trade and, in turn, the association of these two elements to economic activity conferred upon Vitória - an aspect which, over the years, has come to be known as port vocation. The formation of a port complex made up of six ports and terminals unites the perception of ports as a physical movement interface, i.e. embarkation and disembarkation of cargo and people, with a new vision of the port as a magnet for economic activities, an economic agent, a link in the logistical chain and physical interface (Campos, 2004). The port vocation is exclusively linked to logistics facilities for international trade companies and to the economic development they bring about. It is not tied to value appreciation of port property or to perpetuation of a seaport identity nurtured by tradition or public policies.

In the 1990s, with its logic distanced from urban logic, the urban centre became an obstacle to good function of port operations and activities. Changing Port operations came to require more spaces for accommodation of containers; deeper waters for giant-size ships and open transport corridors operating 24 hours a day, among others.

The port also hinders the city. Access to and the view of the sea became objects of desire for the city's inhabitants, hampered as they were by the Port walls; spaces in urban centres began to increase in value and large port spaces became a target for interest from developers; the presence of the port is generally associated to considerable activity during the day, with circulation of workers and trucks hindering urban mobility, and of isolation at night, with high, dirty and dark

walls, encouraging prostitution establishments. The urban port became a stumbling block in a city developing in search of better quality of life for its population.

The fifth stage of the Hoyle model (1989) deals with city-port spatial re-approximation along new lines. In the modern port, giant ships and containerisation came to require more extensive spaces, and ports tend to migrate away from city centres, freeing up spaces for urban use. As part of urban regeneration, the concept of waterfront has become popular – port zones in urban areas revamped into spaces which value the historic-port heritage in the form of leisure facilities for people to enjoy the city.

The debate on the future of Vitória Port began initially in academia in the mid-1990s. Lecturers on the Architecture and Urban Development course at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES) collaborated on compilation of strategic documents and plans for the public sector, based on the waterfront concept. The new interpretation of port environment regeneration, however, did not please the entire port community (Soares, Lima Jr, 2005).

Such polarisation occurred between the local public authority – the Vitória Municipal Government (Prefeitura Municipal de Vitória - PMV) and the Port Authority – Espírito Santo Docks Company (CODESA). Under the then Mayor, Luis Paulo Velloso Lucas (1997-2005), PMV was keen to see the end of the Port's lifespan and implement redevelopment projects in the city centre, transforming warehouses into leisure and tourism centres. The Vitória do Futuro (Vitória of the Future) project labelled the Port as a historical reference in its city-centre redevelopment plans and sought to regain the region's identity by drawing on its natural and landscape advantages. With no consensus having been reached, a number of CODESA employees recognised that the Port of Vitória was unsuitable for modern port operations and needed to be replaced by another port outside the state's capital city, while another group claimed that the Port was in full operation, providing logistic support to offshore oil and gas exploration (Prata, 2010; Breciani, 2010).

It was only after a new local government came into power and the public authority withdrew its proposals to regenerate port spaces for urban use that dialogue was re-established (Zimmer, 2010; PMV, 2010). A further two events provided impetus for a re-approximation of city and port in Vitória: (a) Law 8.630/93, the Law on Port Modernisation, created the Port Administration Board (Conselho Administrativo Portuário – CAP), with representatives from the public authority, port operators, workers and port service users, establishing a permanent forum for negotiation; and (b) the international workshop Les Ateliers, bringing together different parties, architects and scholars from overseas to discuss the city-port interface, with working groups presenting different proposals to improve the relationship. Les Ateliers was an essential milestone in city-port re-approximation in Vitória, and played a central role in getting dialogue onto the PMV and CODESA agendas for discussion of matters of mutual interest (Breciani, 2010).

A sixth stage is added to the Hoyle (1989) model by Henry (2006), *Renewal of Port-City Links* (1980-2000), which provides for new city-port associations and a streamlining of their integration. Following a period of distance and conflict in the urban port and city relationship, the current trend in port cities is to harmonise the coexistence between the two, i.e. seek ways in which to maintain the port in the city.

This is the current situation in Vitória. If on one hand we see that relations between the city and CODESA were far from consensual, then on the other hand it is important to highlight the resumption of dialogue and attempts to find a common denominator from 2000 onwards. CODESA has made efforts to accommodate requirements for regeneration and modernisation of port environments in line with urban mobility needs in Vitória (Breciani, 2010). For its part, PMV has carried out works to revitalise walkways, walls and warehouses at the Port and implemented specific policies designed to bring the Port closer to the local population (Meneghel, 2010).

In addition to the challenges that the presence of an urban port and the city represent for each other, current PMV and CODESA representatives and managers have rescued the perception that there are common interests and that dialogue and partnership are the tools for a harmonious coexistence in the historical city-port interface in Vitória (Meneghel, 2010; Breciani, 2010; Zimmer, 2010). The historic centre and Port of Vitória are included in the isolated policies and actions of the local authority (PMV) Tourism Department – to attract cruise ships and define tourist excursions in the city's historic centre – and of the City Development Department – for regeneration of the Centre.

There is currently opposition between the Transport and Public Works Department and the State Culture Board/Culture Department of the Espírito Santo State government. The former has plans for BRT bus routes among port warehouse environments, and the latter has, since 2011, been developing a project for the listing and protection of these buildings as historic-cultural heritage, and its members have approximated organised civil society which complains of the potential loss of the Estação Porto cultural space in Warehouse 5.

In this current situation the lack of a wider, more consistent public policy involving the different municipal departments in projects with the common goal of projecting the Port as a cultural, aesthetic asset and which serve to rescue the feeling and identity of a port city have an impact on the possibilities for advances in dialogue between these parties.

The city-port interface in Vitória/ES in the perception of residents and traders in the surrounding port area

The perception of the researcher in respect of the city-port interface in Vitória is that the people of Vitória no longer see, think and much less act as if it were a port city. It would seem that the Port has become detached from the city or the city has lost its reference as a port. In an attempt to confirm this hypothesis, the opinions of those living in the city and having the Port physically present as part of their everyday lives were heard: residents and traders around the Commercial Docks.

The sample was calculated based on the electoral population in the City Centre district (8,670 inhabitants), with a 9% error margin and 95% accuracy. In total, a single structured questionnaire model was applied to 110 people, 51 of which residents and 59 traders - 42 women and 68 men.

To define the port surrounding area, we considered the spaces immediately in front of the Port in addition to the Vitória City Centre commercial area (High City or Cidade Alta) and the area around Vitória Cathedral and Costa Pereira Square. The Port occupies an area of some 1.3 km from the Vila Rubim area to the beginning of Avenida Beira Mar (along the shoreline), passing along Avenidas Elias Miguel and Presidente Getúlio Vargas and terminating at the start of Avenida Marechal Mascarenhas. The dividing line between the Port and the city is almost all defined by the walls of warehouses and other buildings. Open spaces are few and far between and are always fenced or walled.

To compile the questionnaire, we used a document from the Worldwide Network of Port Cities (AIVP) which suggests good practices to improve the city-port interface. The document presents five dimensions to be addressed: integration of spaces, urban dimension, functions, the environment and society.

We chose urban dimension as our area of study. The questionnaire was compiled with a view to obtaining the perception and opinion of residents and traders on three aspects to be applied as good practices in this dimension: (a) to treat the port as an urban space, ensuring quality architecture and taking care of elements which separate city and port; (b) to render the port

visible, combining reduction of visual pollution with openings to the water and port itself; (c) exploit all the potentialities of the water, using access points for a soft transition from city to sea, sharing use of the water and favouring movement of inhabitants by water, moving the city towards the port on the water.

Firstly, we asked interviewees about their perception of the Port's physical presence. We sought to identify whether they perceive port constructions as part of the cityscape, whether they were critical regarding the quality of upkeep of such spaces and if the elements separating city and port – fences and walls – are necessary or if they could allow more integration of the citizen with Vitória Bay.

75% of those interviewed see the Port warehouses and buildings as an integral part of the cityscape. It is worth noting that this perception is more significant on the part of traders (81%) than residents (68%). This is a trend identified through analysis of the data collected - half of those interviewed agree that the existence of the Port contributes positively to the landscape of the City Centre district, with the remainder divided between a belief that the contribution is negative (26%) or indifferent (22%). If we look more closely at the negative perception, we see that the percentage of residents (29%) which perceives the presence of Port constructions negatively is greater than that of traders (24%).

In respect of facades and upkeep of the port space, the majority complained of the poor state of paintwork and physical port structure, primarily in respect of buildings (69%) and walkways (71%). Discontentment with walkways and cycle paths was a significant response from residents, of which 82% stated that such elements do not satisfactorily meet their needs. It is worth noting that traders (81%) were more expressive than residents (65%) in relation to poor upkeep of facades. Also, 12% of residents had never stopped to look at the Port facades, while only 4% of traders had not.

The wall separating the Port from the city – as much a visual obstacle to Vitória Bay as a security measure for port operations – is seen by 78% of interviewees as being a necessity. According to 36% of residents interviewed, the wall is necessary, but should allow greater integration of locals and passers-by with the Bay. Only 7% of traders shared the same perception; 27% have no fixed opinion about the wall and 51% understand that for security reasons, no changes could be made. The traders' view is more pragmatic and associated to the port end-business activity, while residents take the view of citizens who wish to enjoy the city's natural features.

To summarise, the physical port infrastructure is seen as being integrated to the cityscape and life and, perhaps due to identification of economic-commercial practices and the physical presence of the port impacting on the local business environment, traders demonstrated more interest and knowledge, while taking a more critical stance than residents. The conclusion is surprising when one considers the profile of City Centre district residents, with a high rate of ageing – the sixth most populous neighbourhood in Vitória, with no relevant growth and a population which, generally, is made up of long-term residents of the region.

To address the second aspect of the dimension under analysis, which deals with visibility of the water and opening the port to the public, we devised questions which sought to encourage interviewees to imagine the Port as an urban space open for cultural and leisure use or to improve urban mobility.

Along the physical port-city interface there are four visual openings providing a view of the bay which lies hidden behind the walls. The first enables the passer-by to observe the ingress and egress of vehicles, parts and tubes at petroleum exploration solutions company Flexibras-Technip. There are two small gaps between the old warehouses, with presence of rubble, where a quick glimpse of the sea can be caught. Finally there is the central, largest opening opposite the

Anchieta Palace, where petroleum-related loads, anchored ships and passage of pedestrians and vehicles can be observed.

According to those interviewed, opening more spaces to provide views of the bay between warehouses would be very good (51%), good (24%), indifferent (19%) and bad (7%), leading us to conclude that the local population is in fact interested in having more spaces to view the bay or port activity. Opening more sections for such viewing would be an excellent option to bring daily port operations closer to everyday life in the city and attract the attention of those who are indifferent.

We observed that the Port is unknown territory to a considerable number of those who coexist with it daily – 44% of traders and 32% of residents have never been inside the port. Among those who have visited, 40% did so for tourism reasons with 23% entering for professional reasons. There is, therefore, interest in the Port as a tourist attraction, an aspect which could be potentialised as a means of approximating city and port.

It is interesting to note that among those traders yet to visit the Port, 31% have not done so due to lack of opportunity. Only 8% of residents have not had the opportunity, while 23% are not interested, adding weight to the distancing of city residents from the Port.

The lack of awareness-raising and debate over city-port interfaces is borne out by the percentage of interviewees unaware of the proposals of CODESA and the state government to demolish the warehouses (75%). Asked if they would be in favour of, against or indifferent to destruction of Port warehouses to increase storage space, 44% of traders and 43% of residents were in favour. It can be seen that more traders (43%) are against demolition than residents (34%), which indicates on the surface that the former identify more with the Port's historical buildings and warehouses than the latter. The rate of indifference among residents interviewed (23%) is significant, reinforcing the hypothesis of detachment from the historical and heritage value of the Port on the part of the city's residents.

When we put the question on demolition of the warehouses for urban mobility purposes, we observed an increase in the percentage of those in favour – from 43% to 59%. The stance of residents against demolition remained stable regardless of motive. There was a drop from 44% to 34% of traders against demolition if the motive is not for port operation purposes but rather to enable urban mobility improvements. In other words, the traders' ties of cultural and heritage identity and value with the Port are not as strong or relevant as could be supposed at the outset.

In respect of urban use of port installations, 87% agree that the port administration should allow unused spaces to be given over to culture and leisure. Among interviewees, 65% know of the Estação Porto Project, a joint endeavour by the Municipal Culture and Tourism departments, housed at Warehouse 5, with shows and cultural activities. Given the considerable media coverage, the fact that events are free and the project has been running since 2006, the percentage of people unaware of cultural activities at the Port (35%) is high.

While 34% of traders have not had the opportunity to attend any event at Estação Porto and only 7% are not interested, this proportion is inverted for residents: 14% of residents have never had the opportunity and 25% were not interested in participating.

Given that this is currently the only option for the local population to enter the port space or have a cultural experience developed in a city-port partnership, it is not surprising that 59% of those interviewed consider the Port not to be very accessible to the public. It is surprising, however, that interest in the port space being more accessible to the public is greater among traders (82%) than residents (71%). It is noteworthy that 29% of residents are indifferent to or not interested in having access to the port space, a position that adds weight to perception of the Port as an isolated activity.

With waterfronts in mind, the interests of those interviewed were gauged and they were found to be in favour of: a place from which to observe port activities (80%), a Port history museum (86%), resumed water transport linking Vitória, Vila Velha and Cariacica (95%) and sporting activities in the bay (92%). The possibility of creating a Port museum was the only aspect where a greater number of traders (10%) than residents (5%) thought it a bad idea. The number of residents who found the other proposals bad or expressed indifference was greater in all cases than the traders. Even so, the high percentages suggest that a public policy aimed at rescuing the cityport identity through cultural and sporting events may circumvent the apparent lack of residents' interest in the Port.

In summary, there is interest among the public in having better visual access to the Bay of Vitória, viewing of which is hampered by port buildings. The Port is considered a closed area and is still unknown territory to a significant number of those interviewed. Continuance of tourist and cultural programmes and implementation of waterfront projects (museum, aquarium, lookout points, etc.) are well regarded by the public and may increase city-port integration. The high percentages of respondents in favour of demolishing the warehouses, regardless of motive, demonstrate the little relevance afforded by the public to their place as historic heritage, a fact which, together with the display of indifference and even negative perception residents have of the Port is a reflection of the loss of identity as a cityport.

The third aspect considered in the urban dimension of city-port interface is exploitation of the potentialities of the water. A traditional option in the bay for public transport is provided by the boatsmen. In Vitória this activity, passed down from father to son, is performed by some 10 small rowing boats which, for a minimal fee, transport small groups across the bay, alongside large ships, between Vitória and Paul or on visits to the Penedo Stone. 86% of residents are aware of this activity, a figure which drops to 47% for traders. Despite the fact that 41% of interviewees consider the activity very important, residents and traders in the City Centre district are not among the most frequent users, as only 56% of residents and 20% of the traders have taken such a trip.

Finally, we included questions on peoples' opinion in relation to positive and negative aspects of the Port's presence in Vitória. Positive aspects were mentioned in the following order of frequency: economic growth, attraction of tourists, historic and cultural symbolism and the urban landscape of the City Centre district. This confirmed the direct association of the Port with economic activity – the aspect singled out as most important – and also with attraction of tourists – an aspect linked to the arrival of large cruise ships which berth at the Commercial Docks. Historic and cultural symbolism was considered of secondary importance, highlighting the weak historic influence of the Port on life in the city.

Negative aspects are listed in the following order: lack of safety, visual pollution, lack of access to the bay and urban mobility. The area surrounding the Port is unsafe according to 75% of interviewees and complained of by many, and its physical presence is seen more as visual pollution than a positive part of the cityscape.

When asked whether Port operations have any impact on quality of life in the region, 53% said yes – positively, 33% claimed it had no relevant impact and only 14% said it had a negative impact. It is evident that port operations take place without hindering or inconveniencing life in the city. We believe that positive perception of the Port is associated to its role in the economy, as 70% agree with the essential nature of its operations for the city's economic development.

Conclusion

The city of Vitória was born a cityport. Port and city have developed in harmony for centuries. According to Brian Hoyle's model (1989), we can identify other cases in which city and port become detached, hinder each other and come together again.

General policies and actions of current public municipal and state administrations have placed promotion of a cityport identity on the back burner and, as such, urban history and tradition linked to the Port of Vitória have been lost and forgotten. Lack of interest and disregard shown during the field study by residents of the City Centre district are reflections of a city which was once a cityport and is now a port city.

The community around the Port does not regard it as something which hinders their lives, but quite the opposite - maintaining a positive opinion. However, there is no interest, historical attachment, identity or any feeling of a bond. The Port is simply there; a neighbour about which little is known and about which people have no desire to know much. In general, the stance demonstrated by residents of the Centre district is one of indifference or detachment. On hearing the voice of the cityport of Vitória, we have seen that little remains of the symbiosis, complementarity and integration of being a cityport.

Bibliography

- AIVP (2007) Plan the city with the port. Available at: <http://www.aivp.org/en/blog/2007/11/02/plan-the-city-with-the-port-guide-of-good-practices/>. Accessed on 6th August 2013.
- Breciani, M. (2010) A Interface Cidade-Porto de Vitória: o ponto de vista da Codesa. Vitória: 29th April 2010, 5th May 2010. Interview given to F. N. Vasconcelos.
- Bird, J. (1963) The major seaports of the United Kingdom. London: Hutchison.
- Campos, M. M. (2004) Vazios operativos da cidade: territórios interurbanos na Grande Vitória (ES). Doctorate thesis. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.
- Ducruet C. (2005) Spatial structures and trends in port cities: from the local to the global. *Mappemonde*, 77(1).
- Wang, J.J.; Olivier, D. (2003). A gouvernance des ports et la relation ville-port en Chine. *Les Cahiers Scientifiques du Transport*, 44.
- Henry, M. (2006) Villes portuaires en mutation - Les nouvelles relations ville-port à Marseille dans le cadre du programme de renouvellement urbain Euroméditerranée. Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, Institut de Géographie.
- Hoyle, B. S. (1988) Development Dynamics at the Port-City Interface. In: Hoyle, B. S.; Pinder, D. A.; Husain, M.S. (Eds). *Revitalising the Waterfront*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Hoyle, B. (1997/1998) Cities and ports - concepts and issues. *Vegueta*, Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Facultad de Geografía e Historia, 3, 263.
- Meneghel, Clemir. A Interface Cidade-Porto de Vitória: o ponto de vista da Secretaria de Desenvolvimento da Cidade (SEDEC). Vitória: 7th July 2010. Interview given to F. N. Vasconcelos.
- Norcliffe, G.; Bassett, K.; Hoare, T. (1996) "The emergence of postmodernism on the urban waterfront: Geographical perspectives on changing relationships". *Journal of Transport Geography*, Amsterdam, 4 (2), 123-134.
- Prata, E. (2010) A Interface Cidade-Porto de Vitória: o ponto de vista da Codesa. Vitória: 15th June 2010. Interview given to F. N. Vasconcelos.
- Prefeitura Municipal de Vitória (2011) Dados da Sinopse - Julho/2011.
- Siqueira, M. P. S.; Vasconcelos, F. N. (2012) Urbanização da cidade e nova concepção portuária: a trajetória compartilhada pela cidade e porto de Vitória na construção do progresso e de identidades. Available at: <http://www.aahe.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/jornadas-de-historia-economica/iii-cladhe-xxiii-jhe/ponencias/Penha%20Nico.pdf>. Accessed on 10th August 2013.

Siqueira, M.P.S. (1995) O desenvolvimento do porto de Vitória 1870-1940. Vitória: Codesa.

Soares, H. A.; Lima Jr., P. N. (2005) Argumentos intelectuais e articulações escalares: o debate em torno da revitalização do Porto de Vitória (Brasil). *Scripta Nova*, Universidad de Barcelona, v. IX, n. 194 (45).

Vasconcelos, F. N. (2011) O desenvolvimento da interface cidade-porto em Vitória do período colonial ao início do século XXI: uma cidade portuária? Doctorate thesis. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.

Zimmer, Henrique. (2010) A Interface Cidade-Porto de Vitória: a experiência do ex-diretor da Codesa. Vitória: 24th May 2010. Interview given to F. N. Vasconcelos.