

# EVALUATION OF URBAN REGENERATION PRACTICE IN TURKEY IN COMPARISON TO GENERAL FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING URBAN REGENERATION IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

**DR. HANDE AĞAN YALÇINTAŞ**

*Directorate of Public Works and Settlements, Istanbul, Turkey*  
[handeaagan@yahoo.com](mailto:handeaagan@yahoo.com)

**ASSIST. PROF. DR. GÖKÇEN KILINÇ**

*Erciyes University, Department of City and Regional Planning, Kayseri, Turkey*  
[skilinc@erciyes.edu.tr](mailto:skilinc@erciyes.edu.tr), [gokcenkilinc@yahoo.com](mailto:gokcenkilinc@yahoo.com)

## **ABSTRACT**

*Urban regeneration, having been claimed for the perception of urban decline and reversing the situation by means of social, economic and physical enhancements throughout the 20th century and onwards, is today, still one of the most popular notions of urban planning. It has been continually questioned for years in order to identify its scope by redefining its focal points, policies and priorities put forward. The focus on urban regeneration has evolved from an emerging awareness on enhancing the quality of physical environmental in the 1950's, through an emphasis on social policies in the 1960's and shifted with increasing concern to economic issues in the 1970's and so far. 1980s are especially subjected to the agreement of developing ideas on urban regeneration about stimulation of private investment and creating commercial confidence for managing efficient redevelopment schemes. However, late 1990s and 2000s have witnessed the rise of strategic management of urban regeneration much more concentrating on comprehensive, long-term and action-oriented policies rather than the ad hoc, opportunistic, incremental and locally driven approach to urban regeneration. In contrast to its long process of changing prospects, urban regeneration management has found grounds in national planning agenda of Turkey very soon in late 1990s. Attempts for creating a national policy framework have come out by means of several projects in Istanbul as it is the city leading the development of new approaches to nation's urban planning in response to new policy drivers. But unfortunately, progressive stages and possible future outcomes of those recent projects in Istanbul indicate that urban regeneration practice in Turkey is still experienced as for-profit real estate development and in many aspects as an extension of advocates of 1980s. Many of the central and local planning authorities, politicians and policy makers still consider at present the necessity of manipulating urban land policy drivers and legislative instruments in favoring the property development as a policy action targeted at regeneration of deprived areas. In this respect, the present paper draws on the development of the experience and understanding of urban regeneration practice in Turkey, after giving an insight to its origin, challenges and its purpose in the global scale. It focuses on the need for creating more innovative mechanisms in terms of legislative, organizational and financial aspects of regeneration practices in Turkey through remarks on political uncertainties, economic instability, and available financial mechanisms together with current legislative and institutional capacities. Finally, the paper concludes with recommendations on*

## URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges

*above aspects that will help promoting opportunities of deprived built environment including all of its social, economic and physical components and finding their best economic use in the future.*

### CAUSES OF URBAN DECLINE

Urban decline is degeneration of parts of cities usually as the result of structural economic change and its associated effects like depopulation, property abandonment and decrease in property values, increase in social problems and respectively a deprived urban environment. The reasons for urban deprivation are many and varied. The most important factor that gave way to radical restructuring in social, economic and spatial base of urban areas is the rapid industrialization experienced by developed countries in the late 19th and 20th centuries. The economic transition and employment change together with technological improvement were the major consequences that dominated the scale of urban problems. Those problems were part of a broader process of restructuring in which older built-up areas had suffered mostly due to the weaknesses of their economic base and to their inability to adapt to new production technologies and infrastructural requirements.

Parallel to the industrial transition, the rising trend of decentralization, or suburbanization played also important role in shifting of many functions and jobs out from inner city areas to peripheries. A considerable urban expansion has been realized in many Western European countries and especially in U.S. resulting with immense suburban development. As a result of replacement of more prosperous who have moved out to suburbs and invasion of inner built up areas by the poorer, many characteristics of deprivation such as high unemployment and low education levels, low economic base, poor housing conditions, poor environment, congestion and acute social problems became apparent in inner city areas (Dieffendorf 1989, Clark 1989, Couch 1990, Fainstain 1994, Couch, et al. 2003).

Other than changing socio-economic base, the Second World War emerged as another important factor that prepared the conditions for urban decline especially in Europe. "The wartime damage have shaped the spatial restructuring of many cities in Western and Central European countries like Holland, Poland, Germany; the cities which were unfortunately damaged and largely rebuilt after the war" (Yalçintaş 2008, p.13).

Unlikely, the urban change that gave reason to urban deprivation had followed relatively a different process in underdeveloped and developing countries and for many aspects in Turkey, as well. Urban centers in those countries rather lately experienced economic restructuring caused by the effects of rapid industrialization and globalization. Given the conditions of fragile economic basis, unequal wealth distribution and inadequate reserves and resources, developing countries had much more severely realized undesirable reflections of restructuring and the successive decline. Urban centers during this process experienced a number of characteristics critical for sustainable development like; uneven distribution of wealth, agglomeration of income generating activities on key urban centers (mega cities), demographic pressures caused by

## 14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

rapidly growing population and inner migration; increasing rates of poverty, crime and unemployment; extensive use of natural resources such as land, water, energy; industrial pollution as a result of investments through uncontrolled industrial development, a deteriorating urban built-up environment and high vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters as a result of uneven urban development (Fernandes and Varley 1998, Cordaid 2003, Weiss 2005).

As understood from the urban change historically experienced in different localities above, decline of inner city areas occur as a result of dynamic and inevitable nature of social, economic, environmental, demographic and sometimes political processes. In reality, each locality whatever the scale is has different characteristics and different particular reaction against those restructuring processes.

### **EVOLUTION OF URBAN REGENERATION AS A RESPONSE TO URBAN DECLINE**

The focus on urban regeneration has evolved from an emerging awareness on enhancing the quality of physical environmental in the 1950's, through an emphasis on social policies in the 1960's and shifted with increasing concern to economic issues in the 1970's and so far. 1980s are especially subjected to the agreement of developing ideas on urban regeneration about stimulation of private investment and creating commercial confidence for managing efficient redevelopment schemes. However, late 1990s and 2000s have witnessed the rise of strategic management, the notions of which depict the basis for the intentions of today's urban regeneration as a discipline.

In practice, there is still not a fully worked out set of principles on urban regeneration with a clear ground and proven prospect of success. However, both the theory and the practice of urban regeneration management have been developed by having lessons from what has been done and what has been achieved throughout the history.

### **The Approach to Urban Regeneration in the Postwar Period - After 1945 & 1950s**

The most important response to urban decline evolved in this period was the attempt to renew the urban physical context caused by the wartime damage. The process of reconstruction of the ruins was seen as the national task in many European countries directed with a public-planning investment style. Policy prescriptions were concentrated on reconstruction of old central areas. Especially after realizing the disruptive results of industrialization, central and local governments in Western countries and in US, immediately developed government-led physical renewal schemes, which in many cases occurred within the form of large-scale slum clearances in 1940's and 1950's (Falk 1993, Roberts and Sykes 2000, Couch, et al. 2003).

“On one hand, there was an immense need for physical intervention in order to replace outdated or unsatisfactory residential uses. On the other hand,

## **URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges**

suburban growth was also essential beside the central redevelopment. Although several urban constraints were adopted like the designation of greenbelts, substantial peripheral expansion within the urban fence continued in 50s” (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.21).

### **The Approach to Urban Regeneration in 1960s & 1970s**

By the mid-1960s it was already recognized that many of the immediate post-war solutions had simply transferred the location temporarily and just altered the expression of urban problems. People learnt by the 60s that a cosmetic or physical revitalization may be a short-term strategy to facilitate deeper community revitalization in the longer term. Popular planning style had been adopted with joint action of authority and local communities which has later turned to the style of trend planning. The growing dissatisfaction with slum clearance schemes of 50s and continuing shift of population to peripheral areas led to a series of adjustments on policies of government with a more participatory and decentralized approach (E.g.: “Soft Urban Renewal” scheme in Kreuzberg, Germany) with a growing role of private sector in 1970s (Brindley 1996, Kleinman and Whitehead, 1999, Roberts and Sykes 2000, Couch, et al. 2003). Change in priorities in the urban policy field resulted with an increased emphasis on improvement and rehabilitation with a shifting interest from large scale reconstruction to local scale in-situ renewal schemes.

### **The Approach to Urban Regeneration in 1980s**

The period of 80s was a turning point in terms of the change in public response to urban regeneration. The earlier targets; provision of housing, public-amenities and specific emphasis to low-income people have been put aside and aggregate economic growth, measured by concentration of private investment, has become the only criterion of the success for urban revitalization. This was not coincidental, but a general reflection of driving rapid globalization process and liberalization policies. Since market-led processes are geared to economic growth, the redevelopment in distressed inner cities was designed to remove barriers that prevent smooth functioning of markets and discourage inward private investment (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.22).

The major key characteristics of this period, which is also critical in assessing the degree of change in the targets of regeneration and which may help understanding the recent challenges of urban regeneration practice in Turkey as well, can be stated as follows (Healey 1992, Berry, et al. 1993, Brindley 1996, OECD 1998, Roberts and Sykes 2000, Couch, et al. 2003)

- Focus on market-led solutions
- Predominance of public-private partnership arrangements
- Emergence of new key actors (Specialized agencies)
- Focus on incremental prospects
- Concentration on supply-side measures

### **The Approach to Urban Regeneration in 1990s**

The major aspect of the new policy formulation of the 1990s, which is evident both in the politics and in urban policy, is the acceptance of the need to work in accordance with the environmental objectives for sustainable urban development and regeneration. The other significant aspect of policy formulation in 90s is the consensus for building a more holistic and strategic approach to urban regeneration arising from the concerns regarding property-led urban regeneration in 80's which was incremental in style and ad hoc in progress (Healey 1992, Kearns and Philo, 1993, Roberts and Sykes 2000). The emphasis in the late 1990s has shifted to the regional scale and especially to the society more than areas. Public-private consensus have gained importance based on the idea that urban regeneration requires a strategically designed, locally based multi-sector and multi-agency partnership approach (Yalçintaş 2008, p.24-25).

### **The Scope, Purpose and Notions of the Present Urban Regeneration Scheme - 2000s**

Since 90s, how more effective and more sustainable urban regeneration process could be achieved has become the primary concern to understand wider requirements of a distressed urban locality. This has led to identification a holistic approach that focuses on improving the ways that together reduce social exclusion (society), enhance the economic reintegration of disadvantaged areas (economy) and improve the spatial context (physical environment). Regeneration of deprived urban areas is today expected to provide long-term and wider benefits than ever before. An efficient regeneration process today is expected to:

- Promote smart economic growth
- Increase overall tax revenues
- Provide financial return from under-utilized or abandoned property
- Create new business/new jobs opportunities
- Empower the community
- Address community needs
- Remove blight and increase environmental quality
- Improve quality of life

The major key characteristics of the urban regeneration management in the period of 2000s can be emphasized through the policy drivers stated below:

#### *Strategic Management of Urban Regeneration*

General agreement on strategic planning throughout the theories of urban planning in 90s has led to a growing consensus amongst policy makers in the last years about how a system for strategic management of urban regeneration could be managed. A more comprehensive range of long-term policies supported with high quality analyses for policy-making and program development and process-driven decision making has priority today to move towards more sustainable cities (Yalçintaş 2008, p.27).

A strategic approach is expected to clearly identify the intended outcomes of regeneration, construct a framework within which comprehensive strategies and action plans should be designed and implemented, provide clearly targeted

## URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges

policy instruments and clarify the roles and responsibilities of each actor and organization within regeneration process. A strategically designed regeneration project is expected to have a common purpose and cooperation for most of the actors involved, at the same time, bring added value in the long term (Urban Task Force 1999). Evidently, many of the governments in developed countries as well as the European Commission itself have in recent times revised their urban policies through strategic management of regeneration.

### *Mixed-use Development*

Mixed use development is another common aspect of recent approaches to regeneration. A regenerated derelict site is believed to be more viable when it offers variety of options to enhance the economy and social life at the same time which explains the reason why redeveloped residential areas could not achieved success in the long term in many previous cases of 50s or 60s. Enterprise Zones and Simplified Planning Zones in Britain introduced in 80s are typical examples for mixed use development designated differently from the traditional land-use decisions and/or zoning regulations. The underlying reason of encouraging the compact city forms and mixed use cities is the idea of strengthening the local economy to act against long term dereliction and abandonment of land values near central city areas (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.28).

### *Compact City Form*

Compact city form is a lately introduced concept to urban planning literature that emphasizes the need to make the best possible use of urban land and to avoid unnecessary sprawl. The notions of compact city forms which can be stated as increasing the density of development, ensuring a mix of uses, containing urban 'sprawl' and achieving social and economic diversity and vitality in many cases directly correspond with the intentions of urban regeneration. A compact and centralized city provides variety of environmental, social and economic benefits ranging from a more efficient use of energy and reduced pressure on greenfields through more efficient services and increased quality of urban environments. More important, a compact city is economically thought to contribute to profitability and economic growth and also lead to new business formation which attracts new residents to central urban areas, by the way, turn run down urban areas back into beneficial use.

Today, many urban policy prescriptions of member states in European Union such as; "The Urban Exchange Initiative in United Kingdom, Compact City Policy in Netherlands" as well as "The New Re-urbanism Policy in Japan", stress similarly on the need for encouraging both intensified use of existing built-up urban areas in order to contain urban sprawl, preserve the countryside and make inner cities more livable (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.28-29).

### *Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)*

Most organizations involved in urban regeneration in previous decades have recognized that the issues they face have multiple causes and therefore need a multi-agency approach to plan and implement effective solutions. A model of more balanced partnerships between the public, private and community/voluntary sectors has evolved by drawing on the limitations of single-sector or single-agency approaches experienced in 1970s and 1980s. From the mid-1990s the term of partnership planning has been redefined as private

sector still in the leading role and public sector as a regulator, catalyst or enabler rather than a provider. Traditional policy boundaries have been eliminated and multi-level governance has been adapted. Parallel to the agreement on partnerships, devolution of power and resources from central to local governments has been adopted in many European countries and in U.S. (Roberts and Sykes 2000, Beaten 2000, Osborne 2000). But resulting from the emphasis in the new policy on strengthening community organizations outlined within the notions of latest strategic approach, today, more equal partnerships planning is encouraged for successful regeneration projects.

#### *Community Capacity Building*

The increasing concern for sustainable regeneration and for equal partnerships by the 90s has also led to seeking methods for active engagement of social capital in regeneration processes, since the progress on social dimension of regeneration requires extensive 'community capacity building' to ensure active contribution of deprived communities to regeneration projects especially at the local level. More specifically, community capacity building involves; equipping people with skills and competencies; realizing their existing potential; promoting their self-confidence to take responsibility and consequently encouraging them to become involved in their community within a purposed regeneration process (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.30). Although community development programs are long-term goals and although sufficient time must be given for progress, an increasing number of government initiatives today rely heavily on social capital for effective regeneration, since there are significant social and economic returns from investing on community capacity building in the long run.

## **DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN REGENERATION MANAGEMENT IN TURKEY**

Similar to the countries with advanced economies; disappearance of traditional sources of employment, effects of policies that encouraged re-housing of urban residents, impact of infrastructure and commercial property development and physical decay of the built environment have all prepared grounds for urban deprivation in Turkish inner cities, however, their consequences upon the urban fabric have been more threatening. The effects of industrialization were lately, but so rapidly recognized that majority of the urban centers could not adjust their economies, planning policies or political stances to prevent possible future urban problems. Associated with uneven urban growth, older built-up areas were not protected and lately built-up areas lacked the quality considerations as well. Together with relocation of job opportunities and the emerging residential preferences in alternative locations, there became both physical and socio-economic decline in Turkish inner cities, but most dramatically illegal housing development in the periphery conurbations. Since, the scope of problems was quite extensive for central and local governments to cope with, regeneration of inner-city areas and conservation of historical sites that have been inevitably put apart for years.

### The Emerging Conditions in Urban Regeneration Processes in Turkish Cities

Distressed urban areas in Turkish cities are more differentiated as to their characteristics and their location when compared with the ones in Western European or U.S. cities. Parallel to the reasonable classification of Göksu (2006, p.1), urban built areas that need to be revitalized in Turkish cities can be stated as; squatter housing areas (Gecekondu) which are generally structured in the peripheral conurbations; illegally developed high density which have been later legalized by legislative arrangements; historical urban areas majority of which area stated as preservation areas; urban areas of under high natural disaster risk; and distressed inner urban areas that have completed their economic life (obsolete areas). Each pattern reflects its own characteristics that may require diverse courses of policy actions. Despite all the past attempts for developing policy actions to cope with for such problem areas in Turkish cities, the results of regeneration practices remained unprogressive when compared with developed countries, because complexity of conditions behind the problem areas have all averted implementation of wide scope urban regeneration projects.

Complex ownership pattern has always been one of the most important problems in preventing implementation of regeneration projects in terms of creating difficulties in assembly of development rights and creation of meaningful sites (land reclamation) for regeneration. The low economic and social profile and attitudes of local people have also created barriers for managing successful regeneration schemes. Local residents of deprived areas which are very low income families and of different ethnic groups have mostly been resistant to actively take part within a regeneration process.

In addition to area-specific problems like ownership and social structure of residents, lack of the necessary legislative framework and regulatory tools have restrained development of efficient projects. Classical urban planning system and the regulatory framework of current Development Act could not cope with complex problems encountered within deteriorated areas. Together with the available legislative structure, the current administrative framework did not enable grounds for creating mechanisms of cooperation of public authorities, professional and non-governmental institutions, non-profit organizations, private dealers and enlightened citizens. Since then, the previous attempts for revitalization in Turkey have generally evolved in the form of property-led redevelopment projects created by private-individual investments except for a few number of cases.

The problem of access to capital for both public and private sectors for inner city regeneration in Turkey creates perhaps the most significant obstacle for managing desirable outcomes through inner city regeneration. While a considerable portion (E.g.:1.3 billion pounds per year in England) of public resources is specifically dedicated to regeneration activities in urban areas every year, fiscal pressures on regular public budgets of both central and local governments in Turkey have restricted shifting urban public spending towards regeneration activities. Moreover, the lack of available funds, credits and other types of financial incentives have not enabled commercial commitment to private sector and even participation of local residents in proposed regeneration schemes.



### **The Attempts for Managing Urban Regeneration Practices in Turkey**

As mentioned, globalization effects and the earthquake disaster in 1999 have been the major driving which accelerated urban regeneration attempts forces in Turkey. The inadequacy of the legal framework was one of the most difficult issues faced in the implementation of regeneration projects for years. Before 1999, the urban renewal, conservation, renovation, rehabilitation activities and works were regulated by the articles and regulations under some general legislations. These are; Conservation Law For Cultural and Natural Heritage (No.2863 and the Altered Version of the Act No.5226), Housing Development Law (No.2985) and Revisions in the Powers and Responsibilities of the Housing Development Administration (No. 5162), Expropriation Law (No. 2942&4650), Gecekondu Law (No.775) together with several Development Amnesties mainly for Gecekondu Areas (No.2981, 6785, 3290, 3366), Coastal Law (No.3621/3830) and Bosphorous Law (No.2960). Even though these laws are still valid, a series of new legal arrangements have additionally have been enacted in the recent years. These legal arrangements can be grouped as the “laws concerning local administrations” and “specialized laws concerning urban regeneration”.

Special Provincial Administration Act (2005, No.5197), Metropolitan Municipalities Act (2004, No.5216) and Municipalities Act (2005, No.5393) refer to the first group today which entitle local authorities with the right to designate project areas and undertake projects with redevelopment, restoration, preservation and development purposes. In addition to legislative arrangements brought up with laws concerning administrative units, specialized laws concerning urban regeneration are other important progressive steps made through development of urban regeneration management. Urban Regeneration Project Act for the Northern Entry of Ankara (2004, No.5104) was the pioneering law specialized on regeneration in Turkey, though with a piecemeal approach, prepared and enacted only for specific project area in Ankara. The Law of Preservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalizing of Deteriorated Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties (2005, No.5366) was the most important one among all the other Acts, which was immensely criticized in terms of its aims, authorization and driving forces on implementation, especially through Sulukule Neighbourhood Regeneration Project, Süleymaniye Pilot Renewal Project and Tarlabası Regeneration Projects announced in 2006. Perhaps, the most critical debate around the Law has been its giving opportunity to the renewal interventions on historical and cultural conservation areas.

Besides, a series of draft laws about urban regeneration (Draft Law of Urban Regeneration-2004, Draft Law of Development -2004, Draft Law for Planning and Development-2005, Draft Law of Urban Regeneration and Development-2005, Draft Law about Regeneration Areas-2006) for providing a comprehensive legal basis have been introduced after 2004 (Sakızlıoğlu, 2007), however they have still not been enacted until now. On the other hand, even the mortgage system which effectively works in majority of the developed countries for years as a credit mechanism in housing provision could hardly be constructed on legislative basis in 2007.

## URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges

Attempts for creating a national policy framework for urban regeneration in Turkey have come out by means of several projects held in big cities but especially in Istanbul which is “the city leading the development of new approaches to nation’s urban planning in response to new policy drivers”. (Kocabaş 2005, p. 29) Not the strategic plans, programs but the market dynamics, ad hoc solutions of different actors, urban coalitions, informalities, political balances between different governmental layers have been significant in shaping the urbanization process of the city (Turel et al, 2005).

Regeneration attempts in Istanbul has started after lately realizing the detrimental effects of unplanned urban growth and unauthorized construction but in fact, the increasing concern for threatening earthquake risk has been the most pioneering issue which accelerated the attempts to construct the lacking national legislative framework for urban regeneration. The overall regeneration practices within the city can be generally classified as to its scope; its process and the main actors participated. In such a classification, mainly three groups can be stated similar to the classification of Gürler (2004) which are: 1) adhoc interventions, 2) interventions with mixed processes and 3) planned interventions for inner city revitalization.

Table 1. Classification of Urban Regeneration Practices in Istanbul according to their aims, legal basis and main actors

14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

	Aims	Legal basis & Main Actors	Implemented or projected examples
Adhoc interventions (1980s)	To restore historical buildings To renovate the outdoor spaces To rehabilitate socio-economic structure To create attraction	Act no:2863 Act no:2960  Elite Groups in the Neighbourhoods	Old Inner City Neighbourhood Vision: "Liveable Neighbourhood" Cihangir Neighbourhood Kuzguncuk Neighbourhood
Interventions With Mixed Processes (1980s and 1990s)	To make areas commercial, cultural and recreational node. To increase in demand to tourism industry	Act No:2863 Act No:2963  Private enterprisers Central Government	Urban Historical Sites Vision: "Attractive Neighbourhood" Ortaköy Neighbourhood Cankurtaran Neighbourhood
Planned Interventions For Inner City Revitalization (1990s and 2000s)	To rehabilitate historical buildings To encourage tourism To increase functional use of areas To obtain local economic development To enhance life quality To improve living conditions To create alternative sub-centres and to decrease burden of existing CBD Modernization of squatter neighbourhoods. To mitigate earthquake risk	Act No:2634 Act No:2863 Act No:3621/3830 Act No:5366 Act No:2985 Act No:5262	Urban Historical Sites Vision: "World Culture City" Fener-Balat Neighbourhood Süleymaniye Pilot Project Tarlabaşı Regeneration Project Sulukule Neighbourhood Project
		Act No:5216 Act No:5393  Draft Law About Regeneration Areas	Flagship Prestige Projects Vision: "World Culture City" Galataport Projects Haydarpaşa World Trade Centre Project
		Metropolitan Municipality-IMP District Municipalities TOKI KIPTAŞ	Squatter Neighbourhood and Neighbourhoods with high earthquake risk Vision: "Liveable Cities", "Information City" Zeytinburnu Pilot Project Tuzla Urban Renewal project İkitelli-Halkalı Urban Renewal Project Kadıköy Urban Renewal Project... etc
			Old Industrial Sites Vision: "Information City" Kağıthane Centre and Boulevard Connection Spatial Project Kartal High-Level Centre Special Project

A considerable amount of the projects mentioned in Table.1 have not have chances to realize. Despite all the attempts for developing the legislative and technical basis for urban regeneration in Turkey, the practice has remained primitive when compared with Western European countries and U.S. The major problems behind the previous regeneration schemes but especially the planned interventions still elude policy makers and local authorities to achieve more progressive phases in implementation of wide scope urban regeneration projects.

**Reasons behind the Dilemma of Urban Regeneration Theory and Practice in Turkish Cities**

Turkey has already constructed a concrete policy framework and administrative role models for management of urban regeneration. Parallel to the global trends, the national trend today favors democratization, decentralization, world-wide communication and information exchanges, and a steady progress in urban development. In this macro level, policy makers are trying to provide an adequate platform to promote urban growth, openness to international investment and a healthier business environment which will contribute to revitalization. There have been positive reflections of creating this platform on stressing the enabling status of governments, empowerment of local authorities, privatization policies and relevant policy reformulations. Local authorities have recently launched several regeneration schemes. Some of the proposals have been developed in the form of renewal or rehabilitation projects in peripheral squatter neighborhoods, and some have been introduced in the form of speculative flagship projects, while however plenty of the valuable inner city areas have still remained untouched. In effect, each type of the schemes prepares its ground towards the debates on urban regeneration practice in Turkey.

First of all, renewal or rehabilitation projects in peripheral squatter neighborhoods do not fit with today's logic of regeneration firstly since those areas are built up in unlivable conditions from the beginning rather having been deprived later in time and since urban regeneration is an aspect of management and planning of existing urban areas rather than planning and development of new urbanization. Secondly, those projects generally reflect the attempts on enhancing the spatial quality as in case of responses to urban deprivation in 50s which neglects wider social and economic problems. The other case is flagship prestigious projects, the progressive stages and possible future outcomes of which indicate that urban regeneration practice in Turkey is unfortunately experienced still as for-real profit real estate development and in many aspects as the extension of advocates of 1980s. Such projects generally take place as in the form of place based regeneration schemes which is categorized by Zielenbach (2000, p.27-30) as an approach that aims to improve property values as a primary goal, and that views bettering conditions for existing residents as a less important outcome.

Many of the central and local planning authorities, politicians and policy makers still consider mainly the necessity of manipulating urban land policy drivers and legislative instruments in favoring the property development as a policy action targeted at regeneration of deprived urban areas. A wide-scope and holistic regeneration process is a capital intensive process and largely involves private capital. Demand for both residential and commercial uses is essentially market driven, since then purposed regeneration activity should meet the test of market efficiency. However, establishing a stable economic base with its employment opportunities and improved revenues at targeted areas should be the primary concern for the long-term success. In fact, today's challenge for the case in Turkey is to promote a shift from the past emphasis on narrowly-focused, relatively isolated and free-standing projects, to more integrated and counterbalanced approaches to ensuring the sustainability of regeneration.

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS THROUGH REINFORCING THE EXISTING FRAMEWORK FOR URBAN REGENERATION MANAGEMENT IN TURKEY**

The recent notions of urban regeneration in the world have focused on strategic management, enhancing economic integration of disadvantaged areas, reducing social exclusion, improving life quality, strengthening local economies by mixed-uses and public private partnerships. However, the conceptual framework of urban regeneration in Turkey has been up to date: the reflection of globalization and its impacts on public administration in contrast to the comprehensive social and economic programs and policy actions in Europe.

In fact, traditional urban policy actions do not help addressing the degree of decline in deprived areas since they failed to realize the validity of economic concerns in the past. First of all, a strategic marketing planning is to be encouraged with an emphasis on stimulating private inward investment and creating business friendly and liveable environment to find best economic use of deprived inner city areas. Policy actions reformulated with respect to markets dynamics will indicate how adequate our national and local governments plan the use of urban economic space. (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.261).

Moreover, there is a need to replace the ethos of the statutory and conventional planning system with a more strategic and action oriented planning. A process driven and territorially based decision-making process is to be adopted for carrying upper-scale policies into program and project levels in urban areas. New legislation should be specifically designed to address the urban blight independent from wherever it takes place; within the inner city, within the borders of Preservation Areas or in the peripheries. Area-specific development projects should be generated through strategic planning procedures depending on participatory roles of all the actors together with transparency in the overall processes from the beginning to the end. (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.268). Moreover, detailed inventories for providing comprehensive information about abandoned or vacant land patterns and prizes and new mechanisms and tools are to be developed for strategic land marketing. Rather than classical methods (e.g. expropriation, build-and-sell, land readjustment, directly purchasing or renting) in practice, more flexible and entrepreneurial land management tools should be generated according to the characteristics of the project areas. (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.276).

The evolving management of urban regeneration will also require formulation of PPPs for delivering successful project outcomes. PPPs should refer to both Policy-Program-Project and Public-Private Partnerships. The Policy part of "Policy-Program-Project" should be performed by metropolitan municipalities and the operational level should be under the responsibility of district municipalities in order to obtain effective vertical coordination between the local authorities. Additionally, the horizontal relationship between local and other central governmental entities should also take place in organizing further financial and institutional aspects in the Program stage. (Yalçıntaş 2008, p.264).

On one hand, urban regeneration projects and implementations in Turkey have mostly focused on solving the physical problems of newly urbanizing areas rather than enhancing the overall social, economic and physical conditions of the built-up environment since 1960s. In this context, it is necessary to

## **URBAN TRANSFORMATION: Controversies, Contrasts and Challenges**

determine the regeneration areas within the scope of cities through a strategic planning process in order to prevent piecemeal developments which produce cellular zones and cause specific disconnected urban areas. Moreover, a commitment to comprehensive inner city regeneration should be strengthened between both central and local governments rather than allowing greenfield land for real estate development through effective zoning policy ordinances.

On the other hand, the legislative attempts to fulfill urban regeneration projects have been composed of destroying the dilapidated buildings and reconstructing them through renovation. In the draft laws, the urban areas are considered as investment and rent tools in a way to preclude public interest and participation. However, as it is emphasized in the paper partnership is an instrument of urban governance to realize, among others, regeneration projects. As Van Bowmeester and Van Bechoven (2005, p.13) emphasize, all actors within a partnership should agree that it is the best instrument to reach the common goal and not pursue individual goals. Not the division of power within the partnership, but a shared vision on the regeneration project and agreement on the share of power, will also be important for successful regeneration outcomes in Turkish cities. Indeed, there is a need to search for the ways of creating innovative approaches, applicable techniques with participatory partnership models to overcome the existing problems in generation of urban regeneration schemes.

Reformulation of policy directions and the regulatory framework in Turkey will especially contribute to the overcoming of the existing controversies and challenges throughout the current national framework for managing urban regeneration in the way that countries with advanced economies have developed by having lessons from intolerable costs of outdated approaches.

### **REFERENCES**

- Berry, J., McGreal, S. and Deddis, B. (1993) *Urban Regeneration: Property Investment and Development*, London: E & FN Spon.
- Brindley, Tim. (1996) *Remaking Planning: the Politics of Urban Change*. London: Routledge.
- Clark, D. (1989) *Urban Decline: the British Experience*. London: Routledge Pub.
- Couch, C. (1990) *Urban Renewal Theory and Practice*. London: Macmillan, London.
- Couch C., Fraser, C., and Percy, S. (2003) *Urban Regeneration in Europe*. Britain: Blackwell Publishing, Britain.
- Diefendorf, J.M. (1993) *In the Wake of War: the Reconstruction of German Cities after World War II*. England: Oxford University Press.
- European Commission (EC). (1999) *The European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

#### 14th INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY SOCIETY CONFERENCE

- Falk, N. (1993) Regeneration and Sustainable Development. in Urban Regeneration: Property Investment and Development ed. Berry, J., McGreal, S., and Deddis, B. London: E & FN Spon.
- Göksu, F. (2006) Yeni Kentsel Düzen için Öneriler <http://www.kentselyenileme.org/dosyalar/turdok02.doc>. (accessed December 03, 2006)
- Gürler, E. (2004) “1980 Sonrası Kentsel Dönüşüm Sürecinde Küresel Perspektiften İstanbul Örneği: Kent İçi Tarihi Alanların Yeniden Üretim Modelleri” Dünya Şehircilik Günü 28. Kollokyumu, METU, Ankara.
- Healey, P. (1992) Rebuilding the City: Property-led Urban Regeneration. London: E. & FN Spon.
- Kearns, G. and Philo, C. (1993) Selling Places: the City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kleinman, M. and Whitehead, C. (1999) “Housing and Regeneration: The Problem or the Solution”, National Institute Economic Review, 170 (10): 78-86.
- Kocabaş, A. (2005) “The Emergence of Istanbul’s Fifth Urban Planning Period: A Transition to Planning for Sustainable Regeneration?”, Journal of Urban Technology, 12(2): 27-48.
- OECD (1998) Integrating Distressed Urban Areas. Paris: OECD Publications.
- Osborne, S. P. (2000) Public-private Partnerships: Theory and Practice in International Perspective, London: Routledge.
- Roberts, P. and Sykes, H. (2000) Urban Regeneration: A Handbook. London: Sage Pub.
- Türel, A.; Osmay, S.; Güvenç, M.; Ataöv A. and Akkar, M. (2005). İstanbul Eylem Planlamasına Yönelik Mekansal Gelisme Stratejileri Arastırma ve Model Gelistirme Çalısmaları. ODTÜ: Sehir ve Bölge Planlama Bölümü.
- Urban Task Force (UTF) Great Britain. (1999) Towards an Urban Renaissance / Final Report of the Urban Task Force. London: Spon.
- Sakızlıođlu, N. B. (2007) “Impacts of Urban Renewal Policies: The Case of Tarlabası/İstanbul”, Master Thesis, METU.
- Van Boxmeer, B. and Van Beckhoven, E. (2005) “Public-Private Partnership in Urban Regeneration: A Comparison of Dutch and Spanish PPPs”, European Journal of Housing Policy, 5, 1, 1-16.
- Yalçıntaş, H. (Ağın), (2008) “Evaluating the Impact of ‘Urban Competitive Advantages’ on Economic Revitalization of Deprived Inner Cities through a Case Study Held in İstanbul”, PhD Thesis, Izmir Institute of Technology.
- Zielenbach, S. (2000) The Art of Revitalization. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

