

## TENSIONS AND TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE MASTER PLANNING PROCESS OF ISTANBUL

James STEELE, Prof.  
University of Southern California, United States  
jamesmcleodsteele@gmail.com

Rania SHAFIK, Research Associate  
National Research Center, Egypt  
raniashafik@hotmail.com

### INTRODUCTION

Istanbul has been described as a city on the edge, of Europe, of modernization, of fundamentalism, of the future. But it would be more accurate to describe it as a city in between: split between Europe and Asia, modernization and tradition, poverty and wealth, an industrial and post-industrial ethos and financial system, secularism and spirituality, past, present and future. It also spans one of the largest and most active tectonic plates on earth, between the Eurasian and Anatolian plates. This interstitial condition is most legible in the physical layers of city growth, clearly documented, in the modern period, in an incremental series of urban plans that convey the social, cultural and religious values of its inhabitants.

Istanbul has a unique Eurasian character due its location on two continents; the western side of Istanbul is in Europe, while the eastern side is in Asia. However, there are lots of arguments regarding the western influence in architecture, the consumption based projects around the city and the increase of gated communities in the European side, which have been invading the socio economic and the ethnic character in the city fabric. Today, Istanbul faces many challenges in its development process where global and regional influences compete with the needs and demands of diverse local groups (IMM, 2009) .

### ISTANBUL UNIQUE SILHOUETTE

Istanbul is characterized by its unique relationship with water. The city's architecture is enriched with different Islamic elements past and a unique silhouette of the Ottoman capital surrounded by Roman city walls covering the hills sloping towards the water, providing amazing views (Yenen, 2001). The unique character of the city derives from its architecture as well as its natural setting. The characteristic connection of land and water make the views of the historic city an important part of its heritage. The Historic Areas of Istanbul World Heritage Site was inscribed in 1985 not including Galata and without a buffer zone to protect the surroundings. The core areas consist of: the "Archaeological Park" of Sultanahmet, the Süleymaniye area, the Zeyrek area, and the Land Walls of Theodosius. The boundaries of the core areas and the buffer zone were redefined in the mid 1990s as not all the historic walled areas of the Byzantine and Ottoman cities are included in the World Heritage Site (Michelmores, 2006). The approach now in Istanbul is in favor of preserving the historical buildings as well as the preservation of the valuable skyline views (per UNESCO standards). Structures with scale small or medium should accompany the historical preservation agenda for the sites which have an impact on the skyline (IMM, 2009).

### A RAPID PACE OF CHANGE

Between the time of Sultan Suleyman and the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the population of Istanbul nearly doubled, from 300,000 to 600,000. In that time, the accumulation of *kulliye* and new settlements had completely altered the axis of the Byzantine city, which had primarily been parallel to the coast of the Marmara Sea, to one along the Golden Horn. This new alignment linked the Bayezit, Suleyman and Fatih complexes together. With the opening of the first Ottoman customs office between the Sultan Ahmet and Bayezit Square near the Golden Horn, a new urban focus began to be established, but the old city walls on the west restricted further development. Because of this limitation, all new growth in the city extended along the Bosphorus, including Kadikoy and Uskudar. These were, at first, totally separate settlements which each had their own unique character,

divided by wide fields and gardens. Their boundaries were originally determined by the distance that people in each village could easily walk to get water from the public fountains that served each of them (Kuban, 1986).

Prior to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, more than 60 % of the mosques in Istanbul were located in the old city, with the remainder scattered among the settlements along the Bosphorus. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, this ratio dropped to 45 % on the peninsula and 55% outside. All of the new settlements along the water's edge also helped to establish the Bosphorus as a major lane of water transport, gradually transforming the image of the entire region even further.

## PRECURSORS TO FORMAL PLANNING

Along with the new axis of development along the Golden Horn, additional pines were established, from Sircige to the west and the Old City, across the Golden Horn to Taksim and Harbeye, where a large influx of foreigners established a vibrant colony at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This enclave continued to grow there for nearly two centuries. The expansion of this second axis corresponded to a general move toward Westernization in Istanbul at this time, which was called the "Age of Tulips" because of all the new gardens that seemed to grow overnight. It was a period characterized by a general liberalization and social *joie de vivre*, as well as a growing governmental interest in cultural development.

A series of military setbacks prompted several successive Sultans, such as Abdulhamid I, Selim III, and Mahmut II, to make a determined effort to re-organize the Ottoman army between 1774 and 1839, despite stubborn resistance from both the elite army core of Janissaries and the *Ulema*, or clerics. One important result of these reforms, as far as the configuration of the city is concerned, was that foreign military advisors and their dependants moved into it, and a series of military schools and barracks were built along Western lines that became the focal point of expatriate compounds around them.

The best documentation of these rapid changes to the city are the first scientific map, or plan, of Istanbul, drawn by engineers Francois Kauffer and Metochites Lechevalier in 1807, and a series of etchings made by Antoine Ignace Melling, who served as the architect to Sultans Selim III and Hatice Sultan. These both show that, at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the configuration of Istanbul was still determined by the circuit of its walls, which were maintained up through the reign of Sultan Ahmed III.

Yedikule fortress terminated the view to the west. There were no settlements outside the walls along the coast of the Marmara Sea. And the Topkapi Palace cascaded in terraces down the hill of the *Saraburnu* to the shore. Most importantly, perhaps, the horizon of Yedikule was crowned by a line of mosques that defined the skyline, rising above a baseline of densely packed dwellings below (Ousterhout, 1983). It was one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

## TANZIMAT

These changes eventually led to a series of reforms, or *Tanzimat*, enacted in 1827, which inevitably altered the predominantly eastern customs and manners of Istanbul. Factories, railroads and a Stock Exchange were introduced, followed by the publication of the first newspaper in 1831, the opening of a postal service in 1834 and the replacing of the title of Grand Vizier by that of Prime Minister in 1836. Slavery was outlawed in 1846, followed by the opening of universities, as well as schools of medicine and art. Between 1846 and 1868, Ottoman embassies were established in many foreign countries, which also gave many Turkish students the chance to study outside the country. As a final important step, the *Istahat* was passed in 1856 that guaranteed the rights and equality of all of the people in the Empire, regardless of religion or ethnic background (Borie, 1987).

As a result of the prevailing governmental attitude toward *Tanzimat*, and with the advent of the industrial age at the turn of the twentieth century, the pace of Westernization quickened. New railways were built that connected Istanbul to Europe as well as to other cities in Turkey; making it a hub of industry and trade, and this had a significant impact on its economic and physical structure. New banks, attracted by this change, flocked to the city to take advantage of its increased wealth. Steamship services started in 1850, with six ships, and the Galata

port opened in 1909. All of this was a great impetus to economic activity in Istanbul.

## A SERIES OF CITY PLANS

This new openness to western technology and culture also led to the first of what has now become an ongoing series of city plans, following the lead of those that were then being implemented in the major cities in Europe. The first of these was prepared under the supervision of Marshal von Moltke, who, inspired by the work of Baron von Hausmann in Paris, proposed the opening of fourteen meter wide boulevards and avenues that were to be cut through the traditionally closed and dense fabric of the old city. Aside from improving transportation links from one neighborhood or district to another, one of his most important rationales for this approach, apart from it being in vogue at the time, was his wish to create broad open vistas that would highlight the mosques and other large monuments more effectively, by isolating them within wide open spaced in the European fashion. While the width of the avenues proposed by von Moltke was later substantially reduced, the basic concept of the destruction of large sections of the traditional city was firmly implanted and remained as a central feature of all of the plans that were to follow.

Istanbul was transformed under Ottoman rule according to Islamic tradition, and nearly 30 % of the buildings within it were dedicated to religion. Mosques were located according to the distance of a muezzin's voice and the practicality of walking to them; daily routines conformed to the call to prayer (Kuban,1986). The rhythm of life was soon to inalterably change.

The last gasp of the Empire was accompanied by neglect, which allowed for the destruction of entire neighborhoods of traditional wooden houses later on.

## THE PROST PLAN

With the end of the Empire in 1923, the pace of change quickened further. While there was no appreciable planning activity during the first decade of the Republican Period, Ataturk, commissioned Alfred Agache, Herman E.H. Lambert and Martin Wagner to do a report on potential transportation growth, historic preservation and zoning in the early 1930's, but it was never implemented. This led to an important Plan formulated by Henri Prost, Alfred Agache and Herman E.H. Lambert, which was implemented, and has served as the basic framework for all of those that have followed.

Henri Prost had first visited Istanbul in 1902, as the winner of the *Prix de Rome* on the Grand Tour. He advised the government on a restoration of the Hagia Sophia that was going on at that time. He worked on several plans for the French government for colonial cities in North Africa, and was contacted to be a consultant for the rebuilding of Izmir, following a fire in 1922 (Borie,1987). Based on past involvement, he was invited by Ataturk to come to Istanbul in 1936 to produce a Masterplan for Istanbul, best summarized as an epic attempt to secularize the city, to modernize it according to prevailing modern, and Modernist standards, and to adapt it to the automobile. Following von Moltke's lead, in his 1839 Plan, Prost focused first on opening up the city, on "beautification" and on highways and squares. Based on his experience in Izmir, and government concerns about fire, he implemented the Modernist concept of zoning, popularized by the *Congres Internationale Architecture Moderne*, and Le Corbusier a decade earlier, as a way of also providing fire breaks. The three main categories of the Plan are Industrial, Cultural and Tourist zones, which still remain today. The arterial plan he implemented follows the line of the Theodosian walls to the west, the sea wall, which was removed, along the Marmara coast to the south, an the "Y" shaped *Cardo Maximus* of the Constantine city running through the middle. The *Decumaus* was widened to become a link between the Marmara freeway and the Asian side across the Bosphorus, creating the Galata bridge-Beyazit connection. Parks were opened up along the Theodosian wall and the primary fork of the old *Cardo Maximus*, running south-east to north-west.

The Prost Plan was incrementally implemented, between 1936 and 1950, which was a critical period in the history of the city, socially and politically. Prost's concept of an "Archeological Park", tied to his third category of a Tourist zone, has left buildings like the Hagia Sophia and the Yeni Cami standing alone in the midst of

vast open spaces, instead of being an integral part of their specific urban context, as they would have been in the past. This concept did yield good, lasting results, however, in the case of the Topkapi Palace and Sultanahmet, which were also included as part of the archeological park, preserving that part of the cities historical silhouette, and unique urban identity, when it is viewed from the shore. The zoning of the Golden Horn as an industrial area, which was also implemented, was originally only intended for light industry, but opened the door for heavier use. This has left a blighted visage facing the water, and now that the industrial phase of the cities life is almost over, this will be even less attractive and hard to reverse, in the future (Kuban, 1996). This provision virtually assured the destruction of the natural beauty of the Golden Horn as that industry inevitably grew, and that segment of the city silhouette with it.

Prost also proposed a large harbor and railway station at Yenikoy, of a scale similar to earlier proposals put forward during the reign of Abdulaziz, but this was not realized. This indicates his “make no little plans” mindset, as well as offering a clue to the scale of his interventions, and their effect on the city.

All of the urban plans that have been commissioned since Prost, namely the Revision Committee Plan of 1951, Musavirler Heyeti of 1956, Hans Hogg in 1960, Luigi Piccinato and Cegis Donemi Tedbirleri of 1961, the Bakanliklaraasi Commission Plan of 1966, the Greater Istanbul plan of 1967 and the Metropolitan Plan of 1972 to 1981, are all arguably predicated upon the same philosophy as the Prost precedent: revolving around the creation of wider concrete streets at the expense of human scale and pedestrian ease, the establishment of a social museum, and the denial of this conurbations singular historical role as a city on the sea. This relationship to the water, which was once an essential part of the character of Istanbul, putting it at the head of a select league of others, such as Venice, San Francisco, Hong Kong and Vancouver, has hardly been considered in any of these plans, either in the preservation of its historical profile, nor has the potential to use sea lanes as a means of transport, or parts of the shore for sustainable recreation, or entertainment (Kilincaslan, 1996).

## NEGATING AN IMPORTANT APPROPRIATION OF POWER

One essential point that seems to have been missed out in each of them, in the blind rush toward development and the establishment as a world city, is that Istanbul has many layers of history, starting with it's the Greek *polis* of Byzas. When Constantine took over the Roman *castrum* of Septimus Severus, he altered the topography to replicate the Seven Hills of Rome, to make this new version a perfect physical as well as Imperial copy. Mehmet the Conqueror and subsequent Ottoman Sultans decided to dominate the crest of each of those hills with mosques, in a deliberate appropriation of power through symbolic image, just as the structural form of the Hagia Sophia was adapted by the great Ottoman architect Sinan in the mosques he built afterward the conquest.

When Ataturk made the momentous decision to move the capital of Turkey from Istanbul to Ankara for security reasons in 1923, Istanbul lost political dominance within the country virtually overnight. But, it started to find a new economic role for itself around 1950, which was a turning point for the modernizing city. In the first part of the republican Period, from 1923 to 1950, Istanbul's loss of its position as the political heart of Turkey brought about the loss of its social, economic and cultural lifeblood as well. The aristocratic and bureaucratic associations of court life that the city had enjoyed for so long diminished as quickly as the Empire it had once ruled. Prestigious residential areas, such as those around Bayezit and the Sultan Ahmet Square, which were just becoming fashionable among court officials at the time of the move, immediately lost value and were either demolished, or suffered the slow destruction of being let room by room.

The beginning of rural-urban migration brought farmers from Anatolia at this time, when the saying was “the streets of Istanbul are paved with gold”. That wave was to soon become a tsunami between 1950 and 1970, starting a critical shift in the social balance in the city. Consequently, many minorities, who have historically formed the basis of the bourgeoisie in Istanbul, and who gave the city a high degree of social texture, now found themselves pushed out. They started selling their property to avoid this human tidal wave of people moving in from the countryside. One surprising cause of this migration, with good intentions but calamitous results, was the Marshall Plan, which introduced the first mechanized

tractors into Anatolia at the end of World War II. From a first grant of 1,750 tractors in 1948, the numbers shipped to Turkey steadily increased to 6,500 in 1950, to 42,000 in 1960, and 100,000 in 1970. This had the incremental effect of causing a redundancy of human labor, subsequent joblessness, and a rush to Istanbul to find work along the greatly improved roads provided by Prost and those that followed him. In a survey conducted in 1979, for example, it was found that hundreds of itinerant workers were living in one of the kiosks of a mosque in the Suleymaniye area, providing a small example of the slow takeover of many parts of historical buildings. A much more dramatic example is the large number of *gecekondu*, or squatter settlements now found around the city.

## RECOVERY AND SPECTACULAR GROWTH

Following its loss of social and economic status in the Republican Period, Istanbul has entered a second phase of development, which may be seen to have started in 1950. A switch to a multi-party system and a more liberal attitude toward economic development has meant that the city has not only regained its old momentum, but today stands as one of the most cosmopolitan cities in the world. As a result of what might be called mural, dendritic growth, the rings of Istanbul's walls, like the rings of a tree, have radiated out, one after another, from the first wall around the base of the old Greek *acropolis*. This growth, when overlaid with the changes of axis in the Byzantine and Ottoman cities and the contemporary legacy of Henri Prost, has resulted in a city with totally separate, highly individual and identifiable zones. These have given Istanbul a uniquely staccato character, and are now related to the squares that have emerged from the idea of the "archaeological park".

## IMP MASTER PLAN

A series of large projects took place in Istanbul as a result of the policies of the 1980's that intended to make Istanbul a "World City." Some of these projects are Anatolia-Thrace Highway, construction of a second bridge over the Bosphorus and its freeway system, international luxury hotels, skyscrapers, office buildings etc. These projects did not take place according to a master plan and their impact on the water front was not considered. This caused the city to grow further towards north threatening the forest areas and water reservoirs, causing spontaneous land-uses and densification of the shorelines (Yenen, 2001).

Later, a series of Master plans was formalized by Metropolitan Municipality of Istanbul Metropolitan Planning and Urban Design Center (IMP). In May 2006, IMP prepared Istanbul Master Plan which was shared with Academics, architects, civil society organizations and the public. In 2008, the latest plan was formulated and its main goal was to establish a balance between conservation and development and to integrate the city into the world economy to reassert its position as a major metropolis in its region and to promote Istanbul as a site of global historical and cultural significance by the year 2023 (IMM, 2009). The major problem which served as a catalyst for the initiation of the Master Plan is that Istanbul Metropolitan area is suffering from a single center in the European side. The service area is concentrated in the European side and the center of activities is not sufficiently developed in the Anatolian Side. Most of the people working in the European Side live in the Anatolian Side due to the low value of housing in this side. This causes a blockage in the traffic in the road connecting the two sides. The service area in the European side includes: Zeytinburnu-Historical Peninsula and Ayazağa Axis, Zeytinburnu between Küçükçekmece Lake, Between the Lakes: Lake Büyükçekmece with Küçükçekmece Lake Break, and the Western Corridor. The Anatolian side includes: Kadıköy-Üsküdar, and Kartal-Pendik-Tuzla. (IMP, 2008)

As a result, a dominant planning approach in Istanbul is the importance of decentralized and polycentric growth has been introduced in 1999 in order to control the uneven development of the European Side (IMM, 2009). The 2008 master plan, stresses on the idea of polycentalism through the idea of Metropolitan sub-centers. It recommends the formation of 'central business districts' CBD (IMM, 2009). The main planning strategies accompanying Istanbul master plan focuses on five main aspects. First, it highlights the importance of Istanbul European Union accession and competing in the global system. Second, it encourages the approach towards sustainable development, ecological balance and disaster sensitive urbanism. Third, it lays emphasis on applying the standards of the World City of

Culture in Istanbul metropolitan area by enhancing Istanbul cultural and natural values and most significantly conserving the Bosphorus and Historical Peninsula, cultural fabric as well as protecting the skyline. Fourth, it stresses on increasing the economic relations with countries in the region to increase competence among world metropolises, global and regional centers. This could be achieved through focusing on service sector, information and communication technology development. Finally, it draws attention to improve the quality of life in Istanbul through urban transformation projects to strengthen, improve and transform the economic and social aspects (IMP, 2008).

A four year target strategic plan was approved by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IMM) council. This plan is prepared by the IMP with the 1/100,000 scaled Istanbul Environment Plan. It was taken into consideration the opinion of the district municipalities, universities, and non-governmental organizations. The aim of this plan is to promote public transportation, protect and develop green spaces and create a financial and tourist city in which the needs of people of Istanbul would be satisfied. The mayor of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, Mr. Kadir Topbaş, stated that a major part of efficiently and effectively problem-solving is planning as he had previously indicated in the preface of the book titled “2010-2014 Strategic Plan.” He stated that,

“The 2010-2014 Strategic Plan that we have prepared includes a wide range of many services, activities, and investments which have important shares in personal life, such as planning, public works, transportation, environment, culture, disaster and risk management, services contributed towards the city, and social order as well as social municipalism to public health. As our works will be done within the framework of this plan, we will put many major projects into practice in the future which aim to increase Istanbul’s attractiveness, image, and prestige as we have done in the past.”

It was determined in the plan that Bakırköy-Silivri on the European side and Kartal, Ataşehir, and Kozyatağı on the Asian side will be the primary centers of the city. Avcılar, Selimpaşa, Çanta, Ümraniye, Maltepe, Pendik, Tuzla, Orhanlı, and Şeyhli are all considered as secondary centers (IMP, 2008).

## URBAN TRANSFORMATION PROJECTS

A central idea of several contemporary planning efforts has been a number of Urban Transformation projects. These projects are the components of the CONCEPT 2023 that aim to transform the city into an international center of attraction while targeting the Year 2023 for the commemoration of 100th anniversary of the Turkish Republic (Tüzin, 2003). Some of these were initiated by the central government and others by the local authority. The recent Urban Transformation Projects passed as law from the parliament in 2005 that give almost unlimited powers to the municipality to re-construct the urban space in order to turn Istanbul into a ‘global city’ (Tuna, 2007). Some of these projects faced a lot of criticism from the public and the key actors due to their sensitive location. The challenge in these projects is integrating them into the city design given their impact on the unique silhouette, identity and collective memory of the city.

The paper will discuss some of these projects like Haydarpasha Port Railway Station, Galata Port Urban Transformation Project, Kartal Pendik Urban Transformation Project and the Golden Horn Environment Protection Project.

### Haydarpasha Port Railway Station

Transformation of Haydarpasa Port area came into agenda due to the strategies about the port areas that took place in Istanbul Master Plan. These strategies include improving port capacities of Istanbul and make them function more efficiently (Erdem Erbas, 2007).

Haydarpasa port is in the Anatolian side of Istanbul and at the entrance of the Bosphorus. This panorama of Haydarpasa is opposite to the Historic Peninsula and is an important visual component to the Anatolian silhouette, which is an essential part of the environment of Istanbul’s World Heritage Sites. The project has a main historical feature which is the Haydarpasa Train Station. The existence of historical heritage in the area such as, Selimiye Barrack, Haydarpasa High School, Marmara University, Girl Tower, Uskudar and Kadikoy Market makes it crucial as well. The project is owned and operated by Turkish State Railways (TCDD). It is the largest

container port in the region, but currently underperforming. This project is an attempt to develop an important commercial sub-center in the Anatolian Side which could lead to an economic vitalization in the city.

When the project first came into the agenda of the Municipality, it included building seven skyscrapers on 350 meters inspired by seven hills of Istanbul to shelter 240,000 people, a cruise ship port, a yacht port in the Haydarpaşa Train Terminal area, and finally building five star hotels, congress centers, fairgrounds, commercial areas, shopping malls, office and residences. The project was not approved by the Regional Committee for Protecting the Natural and Cultural Assets as the population that will be brought in together with the lack of infrastructure and the density of the buildings will cause traffic problem in the region (Erdem Erbas, 2007). Lots of criticism took place after announcing the project. It has been argued that the proposed tower blocks have a serious negative impact on the monuments and that these high buildings in the Bosphorus will threaten the silhouette along the whole length of the Golden Horn and therefore affects the views out from an extensive part of the Historic Peninsula. It was also criticized that Haydarpaşa Train Terminal will be dwarfed by the huge towers behind (Yenen, 2001). Later, Regional Committee for Protecting the Natural and Cultural Assets declared that Haydarpaşa Area is an urban and historical protected area due to its historical value. After this declaration, some content of the Haydarpaşa Project changed and the plan of the seven skyscrapers is renounced (Erdem Erbas, 2007).

### **Galata Port Project**

Galata Port Project (Salıpaşazari- Karakoy Cruise Port Complex) which was on the agenda by 1998 is one of the urban projects which will have a vital role for the image of Istanbul. The area is almost underutilized and the public use of the shoreline is limited. According to Turkish Maritime Organization, the project aims to build a cruise port, five star hotels, shopping malls, restaurants, cafés, entertainments places like bars, cinema and theatre halls, underground car parks for the private cars and buses. The area of the project lies directly opposite Topkapı Palace, so, the Historic Peninsula needs to be taken into consideration during the process of the development of this project (Michelmore, 2006).

Furthermore, some of the historical buildings like the Turkish Maritime Organization Building which was built on 1910 and the wall tile inn (Cinili Han) that was built on 1912 and which is used as the Customary General Directorate office will be transformed into five star hotels.

According to the information given in the web page of the Tabanlıoğlu Architecture Office which prepared the Galata Port Project cited in Erdem Erbas paper, Galata Port will make Istanbul more valuable as a culture, tourism and commerce center and that the present buildings will be renovated according to their original style and will gain new functions which includes an area of more than 1.2 kilometers. The Project area is 100,000 m<sup>2</sup> and the total structure area is 151,665 m<sup>2</sup>. This project brought many discussions due to its critical location. The discussion focuses on the issue of losing the historical identity, integration of the project with the rest of the city plan, building cruise ports in the areas where there is no traffic problem and finally the water connection of Kadıköy will be cut since the front side of it will be surrounded by high buildings and huge ships that anchorage (Erdem Erbas, 2007).

### **Kartal Pendik Project**

This project is part of the development of two new city centers in Istanbul to overcome the monocentric (Eminönü, Beyoğlu, Ayazağa, Büyükdere axis) of the metropolis and solve the unbalanced distribution of the service sector between the European Side and the Anatolian Side. One is in Kartal and the other in Kucukcekmece. Kartal, is fifteen kilometers away from Istanbul, but it's still in the metropolitan district, just opposite the Princess Islands. The eastern airport of Istanbul is adjacent to the project area. The area has been occupied by some old industries. The residents of this area own large lots of land, but there was no guidance for them to invest and build. The design competitions provide a set of plans to guide development. The aim is to transform an Industrial area into a 555 hectare central business district with offices, homes, shopping, and a marina and to design an easily accessible metropolitan area of aesthetic value, with well planned cultural and public spaces with squares and pedestrian ways (Ozkan, 2006).

This project was awarded to architect Zaha Hadid as a result of an international competition. According to Ozkan, Hadid respected the urban fabric and created different land-uses. She connected and meshed the east and the west of the site with three patterns. “At the Grand Buildings scheme for Trafalgar Square in London, I used the concept of carving as a way of introducing multiple events at the ground plane,” Zaha Hadid has said. Her scheme for a new city center in Kartal suggests the same earth-carving approach (Ozkan, 2006). A new architectural network of geometric shapes was created for Kartal and Pendik to connect the two sites. A new metropolis will be established, connecting roads, railways and residential areas. This area is located directly on the Marmaray and Kadıköy-Kartal Light Railway System project which can also connect to sea transportation. The Sabiha Gökçen Airport is located very close to the project area together with the Ümraniye-Üsküdar Light Railway System project planned to pass from the north further increase the opportunities of the area’s integration with the whole of the metropolitan area (Özaydın, 2006).

#### **Golden Horn Environment Protection Project:**

This project started in 1984 by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and Istanbul Water and Sewerage Administration (ISKI). The main goal of this project is to recover the former identity of the Istanbul silhouette on water and add a contemporary dimension to it for the future generations. This project is the major urban cleaning and transformation project of the Golden Horn which includes removing all its unpleasant odors as well as the ugly sights and cleaning the Golden Horn by revitalizing historic and cultural features. Most of the Golden Horn Cleaning Program was completed except some urban design and landscaping projects are still under development and construction. The project gave a prompt urbanization process which made a good impact on several economic and social activities as well as on natural and environmental life. It also played a crucial role on the revitalization and transformation of the Golden Horn with its multifunctional land use characteristics in the planning approach. The municipality won an international prize by the Metropolis Association in 2002 for this project (Tüzin, 2003).

## **CONCLUSION**

Since the Prost Plan was adopted and implemented, there has been an incessant sequence of subsequent Master Plans, which have each shared the western premise of the first. None of these have sufficiently addressed the singular character of Istanbul as a world class city which is stepped in multiple layers of history and tradition. Its most distinctive aspect has always been its silhouette and relationship to the water. By erasing this most important feature, Planners and Developers have erased the very identity of this city. This is a tragedy.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Borie, Alain, et.al. “Istanbul”, Bulletin d’Information Architecturales, Institut Francais d’ Architecture, Singapore, Dec. 1987, p.16.
- Kilincaslan, Yulay “ Maritime Transport in Istanbul”, in Istanbul Biannula, 1996, p.14
- Kuban,D: Turkish Culture and the Arts, Istanbul, 1986, p.23
- Kuban, Dogan , “The Growth of a City”, in Istanbul Biannual, 1996. P. 22
- Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IMM): Request for Proposals for the Future Development of Haydarpasa Istanbul, Turkey, 28 April 2009
- Istanbul Metropolitan Planning Center (IMP); www.planlama.org; 2008
- Michelmores, David, Analysis of the State Conservation of the Historic Areas of Istanbul World Heritage Site, ICOMOS,2006
- Ousterhout, Robert G., The Architecture of the Kariye Camii in Istanbul Dumbarton oaks Studio 25, 1983, p.150
- Özaydın, Gülşen, 42nd The International Society of City and Regional Planners (ISoCaRP) Congress: “Cities between Integration and Disintegration”, Role of urban Projects as a Tool in urban Integration and Disintegration, Istanbul, Turkey, 14 - 18 September 2006.



## URBAN TRANSFORMATION: CONTROVERSIES, CONTRASTS and CHALLENGES

Ozkan, Suha, Sustainable Cities: Urban Design Conference, Institute for Urban Design in cooperation with: United Nations Human Settlements Program (UN-Habitat), Competitions to Guide Development of Two New City Centers in Istanbul, Tokyo University, October 17, 2006

Tüzin, Baycan-Levent, 39th The International Society of City and Regional Planners (ISoCaRP) Congress: Planning in a More Globalized World: Globalization and Development Strategies for Istanbul: Regional Policies and Great Urban Transformation Projects, Cairo, Egypt, 17-22 October 2003

Yenen, Zekiye , NED Architecture and Planning Journal - Townscapes: A World City on Water: Urban Development of Istanbul and Transformation of Townscape, Yildiz Technical University, 2001