The Case of Beyoğlu, Istanbul

Dimensions of Urban Re-development
The Case of Beyoğlu, Istanbul

Dimensions of Urban Re-development

Results of a case study project 2013

Technische Universität Berlin
Urban Management Program
Cover
Celebration on Istiklal Street
Source: Diego Duarte (2013)
Performance on the Street
Source: Zakaria Mohyeldin (2013)
Renovated besides Deteriorated
Lukmoeng Swangpol (2013)
Shop Window in Istiklal
Source: Diego Duarte (2013)
Shops in Beyoğlu
Source: Lukmoeng Swangpol (2013)
Tourists in Beyoğlu
Source: Zakaria Mohyeldin (2013)
Tramway in Istiklal
Source: Diego Duarte (2013)
Urbanscape of Istanbul
Source: Lukmoeng Swangpol (2013)
Vendor
Source: Diana Ramos (2013)
(from top to bottom and left to right).
# Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations .......................... 8

Part I: Context

1 Introduction (Erkut, Shirazi) .......... 11

2 Introductory Contemplations .......... 14

2.1 Legal and institutional context of urban planning and urban renewal in Turkey: Thinking about Istanbul (Fatma Unsal, Sevkiye Sence Turk) ........ 15

2.2 Remapping Istanbul: Taksim after Gezi (Ipek Akpinar) .......... 31

2.3 Transportation Planning and Big Transportation Projects in Istanbul (Haluk Gercek) .......... 39

3 Understanding the Urban Context .......... 46

3.1 Urban Evolution of Istanbul, a short review .......... 47

3.2 Emergence and Evolution of Beyoğlu .......... 55

3.3 Urban Layou .......... 65

3.4 Social Landscape .......... 79

3.5 Cultural Landscape .......... 92

3.6 Urban Infrastructure and Economic Landscape .......... 100
Table of Contents

Part II: Inquiry

4 Public Space in Taksim Square 113
5 Participation in Urban Renewal Project of Tarlabası 145
6 Tourism and Development in Tailim 173
7 Commuting Dynamics in Istiklal Street 197

Part III: Conclusion

8 Taksim, The Metaphor (Shirazi, Erkut) 225
9 References 231
10 List of Figures 247
   List of Figures 247
   List of Tables 247
   List of Interviews 253
List of Abbreviations

AKM         Ataturk Cultural Center
AKP         Justice and Development Party
BRT         Bus Rapid Transit
CBD         Central Business District
IMM         Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality
ITK         Commission for Road Improvement
ITU         Istanbul Technical University
JICA        The Japan International Cooperation Agency
KTVKK       Cultural and Natural Assets Conservation Board
NMT         Non-Motorized Transport
OECD        Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development:
TEM         Trans European Motorway
TOKI        Housing Development Administration of Turkey
TU Berlin    Technische Universität Berlin
TÜBİTAK     Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey
TUROB       Touristic Hotels and Investors Association
TURSAB      The Association of Turkish Travel Agencies
UM          Urban Management
UMP         Urban Mobility Plan

Figure 1: Urban Management Students
Photo: Andres Perez
1 Introduction
Istanbul is a mega city that stretches over two continents, separated by the Bosphorus Strait, which connects the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas to the Black Sea. Today more than 13 million people are living in Istanbul—18% of Turkey’s population. In contrast, when the Turkish Republic was established in 1923, only 5 percent of the nation’s population lived in Istanbul. Today, Istanbul is the economic leader of the country, with the vision to become a finance, tourism and logistics hub in the Euro-Asia region.

Regarding the external dynamics of urban transformation, from the 1980s the processes of neoliberal globalization and the preparations for closer ties with the EU triggered recent amendments in Turkish planning and public administration laws. An important internal dynamic within this context has been the expectation of a forthcoming earthquake in Istanbul, following the earthquake in Marmara region in 1999. This was later used as the main justification of the so-called urban transformation projects.

Despite the localism discourses, planning has become more centralized during the last decade. Istanbul’s top-down macro projects lack participatory planning processes and create opposition and dispute at the local level. The last example of this was what happened at Taksim Gezi Park, and its spirit infused all of the Turkey.

Understanding the dynamics of the production of urban space, exploring the complex relations between planning interventions and land and property development and the lack of participatory planning are major concerns of the field research in Istanbul. We selected four different localities of Istanbul’s Beyoğlu district as the field study area. The initial aim of the field study is to develop a participatory, local, strategic, spatial planning-governance approach for the area.

Beyoğlu is a historical district that was formerly known as Péra. It is a district located on the European side of Istanbul, separated from the old city of the Historic Peninsula by the Golden Horn (Haliç). A shift of the commercial hub from the Historical Peninsula to Beyoğlu took place in the 19th century during the Ottoman Era. During that period Beyoğlu was home to many European traders, and housed many embassies, especially along the Grande Rue de Péra. Today, Beyoğlu is still the most active art, entertainment and cultural centre of Istanbul.

The preparation of the field work started at the end of 2012. All aspects of urban development in Istanbul and in Beyoğlu were presented in a reader. A draft work program prepared the students for the field study to be conducted in April 2013 in Istanbul. It provided a general overview of the structure, objectives, work programs, and timing of the project. Since the outcomes of the student work were intended to be incorporated into the body of an edited book, the entire project has been planned around the structure of a book. The draft started with the structure of the book, included the tasks students are expected to do, explained the content of the tasks and timing of the project, and ended with guidelines that had to be followed for the report.

Two different levels of tasks for the students were defined. First on the Istanbul Metropolitan City level, seven study groups were created for the preliminary reading of the literature and information regarding the dimensions of development of Istanbul during February and March 2013. The second group of tasks was related to the field research process at the Beyoğlu district level conducted during the field trip from 14-23 April 2013.

The group arrived to Istanbul on 14 April 2013. Plenary meeting and lectures began on 15 April at Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, followed by
the visits to Istanbul Metropolitan Planning and Design Center, Beyoğlu Municipality, Galata Association, GAP Construction Company and Talimhane Hotels Association. Invited lecturers from the planning departments of Istanbul Technical University, Mimar Sinan University and Yıldız Technical University provided additional inputs.

The idea behind this research strategy was to attain an in-depth understanding of differing perspectives of as many actors as possible e.g. the city administrators, construction firms, tourism investors, NGOs, academics and the residents and users of the areas. In addition to the common lectures and meetings, later each of the four thematic groups defined its own questionnaires and interview list.

The whole group returned to Berlin on 23 April 2013, and a couple of days later preliminary research findings were presented at ‘Participatory Spatial Planning: Istanbul-Berlin’ organized on 29 April 2013 at TU Berlin. This one day workshop brought together graduate students of the Urban Management program, faculty of TU Berlin, and academics from Istanbul, planning experts and public professionals from Berlin in order to highlight the participatory planning approaches in different contexts.

The knowledge and information gathered through the research process explained above provided the backbone of this book. The main concern of the overall research was to examine the dimensions of urban re-development in Beyoğlu Istanbul.

The structure of the book is as follows:
Part I consists of the contextual background. Following this introductory chapter, the second chapter is written by three guest contributors. The first paper is by Fatma Unsal and Şevkiye Şence Türk, the second paper is by İpek Yada Akpınar and the final paper of the second chapter is by Haluk Gerçek. The third chapter aims to explore and understand the Urban Context of Istanbul. The chapter starts with a short review of the Evolution of the Istanbul followed by the section on Emergence and Evolution of the Beyoğlu. In relation to the contextual landscape, the sections on Urban Layout, Social Landscape, Cultural Landscape and Urban Infrastructure/Economic Landscape have been produced.

In Part II the Case Studies are presented. These focus on the four themes of social, economic, identity, and mobility and transportation issues, and are based on site observations and field research conducted in four different spatial contexts, namely: Taksim Square, which is considered the heart of modern Istanbul and the location of the Monument of the Republic. Taksim is a main transportation hub and a popular destination for both tourists and the native population of Istanbul. The square has been an important venue for political protests during much of its existence. Groups from all sides of the political spectrum in Turkey, as well as many NGOs, try to demonstrate in this square. Taksim is also a favourite location for public events or other social gatherings. The recent pedestrianization project of Taksim Square created ad hoc protests, which started gradually from January 2012, and were particularly focused on the planning decision to re-erect the old military barracks of the Ottoman period.

The second case study is the Tarlabası neighbourhood. It is bordered on the east side by the Tarlabası Boulevard. It is a historical deteriorated area. The residents are low-income, and employed in the service sector in the vicinity of Taksim area. Tarlabası was declared a regeneration area by the government in February 2006. The recently released renewal law no. 5366 for the Protection of Deteriorated Historic and Cultural Heritage through Renewal and Re-use, forms the basis of the renewal process in Tarlabası.
The third case study area is Talimhane. The area used to be a training area for the soldiers. The area is designated as hotel development area by the Beyoğlu municipality. Talimhane is closer to the congress tourism area, namely Congress Valley. This case is interesting as the motivation to transform the area was initiated by the former users.

Finally, İstiklal Street is a long pedestrian shopping street that ends at Taksim Square. A nostalgic tram runs from the square along the avenue, ending near the Tünel (1875) which is the world’s second-oldest subway line after London’s Underground (1863). Taksim is an important transportation hub where underground, and other modes of transport are interconnected.

After the presentation of case studies, the book ends with a concluding chapter by the editors.

This book presents the findings of the Istanbul field work produced by invited experts and the students of UM program.

We owe great thanks to the presenters in Istanbul: Mr. Züver Çetinkaya, (Secretary General, Union of Marmara Municipalities), Semih Turhan (Head of Department, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality Department of Earthquake Risk Management & Urban Rehabilitation), Mustafa Kemal İşler (Director, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality Directorate for Strategy Development), Arif Köklü (Beyoğlu Municipality Deputy Mayor), Nilgün Kivircik (Project Coordinator, GAP Construction Inc.), Cem Tüzün, (Taksim Platform), Günnur Özalp, (Secretary General, TURSAB The Association of Turkish Travel Agencies), Faruk Göksu (Urban Strategy Ltd), Sıla Akalp, (Urban Strategy Ltd), Dursun Özbek, (TUROB, Touristic Hotels and Investors Association).

Thanks to all the local experts, including Zeynep Enlili, Fatma Ünsal, Şence Türk of Academics, İpek Yada Akpınar, İclal Dinçer, Ulaş Akın, and graduate students Seçil Özalp, and Seda Hayal from BİMTAŞ who assisted the working teams.

Many thanks to the contributors to the Istanbul-Berlin Workshop organized by the Urban Management Program at TU Berlin on 29 April 2013: Prof. Philipp Misselwitz, (Chair of Habitat Unit), Hilmar von Lojewski (Deutscher Städteetag + Städteetag Nordrhein-Westfalen), Lukas Born (future Megacities Program Support), Dr. Umut Duyar-Kienast (Quartiersmanagement), Gerhard Kienast (Universität Kassel, Fachgebiet Architektur Stadtplanung Landschaftsplanung) Assist. Prof. Dr. Tuba İnal Çekiç (Yıldız Technical University), Akif Burak Atlar (Chamber of City Planners, Secretary General of Istanbul Branch).

Special thanks are reserved for Dr. Bettina Hamann, the Dean of Studies of Urban Management (UM) Program who supported us always. Lastly, we thank all the young professionals of the UM program for their valuable contribution, commitment and emotional involvement with the planning agenda in Istanbul.

Prof. Dr. Gülden Erkut, Dr. M. Reza Shirazi
2 Introductory Contemplations
2.1 Legal and Institutional Context of Urban Planning and Urban Renewal in Turkey: Thinking about Istanbul

Prof. Dr. Fatma Unsal
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevkiye Sence Turk

2.1.1 Introduction
Urban renewal is a form of planned interference that addresses urban decay in cities. The interference is mostly project-oriented. The results of the interference have a direct effect on the surroundings of the urban renewal area or the whole urban area. Therefore, the urban renewal interference should be integrated with the plan of city. Here, the basic question is how the integration between the plan and the urban renewal interference can be provided.

National planning systems have evolved in two different ways: regulatory and discretionary planning systems. The planning in regulatory planning systems has a clear role in defining rights and limits to rights of individual property owners (Tewdwr-Jones 1999; Rivolin 2008). In discretionary planning systems, the decisions are taken under the regulatory process. The plan becomes a master plan, or a form of zoning ordinance, taking on more significance as the sole material consideration (Tewdwr-Jones 1999). Although one of the main advantages of regulatory planning systems is to provide ‘certainty’, the external interference plan cannot be easily absorbed (Rivolin 2008). In contrast, the discretionary planning system is linked more closely with flexible decision making that is able to be responsive to individual circumstances and provide scope for negotiation (Steele and Ruming 2012). Although one of the main advantages of regulatory planning systems is to provide ‘flexibility’, the external interference plan can be absorbed. As a general tendency, many planning systems demonstrate a hybrid form (Booth 2003). Countries with rigid regulatory planning systems tend to adapt them to facilitate more flexibility, others operating discretionary planning systems look for ways to provide more certainty. This means that countries have different approaches regarding how the integration between the plan and the urban renewal intervention is provided.

This chapter discusses this integration (or disintegration) in Turkey’s case. The aim of the chapter is to understand the Turkish planning system and urban renewal in terms of their legal and institutional structure, and to reflect on the context on Istanbul.

A discussion about the Turkish planning system and urban renewal intervention is relevant for the following reasons. Firstly, Turkey has high rates of urbanization. The degree of urbanization rose from 19% in 1950 to 70% in 2010 and it is estimated to reach 84% by 2050 (UN 2008). Secondly, Turkey has a legal-illegal (dual) market structure. This dual structure is especially dominant in housing markets (Yönder, 1998; Leitmann and Baharoglu, 1999). Thirdly, there is lack of social and infrastructure areas in Turkish cities (Kenleşme Şurası 2009). Fourthly, 92% of Turkey’s area is located in an active earthquake zone, and 95% of the total population is exposed to earthquake risk (Jica Report 2004). On the one hand, these figures demonstrate the necessity of urban planning and the inevitability of urban renewal interventions, especially in big cities in Turkey, such as Istanbul. On the other hand, a hierarchical statutory planning system is responsible for land use planning and development control in Turkey. Although the planning system seems rigid in theory, it has become flexible in practice with different interventions both at the central and local levels. Urban renewal interventions are realized through the special-purpose plans both at the central and local levels. However, the results demonstrate that the Turkish planning system does not absorb urban renewal interventions.

Figure 2.1: Istanbul Urbanscape
Source: Zakaria Mohyeldin (2013)
of urban planning in Turkey, and includes a reflection on the urban planning context on Istanbul. The third section explains urban renewal in the Turkish planning system and reflects on the urban renewal context on Istanbul. The fourth section provides the concluding remarks.

2.1.2. Legal and Institutional Context of Planning in Turkey

The legal and institutional context of planning in Turkey displays an over-fragmented structure. The planning authority is widely dispersed through the Law of Development and the related laws mentioned in that Law. The planning system consists of 56 plan types and 18 authorized planning institutions.

The legislation in Turkey that guides spatial developments and planning starts with the Law of Buildings and Roads (1933). The rapid urbanization process of the 1950s, which was the result of the mechanization in agriculture and the subsequent migration from the rural areas to the cities, necessitated a new legislation and an institutional governing body regarding urban development. In this context, the Law of Development (1957/6785) was passed and the Ministry of Reconstruction and Settlement was established (1958). As per the first Law of Development, the planning authorities were assembled at the Central Government. The passing of the Law of Development and the establishment of the Ministry coincide with the period of setting up the State Planning Office and the First Development Plan (1963-1967) coming into force.

On the other hand, the Law of Development (1985/3194), which is currently in effect, was the starting point of an important change in the planning field through transferring planning authorities to the local governments. This legislation, which is a turning point in the recent past of planning, despite being a forward step in the democratization process, has been controversial ever since the very first implementations. The internal inconsistencies as well as the unclear relations with the other legislations have led to implementation difficulties and also resulted in many legal cases.

2.1.2.1. Main Plan Types at Two Levels of Planning

In the context of the Law of Development, two planning levels and corresponding plan types are referred to. At the first level, “Regional Plan” and “Environmental Master Plan” are defined, generating macro decisions for urban and regional developments (see Figure 2.1.1).

For the pre-2000 implementations, the planning authority lies with the Ministry of Reconstruction and Settlement for the Environmental Master Plans, covering a number of provinces. On the other hand, a Regulation was issued in the year 2000, regarding the fundamentals of the Environmental Master Plans and giving the planning authority to the Ministry of Environment. The Ministry of Environment has been exercising the authority forcefully between 2003 and 2011. However, the Ministry of Environment had faced authority disputes with both the State Planning Office and the local governments, when exercising environmental planning authority.

---

1 This part of the article is based on two other articles: 1) Unsal Fatma, “Critical Evaluation of Legal and Institutional Context of Planning: The Case of Istanbul”, PLPR Conference, 11-13 Feb 2009, Aalborg 2) Unsal Fatma, Ozgur Ebru, Yesilirmak Asuman, “Planned Disorder in Istanbul, 24th Annual AESOP Conference, 7-10 July 2010, Helsinki
2 Duygulu E., 2006, p.28.
3 Date of the Law/ Code of the Law
4 Ministry of Reconstruction and Settlement had been united with the Ministry of Public Works in 1983. The Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Public Works have been united under the title of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism in 2011.
5 Regional Plans have been made by the State Planning Office (State Planning Office has been united to a newly established Ministry, the Ministry of Development, in 2011) in order to determine the socio-economic development trends, development potential of the settlements, sectoral targets and the distribution of the infrastructural facilities as well as the functions (Law of Development 1985/3194, Item 8).
6 Environmental Order Plans have been made and approved by the Ministry of Public Works and Development (Ministry of Environment and Urbanism since 2011) in line with the already-approved national and regional plans (if they exist) in order to determine decisions regarding the settlement and land use such as housing, industry, agriculture, tourism and transportation (Law of Development 1985/3194, Item 5).
7 The expansion of the environmental plans over the national territory has gone up from 5.5% in 2003 to 57.5 in 2008.
The authority disputes between the State Planning Office and the Ministry of Environment originated from the new regional split, in use since 2002. Within the process of the candidacy for the European Union, the State Planning Office and the State Statistics Office have defined three levels of regions. 12 regions are defined on the first level, 26 on the second level and 81 on the third level. For the 26 regions on the second level, there are plans to set up "Regional Development Agencies", which will also have planning authority.

The origin of the dispute between the Ministry of Environment and the local governments, on the other hand, was the "Law of Special Government for Provinces" (2005/5302). A "Special Government for Province" is a local democratic governmental council, the president of which is the governor of the province (see Figure 2.1.2). The governors are not elected but assigned by the central government. The Law of Special Government for Provinces gives the planning authority for the Environmental Master Plans of the provinces (at a scale of 1/100 000) to the special governments for provinces. In this context, especially in urban areas with dense populations, an authority dispute arises between the Ministry of Environment and the local governments, namely either with the special governments for provinces or with the greater metropolitan municipalities (Figure 2.1.2).

The Law of Development defines the “Development Plan” and the “Implementation Plan” as the main plan types at the second level. The Law of Development grants the authority of preparing and approving these plans to the municipalities or metropolitan municipalities within municipal

---

8 Ministry of Environment and Urbanism since 2011
9 Babacan Tekinbas B., 2008, p.15
10 Development plans are made by the municipalities in line with the already-approved regional plans and environmental order plans (if they exist) in order to determine the general land uses and future population densities (building densities if necessary); principles, direction and size of the future developments; transportation systems and solutions of current urban problems (Planning Law 1985/3194, Item 5 and Item 8).
11 Implementation plans are made by the municipalities, based on the principles of the development plan, in order to determine the development pattern and density of the building blocks and defines the phases of implementation (Law of Development 1985/3194, Item 5 and Item 8).

---

The spatial developments in accordance with the national and regional socio-economic plans set the basic land-use decisions for housing, industry, commerce etc. as well as the major infrastructural facilities.
borders and in annexed areas, Governorates in other areas (see Figure 2.1.3).

However, items 4 and 9 of the Law define the exceptional cases that grant the planning authority, which has been delegated to the local governments, back to the central government. These exceptions are tourism areas, conservation zones and special environmental protection zones. Furthermore, item 9 of the same Law gives the planning authority to the related institutions of the central government in illegally developed areas, mass housing areas and areas where the major transportation routes pass through, if the circumstances necessitate such a transfer of planning rights. In other words, granting planning

---

Figure 2.1.2: Local Governmental System
Source: Adapted from the Figure in “Critical Evaluation of Legal and Institutional Context of Urban Planning: The Case of Istanbul”, Unsal, 2009.

Figure 2.1.3: Main Plan Types (Level 2)
Source: Authors
authority to the institutions defined in items 4 and 9 of the Law of Development further complicates the already fragmented planning structure.

Most recently, especially in the last decade, there has been a tendency of the central government in Turkey to use the planning authority by way of special purpose plans. Actually, the special purpose plans were formerly the most rational functions of planning for protecting the natural and cultural assets against the pressure of development. However, in the last decade, special purpose plans have turned into the tools for bypassing the local authorities. Additionally, the Law on Protection and Usage of Historical and Cultural Immovable Assets by Renewal (2005/5366) and the Law of Regeneration of the Areas under the Risk of Disaster (2012/6306) are subject to debate as they undermine the integrity of the holistic development plans. Although risk of disaster is a crucial issue in the context of planning in Turkey, it should be taken into account in an integrated approach with the other development dynamics.

2.1.2.2. Supplementary Plan Types

Besides the main plan types performing at the two above-mentioned levels, there are supplementary types of plans defined within the context of the Law of Development. The concept of supplementary plan types is predominantly valid for developing countries. In a developing country, the stark contrast between the dynamism of the rapid urbanization and the static structure of the comprehensive planning approach requires new planning types. The Law of Development and the associated Regulation define processes and the plan types in order to meet the requirements in the phase of implementation. “Plan Modification”\textsuperscript{12}, “Revision Plan”\textsuperscript{13} and “Local Development Plan”\textsuperscript{14} are all within this context. According to the Law of Development, modifications can be done at all levels and for all types of planning. The modifications in the plans should be done for the public benefit, in line with the development plan and namely the social, technical infrastructural balance of the plan. They should also be based on objective and technical reasons. The Plan Modifications are grouped in four categories within the context of the Regulation of the Law: modifications linked to social and technical infrastructure, modifications affecting the densities, modifications related to the routing or the enlargement of the roads and the land use changes.

Although the Plan Modification should be done without disturbing the integrity of the plan and should be in line with the decisions of the development plan, in actuality many modifications are dedicated to speculative expectations and political gains as rewards. Especially after the handover of the planning rights to the local governments, a radical increase in the number of Plan Modifications has been experienced.\textsuperscript{15}

Within the context of the Law of Development, other plan types are defined where the Plan Modification is insufficient. One of these plan types is the Revision Plan, which calls for an entire or a partial renewal of the plan in order to meet the deficiencies of the Development Plan or to overcome the problems in the phase of implementation. The most important difference between the Revision Plan and the Plan Modification is the need for renewing the analytical research. If a change in

---

\textsuperscript{12} Plan Modifications are based on objective and technical reasoning, for the achievement of the public benefit, without jeopardizing the integrity and the infrastructural balance of the Development Plan (The Regulation on the Principles of Development and Implementation Plan Preparation, 1985, Item 3/6).

\textsuperscript{13} Revision Plans are made by the municipalities, when the current development plan is insufficient in meeting the needs of the society due to the environmental changes or other major considerations. The revision may cover the entire plan or a part of it (The Regulation on the Principles of Development and Implementation Plan Preparation, 1985, Item 3/3).

\textsuperscript{14} Local Development Plans are made by the municipalities when a settlement is needed to be developed beyond the boundaries of the current development plan and is located isolated from an already-planned settlement (The Regulation on the Principles of Development and Implementation Plan Preparation, 1985, Item 3/5).

\textsuperscript{15} Ersoy M., 2000, 44-71
the essence of the plan is required, then the Revision Plans should be done. However, Plan Modification erroneously substitutes the Revision Plan in most cases and the impulsive process of Plan Modification instead of making a Revision Plan yields implementation difficulties as well as socially unacceptable unfairness.

Within the context of the Law of Development, the Local Development Plan is defined for the cases where the existing plan does not meet the requirements of the population and new development areas need to be allocated. Since the Local Development Plans are accepted as an extension of the Development Plans, they should be made at the scales of 1/5000 and 1/1000. Hence, they should include the analytical research and evaluation requirements of the development plan. However, especially in the areas where sectoral developments such as tourism or industry are rapid, the developments are guided by the Local Development Plans without proper analytical studies. In these areas in which developments are fairly rapid, the cost of infrastructural investment and the provision of municipal services are higher than expected. Furthermore, the integrity of the plan is

Figure 2.1.4: Main and Supplementary Plan Types Based on the Law of Development
Source: Adapted and updated from the Figure in "Critical Evaluation of Legal and Institutional Context of Urban Planning: The Case of Istanbul", Unsal, 2009.
Figure 2.1.5: Related Laws Based on their Approaches
Source: Adapted and updated from the Figure in “Critical Evaluation of Legal and Institutional Context of Urban Planning: The Case of Istanbul”, Unsal, 2009.
jeopardized by these developments. Especially in coastal settlements, a mosaic-like development pattern emerges through the implementation of the Local Development Plans and it becomes difficult to stay in line with the population and development targets of the development plan. The main and supplementary plan types based on the Law of Development are seen in the Figure 2.1.4.

2.1.2.3. Fragmentation of Planning Legislation and the Institutional ‘Crowd’

Besides the Law of Development, there are other Laws which give the right of making and approving the development and implementation plans to different institutions for special areas. Some of these Laws are for the protecting and conserving the natural and cultural assets whereas others are dedicated to smoothing the path for the development projects. Although the populist attitude of the decision-makers of the 1980s has lessened, it is worth mentioning, especially to comprehend the developmental dynamics of Istanbul.

However, a new approach has been added to the Law making process following the 2000s. It is the hidden approach, in which the real-estate development oriented intentions are covered by essential goals of urban planning such as the prevention of the risks of disaster. The planning related Laws, other than the Law of Development, are categorized according the essence of the Laws in the Figure 2.1.5.

The lack of the coordinating instruments and processes for the integration of different plan types leads to disorder among the authorities within the planning system and ongoing disputes in the form of court cases.

2.1.2.4. Principles Versus Implementations in Istanbul

The Law of Development, although undermined by numerous laws, has three basic principles:
- The local government is the main planning authority and the use of planning authority by the central government is limited to extraordinary situations
- There should be a hierarchical accordance between different levels of planning

---

16 Babacan Tekinbas B., 2008, pp.25-28
The supplementary plan types are raised only if the main plan types are insufficient. However, the urban development of Istanbul clearly displays the lack of adherence to these principles.

The first principle, which is the embodiment of democracy in urban planning, is effectively disregarded in Istanbul. Above all, the macro-form of the city is determined by the bridges over the Bosphorus and their connecting highways. The decisions about the bridges are taken by the central government without the consent of the Greater Istanbul Municipality. The impact of the bridges on the macro-form of Istanbul is seen in Figure 2.1.6.

In addition to the Bosphorus Bridges, mass housing projects of the Mass Housing Directorate and the organized industrial sites which are planned by the Ministry of Industry have been effective in the spatial expansion of Istanbul, especially in the northern direction in opposition with the Environmental Master Plan of Istanbul. The layers of the spatial expansion of Istanbul, with respect to the mass housing and the organized industrial sites are seen in the Figure 2.1.7.

The second principle about the planning hierarchy is de facto disregarded due to the lack of a legitimate comprehensive plan. The first comprehensive plan for the metropolitan region of Istanbul was made in 1980. However, the spatial expansion supported by the populist development amnesties undermined the comprehensive plan and development beyond the limits of that plan (see Figure 2.1.8a). The second comprehensive plan was made in 1995. However, the Plan was cancelled due to a plot-based court case. The judicial review was not about the contents of the Plan, but about the administrative reasoning for using the planning authority instead. The spatial developments beyond the scope of the comprehensive plan are seen in the Figure 2.1.8b. Therefore, the spatial development in Istanbul has been guided by the development and implementation plans without a comprehensive plan for their integration, and consequently without hierarchical order, until the final comprehensive planning ‘effort’ in 2009.

---

17 Mass Housing Directorate is a powerful bureaucratic organization which is directly reporting to the Prime Minister.
The third principle about the role sharing between the main and supplementary plan types is also disregarded. The areas developed through the “Improvement and Development Plans” or through the plans approved by the first-tier municipalities, both of which are implemented without the approval of the Metropolitan Municipality of Istanbul, constitute 16% and 17% successively of the total built-up areas in Istanbul, which adds up to 33%. (see Figure 2.1.9).
2.1.3. Urban Renewal in the Turkish Planning System

2.1.3.1. Legal and Institutional Context

Turkey has never had a systematic urban renewal policy. Private sector initiatives are mostly on a single building scale. This approach is implemented directly by landowners and contractors (builder-and-seller), and depends on development rights in local plans (Baharoglu 1996) under market rules. This approach was a ruling approach in urban renewal in all big cities before the beginning of the 1990s. Within the framework of this approach, single family houses (single-story houses) have been turned into apartments depending on the development-plan decisions. Again, the buildings that have historical value in city centers or areas close to city centers are bought and restored, and then sold or rented for housing or commercial purposes by small-scale entrepreneurs (Turk and Korthals Altes 2011, p.10)

There have been various public initiative approaches to the renewal of inner city housing areas in Turkey. One of them is intervention into the urban texture by central or local governments. This intervention mostly includes the construction of new boulevards, squares and roads. The basic aim of these interventions is “to beautify the city”. The boulevards constructed or the formation of open spaces in Istanbul in the 1950s, construction of Tarlabasi Boulevard at the beginning of the 1990s or even making arrangements for the North Ankara entrance in the 2000s can be shown as examples (Turk and Korthals Altes 2011, p.10).

The amnesty laws enacted at the end of the 1980s provide another example. Illegal housing has been a significant problem in Turkey since the 1940s. Proposed solutions related to this problem have changed over time. Until the 1960s, the approach was demolishing squatter areas whereby reconstruction was not allowed, providing opportunities for building land production for poor and low-income people and ensuring legalization of

---

18 Improvement and Development Plans are made by the municipalities in order to improve the living standards in the irregularly developed, unhealthy urban environments by taking into consideration the current situation of the settlements (The Regulation on the Principles of Procedures to be Applied to the Unauthorized Developments, 1984/2981, Item 4/24).

squatter housing. In the planned period as of the 1960s, the approach of up-grading, clearance and prevention within the framework of Squatter Law No. 775 was implemented under the economic reforms enforced by the government since the 1980s within the framework of a liberal understanding. Within this period, squatter housing areas have often been legalized using amnesty laws. In the context of the structural changes of the 1980s, a general building amnesty was issued in 1983, followed by a number of amendments until 1989. The logic of Amnesty Law No. 2981/3290 was to upgrade existing illegal housing areas and to prevent new informal settlements. The law brought an improvement development plan, which was a special type of plan. The improvement development plan included unification of irregular, haphazardly formed parcels and their redesign to create new parcels of maximum 400 m² and to allow construction of four-story apartment buildings (Leitman and Baharoglu, 1999; Dundar, 2001). With the development right, in this way a transformation from squatter settlement to apartment building has emerged and this renewal has been realized directly by landowners (who have a title deed allocation certificate) or by contractors (builder-and-seller) at the single building scale (Turk and Korthals Altes 2011; Turk and Korthals Altes 2013).

At beginning of the 1990s, the public initiative renewal approach based on building blocks or area scale urban renewal instead of single building scale has gained importance. The most basic examples to this approach are the Portakal Çicegi Valley urban renewal project and the Dikmen Valley urban renewal project. These arrangements were realized under the public-private approach with different formulas. For example, a company (Metropol Imar A.S.) has undertaken the Dikmen Valley project as a business enterprise of the municipality. As for the Portakal Çicegi Valley project, Portas A.S. was established as a joint venture with the municipality, construction firms and landowners (Turan 2007). In these two examples, the public-private sector cooperation is an important change. However, there is some criticism related to this type of renewal. One is that gentrification has occurred as a result of the projects. For example, it was determined that following the completion of the Dikmen Valley project only 8 of the 47 returning families live on the project area and the remaining 39 families have moved to other places. Original landowners who returned to the areas after renewal have sold their houses in the renewal area and purchased two houses in different parts of the city (in the periphery) (Uzun 2005). The other is that this type of project can be applied only at the places where there is potential for high real estate values and not throughout urban areas or all slum areas (Güzey, 2009). Another criticism is that the entrance of low income groups to housing is not possible, because the projects focus on middle or upper income groups (Turk and Korthals Altes 2010a; Turk and Korthals Altes 2011).

Various legal sources related to urban renewal have been issued since 2004. The first is the North Ankara Entrance Urban Renewal Law No. 5104 which came into force in 2004. This law aims at improving and beautifying the physical status and environmental appearance of the areas covering the North Ankara entrance and vicinity and ensuring proper urbanization within the framework of an urban renewal project.

---

20 The Portakal Çicegi Valley is located between Çankaya and Ayrancı districts within Ankara Metropolitan Area. The area size is 11 hectares. The first stage of Portakal Çicegi Valley project started in 1992 and finished in 1996. Before the project, half of the ownership was public and the other half was private. Its function in the detailed local plan was defined as a green area before the project. However, the area was not expropriated before the project because of lack of budget and the long time needed to expropriate the area. After the renewal project, recreational areas, housing areas and culture and trade center areas were developed in the area.

21 The Dikmen Valley is located in Çankaya district near to the Portakal Çicegi Valley within Ankara Metropolitan Area. The area size is 290 hectares. The first stage of Dikmen Valley project started in 1989 and finished in 1994. There were squatter houses in the area before the projects. After the renewal project, green areas, housing areas, culture and social facilities, and trade center areas have developed in the area.
The second is “Law on Protection and Usage of Historical and Cultural Immovable Assets by Renewal,” Law No. 5366 which came into force in 2005. By the law, municipalities have implementation powers in areas declared as protected sites by protection committees. According to the law, the municipality can declare any site as a renewal area in order to take precautions against the risks of natural disasters and protection of deteriorated historic and cultural heritage through renewal. The applicability of the law is limited to the areas that were previously designated as historic preservation sites. The law increased the ability of the municipalities to intervene to the deprived areas by expropriation in the declared regeneration areas.

The other law that was issued in 2005 is “Municipality Law No. 5393” (also 2005), which (by article 73) authorizes municipalities to designate urban renewal areas. Article 73 of the Law no. 5393 allows the municipalities to interfere in accordance with the development of the city, establishing residential areas, industrial and commercial areas, technological parks and social infrastructure, taking precautions against earthquake risk or protecting the historical and cultural texture of the city. Furthermore, the municipalities have the authority to declare any area as a renewal area. For this, the city council’s decision is required in determining a project area. An urban renewal area should be an area of minimum 5 hectares. Although the renewal process has not clearly defined, the expropriation method is used for the implementation process.

In 2010, with Law no 5998, the scope of Article 73 was extended. According to the law, municipalities can determine urban renewal projects in order to create housing areas, industrial areas, business areas, technology parks, public service areas, recreation areas and all sorts of social facility areas, rebuild and restore worn-out parts of the city, preserve the historical and cultural heritage of the city or take measures against earthquakes. The municipalities have the authority to decide which areas are to be declared as an urban renewal areas regardless of whether or not they contain buildings, specify the building height limits and density, require that the area size be minimum 5 and maximum 500 hectares.

A new law, entitled ‘Regeneration of Areas under Disaster Risk’ (Law No: 6306), was issued in 2012. The law regulates the improvement, settlement and renovation of areas at risk of disaster and other lots with risk-bearing buildings, even if outside a designated disaster risk area. Law No. 6306 also gave further authority to the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism, TOKI (Housing Development Administration of Turkey) and local authorities (both municipalities and special provincial administrations).

2.1.3.2. The Promoters of Urban Renewal and the Significance of TOKI

In Turkey, the promoters of urban renewal vary widely including central and local government agencies, joint ventures, construction firms, landowners, partnerships of landowners, developers, and incorporated companies. However, public initiative is generally preferred. According to findings of a questionnaire survey by Turk22 (2010a, 2011), 30.2% (13) of the municipalities have developed projects directly by themselves. 41.9% (18) have implemented urban renewal projects with an agreement with landowners under private law, 9.3% (4) have established a project-based joint venture with the private sector. 44.2% (19) have worked jointly with TOKI. 14% (6) have implemented urban renewal projects through delegation to the private sector and 2.3% (1) implemented the projects by union or cooperative established by landowners. So, different methods are used in

22 Because the municipalities used a combination of methods, the percentage of responses is so 100 percent.
urban renewal projects: the joint project development method with TOKI was used most often.

Three reasons for municipalities joining forces with TOKI can be considered. First is that the powers of TOKI have been widened. TOKI has the authority to realize urban renewal projects in both illegal housing areas and areas where existing urban renewal laws (Law Nos. 5366, 5162 and 6306) are applied. TOKI is granted a broad range of powers and duties for the housing sector and urban upgrading. The second reason is that TOKI’s resources have been increased. With an amendment (Law No. 4966; 2003) TOKI became authorized to allow projects and developments for profit so as to provide resources for their activities. Generally, TOKI’s illegal settlement upgrading model is generally implemented to upgrade unplanned and problematic areas, occupied public lands, regions with disaster risks, and cultural and historic areas surrounded by illegal settlements. The project areas are generally located around the city centres where the land is particularly valuable. This enables TOKI and local authorities to accomplish upgrading projects without having financial difficulties because the surplus of constructed houses that must not be allocated to the right holders are sold for good prices (Uzun et al. 2010). The third reason is a political effect. Cooperation between local and central governments that are from the same political party can be easier established.

2.1.3.3. Main Features of Urban Renewal
Depending on legal sources that have been issued since 2004, an urban renewal practice has emerged in Turkey. This practise has some features. The first is related to land assembly. In Turkey, land assembly in urban renewal projects is a problematic issue. Because there are many small parcels, fragmented ownership structure problems and illegal uses in renewal areas make the use of purchase difficult for a developer and public authorities in Turkey (Turk and Korthals Altes 2010a, 2011). The use of expropriation is seen as a solution with the active public role in land assembly in inner city renewal. However, social resistance and increasing costs prevent the direct use of expropriation (Shoup 2009; Azuela and Herrera 2007; Adams et al. 2001). So, the necessity to agree with landowners emerged. In recent years, in Turkey, in public initiative urban renewal projects, an intersection solution (agreement or expropriation) is preferred. In Municipality Law Nos. 5393 and 5366 which came into effect in 2005, agreement was given to priority for land assembly in urban renewal and, if there is no agreement, the municipality has expropriation authority. Also, according to Law on Regeneration of Areas at Disaster Risk (Law no.6306), the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, TOKI, local governments (Municipality or Special Provincial Administration) expropriates the property if a two-thirds majority cannot be agreed on by co-owners of a demolished structure within at least 1 month after building demolition in an urban renewal area. This type of power provides flexibility to the municipalities, but the use of the method has caused doubts about this way of land assembly in society. The first doubt is related to the low compensation payment in both agreement and expropriation processes that is based on the value of current use. Future use is not taken into consideration. Expropriation based on this level of compensation is considered an unjust treatment of landowners and tenants. Secondly, the resettlement costs are not included in the compensation of the expropriation and the tenants are not taken into consideration. Thirdly, planning for private development and not for social housing production is a controversial reason for using expropriation (Turk and Korthals Altes 2013a).

The second feature is that gentrification occurs in public initiative urban renewal projects. Although original landowners participate in projects with public enterprises, they cannot continue to live in the area because of the increased costs and land values after the project. Urban renewal projects predominantly aim at physical and demographic
upgrading of their respective areas rather than improving the living conditions of existing inhabitants, thus instigating a process of property transfer and displacement (Kuyucu and Unsal 2010, Turk and Korthals Altes 2010a, Dinçer 2011, Lovering and Turkmen 2011).

The third feature is that most projects are in the form of expensive, profit generating residences based on owner-occupation for middle and upper income groups or for commercial use. In this situation, the participation of landowners in public initiative urban renewal projects involves facilitating land assembly more than the protection of social capital or social mixing (Turk and Korthals Altes 2013b).

2.1.3.4. Reflections on the Urban Renewal Context in Istanbul

The urban population of Istanbul showed a dynamic increase from 2.9 million in 1980 to 13.1 million in 2010 -- an increase of 4.5 times over the last 30 years. Rapid urban growth in Istanbul has affected the spatial pattern of the city in two different ways. While the Istanbul metropolitan area has been continuously sprawling since 1975 (Eraydın 2008, Terzi and Bölen 2009), there has been a simultaneous increase of density in built-up areas of the city (Turk and Korthals Altes 2010b). These developments have an impact on land values and are partly guided by governmental decisions. New plan decisions in built-up areas and plan changes have important impacts on the development towards compactness within sprawling neighbourhoods. The deregulation of urban planning systems and development controls that encourages public agencies and private developers to initiate large urban projects (Balaban 2012) also led to a construction boom between 2002 and 2007 in Istanbul. Although plan decisions have a certain role in planning, about half, i.e. 52%, of the existing Istanbul housing stock (3,136,931) is located in buildings that have no construction permits. The pattern of growth contributes to an increasing and cumulative shortage of housing stock with construction permits and minimum standards and quality (GYODER 2006). Due to the increasing problems related to infrastructure and socio-economic structure and the major earthquake threat the city faces, Istanbul’s unplanned and unregulated growth makes radical interventions into the built environment in the form of ‘renewal’ or ‘transformation’ projects a necessity (Kuyucu and Ünsal 2010). However, the current urban renewal projects in the city seem unlikely to be a remedy for these problems.

The current renewal projects in Istanbul--Ayazma, the Basibuyuk, Gulsuyu and Gulensu, Tarlabası, Sulukule, and Fener Balat--resulted in the displacement of low income groups from the renewal areas (Dinçer 2011, Lovering and Turkmen 2011, Kuyucu and Ünsal 2010; Turk and Korthals Altes 2010a and 2011, Dinçer at al. 2008). These urban renewal projects in Istanbul ‘disproportionately benefit a coalition of urban developers, credit institutions, local and central state actors and the politically and economically stronger inhabitants of these areas’ (Kuyucu and Ünsal 2010 and 1480). The promotion of rising land and property values is the key ingredient of the urban development strategy, the explicit goal of key authorities charged with urban development, the key to engaging private investors, and the main resource that the authorities use to win local consent (Lovering and Turkmen 2011). The approach taken by the authorities focuses excessively on the renewal of physical place and the built environment. Not one of the projects reviewed here seriously addressed the socio-economic and cultural–political implications of regeneration. Nor did they reveal any common perspective on design (Dinçer 2011).

2.1.4. Concluding Remarks

The legal and the institutional context of urban planning and urban renewal in Turkey should be evaluated in a critical approach in order to achieve a properly functioning and, even more impor-
tantly, socially just planning system. In this framework, the following concluding remarks aim to draw attention to the systemic deficiencies:

- The major development decisions are initiated by the powerful central governmental agencies rather than the democratic establishments.
- Real estate development dominates the economic domain and there is a political inclination to promote these earnings.
- The highly fragmented structure, lack of coordination and overlapping jurisdictions make it almost impossible to implement the basic principles of planning.
- Neither proper participation practices nor efficient auditing mechanisms are encouraged by the planning legislation.
- Although there are enough protective laws and regulations, the ecological concern and the democratic processes are not embraced.
- The mosaic of projects undermines the holistic plan.
- The renewal process had been either private but small investor led or amnesty oriented until the 1990s.
- The renewal approach initiated by the public authorities has become the significant renewal policy since 1990s.
- The impacts of the extensive, public-private renewal projects have disturbed the social conscience.
- The Laws and Regulations, which have been enacted for specific projects in order to increase the ability of the municipality but disregard the social rights of the society, disturb the basic principles of justice.
- The implementation techniques of the recent Laws and Regulations, especially the land assembly methods, not only disregard the use of public resources in a fair manner but also generate new social problems.
2.2. Remapping Istanbul: Taksim after Gezi

Prof. İpek Akpınar

“Space is political. Space is not an object to be separable from ideology or politics; although it looks homogenous, pure form or objective, space is a social product. The production of space can be similar to the production of any machine/product/good.” Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space.

2.2.1. Introduction

This study of Taksim, questioning the present, contextually looks at the past and describes the process of commissioning a public project as well as comprehending the process of the creation of the ‘Cultural Valley’ in the light of the 1937 Prost Plan. Based on an overview by the works of doctoral students on Taksim, my study sheds light on the new projects and the rhetoric of the social actors around the subject.  

Thus, following a conceptual introduction, my study indicates the spatial and primary planning works; afterwards, focusing on the Taksim area, it conveys the city’s and Turkey’s public space transformation since the early Republican years. Going back and forth between the social memory and public space concepts, this study may give a broader understanding to the making of public space, and the production of public space in Istanbul and in Turkey in general.

Entering the 20th century as an imperial city that had been a capital of three empires, Istanbul, once more, emerged in the world arena as a “global city” - one of the cities linking leading regional economies to the world economy. Similarly today, we are witnessing an intense economic, social, cultural and spatial transition to a different platform. On the one hand, in the globalizing period, it is possible to read the dynamics of Istanbul through Castell’s notion on the ‘space of flows’. Urban and social mobility reflect the flow, the transfer and sharing of knowledge, information, and people, which have been primary dynamics of globalizing Istanbul. Istanbul, an 8,500 year old imperial city, has become a ‘theatrical stage’ for populist policies welcoming multi-national investments and their spatialization with upscale architectural vocabulary. The contemporary urban transformation possesses its own local characteristics. However, it must be pointed out there are similarities with transformations in Sao Paolo, Dubai and Shanghai.

Very similarly, in the dominant global context on Istanbul, a fragmented “urban collage”, physicalized through its pluralist identity, or a “mélange” – as defined by Uğur Tanyeli - has emerged as the main local aspect. Through the dynamic globalizing process that Tansel Korkmaz (2010) names “pressure of the global”, the overlapping of the service industry with the development of finance and technology sectors along with the industry of culture brings out a social and economic dissociation. Imports that were prioritized through neoliberal policies as well as land and real-estate speculation have dominated the economy. In 2006, Prime Minister Erdoğan’s emphasis on the economic in his pronouncements complements the picture: “my main responsibility is to market my city and country”.

1 This paper is an outcome of my master course entitled Urban Representation: Remapping Istanbul at ITU. A short version was presented as a seminar at ITU in June 2013 and AKBANK SANAT on 14 September 2013.


4 To state Istanbul’s physical change in its macro-form numerically, the city’s core area lying within the city walls was 1,440 hectares. Today Istanbul’s geographic area is around 200,000 hectares. The population grew from 1,000,039 in 1897 to 1,200,000 through migrations; in 1927 it was nearly halved at around 691,000 and in 1950 it was 1,369,799. In 1990 it reached 7,521,000 and in 2007 it was 13,452,000. See İlhan Tekeli (2009), 11-34.
Researchers who depict Istanbul as a “show city” enclosed by a consumption culture, believe that the integrity of the city is slowly being fragmented. An ‘islandisation’ as well as a ‘museumification’ is occurring, and the process excludes certain social classes.\(^5\) Keyder’s (1999; 2010) description of the urban and architectural transformation scenarios in Istanbul through “those who could be part of globalization and those who could not be”, points to the fact that new models of wealth and poverty are rising in the city. In this regard, Nora Şeni indicates that two radically disintegrated and ideologically different social groups are present: the seculars and conservatives.\(^6\)

Today, “beautifying Istanbul and glorifying its Ottoman past” have become the main mottos. Making car traffic flow like water and getting rid of the ugliness have become national concerns across Turkey, and Istanbul is no exception. Visualised by the so-called urban transformation, the past decade has been characterized by rapid destruction, eviction of urban poor, combined with the accumulation of global capital. In the 21st century, with all governmental and municipal support, Istanbul is undergoing radical spatial and social changes.

In this framework, the so-called urban transformation projects in the centre of Istanbul have brought about a transformation that is intertwined with the social networks, economic and cultural dynamics and that is rapidly gentrified and gentrifying via the integration with the industry of culture. In recent research on Istanbul, emphasis has been placed increasingly on the uneven allocation of urban resources, the increase in urban poverty and spatialisation. In this process, wealth is becoming polarized; life, work and recreational areas are separated according to social, economic and spatial criteria. In other words, the public integrity that gave an ideological meaning to the modern city of the 20th century is in the process of disintegration. Surrounded by consumption culture, the urban integration of the city has been fragmented. With a hygienic atmosphere created by upscale architectural vocabulary, the city has witnessed privatisation of public space as well as public buildings and a segregated museumification process accompanied by the emergence of a social, cultural, economic and spatial segregation process.

It is thus possible to speak of the “Global Istanbul Project” and the staging of neo-liberal policies over the spatialisation process. The speculative, and ideologically connotative project creation processes are characterized by ad-hoc, spontaneous and fragmented decisions made with no discussions in an opaque environment.

In 2010, Turgut Saner and Cem Kozar’s publication Ghost Buildings asks what would happen if 12 historical buildings of Istanbul had not been demolished or destroyed by fire. The authors give a sarcastic and fictive scenario via a photomontage visualising the reconstruction. Taking this joke seriously, just before the general elections in 2011, Prime Minister Erdoğan announced his Taksim Project, its so-called pedestrianisation as well as the reconstruction of a former military barracks, Topçu Kışlası.

In this context the process of the so-called “urban transformation” project that has overthrown Taksim came into existence. It was accompanied by the utterance of Halil Onur, architect of the Taksim project, stating, “not everyone can enter everywhere”; and it is a process of destruction that began without the finalization of the legal decisions. First of all, the local and central administrations are transforming Turkey’s public space in an opaque process from a public park into an enclosed private structure, and the tunnel is constructed in the name of pedestrianisation.

---


6 Nora Şeni, conference notes, the Taksim panel, ITU Taşkışla, March 2013.
without waiting until the end of the legal process. Secondly, the administration, virtually in an “ideological war” with the 1930s, is trying to “transform” an important space of public memory as well as an active part of the urban daily life.7

As Ertuğ Uçar (2012) states, architects, planners and designers are lured into an ideological-political discussion rather than an urban-architectural one. In Taksim, the demolition process carries other connotations. With the lack of public transparency of the local and central administrations, the public space is being expropriated and privatized. The protection and development of the area can be secured through the decisions of the Preservation Committee, protective measures or the relevant responsibilities of the directorate of parks and gardens. Having seen the plans and the projects of the local administration, it can be said that the modern metropolis cannot be administered with a fragmented approach, but with a holistic one - based on open participative discussions related to the varying functions and priorities of the public space. However, the local administration began the demolition process without waiting for the legal resolution or without convincing the dwellers through a participative decision-making process. In short, the city is undergoing another period of “building through destroying” during which construction sector is used as a catalyst.

2.2.2. The Making of a Public Place in Taksim: Istanbul and the Prost Plan of 1937

In today’s cosmopolite8 Istanbul, Taksim is on the
one hand the source of water distribution and on
the other hand it is the “place of the dead” at the
periphery of the city: Armenian and Greek ceme-
teries are located near Elmadag; there are small
scale Muslim cemeteries in Ayaspaşa. Old visual
documents depict the presence of city terraces
in the topography of this periphery. It was a hill
where urban terraces were formed and where the
lively picturesque life continued. The semi-ruined
barracks was a part of the city experience at the
beginning of the 20th century. It is in this declining
urban context that the former imperial stage
welcomed a French urban designer for modernisa-
tion and beautification.

The Taksim Gezi and the cultural and recreational
valley idea between Beyoğlu and Şişli suggested
and implemented with the 1937 Prost Plan is
perhaps the most comprehensive planning experi-
ment in Istanbul’s Republican history. In 1936 archi-
tect and city planner Henri Prost (1874-1959)9 was
invited to establish a master plan to beautify and
modernise the city. He submitted the first master
plan (Le Plan Directeur) in 1937 (see: Figure 2.2.1).
Prost prepared a project “plan de concentration”10
that included wide boulevards joining the func-
tional areas, wide squares and eighteen parks with
the beautification theme. “Istanbul is the most
beautiful work of art that I have had to work on [...]
The new appearance of Istanbul will honour the
young Republic,” stated Prost (1948). He created
the master plan of Istanbul and the public spaces/
espaces libres against the backdrop of the ideo-
logical transformation of the national foundation11.
The most comprehensive and modern proposal of
the eighteen parks, which were to be located at
the empty spaces due to former fires at the histor-
cal peninsula or to replace cemeteries, was the

7 The Prime Minister stated in one of his speeches: “they made us believe
that this is Gezi”. (For completeness sake, this area was initially named
“Inönü”, then “Taksim Gezisi”) According to the Prime Minister, Prost’s Plan-
ning of Istanbul is “non-sense”.
8 “Cosmopolitan” refers to the co-existence of a high number of cultural
differences, but does not indicate their inter-transition.

9 Henri Prost studied in L’Ecole Nationale de Beaux Arts in Paris. In 1902,
with Le Prix de Rome he stayed in Rome in 1903 and 1907 as a student at
the Villa Medici Institute - L’Académie de France. With the special permis-
sion of the Ottoman Sultan, arrived in Istanbul and studied Hagia Sophia
and its surroundings between 1904-1905 and 1906-1907. In 1910, Prost won
the International Design Competition in Antwerp. He was at Musee Social
(1910-1913). In 1911, he was a founding member of urban planning commis-
sion along with A.Agache, E. Hénard, L. Jaussely at the Institut de France.
He prepared plans for North African cities. In 1924, he was invited to plan for
İzmir. He declined but consulted René Danger and his brother (Bilsel, 1996).
He was appointed as the head architect-planner of Paris and surroundings.
Between 1936 and 1951, he was the head urbaniste of Istanbul.
Bartlett, University of London, 2003; İ.Y. Akpınar, İstanbul’da Modern bir Pay-ı
Taht: Prost planı çerçevesinde Menderes’in icraatı”, C. Bilsel, P. Pinon, ed.
İmparatorluk başkentinden Cumhuriyet’in Modern Kentine: Henri Prost’un
İstanbul Planlaması (1936-1951), İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2010, s.167-
199; C. Bilsel, “Henri Prost’un İstanbul Planlaması (1936-1951); Nazım Planlar
ve Kentsel Operasyonlarla Kentin Yapısal Dönüşümü”, C.Bilsel, P.Pinon, ed.
İmparatorluk Başkentinden Cumhuriyet’in Modern Kentine: Henri Prost’un
İstanbul Planlaması (1936-1951), İstanbul Araştırma Enstitüsü, 2010, s.101-
165.
11 Espaces libres (‘Serbest saharalar’, kamusal mekan) refers to more than
squares, promenades, kinder gardens and entertainment spaces. The termi-
ology refers both to public sphere and public space.
one in Taksim in the European region. It should not be forgotten that in that era’s understanding of conservation, for the development of a new life scenario in the northern area of the city demolition was a valid method (see: Figure 2.2.2). Within this context, the Artillery Barracks, which represented a preceding period, was slowly dismantled and a new integrative Cultural Valley was proposed in its place. The valley is demarcated by the death zone in the periphery of the city, and the city centre Beyoglu, which was transformed through 19th century capitalism, and the area that developed following the 2nd constitutional monarchy i.e. Sisli. New promenade routes, multipurpose halls, a stadium, a theatre and exhibition halls and finally an opera were built as part of the new comprehensive urban design experiment that took place. The Governor and Mayor of Istanbul Lütfi Kirdar describes the project as follows: “this is not any park, it is a promenade area like the ones seen in European Capitals. Just like the Trocadero Garden in Paris or Hyde Park in London, it is a place where the dwellers can relax from the exhaustion of city life”.12 (Figure 2.2.1, Figure 2.2.2)

Hence the broad stairs that are opposite the square were built in such a way as to invite the dwellers into this green area. Today, the geometric order of trees in rows, uniform and regular flowerbeds, the water fountains and sculptures in Taksim, which can be read through the notions of Europeanisation, gentrification, secularisation, popularisation, point to more than an architectural scenario. The ‘cultural and sports education centres’ developed within the context of a new social existence, new housing and public spaces/espaces libres, physicalize the Cultural Valley. When asked by the reporters why he designed a series of parks for Istanbul, Prost showed them a number of photographs13 that he had taken in Taksim Gezi Park. Prost had inscribed the importance of the eighteen parks behind the photographs: he consciously repeated the reasoning behind the existence of parks as “in order to take women and children out of their cages”14. Public spaces make women “visible” in the cultural framework of Islam (see Figure 2.2.3).

Within this context, Prost repeats that for a mixed population, the public space and the proposals in the master plan support radical social and cultural transformation.15 In the context of the educational, cultural and legal reforms of the new republic, espaces libres were not simply “beautification”, but an authentic characteristic of the Turkish modernisation project. As in Haussman and Hénard’s Paris, the green areas become an important spatial design in the context of the city. In the mostly Muslim Ottoman state, this type of organisation of space is not an urban tradition: wide public spaces are a novelty in the context of Istanbul.16 The design of espaces libres points to a more hygienic built environment, a new social life and thus a radical change in urban lifestyle. The public space physicalizes the direct transition to a mixed population of a secular state from the Ottoman social structure in which men and women were separated. In order to understand the real meaning of the public spaces within the context of Turkish politics, Prost’s designs should be interpreted

---

12 Istanbul Belediyesi yayını, 1940.
13 Prost, notes, IFA/AAarchive.
14 Prost, notes, IFA/AAarchive.
15 Prost, personal notes, IFA/AA archive.
16 This study is aware that the 18th Century public spaces along the Golden Horn and Bosphorus were exceptional. Some researchers also argue that the fountain and its surrounding can also be accepted as a ‘public space’.

Figure 2.2.3: The Making of a Square: Taksim. Source: Photograph taken by Henri Prost. IFA/AA Archive
through his own statement of 1943: “the plans that have partially been implemented to my satisfaction will shake old Istanbul to a great extent.” The public spaces of the master plan of Istanbul are not only a tool for visual beautification and the connection of several regions, but also a strong political and social tool in the transformation of the Muslim Ottoman population into secular citizens of a nation-state. This plan is not only a platform in which the public space planning is taken spatially, it also allows men and women to enjoy a mixed public life freely and where the theoretical reforms can both be seen at national (the religious conservative sections of the population) and international scales (Western European Countries). This recreation and culture area includes the large green area between Beyoğlu that developed in the 19th century and Şişli that evolved at the start of the 20th century. Prost’s urban design, while aestheticizing the city, undertakes an important role in bringing together the planning and urban design disciplines. The physicalisation of the plan through the separation of functions and its reflection on daily life through architecture becomes the stage of the republic. Bozdoğan (2010) defines the stage as follows:

“The witnessing of the transformation movement of the new city of the republic into a contemplation area, a stage of modern life; it is a period that pieces back together the remains of the empire, it is a period that carries the impressions of the modern city landscapes and new public spaces… it is the last point in time when “contempt is fought against”, when swimming was possible at its beaches, when dances were held at its clubs, and when the vision that Istanbul could be homogeneously formed […].”

In this context, similar to the gardens and parks that became the “window of the republic”, public beaches and cafes also gained significance. These “new structures”, which were physicalizing the Prost Plan through modern aesthetics, beautify the city with the central or local authorities’ etiquette and behavioural guidance. The public settings of the embellished city’s new ‘secular lifestyle’ are the new cafes, family tea gardens, club buildings, beaches along the coasts, swimming pools and clubs by the sea. In this regard, Dücke Cündioğlu argues that cultural differences arise precisely at this point: “the idea of a square as well as public space is foreign to our culture, to our cultural practice; in other words, the public space as an unknown concept in our relationship with the object”.

Secularised through Prost’s public spaces, and modernised through his master plan, Istanbul was being transformed from an Ottoman capital to a city of the republic. Taksim Gezi Park and the Cultural Valley that was established as the most comprehensive planning project of the Republic in Istanbul slowly became Turkey’s most important public area through the multi-purpose halls, stadium, theatre and exhibition halls and opera: Taksim was now where the dwellers lived intensely during good or bad days. The public space with its cultural role enriched the city life for years. Taksim became a place where both political and civil demonstrations took place. It evolved from an official ideological place into a place for the people.

With the construction of the Hilton Hotel at the centre of the Cultural Valley in the 1950s, the spatial relationship and continuity was partially interrupted. In time, hotels and officers’ clubs were built and, although the interventions were limited to single buildings, the most interesting urban implementation in Istanbul’s modernisation history became indiscernible. It could not be administered through a place policy that was based on public intentions. When looked at through the lens of sociology, Taksim is described as “emblematic” by Cengiz Aktar, and its demolition and the
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process that is taking place behind closed doors is a “historiographic” problem according to Uğur Tanyeli. The dominant statement that “the past was good, let’s ameliorate it through reconstruction” is, in fact, a ‘naïve’ expectation. Is it possible to rebuild the past by reconstructing the buildings? The belief of being excluded from history is in Tanyeli’s words, an “unhealthy comportment.” How can the lost vital meaning be rebuilt? The second dominant behaviour is ‘aesthetization’. As Walter Benjamin notes, this is actually a “totalitarian behaviour.” The idea that the past was free of problems is problematic. We are talking about an attitude that gets a law decree prepared by the Prime Minister’s order, and that tries to end a historical TV series. It is an attitude that declares, ‘we will object to the objection’ of the local commissions. Thirdly, there is an ideological construction over architecture and places: a similar attitude is noticed among all the buildings old and new in the spatialisation of the ideology. There is an expectation to take the whole country back to that ‘awesome’ past. During this process “we are terrorizing each other using buildings” as stated by Uğur Tanyeli. In short, this is a road towards totalitarianism as suggested by Benjamin in his theses on the philosophy of history.

In Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü (1961, 1999) Ahmet Hamdi Tanpinar depicts the ironic situation of two separate civilisations in which Turkish society has to struggle between two worlds of values. His depiction is also reminiscent of what we have been witnessing in the last few years in the name of urban transformation. Tanpinar indicates that demolition is always harmful – even it is meant for rebuilding; the real constructivism is to complement. As well as capitalist investment, the administration’s approach towards the past is based on museumification. Museumification: a dead-end street of the past. Museumification and/or ‘building by demolishing’, the contemporary everyday life is isolated...

In Taksim, the project that bypassed the legal processes, the taking of traffic below-ground as well as the construction of a new structure in the park, was completed behind closed doors without demanding the opinion of the dwellers or the employees in the area. It is a process that goes against the rights of the dwellers, against public interest and against the essence of social government. It is an implementation against the construction legislation and transformation spirit of public places in the EU that Turkey is trying to participate in. There is a need for a novel understanding (experience) in the metropolis’ modern administration practices for this gigantic public space.

The restoration and rehabilitation of this public space should not only be focused on the renewal of its physical identity. Beginning with Taksim, how can an integrated design and planning culture be implemented that would take the experience from the ecology of the city to the economy of culture beyond their disciplinary borders? Just within this framework, to look at that which is specified as daily, boring or banal, as well as the chaotic and informal, and to make an urban space’s reading of the inconspicuous but yet which still is part of life may produce important data. Flexible scenarios equipped with different functions based on the person on the street and his/her walkability may allow the dweller to breathe. The public space that creates a micro-climate and that is the point of

---
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escape during an earthquake belongs to everyone. Distancing itself from the criteria of “dweller and urban rights” in the city-centre, a critical capitalist and ideological urbanisation freed from design dreams with sterile projects filled with top-down orders is thought provoking. This opposition filled with contradictions at the public space can be transformed into a public encounter. The meeting of politics with architecture and art is not an “anesthetization” or “ornamentation” of politics, it is its transformation or reshaping. The real question lies not only in the fact that the public is closed, but also in the fact that politicians see design as a policy tool. However, politics begin where this encounter becomes visible and transformable and not where it is delayed and assumed non-existent.
2.3. Transportation Planning and Big Transportation Projects in Istanbul

Haluk Gerçek

2.3.1. Land-Use and Transportation
With a population of 13.8 million in 2012, Istanbul is the largest city in Europe and among the largest cities in the world. The city has a unique urban form with hilly terrain divided by the Bosphorus Strait connecting the Black Sea to the Marmara Sea. Urbanization has spread into both the European and Anatolian sides of the Bosphorus, combining historical quarters and new urban areas. The macro-form of the city is basically shaped by its historical spatial patterns, topography, geographic (physical) barriers, transportation infrastructure, and demographic and socio-economic structure.

Two highway bridges over the Bosphorus Strait connect the European and Asian sides. The first bridge (Bosphorus Bridge) and its beltway were opened in 1973. The second bridge (Fatih Sultan Mehmet Bridge) commenced operations in 1988 on the north side of the first bridge, and connected to the Trans European Motorway (TEM). Although the TEM serves the intercity traffic, it is mostly used by daily intra-city travellers crossing the Bosphorus, especially during the rush hours.

The land-use pattern in Istanbul has changed dramatically after the construction of the two bridges. The bridges and beltways have led to changes in the distribution of the population between the two sides of the city. The ratio of population on the Anatolian (east) side of Istanbul has increased from 24% in 1965 to 38% in 2009. In 2009, 30% of the work places were located on the Anatolian side (İUAP, 2011). As a result of land-use distribution, the Bosphorus Strait crossings have increasingly become a major issue. The people commuting between the more residential east side and work places on the west side spend increasingly more time in congested traffic conditions over the bridges where 87% of the vehicle traffic is automobiles.

Today, the coastal areas along the Marmara Sea and the Bosphorus Strait are mainly residential areas. The historic peninsula and the inner areas far from the sea are places of mixed residential and commercial functions, sometimes sharing the same buildings. The historic peninsula, which is the old core of the city, lost its central business district (CBD) role after the 1980s, as a result of the decentralization of both industrial and commercial services and transportation infrastructure shaped by the two bridges and the beltways. The new settlements were formed on the periphery, expanding the city borders in the direction of west, east and north. The CBD has shifted to the Şişli – Zincirlikuyu – Maslak axis along the Büyükdere Street. The lands left by the manufacturing industry along this arterial street have been occupied by new high-rise shopping malls and business centers that generated considerable transportation demand. However, there are still many traditional handcraft production units, some retail and commercial activities in the old CBD.

2.3.2. Spatial and Transportation Plans
Spatial planning and the development of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area have been controlled by a mosaic of decision-making bodies in the form of super national, national, regional and local legislative, legal and institutional frameworks. The first 1/50,000 scale land-use master plan of the Istanbul Metropolitan Area was approved in 1980. Since then, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IMM) has carried out several comprehensive spatial and transportation planning studies. In 1995, the new legislation which enabled the IMM to cover the whole province for the first time in spatial planning work was enacted and the Istanbul Metropolitan Planning Office completed the Istanbul Metropolitan Area Sub-Region Master Plan. One of the three main strategies of this plan was to achieve growth of the urban macro-form in a linear and
multi-centered pattern, but with a degree of hierarchical ranking. The development of sub-centers was encouraged to achieve population decentralization away from the highly populated areas. Specifically, new “wing-attraction centers” were proposed, and their development as primary centers of “first degree rank” was promoted. This was closely related to the principle of a balanced distribution of development and growth over the metropolitan region.

As a result of rapid and extensive growth, the macro-form of the city has changed from a single-centered to a multi-centered one with a number of sub-centres such as Bakırköy, Bağcılar, Büyükçekmece on the European side and Kadıköy, Üsküdar, Kozyatağı on the Anatolian Side. The new settlements far from the original city center have emerged as car-dependent residential areas (Figure 2.3.1).

However, the Istanbul Metropolitan Area Sub-Region Master Plan was challenged in court by local professional organizations questioning the legitimacy of the IMM’s authority on planning over expanded areas. Subsequently, the plan was cancelled. In the meantime, based on the land-use plan recommended by the Istanbul Metropolitan Area Sub-Region Master Plan, Istanbul Technical University prepared a Transportation Master Plan in 1997 with a target year of 2010 (İTÜ, 1997).

Istanbul’s latest 1/100,000 scale Strategic Plan was prepared by the Istanbul Metropolitan Planning and Urban Design Center (IMP), which was established in 2005 by the IMM. In a suit filed by professional associations, this plan was also ruled invalid by the court with the justification that the IMP had no planning authority. Reviewing the plan briefly, the IMM City Planning Directorate revised the plan with a number of changes and the new plan was approved by the IMM Municipal Council (İBB, 2009). While Istanbul’s Strategic Plan was on the verge of completion by the IMP, a Japanese consortium that was hired by the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), together with the IMM Transportation Planning Directorate, began to revise the Transportation Master Plan, prepared by İTÜ in 1997, with a new target year of 2023. The main goals of the plan were “to reduce motorized traffic by investing in the improvement of public transport services thereby promoting a shift in traffic demand from private passenger cars to public transportation, and ultimately to upgrade mobility and accessibility within the city and to regenerate a more livable urban environment (e.g. better traffic safety, prevention of air pollution, etc.) (JICA 2008). As with the previous plans, the urban spatial
and transportation plans were not prepared together in this planning study. At the end of two years’ work, JICA submitted the Draft Final Report to the IMM and requested the views of interested organizations. The collection of IMM (municipal) and national-level (ministerial) views regarding this plan continued for a long time. Then, because Istanbul’s strategic urban plan changed, the task of completing the Transportation Master Plan was given to the Transportation Planning Directorate of the IMM. The revision of the Transportation Master Plan was finally completed in May 2011. In this plan, there were two new Bosphorus crossings that did not appear either in the 1997 İTÜ Transportation Master Plan or in the 1/100,000 scale Strategic Plan: The third Bosphorus bridge and a Bosphorus road tunnel (Eurasia Tunnel) project for automobiles.

2.3.3. Divided Opinions

Gerçek (2013a) argues that regarding these types of major transportation projects, in order to make sound decisions for the benefit of society, the requisite course of action is clear: First of all, it is necessary to prepare a city plan that aims to guide the city’s future development in accordance with clear goals and policies. At the same time and in coordination with this plan, it is also necessary to prepare a transportation plan. In this plan, the future projects to be undertaken in the city’s transportation system, the projects’ priorities and their economic, social and environmental impacts must be made clear through a comprehensive and transparent evaluation. The financial resources required for these projects should be realistically estimated. Throughout the planning and selection process, the opinions of residents, experts in the field, professional groups and civil society organizations should be obtained and evaluated. Finally, there should be a selection reached through a broad consensus resting on a scientific, social and economic foundation.

In order to open bidding for the third bridge to the north – which was decided by the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications as if no local planning existed – the project had to be officially included in the city plans. Furthermore, because the connecting roads would pass through officially designated forest lands and natural heritages, the Commission for the Preservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage had to approve the project.

Currently, approximately 400,000 vehicles cross the Bosphorus daily on the city’s two existing bridges, so the government’s logic is rather simplistic. Today the two bridges are clogged and because the city is growing fast and the number of automobiles is growing even faster, a third – and even a fourth or a fifth – bridge are necessary. But this argument ignores a crucial factor in transport planning – the ‘induced traffic’ that results from changes in land-use and activity patterns following road construction. Thus, construction justified as a remedy for congestion only creates congestion in its own right. Or as futurist Glen Hiemstra put it, “Trying to cure traffic congestion with more capacity is like trying to cure obesity by loosening your belt.” It is impossible to build one’s way out of traffic congestion by increasing the road capacity and attempts to do so only lead to a continuing cycle of rent-seeking land speculation, lobbying by construction firms, political patronage and a renewed search for ‘solutions’. Public opinion about the third bridge is divided. Some residents hope it will help develop their neighborhood and/or solve traffic congestion. But not everyone shares this optimism. There are also strong concerns that the natural environment – the forests (the city’s lungs) and the water reservoirs in the north – will be severely damaged by a third bridge and its beltways. A railway line was also announced to be incorporated into the third bridge, perhaps in anticipation of criticism from mass-transit groups opposed to third bridge’s construction. No analysis has been documented of how these add-on train tracks will be connected with the urban and
regional rail networks or how problems related to rail system design and engineering standards (for example, slope and the location of stations) will be addressed. The ‘railway’ added to the bridge appears on drawings merely as two pathetic lines, with no clear idea of how or where the two ends will go (Gerçek 2013a).

Further evidence of how Istanbul’s transport policies fail to establish a sustainable low-carbon transport system for the city can be found in the controversy surrounding the Eurasia Tunnel Project, the Bosphorus tube tunnel for cars. This €1.1bn two-storey, two-lane, 5.4km-long tunnel is expected to bring 80,000 cars into and around the historical heart of the city every day. Yet, despite calls from transport experts, professional organisations and NGOs, tendering of the project has been completed even though neither the tunnel nor third bridge were included in the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality’s strategic plan for the city.

### 2.3.4. Travel Patterns

With almost two million automobiles choking its roads, traffic congestion is diminishing the quality of life in Istanbul. Blessed with graceful natural beauty as well as a rich historical urban fabric, Turkey’s largest city faces serious challenges in trying to accommodate an additional 84,000 cars a year. The rapid increase in motor vehicles – more than tenfold since 1980 – has coincided with dramatic population and economic growth. As a result, the city is now overwhelmed by a flood of people and vehicles and hampered by an inadequate road network and public transport that have been slow to develop. With new road tunnels, overpasses and an infrastructure that favors the use of the automobile, the city struggles with air pollution, the destruction of its natural and cultural heritage, and severe traffic congestion. Although there were only 145 cars per 1,000 inhabitants in 2012, according to the latest “Traffic Congestion Index” published by TomTom, Istanbul is by far the most
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congested city in Europe (TomTom, 2013). As with many other metropolitan cities in emerging economies, Istanbul suffers from high traffic congestion at a low level of car ownership.

According to the household travel surveys in 2006, Istanbul’s citizens make an average number of 1.74 trips daily, up from 1.54 per capita in 1996. The road-based public transportation system largely consists of municipality buses, private buses and the minibuses. Buses and minibuses play a key role in the commuting patterns of Istanbul’s residents, comprising the highest share – 40% of all daily motorised trips. Company and school buses carrying employees and students form a complementary mode to the public transport system, with a 15% share of daily motorised trips. Thanks to the considerable investments that have been made to improve the rail transit system in the past decade, the share of rail transport of public transport journeys has doubled to 19%, while sea transport has remained at a stable level of 2.3%. Two metro lines with a total length of 39km, Hacıosman-Şişhane in the European side and Kadıköy-Kartal in the Anatolian side, carry 378,000 passengers daily. Istanbul’s rail transit network is 170km-long and serves 1.3 million passengers daily (Figure 2.3.2). The increase of modal share of private car trips from 19.3% to 25% in the last decade has caused serious traffic congestion and environmental pollution.

2.3.5. Sustainable Initiatives

Istanbul’s Metrobus, a bus rapid transit, carries almost 700,000 passengers daily over 52km of bus lanes separated from the highway at an average speed of 38km/h. The Metrobus has reduced in-vehicle travel time by about 50% and increased the use of public transport. The mayor has recently admitted that the Metrobus has been running at capacity and now it is necessary to convert it to a high capacity metro line.

The Transportation Master Plan (İUAP 2011) proposes an extensive rail transit network of about 615km to be built by 2023 (Figure 2.3.3). Part of the Marmaray Project, the Bosphorus rail tunnel, will be completed and a limited train operation over 5 stations between the two sides of the city will begin by the end of 2013. Full operation of the 70km-long project is planned to begin in 2017. Trains running over a line of 76.3km with 40 stations are estimated to carry about 1.2 million passengers daily in 2020 and 1.8 million passengers in 2030 of which 25% will be the commuters.
travelling across the Bosphorus (Gerçek 2013b).

(Figure 2.3.3)

The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) is developing a diesel-electric hybrid vehicle that will emit less carbon and other gases and also reduce noise pollution. Currently, only a few studies have measured the emissions from motor vehicles in Istanbul. In general, CO₂ emissions are estimated by considering the yearly consumption of gasoline, diesel and LPG with calculations based on the carbon content of each fuel. CO₂ emissions from road transport in Istanbul were estimated to have increased by 37% between 1990 and 2007, from 6.5 million to 8.9 million tons a year (Verbaş 2008). Old motor vehicles and low-quality coal are now seen as the main culprits behind the clouds of pollution over Turkey’s urban areas. Transport GHG emissions result from a well-known ‘three-legged stool’: a) vehicle fuel efficiency, b) each fuel’s lifecycle (how long the greenhouse gas emissions remain in the atmosphere), and c) how much people drive. Recent studies make it clear that where and how we invest in transport infrastructure makes a difference: people drive less in areas with more transport options and where it is easier to walk and cycle. Investments that reduce the demand for car travel benefit the environment as well as the economy. May and Crass (2007) argue that one of the greatest challenges associated with implementing sustainable strategies, as Brundtland (1987) observed, relates to the need to pay sufficient attention to long-term impacts. Reducing greenhouse gases and improving air quality are likely to be of greater concern for future generations. Yet given their typical four- or five-year term of office, it is too easy for policy-makers to focus on immediate needs and overlook long-term problems. As a result, governments favor solutions achieved through policy measures that represent the supply-side of transport policy rather than the demand-side measures of regulation, information and pricing.

Although almost half of the daily trips are made on foot in Istanbul, pedestrian pathways and cycle lanes have been ignored by policy-makers. Cycle trips represent only 0.05% of the total trips in Istanbul and, in addition to traffic pollution and high risks of accidents, cyclists have to confront the flooded and obstructed cycle paths and lack of adequate bicycle parking. There are rumors about a Bicycle Master Plan to add more than 1,000km of cycle lanes, although without a clear timeframe for delivery, implementation is doubtful. Even so, progress is being made to reduce emissions caused by transport. The motor vehicle industry in Turkey has adopted the Motor Vehicle Technical Regulations of the EU. And over the past decade, the urban rail transit network has expanded, and emissions from road traffic have decreased due to an increasing number of vehicles equipped with catalytic converters using unleaded gasoline and LPG.

2.3.6. Package of Tools

Demand-management measures are known to be more cost-effective in reducing congestion than infrastructure provision but are more difficult to implement. As May and Crass (2007) argued, it is now accepted that no single type of policy will solve our transport problems. We cannot, for example, build sufficient infrastructure to overcome congestion. Instead, a package of solutions implemented in tandem will be more effective than any on its own: combining public transport improvements, for instance, with parking controls and congestion charging can substantially reduce private car use. As the service level of the public transport system improves, it is necessary to implement policy options such as congestion charging and parking policies to discourage car use in city centers. The Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications and the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality play key roles in transport management in Istanbul, yet responsibilities for traffic legislation and its implementation are scattered across more than 10 other ministries.
and authorities. In a study carried out by the First Council of Urban Transport (IBB 2002), 17 local and national authorities were identified to be partially responsible for the planning, investment, operation and management of the city’s transport – a fragmentation that makes planning and coordination of activities extremely difficult. Mechanisms for establishing more effective coordination and streamlined decision-making between the ministries would go a long way to improving transport in Istanbul. To address issues of regulation, a proposal for new legislation has been prepared to create one local authority to coordinate transport across Istanbul. At the same time, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality faces overcrowding, immigration, insufficient policy programs, illegitimacy, and an inefficient control system. But it seems so clear that decisions for major transportation projects are still made in Ankara regardless of the master plans prepared in Istanbul.

The path and the extent of urbanization in a megacity like Istanbul require sound urban management, efficient planning and efficiently operating local institutions. Policies may be duplicative or unintentionally interfere with each other, retarding rather than stimulating urban development. Horizontal co-ordination and more systematic integration of spatial planning, transport infrastructure, and socio-economic development are also particular challenges for Istanbul. The development of mega-urbanization has gone ahead of urban planning and the provision of public facilities. Especially outside the core city, the informal housing areas built by the migrants themselves have led to an extensive settlement structure, with serious consequences on transport and land use, and thus for the environment and public health. The ability of the main local actors to face these challenges will depend highly on their internal organization and capacity, as well as on how well they can foster public confidence, trust and civic participation for an efficient urban development process (OECD 2008).

2.3.7. Conclusions

Strategies for sustainable transport policies should emphasize

a) longer term impacts. Reducing GHG and improving air quality are more important for future generations. 88% of people in Istanbul are concerned about the environmental problems, because of the life of their grandchildren (Page et al. 2009). Policy makers tend to focus on current needs and overlook longer term problems.

b) demand-side measures that are more cost-effective. It is impossible to build one’s way out of traffic congestion. Only 7% of respondents in Istanbul think that construction of more roads would solve the transportation problems. 3% think the third Bosphorus Bridge is a solution (Page et al. 2009).

Finally, in order not to utterly destroy the natural and historical heritage of Istanbul, it is necessary to stand on firm ground and abandon the two major transportation projects that have been based on top-down decisions not guided by planning and that will irreparably seal the city's future: the third Bosphorus Bridge and the Eurasia Tunnel.
3 Understanding the Urban Context
3.1. Urban Evolution of Istanbul, An Overview

Alejandro Martin Rodriguez & Ana Luisa Azenha

3.1.1. Introduction: The Context of Urban Transformation

Istanbul is a multi-centered city that has over 13 million inhabitants distributed throughout a territory of 5300 km². Studies by the Turkish Statistics Institute (2013) estimate that the city can reach a population of 16.6 million in 2023. During this process, its urban configuration may change drastically due to the implementation of huge infrastructure projects, such as the promised third bridge over the Bosphorus, and due to the construction boom that it is going through. Such a model of infrastructure development, which has been ongoing for the past 40 years, has already had a significant impact on the city's shape. The construction of its existing bridges, for example, was vital in conditioning Istanbul's urban form and its physical pattern of growth.

This chapter addresses the different phases of the urban transformation of Istanbul by various angles and by combining different aspects that have been shaping the city physically, administratively and socially. A concise description of the city's urban evolution starts off with its historical background, then its four main phases, entitled “From Westernization to Nationalization”, “The Industrialized City”, “The Transition towards Neoliberalism” and the expectations under the slogan “Istanbul, a Global City” – and this model’s effect on the urban pattern.

In order to analyze Istanbul’s dynamic transformation in the last century, it is crucial to consider all these transitions, addressing aspects before the creation of the State of Turkey, the early years of the Republic, the pattern of industrialization in the period between 1950-1965, as well as the neoliberal policies of the last 30 years implemented on both local and national levels.

3.1.2. The Historical City

Istanbul has a very strong historical heritage. The city has been shaped by diversity. The Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Venetian and Ottoman civilizations have inhabited this territory until the formation of the state of Turkey in 1923, each one of them naming the city in its own terms and contributing somehow to the present urban form of the city. Of all of these, the Islamic Ottoman civilization was the one that contributed most to the city's present format; not only physically, but also culturally.

The first civilizations that occupied the peninsula that later on gave birth to the city of Istanbul date from the late third or early second millennium B.C. During the mid-seventh century B.C., Megarian colonies, of Byzantine origin, established themselves there. In 196 A.D., they were invaded and destroyed by Septimus Severus of Rome, who initiated the changes in the fortifications of the ancient city, extending its domains. The year 330 A.D. was a turning point, for it was the year that Constantine the Great moved the seat of the Roman Empire to Byzantium, giving the city its famous name: Constantinople. The newly acquired role of the city meant changes in its morphological aspects, including a new set of fortifications, adding even more territory. The population rose notably, and went from 100,000 inhabitants in 330 A.D. to approximately 150,000 in 380 A.D. The population growth pushed the expansion of the city outside its walls, and it was only when Theodosius II (408 - 450 A.D.) came into power that the city’s fortifications were adapted to its new limits. (Figure 3.1.1)

During the mid-fifth century, Constantinople had between 200,000 and 300,000 inhabitants and was developing its basic infrastructure (cisterns and water provision). Justinian, who ruled from 527 to 565 A.D., contributed greatly to the construction of incredible architectonic structures and embellishment of the city. He built, for example, the dome of Sancta Sophia between 532-537 A.D., a clear reference to Byzantine architecture.
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The eleventh century was an important moment for Constantinople, for it held a strategic role in the Mediterranean and in the Black Sea trade. The number of foreigners increased due to this, and the city became increasingly multicultural. The fifteenth century was another turning point: in 1453, the Ottomans, led by Mehmet II, took over Constantinople. The city lost its ecclesiastical significance as “New Rome” and passed its domains to the Islamic Ottoman civilization. Sanca Sophia became the Great Mosque. The reign of Mehmet II was very prolific and modified the internal structure of the city by creating a big number of beautiful mosques, markets, schools, baths, and other types of buildings. Mehmet II also incorporated Galata, an area traditionally occupied by a European population because of its past as a former Genoese colony, into the Ottoman reign. Another Ottoman ruler that contributed greatly to the magnificence of Istanbul’s architectonic patrimony further on was Süleyman I (1520 - 1566 A.D.).

From the early seventeenth century to the mid-nineteenth century, the growth of the city’s population was concentrated on the area of Galata, due to its importance as a cosmopolitan harbor town. Consequently, there was an increase of its population, although the Theodosian walls continued being the limit of the peninsula agglomeration until the nineteenth century.

The cultural heritage left by the Ottoman Empire is reflected in every aspect of Istanbul today: in architecture, urban life and Istanbul’s symbolic heritage for humanity. According to the census of 1897, Istanbul was home to 1,059,000 people, a number that has changed dramatically during the last 85 years in the midst of urban transformation shaped by the strong economic changes explained in the following paragraphs. All these factors, combined with the city’s strategic location, have created its particular identity.¹

### 3.1.3. From Westernization to Nationalization

Turkey underwent a westernization process from the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth century. There was an economic reform that opened the market to outside investors. The entrance of European capital that followed turned the commercial bourgeoisie into an important stakeholder. The Tanzimat Charter of 1839 brought further changes by creating the background policies for considerable alterations in education, the military and administration based on “western ideas” sometimes opposed to the Islamic tradition. During this period, the country initiated its industrialization process, but, as Celik, (1986, p. 35) describes: “Ottoman industry thereby became totally dependent on European technology and expertise.” In terms of population, this phase was characterized by the arrival of non-Muslim foreigners attracted by the demand for labor force.

In 1838, the territory that today composes Istanbul was separated in three main areas: Galata, Uskudar and Istanbul; the latter was the largest and considered the main one, while Uskudar, on the eastern bank of the Bosphorus, had a large amount of monuments that symbolized its importance. The city maintained itself within the Theodosian walls although the area of Galata, the smallest and densest of the three areas, was still increasing considerably, as well as many areas on the shorelines. In administrative terms, the jurisdiction of Istanbul went from being held by “kadis” – an Islamic type of subdivision, and a decentralized form of control - to a centrally administered system composed by “western style” ministries. The fires that occurred in Aksaray 1856, Hocapaşa 1865, Pera 1870 and others of less magnitude, plus the creation of İTK (Commission for Road Improvement) contributed to the beginning of an urban renewal pattern that imported western ideas in terms of city planning.

---

¹ Relevant historical facts were selected based on Çeslik (1986), and the history of Istanbul in the Encyclopedia Britannica in its online version.
The end of the War of Independence in 1923 inaugurated a new era. Istanbul was no longer the capital; this function was delegated to Ankara. In the following years there was a reduction of its population (from 1,059,000 inhabitants in 1897, to 680,857 in 1927) due to the impact of the loss of its role as the capital, the return of the foreigners to their home countries (creating a homogenous population) and war casualties (First World War and The War for Independence in 1922). In contrast to the westernization process, Istanbul was now following a nationalization process initiated by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk that lasted from 1923 to 1938. This period was characterized by secularization. Economic progress was founded on state-led industrial investments, railway construction and banking. A direct result was the emergence of a new national bourgeoisie (Seker 2007). This new phase would not erase completely, though, the influence the West had on Istanbul’s urban form. (Figure 3.1.2)

3.1.4. The Industrialized City

In 1950 an important period in Turkey’s history began due to economic changes linked to an emerging industrialization process. This first industrialization period lasted until 1965. The political reasons behind the new economic policies were associated to the first multi-party elections in 1950 and the liberal ideas of the elected candidate from the Democratic Party (Inceoğlu and Yürekli 2011). The period between 1950 and 1965 was characterized by an import substitution policy, the emergence of the industrial workers and the urban consumer class. Half of the large industrial establishments of the whole country were located in Istanbul. The manufacture of textiles and footwear and the production of metal products were the dominant sectors.

The phenomenon of rapid industrialization had a strong impact on Istanbul’s physical shape. The economic boom generated changes in the location of industries, commercial activities and housing. The central business district (CBD) increased its size joining other “sub-centers”. Offices, theatres, cinemas, hotels and “yapsat” (build and sell units in vertical property) were created, supplanting residences and small manufacturing units. The small industries moved to a belt outside the CBD or to old industrial districts, while large industries moved to the peripheries (Tekeli 1994).

The industrialization process also led to the arrival of thousands of workers from the countryside searching for an opportunity to work and live with their families in the city. Those who could afford to pay for a higher standard living space did so by following a new concept of what the “ideal home” would be:

“As economic growth brought new consumption patterns, in the 1960s, the notion of the ‘ideal home’ changed: now more spacious apartment blocks built with new materials representing the new home fashion for the ‘modern’ upper-middle class became popular” (Kormaz et al 2009, p. 3).

The majority, though, lived in much more precarious conditions. Since the housing policy of co-operatives was defective in coping with the arrival of the massive wave of migrants, they started making their own housing projects, later named gecekondu. Gecekondu means something placed and built overnight, which corresponded to the type of construction made. Although they were an existing phenomenon in the inner city as well, this type of house structure spread rapidly throughout public land in Istanbul’s peripheries. In terms of construction quality, these types of houses proved to be very vulnerable,

Figure 3.1.2:
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especially in an earthquake area such as is Istanbul. Furthermore, these areas lacked the basic infrastructure to guarantee the dignity and wellbeing of their residents. (Figure 3.1.3.)

Another land-related problem was the rapid subdivision of areas, especially those that were outside municipal boundaries. Speculators started splitting agricultural areas into plots for residential use, therefore urban sprawl was further aggravated. The strong demand for industrial areas led investors to acquire land outside the city where ground water was available and prices were cheaper. Finally, this accelerated process increased the number of vehicles in the city, generating permanent congestion (Tekeli 2004, p. 103).

Overall, the period between 1950 and 1965 is characterized by urban sprawl and disorganization in terms of strategic planning. The emergence of huge gecekondus, the expansion of commercial activities in the CBD that supplanted the traditional residential use of land, and the proliferation of randomly-located industries and houses are the main examples of the urban transformations during those years. In addition to these phenomena, the significant growth of Istanbul’s population, from 983,041 in 1950 to 1,742,978 inhabitants in 1965 also contributed to the consolidation of a particular urban pattern from then on.

3.1.5. The Transition towards Neoliberalism

In the early 80s there was a second wave of industrialization in Turkey and, consequently, a second wave of growth of Istanbul. During this period, the previous state-controlled economic system opened up to the world (Inceoğlu and Yürekli 2011). In 1983, the liberal party came into power and started implementing political and economic reforms. Economically, these reforms removed barriers on local and foreign investment and led to a series of privatization processes in municipal services such as transportation, housing, and provision of natural gas. As a further consequence, in 1996 Turkey signed a
customs union with the European Union. Politically, there was a decentralization process that increased the authority and financial resources of local governments and empowered them to prepare and follow-up master plans.

The immediate appeal of the intensification of the industrialization process brought many more people to Istanbul. The population of Turkey’s biggest city grew from 2.7 million inhabitants in 1980 to 5.4 million by the end of 1985 – doubling its size. This, of course, meant there was also an increase in demand for housing. Due to lack of available squatter settlement areas, many private owners of agricultural land on the periphery of the city divided their land into small plots and sold them to the newcomers. Simultaneously, the government also took initiatives to solve the housing issue. In 1984, TOKI (Housing Development Administration of Turkey) was founded, being responsible for expanded practices in credit provision for housing and housing production. According to TOKI’s official website, referring to its creation: “In order to solve the housing problem and to increase housing production at national level, the Housing Development Administration Fund Law (No: 2487) was passed in 1981.”

Although TOKI was an attempt by the central government to subsidize housing, it faced several problems: longer construction periods, higher prices and difficulty in obtaining occupancy permits, among others. In general, it benefitted the middle and upper middle class, and not those most in need of these subsidies (Özdemir 2009). During this period there was also a new visibility and domination of the finance and service sectors in the city’s economy and urban landscape, a process conceptualized as neoliberal urbanism (Candan and Kolluoğlu 2008). The newly empowered and entrepreneurial local government started playing the role of market facilitator.

From the mid-eighties on, neoliberal policies started being implemented, which brought Turkey into a new phase - one of deep transformations for Istanbul. Due to its strategic location, the city was now the center of regional commerce and banking and financial services (Çekiç and Gezici 2005). Mega-projects that implied a significant reorganization of the urban landscape started being planned. Some examples of these projects are the opening of Tarlabaşı boulevard, an important axis of the city connecting Taksim Square to the Golden Horn; the demolition of industrial buildings on the Golden Horn shore, impacting the urban structure of this previous working-class district; and the relocation of various industries from within the city to the periphery (Candan and Kolluoğlu 2008). A growing number of hotels, shopping malls and office buildings started emerging during this period as well – a tendency that continued in the following years. (Figure 3.1.4.)

3.1.6. Istanbul, a Global City

The use of urban metaphors such as “Global City” to describe Istanbul’s recent development can give clarity to the changes it has experienced and the ones it is going through today, especially because this concept has a concrete reflection in the urban environment. Since the beginning of the 2000s there was a total immersion of the Turkish economy in the global market. In order to attract foreign capital and act as a global competitor, Istanbul authorities began to invest in creating a certain image of the city

Fig. 3.1.4:
– that of a “global city” and to use it as an “aesthetized commodity” (Candan and Kolluoğlu 2008). According to the A.T. Kearney Global Cities Index 2012, Istanbul occupies the 37th position in the world ranking. As Saskia Sassen (2009, p. 5) explains:

“Istanbul is at the centre of a geography of capital flows that stretches both East and West. Even though the EU is Turkey's dominant trade and investment partner, current post-Cold War geopolitics make Asian countries increasingly important. […] Istanbul, that city of intersections and mobilities, sits in the top 30, specifically as a global policy nexus, and as a city for human capital and talent.”

The neoliberalization process that had begun twenty years earlier became more visible and entrenched during this period. Following the market opening process that started off in the United States in the 80s, a new regime based on the accumulation of capital through real estate investments was implemented in Turkey. Although the changes Istanbul has been undergoing in the last years have been defended as a ‘non-Western’ miracle of development, it can be seen as a combination of global urbanization strategies to segment the city into islands of consumption, gated communities and mass housing settlements through partnerships between the state, private investors and local governments (Adanali 2011). The construction industry has an important role in this process, being the key driver of the economic boom based especially on the development of gated communities and mass housing projects.

The need for housing projects was evident because of the remarkable increase in population that can be observed from 2000 to 2010: from 8.8 million, it reached over 13 million inhabitants (See Fig. 01). After the 1990s, new waves of migrants, mainly Kurdish people from Southeastern Anatolia, moved to Istanbul.

A series of changes in the legal framework had a deep effect on the following urban renewal projects developed since the beginning of the 2000s. This new framework can be described as “neoliberal newspeak” – in which the use of terms such as vision, mission, transparency, efficiency, accountability, and participation are widespread.

Municipality laws introduced in 2004 and 2005, currently in effect, made the already powerful office of the mayor even more central in decision-making in urban planning. The laws expanded the physical space that was under the jurisdiction of the greater municipality, thus giving it more authority in the development area as well as more control of the district municipalities. They also facilitated the establishment of partnerships and collaboration between greater municipalities and private companies and laid out a sketch of the first legal framework for “urban transformation projects” (or the so-called mega-projects) in which municipalities had the power to assign, plan and carry out these types of projects. An example of such a law is Law no. 5366 – Law for the Protection of Dilapidated Historical and Cultural Real Estate Through Renewal that was passed in 2005. Other laws that have enabled the current urban transformation of the city were also passed during this period. These gave the municipalities the authority to implement important urban redesign projects without having to go through the standard regulations in the legal system (Candan and Kolluoğlu 2008).

The Mass Housing Administration (TOKI) benefitted largely from the legal changes that occurred in the past few years, becoming increasingly powerful. After these laws came out, TOKI was granted the authority to form partnerships with private construction companies and could build and sell houses for profit, being able to take over state urban land at no cost by having the approval of the prime ministry and the president’s office. Apart from that, it can expropriate land to construct housing projects as well as conduct gecekondu transformation projects. “Gecekondu Transformation Projects” aim at the demolition of gecekondu neighborhoods and
the dislocation of their inhabitants to public housing projects. Many of these processes are justified by the discourse of preservation of the historical and cultural significance of these neighborhoods. After the major earthquake that struck Istanbul in 1999, a public debate has been happening concerning the imminence of earthquakes and how well the city is prepared to deal with it. This discourse has also been used as a justification to restructure gecekondu areas, as it is said that these are the most vulnerable. The future consequences of these projects, that have been having significant repercussions in terms of land value, social displacement and poverty relocation and affected the urban and social landscape of Istanbul, are still not clear (Ibid.).

Urban transformation projects – a term that emerged in the 2000s – involve creating a new pattern of urban restructuring that includes inviting renowned architects to design whole areas of the city. Zaha Hadid, for example, was responsible for a project that relocated industries from within Kartal, an industrial district on the Asian side, to the outskirts, replacing them with office buildings, five-star hotels and a marina. Ken Yeang, an important Malaysian architect, designed a plan to transform the southern part of Küçükçekmece on the European side into a touristic and recreational area. Both of these projects, along with many others of the sort, were extremely controversial due to the fact that they destroy the historic fabric and limit public use of some areas of the city in order to benefit selected upper-class groups.

Until the 1980s, Istanbul could be seen as a ‘softly segregated’ city (Işık and Güvenç 1996). The emergence of gated communities in the 90s was a global phenomenon that followed the neoliberal American urbanism of recent years. They have become a commodity sought all around the world by urban elites, who feel increasingly fearful of violence, in order to guarantee security. In Istanbul, many examples of these communities can be found. Kemer Country is an emblematic example of a leading high-class one, which introduced the concept of gated living to the city and, due to its success, started a trend in the real estate market (Geniş 2007).

The contrast of the development of gated communities in the periphery - that slowly began in the 80s but grew to over 650 until 2005 – with the conditions of those who are living in informal settlements or in the mass housing projects, though, has been increasingly pointed out as a cause of social friction due to the spatial fragmentation and segregation it produces in the city. According to Geniş (2007) this generates a barrier created between the ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, and the redefinition of the meaning of ‘others’. (Figure 3.1.5.)

Urban mega-projects reinforce this very logic by redefining the spaces of the poor and the rich. Social groups have been contesting these projects, since the population is not involved in the decision-making process and the majority does not benefit from them. To contest urban transformation projects is to ponder about the limits of urban democracy, and to question the managerial governance that is prioritized by the neoliberal system.

Fig. 3.1.5:
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3.2. Emergence and Evolution of Beyoğlu
Diana Ramos, Ndimphiwe Jamile

3.2.1. Introduction
This section documents the evolution of Beyoğlu, a district of Istanbul (see Figures 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) from the early developments of the Byzantine period to the current era. It documents the history in a selective manner that makes mention of the more important aspects contributing to the development and the evolutionary processes of Beyoğlu and its surroundings. The emphasis is on analysing the factors and circumstances that have contributed to the establishment and growth of the district, and on understanding the aspects that contributed to the evolution of both the architectural and the urban fabric of the area. The study is focused on what could be defined as the core of Beyoğlu (see Figure 3.2.3, defined area). This area is currently the seat of power for the Beyoğlu Municipality. It also contains the major hoteliers of Beyoğlu and, historically, it is cradle of the whole district.

This section outlines the early evolution of Beyoğlu as a fortified settlement that developed across the Golden Horn. It extends from the Byzantium era to the period of the fourth crusade, documenting the changing territoriality of Galata and the expansion of the town. The transition of power due to the conquering of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmet II is examined before the modernisation period is described, and, more importantly, the driving factors that contributed to this process of change. The developments of newer styles of governance that were a result of the establishment of the Turkish Republic and the continuation of modernisation are the main concerns of the following sections. The chapter ends with a description of the early evolution processes of development in Beyoğlu and a review of the documentation of urban landscape changes since Turkey’s integration into free market economy during the 1980s.

3.2.2. The Early Settlements of Beyoğlu
The northern landmass across the Golden Horn (Haliç) currently known as Beyoğlu, according to Batur (n.d.) was already a settlement during the reign of Constantinople (324-337). Freely (2000) points to early settlement origins during the Greek Byzantium ruling period. According to Batur (n.d.), some archaeological findings reveal an establishment of a pertinent settlement which contained a forum, a theatre, a church, a harbour and bath buildings, as well as 431 large houses.

From 527 to 582, a series of fortification walls were built around the southern side, marking the boundary of what was the Latin constituency. The land across the Haliç was said to be “a small settlement on the northern shore of the Golden Horn” (Freely 2000). According to Batur (n.d.), some archaeological findings reveal an establishment of a pertinent settlement which contained a forum, a theatre, a church, a harbour and bath buildings, as well as 431 large houses.

“Across the Golden Horn, Galata consisted of a narrow band adjacent to the waterfront. This zone,
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then called Sykae, had a porticoed avenue parallel to the shore, which later became the principal artery of the thirteenth century Genoese settlement. Galata had all typical monuments of a late Roman city: church, theatre, baths and harbor.” (Çelik 1986, p.18)

The area of Galata came to be inhabited by various cultural groupings of which one was the Jewish community. According to Çelik (1986, p.21) “Jews were not permitted to live within the city limits and were relegated to a quarter in Galata across the Golden Horn”.

### 3.2.3. The Fourth Crusade

The evolution of settlements gains momentum from this period when the Genoese arrived and obtained a concession to settle within Galata (Çelik 1986). However this was followed by the Venetian-led fourth crusade states (Masters et al. 2009). The formation of trade colonies during these times by Genoese and Venetians, who were given special permission of residence from Byzantines, introduced different cultures to the region. Batur (n.d.) reveals raised tensions due to the arrival of the Venetians that resulted in their relocation to the northern side across the Haliç. This relocation also resulted in an expansion of the built fabric. Through the departure of the Latins, the Genoese took control of the Galata side and constructed more castellations and towers to improve security, thus affirming their authority on the northern side (Çelik 1986). The construction of the Galata Tower in 1348 cemented the strategic fortification that
secured the settlement from possible threat. Erkal (2011) reveals the function of the Galata Tower as a harbour tower for the “enclosable” Golden Horn port, which defined the corner of the defensible area. The positioning of the tower was thus strategic as it was constructed on the highest ground of the citadel. This fortification protected what had become an important place of economic trade. (See Figure 3.2.4)

3.2.4. The Ottoman’s Rule of Pera

In 1453, under the rule of Sultan Mehmet II, the Ottomans conquered the Genoese side (Galata). Çelık (1986) points to Mehmet II’s ambitions of making Constantinople the capital and the imperial administrative, economic, cultural and religious centre. It is clear that the changing of Constantinople’s name to Istanbul was a considered decision taken by the leaders of the Ottoman Empire (Çelik 1986). At this time, Istanbul was a diverse settlement with different cultural groupings, and the Emperor allowed a substantial number of prisoners to settle along the Golden Horn. This is viewed as a strategy to repopulate the town with Christians, Muslims and Jews from different parts of the Empire as a means to revive economic and commercial activity in Istanbul. The increase in the number of embassies and foreign traders’ settlements grew considerably after the conquering of Constantinople. This was followed by the gradual relocation of westerners to the Pera side. Farm-lands and orchards surrounded the fortifications. The population profile is said to have been composed of 35% Turks, 39%, Greeks, 22% Europeans, and 4% Armenians (Batur n.d.). By the turn of the 17th century Galata grew within the fortifications, with the surrounding areas continuing with agricultural activities. The character of the urban fabric within the walls in relation to the outskirts is said to be unchanged until the 19th century. Çelik (1984) claims that prior to the rule of Mehmet II, the city fabric was in a form of tightly knit blocks with wider connections to public spaces. Mehmet II’s rule is marked by the growing population of the city, which, due to further densification of the urban fabric, directly affected the character of the Byzantine avenues. This period of rule is also linked to the change in urban patterns of development towards more geometric and axial forms and away from the original organic arrangements. In this period, Çelik notes the increase of religious buildings that were constructed within the three landmasses of Pera, Istanbul peninsula and Scutari (see Figure 3.2.4).
3.2.5. Modernisation of the Thirteenth District in the 1840s

This period marks an important era that is argued by Çelik (1986) to have elicited the modernisation of Istanbul. Çelik refers to the adoption of different urban policies to modernise the lifestyle of Istanbul as “invented traditions”. Modernisation was seen as a political goal to transform Istanbul through European models. These “invented traditions” that Çelik refers to are categorised as follows:

“Laws and legislation regarding city planning, urban design principles, which, enforced by the new laws and regulations, called for the creation of an efficient street network, monumental public squares, regular streets façades, and a uniform urban fabric. The third is in the field of architecture.” (Çelik 1986, p.xvii)

Further to these invented traditions, there were also other concerns related to the functional aspects of the city that needed to be addressed, such as the destruction of the city fabric caused by fires from 1660 to 1929 (Çelik 1986; Seger and Palencsar 2006; Dökmeci 2005). Çelik (1986) also alludes to various driving factors that promulgated the adoption of the Westernisation standards that differed from Islamic traditions. The experimental urban reforms that were a result of the Tanzimat reform were mainly concentrated within Beyoğlu. Özus and Dökmeci (2005) state that Beyoğlu became the part of the city associated with the lifestyle of the bourgeoisie, with its stylish shops, restaurants, and cafes. They also reveal the increase of housing stock, some of which was built to generate income – another result of the European outlook. Another important factor to be considered was the reform of governance styles and management systems within the European and Asian side of Istanbul. Tekeli (1994) reveals that the transformations that occurred in the 1840s were in part due to the structural inefficiency of traditional institutions. Following the Tanzimat era, a reorganization process occurred that was structured to modernize the capital in 1839. The planners aimed to create a modern capital for the Empire that could compete with Paris or London (Tugal 2008). The development emphasized infrastructure development and communication systems, e.g. new streets, transport networks and improved public hygiene. New building materials were also introduced, for example there was a shift from timber to masonry, due to the catastrophic fires of 1865 and 1870. Tekeli (1994) also states that the new administration was concerned with functions that regulated urban life and urban services, and functions that provided for the structuring and development pattern of the city.

Further to above point, (Tekeli, 1994) and (Demirkan, 2006) reveal that major structural concerns directly affecting growth and safety had to be taken into consideration by the administration. These are stated to be fires, widening of streets and provision of basic services (see Figure 3.2.5). After the fires of 1856 and 1870, a re-structuring and planning of the city fabric was considered. The period of 1838 to 1908 was an intense phase of economic and socio-political transformation. The reason behind this transformation was based on the adoption of the Anglo-Turkish Commercial Treaty of 1838. This treaty allowed British tradesmen to purchase anywhere in Turkey and marked the beginning of the open market trade system, that was soon adapted throughout Europe. It is stated that as the government was financially dependent on foreign capital, changes were implemented to attract more Western capital. Thus, the major development of Beyoğlu took place during the nineteenth century as a result of Westernisation and the integration of the Ottoman Empire with Western economies (Dökmeci et al., 2007; Dökmeci and Özus 2005). The impetus of this Westernisation mainly affected the city’s infra-

---

1 Institutional reforms set in motion by the declaration of the Tanzimat Charter found their extensions in the built forms-in the urban fabric on a larger scale, in architecture on a smaller scale. The result was the metamorphosis of the classical Ottoman/Islamic urban image into a more cosmopolitan one, penetrated by forms and elements adopted from western models (Çelik 1986, p.49). Also see figure 8.
structure development and urban administration systems. Çelik (1986) also states that; “The nineteenth-century modernization effort recasts the traditional urban policies based on Islamic law, replaced the urban administration, institutions, and organisations with new ones adopted from European precedents, and introduced another set of building types, this time conforming to the requirements of a modern Westernised lifestyle.” (Çelik 1986, p.xvi). (Figure 3.2.5)

During the 19th century Beyoğlu’s transportation systems were modernised. New arteries and faster communication systems were established. The city’s communication network developed as four interconnected systems: water transportation, horse-drawn tramways, a short subway, and trains. A more important intervention was the creation of the Galata Bridge in 1845. Çelik reveals the growing importance of connecting the two sides as it “necessitated a fast and convenient connection between Karaköy and Eminönü” (Çelik 1986, p.88). With these 19th century transport developments Istanbul became a metropolis with two centres located on the opposite sides of Golden Horn. A changing commercial structure under the influence of the relations with Western countries and specialisations in the modern sense appeared in the quarters of Galata and Beyoğlu. This dual structure affected the housing and the environment of the city and continued into the 20th century (Çıracı and Kundak 2000). (Figure 3.2.6)

At the beginning of the process of modernisation, the regularisation and new communication systems were one of the biggest concerns of the government in terms of their financial capability. To confront this problem, the government...
issued concessions to private investors, who were granted monopolies to operate the systems they constructed for a specified number of years. At the same time the government grappled with expropriation problems to realize the new developments. Although concessions seemed a better solution for investment, they resulted in long-term losses for the state (Çelik 1986). Under Ottoman rule, Galata was mainly a town sustained through its harbour activities. The urban fabric pattern was said to be different to the main peninsula. Pera’s urban fabric changed in the 19th century due to a large contingent of affluent merchants of European origin who built their residences there. This symbolised a growth of an upper class residences in Pera. The growth of this upper class brought about a shoreline development of Yali (rectilinear seaside mansions) belonging to the outstanding members of a Muslim “bourgeoisie administra-
tive (Çelik 1986). The infrastructure development also improved with the two hospitals that were built within the district. Westernisation processes allowed non-Muslim people rights to trade within the city. Embassies and international trade centres were established and Beyoğlu experienced a gradual increase in shops where European luxury goods were sold. Dökmeci and Çiraci (1990) state that this part of the city continued to display characteristics of a European city.

3.2.5.1. The Commission for the Order of the City
The Commission was an order by the Ottoman Government to carry out more fundamental programs with the aim of improving the city to match those of European counterparts by regularising the street networks and important services. This included paving, widening and straightening of streets within the area of Pera, Galata,
and Tophane. The division of districts into fourteen different parts was seen as a way to localise power. Pera, Galata and Tophane were seen as the experimental area for this urban reform. Çelik (1986) reveals that the make-up of the administrative structure included members of foreign origin. The efforts to modernise the city were somewhat promulgated by catastrophes like fire. The fire of 1870 in Pera brought about change of regulation such as the stipulation that buildings be constructed of stone and brick. The open public spaces and parks were created within Taksim and Tepebaşı on the sites of former cemeteries. The cemeteries had to be relocated to Şişli.

3.2.5.2. The Tanzimat Reforms
The major development of Beyoğlu took place in the 19th century (Dökmeci and Özus 2005; Dökmeci et al. 2007). In this century the Galata city extended beyond its walls, towards vacant areas that had begun to be redeveloped. Beyoğlu became an international trade centre, with areas such as Grande Rue de Péra² (today İstiklâl Avenue) becoming places for trade and commercial development. The settlement of French, English and the Italian industrialists and merchants resulted in the development of technology, arts and infrastructure. (See Figure 3.2.6)

Beyoğlu was one of the first areas in Istanbul to have telephones, electricity, trams, and underground railway services. The Voyvoda Avenue (Bankalar Avenue) developed along the shore to become an administrative part of the colony. This affirmed the political importance of the area as most foreign officials were based there. Demirkan (2006) reveals the emergence of Galata not only as an enclave of certain foreign merchants, but an important area that controlled economic activities. As a result of this:

As Beyoğlu gained the quality of being the “entertainment center” of Istanbul with its posh shops, restaurants, and cafes, Beyoğlu has also become the “trade center” of Istanbul with its trading houses and bureaus in this century. While some foreign enterprises such as foreign mail services, schools, stock exchange building, and research institutes have settled at the vicinity of the embassies; banks, translation agencies, printing houses, and blocks of offices have gathered in the Galata area. (Özus and Dökmeci 2005)

The continuation of these regulations affected the outlook of one of the popular streets of that time within the neighbourhood. The 1875 regulation, which was one of the series of regulations passed in order to regulate the urban fabric and ensure safety in the case of fire, was applied to widen Grande Rue de Pera and other streets in densely populated areas. The regulation also called for brick and stone construction in certain areas considered too risky. However in the lesser populated areas where finances were a factor, the regulation was not strongly enforced and timber construction continued.

3.2.6. The New Republic (1923-1950)
The Republic of Turkey was defined by its modernization projects. With the growth in the 19th century neither physical urban structure nor urban services were sufficient to satisfy the new demands. The buildings required modernization to host the companies’ needs (Dökmeci, Altunbas, and Yazgı 2007). Even though the Ottoman Empire collapsed at the end of World War I, Beyoğlu continued to be the most prominent quarter of Istanbul, and its main street was the prime shopping area until the 1960s when the decentralization of jobs and population started.

3.2.7. Rapid Urbanisations in 1950
According to Özus and Dökmeci (2005), Beyoğlu started to decline due to a process of urban decay. During the development process of the country,

² Grande Rue De Pera is the original name. Later it was changed to İstiklal Avenue.
the city could not attract developers due to the sensitivity of its historic urban fabric. The city structure did not tie in with the modern forms of mobility, due to the narrow and confined old network of circulation. As the urban fabric was oriented towards pedestrians and public transport, the use of private vehicles was clearly incompatible with the economic, cultural and physical fabric of the city centre of Istanbul. At the same time land plots were too small to support a bigger business district. Beyoğlu’s population decreased rapidly. It was not a propitious place for residential use; the neighborhoods deteriorated and became blighted zones with a lack of sufficient rehabilitation plans and projects. This directly affected the high-income group, who relocated to a new sub-centre (Özus and Dökmeci 2005).

3.2.8. Transformation of Beyoğlu Neighborhoods in 1985 and Afterwards

New measures to counteract the neighborhood decay were implemented, such as the establishment of the Association of Beautification and Preservation of Beyoğlu in 1985. The emphasis of the organization was mainly on creating socio-cultural activities. The effects of the preservation plan in 1986 directly led to the widening of Tarlabası Avenue in 1988, and the pedestrianisation of İstiklal Avenue in 1990. These measures were taken to improve the attractiveness of the area and to embellish the business sector. Transforming Tarlabası Street, which connects Taksim to the historical peninsula extended in the west border of Galata–Pera region, into a boulevard was a radical action. The mentioned change very much affected the architectural and cultural dimensions of the area. After many attempts, in 1993 the area was declared to be an urban heritage zone and İstiklal Street was pedestrianised. Today this place is considered to be the centre of culture and entertainment. A similar preservation status was applied to Galata Tower and its surroundings. This period was marked by different aspects of development. The post-1980s period witnessed an increase in the service sector as a result of economic restructuring, development of transportation and telecommunication systems, and globalization (Özus et al. 2012). The last quarter of the twentieth century experienced multi-centre development causing the decline of the old CBD (Dökmeci et al. 2007). These new sub-centres were furnished with modern retail facilities and office buildings, and were supported by modern housing complexes suitable for middle-and upper-income groups. As a result of the economic restructuring by implementing liberal policies, the firms increased in number and size, and demanded greater floor space (Özus et al. 2012). The historical CBD was unable to provide wider space and alleviate these expansion necessities. At the same time the conservation regulations limited the expansion of buildings in height and volume (Özus et al. 2012). Therefore the expansion took place in more peripheral areas of the city (Dökmeci et al. 2007), and new business centres started to develop along highways, supported by large housing projects.

Since 2004 projects related to transformation and investment have been increasing. Nowadays the city is going through a process of urban transformation and globalization and external forces influence the urban management. Private participation with urban development is increasing.
Figure 3.2.7: Grande Rue de Pera street, later called İstiklal, One of the Most Important Commercial Streets, and Taksim Square.
Source: Authors, based on data provided by TUB
### 3.3. Urban Layout of Beyoğlu
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#### 3.3.1. Introduction

After the historical peninsula, the region that is now called Beyoğlu is the oldest urban part of the city. The urban layout of this neighborhood is a consequence of both its historical heritage and its geographical setting. This sub chapter addresses the urban lay-out of Beyoğlu through maps that explain some of its most relevant inner structures. Some important landmarks will be highlighted and some characteristics will be shown, serving as a support for the basic understanding of the area. The administrative boundaries of the Beyoğlu municipality extend to the end of the Golden Horn (See Figure 3.3.1). However, the main focus of this whole research project is concentrated in the older and more traditional part of the neighborhood, more specifically in its southwestern portion, between Taksim Square and Galata Tower. It seems like even the Beyoğlu municipality divides the territory in order to represent and manage the area. Most of the cartographical information found and illustrated here followed this clear division. So, in the following maps, a smaller part of Beyoğlu will be shown in more detail.

#### 3.3.2. Approach and Methodology

The urban layout of Beyoğlu will be addressed in this sub-chapter. To understand the complexity of the urban phenomenon, a multi-dimensional analysis is needed, that is based on the multiple inter-related factors. Although a complex and simulta-

![Figure 3.3.1: Location of the Research Area](Source: Authors, Based on Google Earth.)
neous analysis throughout all aspects would bring a comprehensive understanding of Beyoğlu’s urban layout, through this analysis we attempt to approach the theme by subdividing the layouts. By doing this, we attempt to gain a better understanding of the chosen single aspects and before interrelating them with other dimensions of the urban layout. Through the description and subsequent overlapping of thematic urban analysis maps containing one-dimensional urban features, this chapter attempts to review and give a general understanding of Beyoğlu’s urban features and some of their basic interrelations. The methodology used for this purpose is composed of three steps: (1) selection of two different layouts of Beyoğlu, (2) reproduction and basic description of one-attribute maps and (3) overlapping and analyzing of two maps with distinct properties (e.g. morphological-economic).

The first approach is related to the economic activities as well as to the road infrastructure of Beyoğlu. With the available information it was possible to recognize some commerce agglomerations related to major transportation lines. We decided then to have a deeper view of the interrelation of these two aspects to anticipate our fieldwork in Istanbul. The approach centers mainly on the pedestrian street that goes from Galata Tower to Taksim Square and the main motorized transportation avenues.

Secondly, the topography of Beyoğlu is overlapped with the building area map of the area.

3.3.3. Analysis Maps
3.3.3.1. Topography
Istanbul is divided by a system of straits that joins two seas and separates two continents. The urban
area sprawls between the peninsulas flanked by the Marmara Sea (south), the Black Sea (north) and the main channel of the Bosphorus strait. The eastern peninsula, Kocaeli, at the Anatolian side is the Asiatic part of the metropolitan area. The western peninsula at the European side, Çatalca, is where the historic districts of Byzantium and Constantinople originated, including what is today known as Beyoğlu (Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality 2008).

Being a region of complex drainage, water erosion played an important role in increasing the steepness of river valleys and sculpting the slopes of the plateaus. Both peninsulas are decayed plateaus. After a long period of erosion by rivers and winds, a wide peneplain appeared, some peaks were preserved where the quartzite bedrock supports the terrain.

The research area, Beyoğlu, is situated on the confluence of the Bosphorus Strait and the Golden Horn. The Golden Horn is a narrow 8km long bay that is curved like a horn. The Turkish term for referring to the Golden Horn, Haliç, also means “loch”, which is a serrated shore formation where the river and sea water mix. After the Ice Age, rivers located at this region ending in the Marmara Sea were swallowed under the increased sea water, causing the formation of the actual loch, a narrow bay stretching towards the interior parts of Istanbul’s European side. As a result of this process, the Golden Horn gained the ability to operate as a natural port protected against the storms and convenient for sea traffic (Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality 2008).

The southern and northern shore of the Golden Horn sustains slightly different geomorphologies.
The southern shore, where the historical peninsula developed, is a light waved plain suitable for human occupation. Although not exactly flat, the inner land terrain of the historical peninsula assumed the characteristics of a worn-out plateau, with eroded valleys and low elevations.

On the opposite side of the shore, where Beyoğlu is situated, the landscape has more carved escarpments and more pronounced slopes, and the first settlements are concentrated in the narrow coastal plains of the foothills.

The raised surface of the research area is characterized by a main ridge flattened in its upper part, located between the northwest valley and the shoreline on the southeast flank. Also known as a rocky strip, this ridge results from a narrow advancement from the plateaus further inland, with increasing altitude towards the inner land.

Corresponding to the crest line, the ridge has a convex topographic form and is accompanied by other small ridges that branch out from the main axis.

Figure 3.3.3 shows the topography of the Beyoğlu district. The altitudes vary from sea level to 90 meters. The terrain modeling can also be seen below in Figure 3.3.4 that shows the topography in perspective. The elevation of the model has been exaggerated by 100 per cent so that it can clearly be seen that the research area is situated on the top of a relief composed of conical hills, concave ridges, slopes and narrow plains.

The figure shows two semi-flat altitudes: the narrow plain between the straits and the foothills, comprising the lowest altitudes and a widened plateau or ridge with concave surfaces at the highest altitudes. In between, the morphology

Fig 3.3.4: 3D Topography of the Research Area
Source: Authors
consists of steep slopes connecting the plain at sea level and the concave high lands. In some cases the steepness is above 60°, which can be coupled to the rift valleys carved by overland flow. The declivity map (Figure 3.3.5) corroborates this analysis.

### 3.3.3.2. Transportation

The road transportation of Beyoğlu is mainly defined by two axes that connect Pera with the Eminönü. These two axes are directly connected to the bridges crossing the Golden Horn. In the northern part of the old harbor Tarlabası Boulevard connects Atatürk Bridge with the highest part of Beyoğlu in Taksim Square. The second axis is a prolongation of Galata Bridge that runs on the low area near the port, starting in Karaköy Port and along the Bosphorus named in the south Kemeraltı Caddesi, Necatibey Caddesi, in the Cihangir area and Meclis-i Mebusan Caddesi in the north east, near to Dolmabahçe. These two axes are connected by a main road (Tersane Street) in the old harbor area. Another important transportation axis is the pedestrian street İstiklal Street that runs almost parallel to Tarlabası Boulevard (south) and also ends in Taksim Square. Beneath İstiklal Street, which was pedestrianized at the beginning of the nineties, is an underground train line that connects the Tünel with Taksim Square. The mentioned transportation axes run from south-west to north-east, parallel to the Bosphorus. There are three secondary roads that run perpendicularly and cross both, Tarlabası Boulevard and Meclis-i Mebusan. The fourth secondary axis allowing transportation from south to north is Sıraselviler Street, ending also in Taksim Square in the north side and integrating Meclis-i Mebusan in the south.

![Terrain Declivity Beyoğlu Istanbul](Figure 3.3.5: Declivity of the Research Area)

*Source: Authors, Based on Beyoğlu Municipality Map*
3.3.3.3. Figure-Ground

The figure-ground map clearly represents, like a stamp on the territory, the different stages of urbanization. The imprint that the build-up area leaves on the ground carries in its urban genes the very spirit of the city-making of a specific time and place. If the Zeitgeist as the “spirit of the time” tries to capture the overall feeling that a certain time had in a certain place, the figure-ground map is able to show the closest thing to a “Stadtgeist” (spirit of the city) or a series of overlaid “Stadtgeists”. Analyzing these patterns is one way to understand how the different layers of the urban are interrelated in a morphological way. This analysis can show the differences among land uses, income, or time of urbanization in a city, as each of these differences stamp the territory in its own specific way. On the other hand, it is important not to assume too much based only on it. The map shows only the one side of the physicalization of the urbanization process, it does not show numbers, or important characteristics like height or permeability. But through the analysis of this map it is possible to induce certain observations, and through the combination of this map with other maps we can test some of these conclusions and initiate an understanding on how different land uses, or even different social classes leave their mark on the territory at different times. And through these patterns, a small piece of the whole urbanization process can be understood.

The figure-ground map of this part of Beyoğlu reflects how the area was occupied in its early history, under an Ottoman style of urbanization. The denser parts are composed of narrow streets and small blocks. No big parks or squares can be seen. Apart from this standard pattern, bigger voids can be seen, related to its use, and/or time of realization. First of all the pattern clearly changes...
all along the shore line. Port and port-related activities demand a different kind of urban structure than a more residential one. So bigger voids can be noticed close to the piers of Kabataş and Karaköy, and some storage barns break the small building/narrow space typology of urbanization. Behind this port area along the Golden Horn, Meclis-i Mebusan Avenue also strikes as an important path, coming from the Galata Bridge, and supporting the port activity.

Another major break is Taksim Square and the adjacent Gezi park area. This big void is also constituted by the bigger buildings around it, like the Atatürk Cultural Center (AKM) and the Istanbul Technical University (Faculty of Architecture, Taşkışla), suggesting a different kind of use, or identity this place might have on the area. Also adjacent to Gezi Park, but on the northwestern side, the Talimhane region has a completely different urbanization pattern, suggesting a planned urban intervention rather than the more organic one the rest of the area possesses. From the Taksim area, the Tarlabaşı Avenue is an important cut through the regular original Ottoman style pattern of the urbanization. The avenue leaves Taksim Square through a dense neighborhood, until it hits the Kasımpaşa Stadium, from where the pattern changes to big buildings and wider spaces also related to a port activity, and connects to the Atatürk Bridge. Another relevant aspect worth pointing out is the densification along İstiklal Street. There, the adjacent streets get even narrower and the open spaces smaller, suggesting a particularly busy path, probably with higher land prices.

The overall impression is a first layer of an old and more organic occupation, an area that grew little by little, in a south to north direction coming from the historical peninsula. This organic pattern is
more or less homogeneous, with inner variations but similar overall characteristics, with narrow streets and few open spaces. On top of that layer some important interventions can be noticed, like big avenues, open spaces and bigger buildings. All of which is surrounded by a coastline with intense maritime activity.

3.3.3.4. Land Use
In correspondence to the figure-ground map, the land use map shows intense commercial activity along the Istiklal Street, where buildings are denser. The commercial activity also booms in the southern part of the area, starting around the Galata Tower and spreading until Karakoy and between the two bridges. Other important commercial areas are the one along the Meclisi Mebusan Avenue, especially close to Kabataş, and the Talimhane neighborhood. As seen on the figure-ground map, Talimhane shows a completely different urban pattern, and also a very specific land use, with the highest concentration of hotels in the whole Istanbul, and absolutely no housing.

Regarding housing, two main areas can be seen, one of each side of the commerce axis along Istiklal Street and Tarlabası Avenues. But there are some significant differences between these two areas. On the southeast side, closer to the Bosphorus, besides a pure housing use, housing combined with commercial activity is not rare. The other major housing area, the northwestern one, located on the other side of Istiklal along the Tarlabası Avenue is slightly different. Besides housing and commerce, the manufacturing activity seems to gain importance, both in small manufacturing places and also combined with housing. This suggests that maybe there is a difference of
income between these two major housing areas. The area closer to the Bosphorus may have higher incomes than the inner-area, along the Tarlabası Avenue.

The overall impression of the map confirms the analysis made on the figure-ground map. Istiklal being a dense and busy commercial area, port related activities along the entire coastline, and a different, institutional land use in the area around Taksim Square.

3.3.3.5. Density
This map shows the density of the population in the research area. All port related areas are among the least densely populated parts of Beyoğlu. On the other side, the area around Taksim Square and Gezi Park also have a low density. A lot of public open spaces, combined with the highest hotel concentration in Istanbul, means that few people live in this area.

Along the Bosphorus side of the area, the dense Firuzaga district can be interpreted as an isolated case. It is surrounded by other less dense parts. The important pattern that this map actually shows is the clear division between the two sides of the Tarlabası Boulevard. Like the figure-ground map, this map also suggests a division in class structures on both sides of this axis. The northern part of the Tarlabası Boulevard is significantly denser than the part towards Istiklal Street and the Bosphorus.

3.3.3.6. Morphology
We looked closer at Figure 3.3.7 as a pattern that through its diversity of figures and blanks could tell us a story of rhythm, history and lifestyles.
We sensed three completely different patterns, two in the north, one in the south, two big borders, which both cross Beyoğlu from the northeast to the southwest and one dominating open space in the north. When translating these into words, the three patterns were different, clearly defined neighborhoods: Tarlabası, Talimhane, in the north and the Bosphorus waterside, in the south. The borders were the Tarlabası Boulevard, in the north and Istiklal Street in the south, whereas the open space was no other than one of the most symbolic places in Istanbul: Taksim Square.

Tarlabaşı Neighborhood was chosen because of its density of small forms and their proximity to each other. Looking closer, our exercise also aimed to reveal through photos that the architecture was proof of the historic layers and the lifestyle of its inhabitants.

The houses in this area present themselves as unique examples of turn-of-the-century Levantine architecture: slim, four-storey bow-fronted buildings that huddle along winding, narrow streets. Today it is regarded as an unsafe area occupied by low social classes. There are plans to transform it under the name of preservation of the historical buildings.

The Talimhane area was chosen because of its unique shape and clear boundaries. The area on which 6-7 building blocks with Art Deco architecture were separated by a certain road width was one of the first planned settlements in Beyoğlu and it was designed by Henri Prost in 1938. There
are works by the well-known architects, Seyfi Arkan (Ayhan Apartment), Vedat Tek (Pertev Apartment), Sedat Hakkı Eldem (Ceylan Apartment), Rebii Gorbon and Mustafa Can (Doğu Apartment). At present, the area is a Tourism District, a title it has held since 2009.

A complete analysis of the interesting and rich pattern of the Bosphorus Waterfront could not be done without looking at its edges: the waterside. We chose one dominating rectangle shape, which was blocking the access to the Bosphorus. When identifying the building, it revealed itself to be Dolmabahce Palace, the largest palace in Turkey. The mono-block building occupies 45,000 m².¹

The design contains eclectic elements from the Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassical styles, blended with traditional Ottoman architecture to create a new synthesis, reflecting the influence of European styles and standards of Ottoman culture during the Tanzimat period. Today the place belongs to Directorate of National Palaces and it is a museum.

Beyoğlu seems to have two parallel borders. However, these borders have opposite roles. The first one, the Tarlabası Boulevard in the north, functions strictly as a road for car transit and separates Tarlabası, a low class neighborhood, from the other more prosperous neighborhoods of Beyoğlu. This physical six-lane cut, which is now subject to increasing traffic jams, was made in 1988. At present, from the human scale of perception, the road seems very difficult to cross and creates a strong feeling of separation.

The second border, Istiklal Street in the south, is one of the most famous avenues in Istanbul and was completely pedestrianized during the late 1980s and early 1990s. This is how this border received the role of unifying and blending rather than separating, which is clearly visible in the land use of both its sides, which is commerce. In addition, the street is also a popular venue for all sorts of protests, marches, parades and gatherings in the city. Regarding the urban fabric, the avenue is surrounded by late Ottoman era buildings (from the 19th and early 20th centuries) that were designed with the Neo-Classical, Neo-Gothic, Renaissance Revival, Beaux-Arts, Art Nouveau and Art Deco styles. Today, there are numerous new art galleries, bookstores, cafés, pubs, restaurants, shops and hotels.

The reason to choose Taksim Square was not only the openness of it, but also because it is also the highest point in Beyoğlu. It is considered the heart of modern Istanbul, with the central station of the Istanbul Metro network. The name comes from Arabic and it means “division” or “distribution”, the square being originally the point where the main water lines from the north of Istanbul were collected and branched off to other parts of the city.

---

¹ From an administrative point of view this palace belongs to the district of Beşiktaş.
3.3.4. Overlap - Analysis Maps
3.3.4.1. Commerce + Transportation

Figure 3.3.16 is an overlapping of the two previously introduced maps: Commerce and Transportation Systems. By overlapping the maps there seems to be a relation between infrastructure and economic activities, in the case of commerce. Although many other factors intervene in the economic land use of a region, some broad tendencies can be observed when contrasting both maps with different features. Beyond exposing a direct relation between commerce and transportation in Beyoğlu, this map gives a basic understanding of the “natural zones” delimited by transportation axes.

In the Karaköy area commerce is bounded by Tersane Street in the south. The commerce zone expands north on both sides of the pedestrianized Istiklal Street, bordered to the north by Refik Saydam Street until Taksim Square. From there the commerce area expands to the northern side of Refik Street into the hotel area. According to the land-use maps, in the southeast area of Istiklal Street there is a less dense commercial area along the pedestrian street. Commerce is clearly denser in the area between Yeni Çarşı Street and Siraselviler Street. The triangle made by Yeni Çarşı Street, Siraselviler Street and İstiklal Street is densely covered by “commerce and housing” with buildings with commerce on the ground floor and housing in the higher levels. This zone fades out until the area is met by the southern transportation axis of Meclis-i Mebusan Street. There, commerce is dense on the northern border of the Meclis-i Mebusan along the Bosphorus until the intersection of Boğazkesen Street. From there and in the north commerce fades out and in the south the area is mainly covered by commerce until the Karaköy Port.

Figure 3.3.16: Overlapped Commerce and Transportation
Source: Authors, Based on Beyoğlu Municipality Map
3.3.4.2. **Topography + Figure-ground**

In order to understand how the geomorphology significantly influenced the urban sprawl Figure 3.3.17 was made by overlaying the figure-ground map with the topography. When looking at the map it is possible to observe that the urban fabric is organized according to the watershed of the ridge. The watershed coincides with Istiklal Street that runs along the crest line from the planed platform where Taksim Square is (northeastern portion of the research area) to the edge of the ridge where the Galata Tower is today.

Parallel to Istiklal, a wide strip between the built-up areas is visible, comprising the Tarlabası Boulevard, running from the platform to the lowest points of the valley embedded among the main ridge and the subsequent higher ground to the northeast. Because of the topography, buildings in Beyoğlu were once constructed with the help of terraced retaining walls, and roads were laid out in the form of steps that slope down the hill from Beyoğlu to the straits.

This kind of solution to overcome the slopes produced an urban organisation that respects the topography, with streets and built up areas bending with the contours of the former terraces. The photo in Figure 3.3.18 below was taken from the top of the Marmara Hotel in Taksim Square and it shows the facades aligned with the contour of the terrain. Harnessing the terrain with this arrangement, parallel to the escarpment orientation, also provides the best use of daily sunlight. In this case the facades have a southeast orientation and a view to the Bosphorus Strait. It is no coincidence that the most valued lots in Beyoğlu are concentrated in this area.
In this picture the Golden Horn is also visible with the historical peninsula in the background. Figure 4.2-2 below shows the urban silhouette from the strait, exposing the wall of buildings that spreads through the concave escarpments.

From the Figure 3.3.19 it is possible to observe that coastal constructions have changed the contours of the Istanbul Bosphorus coasts impacting morphologic structures such as beaches and rocky shores, and transforming the silhouette of the coast.
3.4. Social Landscape of Beyoğlu

Natalia Garzón Arredondo, Hamid Soltanzadeh, Daniela Peña Solano, Blanca Villar Mateo

3.4.1. Introduction

Through the years, different factors have influenced the changes in Istanbul’s urban growth and social configuration. These changes are derived from the internal economic and political reconfigurations, as well as from the changes originating from external global factors like the welfare state. As discussed in the previous chapters, at the present time Istanbul consists of more than 13 million inhabitants who mainly live around the coast. Nevertheless Istanbul’s global position in demographic and economic terms has not always been like this. In terms of the social context of the city, three big urban changes, which took place in the 1950s, 1980s and 2000s, gave shape to the current configuration. Each one of the changes involved the particularities of the time in which it was effected, and represents the vision and mentality of the government of that time. When referring to the demographic growth of a place we attribute it to the economic development of the area in the specific case of Istanbul this economic increase is particularly linked to the migration of the city, as will be seen under each of the three big phases of urban growth in the city.

Under Istanbul’s first urban boom between 1950 and 1960, factors such as the industrialization, the mechanization of agriculture and the highway network improvement greatly defined the growth. Nevertheless these changes would not have been possible without the pull factor and the government’s efforts to attract rural migration into the city in exchange for employment opportunities, access to education and health services. This derived from the so called radical modernity and the rise of Ankara as the capital of Turkey, which instigated a more populist modernity represented by the mechanisms of house ownership by the appropriation of land.

During the 1980s a new industrial stage represented the growth of that period, derived from the changes in the economic and political reforms. This growth was the second urban boom of the city, which was conducted by the new global order of the time, as well as the rise of the economic state-run enterprises, among other reasons. Such factors increased Istanbul’s economic presence in Turkey, but with weak connections to the outside world.

Such urban implosion led Istanbul into a city with a dual economy between the formal and informal, derived from the previously mentioned changes and an acceleration of migration which in comparison with previous years was not only rural to urban but also from the Marmara regions and upper social classes. These years represented an important stage in Istanbul, in which the social, economic and political factors would involve a shift in the city’s vision represented not only by the previously addressed factors, but by its conformation and infrastructure. 1985 was the peak of Istanbul’s urban density. Until this point the city’s concentration of inhabitants consisted of a large number of migrants, street vendors and squatters, who would be expelled from the city under the changes of the next years.

As the city approached the 20th century (3rd urban change), big global and internal changes gave new shape to the social configuration of Istanbul. The end of the Cold War and the dismantling of the welfare state, among other points, gave Istanbul an increased interest in having a global presence. This presence entailed a big investment in its image and structure, where the government strategy meant a high investment in urban transportation with the intention of being one of the three major gateways to Europe. It is then where the third urban growth happened which lead Istanbul into a period of strong economic growth as well as into its integration in the global market. Such changes in the history of the city kept
Urban growth is not a new phenomenon in Istanbul. Throughout its history the city has attracted new settlers. According to the census carried out for military purposes on the orders of the Byzantine emperor just before the Turkish conquest, the population of the city was around 35,000. Yet prior to the Crusader occupation of 1204 the population had been between 800,000 and one million. When the Fourth Crusade army saw Constantinople in June 1203 they were overwhelmed by the city’s beauty, size, power and wealth. Over the nearly 60 years (1204-1261) of Latin occupation, however, destruction, systematic plunder and tyranny caused the greater part of the population to abandon their homes, turning it into a virtual ghost city.

The population of Istanbul at the end of the 17th century is estimated at around 700,000. During the 17th and 18th centuries the emphasis shifted from encouraging to preventing population growth. It was not until the 17th century, when the first shanty town development occurred, that the city’s population once again approached its pre-1204 level.

The high fertility and mortality rate in Turkey during the past decades have shaped the age structure of the population. In 2005, 28.5 per cent of all Turks were younger than 15 and up to today the age structure of the Turkish population has pointed to a classic pyramid form (see Figure 3.4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Yearly growth rate (in per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>13.648.000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>14.448.000</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>17.821.000</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>20.947.000</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>27.755.000</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>35.605.000</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>44.737.000</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>56.473.000</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>65.293.000</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>72.561.312</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4.1: Population Development in Turkey from 1927 to 2009

Figure 3.4.1: Population Pyramid 2009.
Istanbul’s population explosion began with changes in the agricultural structure of the country and the expansion of industrialization after World War II. The population has since risen from around one million in 1950 to 12 million today. Between 1950 and 1997 the number of people employed in the industry sector increased by four million, while at the same time the number of urban residents grew by 35 million. The urban labour markets are not able to incorporate the influx of migrants. This leads to high rates of concealed unemployment and to large illegal settlements on the outskirts of the cities (so-called Gecekondu – literally “built over night”). In 2008 an estimated 60 per cent of the population in Istanbul lived in such settlements (see Figure 3.4.2). The irregular and unplanned character of urbanization and population growth has brought serious problems. Even when plans have been drawn up they have not achieved their objectives, because they have failed to keep up with the city’s rate of growth (see Tables 3.4.2 and 3.4.3).

### 3.4.2.2 Population Evolution in Beyoğlu

Presently, the district of Beyoğlu is a settlement comprising 45 neighbourhoods and approximately 225,000 residents. As it is a business, recreation and culture centre, the daytime and nighttime population of the district increases to several millions.

According to a document dated 1476 there were 592 Greek, 535 Muslim, 332 European and 62 Armenian homes in Galata. After 1492, the foreign embassies in Galata moved to Beyoğlu, and the area between Galatasaray and Tünel started to develop as a residential zone. This development continued in the 18th century, spreading towards Kasımpaşa and Tophane. Until the late 18th century, there were not many people living outside the walls of Galata. During the final Byzantine period, the populations of Latin origin dominated the commercial life in Galata. The number of people of Latin origin, most of whom were Genoese, was greater than the Greeks. When Galata went under Turkish administration, the Latin origin population left over from the Genoese did not leave Galata. Those remaining formed the root of the Levantines of the Turkish period.

From the 1950 to 1960, the population of Beyoğlu decreased rapidly and it has not changed significantly since the 1960s. Beyoğlu, which once was the reflection of the Western culture, has begun to answer the needs of cheap residences of the rural people who immigrated to Istanbul. The table below shows the developments and population figures for Istanbul over the past 80 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>806,863</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,019,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>883,599</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3,904,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>991,237</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4,741,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,078,399</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>5,842,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,166,477</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7,303,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,533,822</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9,198,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,882,092</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10,018,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2,293,823</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923-50</td>
<td>Planning initiatives under difficult economic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 - 60</td>
<td>Unplanned development focusing on road widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 80</td>
<td>Return to concept of planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Onwards Planning governed by the market economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.4.2: Development of the Urban and Rural Population in Turkey from 1927 to 2000.
Source: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2002.

Table 3.4.2: Developments in Istanbul Over the Past 80 Years
Table 3.4.3: Census Figures for Istanbul’s Population
than 1,000,000 in 1950, when the urban population density fell to 40,400 per square mile (15,600 per square kilometre). Rapid growth followed, resulting in today’s figure of 12 million. This was accompanied by a further drop in urban density, to 24,300 per square mile or 9,400 per square kilometre (The Density of Istanbul). The physical expansion of the urban area now stretches north all the way to the Black Sea (Figure 3.4.3 shows the present extent of the urban area and the 1950 urban area).

### 3.4.2.3 Density Growth in Istanbul and Beyoğlu

The urban area of Istanbul grew modestly to less than 1,000,000 in 1950, when the urban population density fell to 40,400 per square mile (15,600 per square kilometre). Rapid growth followed, resulting in today’s figure of 12 million. This was accompanied by a further drop in urban density, to 24,300 per square mile or 9,400 per square kilometre (The Density of Istanbul). The physical expansion of the urban area now stretches north all the way to the Black Sea (Figure 3.4.3 shows the present extent of the urban area and the 1950 urban area).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population in:</th>
<th>Beyoğlu</th>
<th>Istanbul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>244,516</td>
<td>12,915,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>248,064</td>
<td>13,255,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>248,206</td>
<td>13,624,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>246,152</td>
<td>13,854,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4.4: Population in Beyoğlu and Istanbul in 2009-2012
Source: http://en.beyoglu.bel.tr/default.aspx

Figure 3.4.3: Present Extent of the Urban Area and the 1950 Urban Area
Source: http://www.newgeography.com/content/003020-the-evolving-urban-form-istanbul

Figure 3.4.4: Istanbul Urban Area Population 1950-2010 with Projection to 2025
Source: http://www.newgeography.com/content/003020-the-evolving-urban-form-istanbul
3 Understanding the Urban Context

Over the 60 years from 1950 until today, the urban area population grew more than 12 times, but the urban land area grew nearly 21 times (see Table 3.4.5). Istanbul demonstrates the near universal truth that as cities grow, they become less dense. According to United Nations projected growth rates, the urban population should approach 18 million by 2025 (see Figure 3.4.4).

Urban density is illustrated below in terms of the number of people living in each square kilometre. Density is largely driven by topographical constraints and the location of public transport and other infrastructure, but also by each city’s inherited traditions of urban planning and development. In Istanbul and Beyoğlu, density levels are high, particularly when compared to other European cities. The city’s peak density of 68,602 people per km² is well above Manhattan’s extreme, and the average within a radius of 10 km is at least 30 per cent higher than that of any of the other American and European Urban Age cities.

Table 3.4.6 shows the density in Beyoğlu district and the changes during last years.

### 3.4.3 Migration Trends
#### 3.4.3.1 Migration Processes in the Recent History of Istanbul

Istanbul’s development and character has been always related to migration. Sennet (2009, p.13) describes Istanbul as a “hinge city, a city of migrants rather than immigrants, a place of location rather than a destination, a city of mobilities”. In this section we will examine the migration processes that have transformed the city in the last decades and review the distribution of migrants within the city.

The recent history of Istanbul has been determined by three major periods of urban growth, linked to three economic booms and political paradigms in Turkey (Inceoglu and Yürekli 2011). The first significant urban growth happened during the 1950s-1960s following the industrialization wave. At the same time, foreign aid funded the mechanisation of farming and improvements to the road networks (OECD 2008) and new industrial areas were created in the city. There was a huge rural to urban migration of low income groups, from the Black Sea and the Anatolian interior (Keyder 2005), which developed the informal gecekondu settlements in the absence of government provision of affordable houses. Migrants were spread throughout the city; they were located “near the industrial sites at the periphery, but also in the gaps in the urban fabric, […], even in the midst of historical building stock” (Dossick et al 2012). This migration was based on pull factors, namely, “employment opportunities, possibilities of house ownership through appropriation of public land and better access to educa-
tion and health services” (Keyder 2005, p.131). The rural middle class also migrated to Istanbul, generating a denser and insufficiently serviced inner city with “the small-scale yapsat system, […] resulting in 3-5 story “build and sell” strategy of multi-family dwellings (Dossick et al 2012). Politically speaking, the period from 1950 to 1980 is considered as the ‘populist modernity’ which tolerated the gecekondu phenomenon in its diverse forms and legitimised them, through a series of amnesty laws and another law to allow fragmentation of ownership (Tekeli 2009).

In the 1980s the second major urban growth took place, based on a “neo-liberal revolution” (Essen 2009) with economic and political reforms. This consisted of a new phase of industrialization that promoted new opportunities, the pull factor to accelerate migration. In this period there were not only migrants from rural areas but also from other parts of the Marmora region, and an influx of foreigners mostly from countries of the former Soviet bloc (OECD 2008).

In the recent decades there has been a reduction in the number and a change in migration patterns to the city in two different ways. One of these changes is related to the factors attracting people to the city, and the second one is related to the migrants’ level of education. Concerning the first factor, the 1990s witnessed an important amount of newcomers, especially Kurds from eastern and southeastern provinces of Turkey who followed push factors to arrive in the city, namely adverse political and economic conditions, including “land devastation, primarily due to the ethnic/separatist war” (Keyder 2005). This forced migration involved several hundred thousand people arriving to Istanbul.

Regarding the second factor, since the 1990s, the well-educated middle and even upper sections of the population have been attracted to the city, not only from Turkey but also from abroad, due to the economic transformation (Eraydin 2007). From 1995 on, the intra-urban mobility dynamics changed. The real estate markets of gecekondu settlements ended because middle and upper income groups were interested in the outskirts of the city as well (Pinarcioglu and Isik 2009).

Finally, the third important urban growth in Istanbul is connected with the on-going period started in the 2000s and Turkey’s most recent economic boom, which is based on the full integration of the country’s economy into the global markets (Inceoglu and Yürekli 2011). This period is defined by the 1999 earthquake and follows a ‘top-down neo-liberalism’ agenda (Essen 2009).

Data from the OECD review (2008) emphasizes the continued relevance of migration in the city: Between 1970 and 2000, Istanbul alone – excluding other provinces – received almost 4 million migrants. Depending on the unit of analysis (Istanbul, the Metro-Region or Polycentric Greater Istanbul), the proportion of residents in Istanbul that were born in a different province represent about one-third to one-half of that born locally.

The distribution pattern of migrants throughout the city is also interesting. According to Daniş et al (2009) the economic centres and the main road infrastructure defines the allocation of different migrants. The population from western cities of Turkey are located in or around the three main economic centres, one in each side of the city, namely north-European side, south-European side and Anatolian side. The E-5 motorway serves as a barrier which separates them and the migrants from the eastern part of the country, settled to the north of the infrastructure. However, the latest well-educated migrants are settled all around the city (see Figure 3.4.5).

3.4.3.2 Migration Processes Throughout Beyoğlu’s History
According to Batur (2006, p.1) Beyoğlu originates
from a fortified settlement of antiquity. In the 10th century Galata was a trading colony with an important migrant population from Italy. The Byzantines gave special privileges, in chronological order, to those from Amalfi, Venice and Pisa. The Genoese were settled in Pera and in the following centuries they strengthened their position by signing an agreement that meant Sultan Mehmet II recognized their privileges.

In the 16th century a considerable number of Western merchants were established in Galata; “It is recorded that the population profile of Galata [...] was composed of 35 per cent Turks, 39 per cent Greeks, 22 per cent Europeans, and 4 per cent Armenians” (Afife 2006, p.2). The Ottoman State systematically “Turkified” some neighbourhoods in the region between the 16th and the 18th century. Galata and Pera were developed in a different way; consequently, in the 19th century they had diverse socioeconomic populations. Galata extended its boundaries and converted itself into a multicultural area, where different nationalities like the French, the English and the Italian industrialists and merchants began to settle. On the other hand, Pera was an aristocratic settlement where the wealthy Levantines, Greeks, Armenians and Jews lived.

The declaration of the Turkish republic at the beginning of the 20th century implied a general national promotion throughout the country and, specifically, the loss of the capital city status for Istanbul. The foreign population started to leave Beyoğlu and Turkish businessmen and intellectuals arrived (BİPM 2008). After World War II there were particular historic events which produced more migration out of the neighbourhood. Firstly, Israel was founded in that period and the Jews of Beyoğlu moved there. And secondly, in 1955 the Greek community abandoned the area after the demonstrations against Greece over Cyprus (BİPM 2008).

The three major urban growth periods of Istanbul, explained in the previous section have influenced Beyoğlu. In the first important growth during 1950s - 1960s, due to the development of new districts and the declining interest in the area, “the wealthier families left the area for the expanding suburbia [...] [while] the migration from rural areas to the city [...] [was] conveniently satisfied [...] [by] cheap residential property” in Beyoğlu (Ergun 2004, p.396). This pattern continued with the second relevant growth period, in the 1980s, and was reinforced by the evictions due to Tarlabası Boulevard construction and continued during the 1990s; consequently, “Beyoğlu developed a very mixed demography: poor Anatolian migrants, [...] as well as Roma/Gypsies, Kurdish refugees, transnational migrants (including many Africans)” (Aksoy and Robins 2011, p.15).

On the other hand, since the 1990s, according to İnceoğlu and Yürekli (2011) and Aksoy and Robins (2011), a process of urban gentrification has developed. In the first years it was individual and informal, adding the creative-professional middle classes (of cool Istanbul) to the already mentioned heterogeneous population, for instance, in Galata. Finally, in the recent years, in concordance with the characteristics of the third growth period of the city since the 2000s, this gentrification procedure has changed into a large-scale public and/or private intervention. In one of the coming chapters the example of the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project will be deeply investigated.

3.4.4. Education in Istanbul and Beyoğlu

Turkey has signed and ratified The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR 1966). Its article 13 claims for “free primary education, [...] generally available and accessible, [...] secondary education, equally accessible, [...] higher education [and] [...] fundamental education encouraged for [those who] have not received or completed their primary education.” Studies show that 77% of residents consider education an
aspect to improve the quality of life in Istanbul, as reflected in the Urban Age City Survey (Bakkaloğlu et al. 2009).

In general, the Turkish education system, which includes primary, secondary, higher and non-formal education, has been improved in the recent years. The higher level of education consists of public and private institutions with the Student Selection Examination taking place once a year. Non-formal education started in 1996 and has also evolved its content from art to vocational and technical training courses.

Higher education in Istanbul is “in the top ranking of university enrolment capacities” (Istanbul Kalkınma Ajansi 2010) with new graduate and PhD programmes which have been developed in recent years (Eraydin 2007). Furthermore, there has been a boom in private higher education institutions, which account for 26 per cent of 41 universities and 33 foundations (Eraydin 2007), due to the 130th constitutional provision that promoted them. Non-formal education has also been increasing, both in institutions, public and private, and in participants. In Beyoğlu there is an important concentration of high quality education facilities, which in some cases do not only serve the district but the entire city. These include the Galatasaray High School, the Istanbul Technical University, the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and the Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University. However, there is an increasing concern about the capacity of primary education. Moreover, there are considerable differences in the access to education based on the families’ income. The education enrolment rates in Istanbul...
are above the average of Turkey, although below the EU and OECD countries average (Eraydın 2007). The great urban development of Istanbul and its immigration processes have created an increasing demand for education facilities, which has led to an insufficient physical infrastructure and an excessive number of students per classroom and per teacher in the lower levels. The early childhood education is especially critical, in 2005 only 16 per cent of 4-6 years old children in Istanbul benefited from this education (OECD 2008). In primary and secondary education, the average in Turkey is 33 students per classroom, while in the Istanbul Region the average is 46 (Istanbul Kalkınma Ajansi 2010). Nevertheless, as Istanbul is a centre of higher education, the number of students per faculty member and lecturer are fewer than the average in Turkey. Vocational education and training is not given fair consideration and is not able to connect its profiles to the labour market needs (OECD 2008). Moreover, a serious point is the deficient financing of education, not only in Istanbul, but in Turkey in general (Istanbul Kalkınma Ajansi 2010). Istanbul’s population’s literacy rate (89.3 per cent) is better than the national average (87.3 per cent) (Istanbul Kalkınma Ajansi 2010). In Beyoğlu, the literacy rate is even better than the average of Istanbul, with almost 92 per cent (BİPM 2008). The education level in Istanbul varies with the year of birth - the illiteracy rate increases and the level of education decreases with age. Moreover, the education level of the population is different by gender; the illiteracy rate is higher among women (6.3%), than among men (1.3%) (Istanbul Kalkınma Ajansi 2010).
3.4.5. Employment in Istanbul and Beyoğlu

Being a city with a major concentration of inhabitants within Turkey, Istanbul is also the major concentration of labour force for the country. The transformation of the country from an industrial and agricultural economy to a more services oriented one has also created a shift in the former employment activities. (Figure 3.4.7)

Within the Beyoğlu district the specific allocation of main functions also determine the distribution and type of labour force. Having a cluster of hotels and convention centres close to the area of Taksim and Taksim Square means that the quantity of employees needed in basic service jobs is considerably high. Another example of this is the concentration of shopping malls and restaurants along İstiklal Street. Also, the sector from Taksim Square to Maslak along the Büyükdere Boulevard, which connects the Trans-European Motorway (TEM) to the E-5 Motorway, is the emerging Central Business District (CBD) of the Metropolitan area (Daniş et al. 2009). (Figure 3.4.8)

The establishment of cores dedicated only to commercial or tourist-oriented services, has increased the economic and spatial gap in the
district. According to the Provincial Employment Board, in 2007 the rate of informal employment in Turkey was over 50 per cent, and over 30 per cent for Istanbul. These high rates of informal employment reflect bigger disparities in the society and a lack of social services and support from the government for these employees.

3.4.6. Housing Ownership in Istanbul and Beyoğlu
Even though the majority of inhabitants of Istanbul and especially in the central district of Beyoğlu are renters or tenants, since the economic crisis of 2001 a key stakeholder in Turkey and Istanbul has been the Housing Development and Administration Ministry of the Republic of Turkey (TOKI). TOKI is currently the most powerful housing developer and real estate agency in the country. It sells valuable land belonging to the Treasury, produces for-profit housing on public land, and thus has become the leading actor for the developing of urban transformation projects on every scale and especially in the gecekondu areas.

Between 2002 and 2009, of the 350,000 houses built in Turkey, 70,000 were built in Istanbul. These numbers represent the high increase of the land rent and speculation in the city. Due to the lack of residential plots, the predominant typology of these new developments is high rise, high-density buildings in the outskirts of the city. Besides the new social housing projects developed by TOKI, another significant phenomenon has taken place in Istanbul: gated communities. As a response to the new needs and lifestyles of the middle and upper-middle class, these kind of projects are mostly located in the northern outskirts of Istanbul, where the residents are seeking to have more privileges in terms of natural conditions and surroundings.

3.4.7. Social Segregation in Istanbul and Beyoğlu
The social segregation in Istanbul and particularly in the Beyoğlu district is correlated with several different aspects, including employment activities, housing tenancy and the spatial distribution and new land uses proposed for the city and the district.

As a way to guarantee social networks, migrant communities tend to organize themselves in specific areas of a city. Even though the different migration processes in Istanbul are related to political or religious reasons, some authors claim that the socio-spatial segregation in Istanbul in strongly

**Figure 3.4.8:**
Employment by Level of Education and Gender
Source: Authors, based on Danış et al. 2009
correlated to socio-economic status (Pinarcio and Isik 2009).

The geographic singularities of Istanbul physically divide the city in particular regions that have historically also divided the social classes within the city, creating different patterns of segregation with clear cores, transitional zones and peripheral areas, as the physical representation of a culture of the served and the server (Figure 3.4.9).

Even though the majority of the district functions as a financial and tourist centre, there are still areas of high social and economic degradation, as is the case of Tarlabası, separated from Istiklal Street and Taksim Square only by Tarlabası Boulevard. For decades this historical and mainly residential neighbourhood has been the location of small manufacturing centres and home to the labour force needed in the surrounding areas. Since 2006 it has witnessed an ongoing process of land speculation and planned gentrification, with the implementation of urban renewal projects oriented to high income households and service centres. Pinarcıoğlu and Isık (2009, p.484) describe social segregation as follows:

The 1980s and early 1990s generated a clear pattern of segregation with the wealthy along the coast, the poor at the periphery of the city and the middle classes between the two. The illegal settlements built by migrants at any point in time were quickly transformed into middle-class neighbourhoods not of those sections of the society victimized by the globalisation processes and the new economic policies, but also of the nascent...
Concerning education, the main priorities to improve its quality in the Istanbul metropolitan region are increasing the financing in order to raise the number of schools and teachers, especially addressing the early childhood education, and promoting the lifelong learning approach, including better coordination between the different educational institutions and matching vocational profiles with labour market needs. Furthermore, to address the problem of education as a cause and effect of social inequality (Pinarçioğlu and Isik 2009) and to promote a more equitable education level it is necessary to decrease the illiteracy in the low-income neighbourhoods and to enhance the mentioned lifelong learning approach.

3.4.8. Concluding Remarks
As has already been evaluated, the future of Istanbul’s social configuration is uncertain due to a fluctuating migration, which is a product of its economic growth and its political structure. Economic changes have led to an alteration of Istanbul’s traditional social structure, whereby the government’s actions for localizing its inhabitants according to their cultural or ethnic group has only strengthened the social segregation that has been taking place since the early eighties.

It is also important to highlight that such segregation has not only been reinforced through the new public policies (such as Law 5366 and Law 6306), but also through the economic growth of the construction sector. On the one hand, there are the desired migrations for the middle and upper-income groups, who are returning to the inner city, but forced migrations for the low-income groups are pushing them away from their traditional neighbourhoods and their social networks. Still, there is the potential among well-educated new migrants, who are located everywhere, to promote a more equal distribution of income groups throughout the city. On the other hand, big investments made in social housing, private hospitals and football fields, have resulted in a separation of people from urban centres and their networks.

This same attitude is the one that prevails in the public sector, where the government is not considering the population’s socio-economic level and the problems that these new developments imply. The connection between the current developments, the increase in the segregation between classes and the levels of education are linked with the transportation lines.

Islamist bourgeoisie nurtured during the period of Islamist governments since 2002. This adds religious contours to the map of spatial segregation in Istanbul and the other cities in the country.
3.5. Cultural Landscape of Beyoğlu
Lukmoeng Swangpol, Carlos Reyes, Hector Rojas

3.5.1. Introduction
According to UNESCO (1992), cultural landscapes represent the “combined works of nature and of man” within a region. In those words, the evolution of any physical space is a representation of the culture and hence of the people. The accumulation of those interventions, through history, defines the landscape and gives it an important value for its inhabitants. It might involve mountains, rivers, sites, buildings, cities, countries, and its inhabitants.

Nowadays, the cultural landscape is considered part of the world cultural heritage (UNESCO, 1992).

The World Heritage Convention organized by UNESCO became the first international legal instrument to recognize and protect cultural elements included in the landscape. Currently there are 82 such elements included on the World Heritage list (UNESCO, 1992).

Even though the historical areas of Istanbul are not included on that list, they have been considered as a whole unit: a World Heritage Site (UNESCO, 1985). For the means of this research project, that recognition is the basis to reconsider, under a different criterion, what a cultural landscape is.

In the present section, the cultural landscape will be defined through the interaction of the community with the physical landscape. Furthermore, the
intention is to understand the social dynamics related with those areas, focusing the analysis on the most representative activities of Beyoğlu. Two questions are asked in this analysis: (1) what motivates residents and visitors to retain the landscape in their memories? And (2), what are the cultural generators of landscape?

It is generally accepted that cultural activities should be preserved as a treasure for the following generations. However, culture is modified through the dynamic relation between local traditions and the needs of the tourism. More precisely, the landscape is generally understood as physical, but the cultural landscape depends on the socio-economic interactions to remain an invaluable piece of heritage (Gratuit 2009).

3.5.2. The Cultural Landscape Generators in Beyoğlu

As mentioned above, the interaction between the place and the community shapes the cultural landscape in a determined region. In Beyoğlu, our case study, the generators of those interactions can be easily perceived by walking along İstiklal Street [31] or Taksim Square [29]. Religion, architecture, historical landmarks and tourist targets are the cultural integrators. Their potential is directly related to the amount of people interacting with these places on a daily basis. Furthermore, the development of activities in these places becomes part of the culture and adds more particular elements to the landscape. This section examines the district of Beyoğlu, looking for potential generators of the cultural interaction, focussing particularly on history, public space, education and tourism.

3.5.2.1. History

Beyoğlu’s history is visible on every street. The evolutionary process of construction, demolition and conservation of the walled city has created a singular scenario that can be described as a living picture of the Byzantine, the Ottoman, the New Republic and the Millennium eras of Istanbul. From the 13th century, when the Genoese received special authorisation of residence in Galata (Batur n.d.), the new settlements brought a new architecture, structures and towers to enhance protection. The Galata Tower [1], built in 1348 by the Genoese, is the most representative icon of the former fortified Galata. The 67 metre high tower was the tallest structure of Istanbul during the times of the Byzantine Empire (Freely 2000).

In 1453, Ottomans occupied Galata under the rule of Sultan Mehmet II and renamed the city from Constantinople to Istanbul (Çelik 1986). Istanbul became a diverse settlement with different cultural groups of Christians, Muslims and Jews from different parts of the Empire who revived economic and commercial activity in Istanbul. The number of embassies and foreign traders have grown considerably after the conquering of Constantinople (Çelik 1986; Batur 2004). However, Galata was completely developed within its walls while the surrounding land remained farmlands and orchards until the late 18th century. The vernacular timber structures became distinctive icons of the era.

During the 19th century, Galata expanded beyond the walls, and the masonry buildings coming from Western institutions added a new and attractive European look to the local landscape. It can be underlined that the modernisation era during the 18th and 19th centuries was Galata’s most important period of (Çelik 1986). The conception of well-organized street networks, public squares, streets facades and architectures as well as infrastructure and communication systems were driven as a political goal to change Istanbul to a modern European civilised city that could equal Paris or London in that time (Tugal 2008).
A definitive turning point in the local architecture was the arrival of luxurious houses to the main axis of Beyoğlu. This axis is known today as İstiklal Street [31], and it is one of the most popular boulevards of Beyoğlu. Through its streets, the landmarks illustrate the evolution of the district, preserving in their facades hundreds of years of identity mixes.

The district of Beyoğlu is a converging point of cultures, as it was in the past, and the stylistic contributions of these mixes are still preserved in İstiklal Street [31]. At the beginning of the northern segments of İstiklal Street is the Monument of the Republic [2], built in 1923 in the middle of Taksim Square [29]. This monument is certainly one of the most commemorative elements of the Turkish Republic’s foundation.

3.5.2.2. Public Spaces
According to Stéphane Tonnelat (2010), a successful public space is where accessibility and communication come together. The public space of the district is used to facilitate a common interaction based on economic activities, mobility, socio-cultural expressions, and recreation (Tonnelat 2010). Jane Jacobs (1961) claimed that the diversity in the public space is what makes it liveable for everyone. The connection between public space, subject and the city are for Isaac Joseph (1998) and Kevin Lynch (1960) what they called the “image of the city”. They name 5 spatial elements for the people to create this image: paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks. The aim of the public space is to foster the cultural integration of the city with its dwellers.

The categories for Beyoğlu’s public space are (1) religious, (2) civil, (3) tourist, and (4) semi-public. Their specific rules are the reasons to differentiate them from one another, and basically allow the users to freely become part of the public space under certain conditions. There are norms that must be respected. This is a way of constructing identity through the coexistence of the elements in the space and the people that use them. In Beyoğlu, this integration can be performed, for instance, in mosques, markets, cafes or on the street.

The mosques are the most common religious public spaces in Beyoğlu. One good example is Cihangir Mosque [7]. This religious place is normally open to everyone, Muslim or non-Muslim, local or foreigner. The religious space, due to its character of a sacred place, is never mixed with the other categories. Religion is part of the historical development and a culture of Beyoğlu. Even though the majority of the population adopted Islam as their religion, the inhabitants could be mainly categorized into two groups: The Muslims (98%) and the different, mostly Christian denominations (2%) (Agency, 2013). The strong religious beliefs have been highly important for the development of Istanbul and it has influenced the whole culture in many ways.

Courtyards and pointed domes are typical elements that generate cultural landscapes. The mosques are the sacred sites that contain these and other religious elements. According to the 2008 report from the Metropolitan Municipality of Istanbul, there are 3,028 mosques, 40 churches and 16 synagogues within the city (Municipality of Istanbul, 2008). Some of the most important religious buildings in Beyoğlu include the following: Cihangir Mosque [7]; S. Antonio di Padova, the largest Catholic church in Turkey [10]; and the Neve Shalom Synagogue, the largest synagogue in Turkey [5]. Catholic churches and synagogues impact the cultural landscape by accentuating the existence of other forms of religion and culture in the middle of an Islamic city.

From the architectural point of view, the symbols, the forms, the figures, the images, and the messages are mainly religious representations of Islamic architecture. This shapes the complex
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Social, cultural and ideological patterns through rituals, faith, gender relations, private and public behaviour (Rabbat 2012). Even thought Christian and European architecture has influenced the image of Istanbul through centuries of history, Islamic architecture had always prevailed. The difference with Western countries is how religion is embedded in the architecture and in the urban elements. According to Nasser Rabbat, Islamic Architecture as a formal expression of Islam is the constitutive component in which religion interacts with and modifies the effect of secular modernism and western cultures through time and space (Rabbat 2012).

A civil public space like Istiklal Street or Taksim Square [29-30] is integrated into the daily routine of residents; it can be a street, a sidewalk, a park or any other “open space” which is normally owned by the state (Tonnelat 2010). The touristic and semi-public spaces are normally administrated by the private sector. For instance, in a touristic space, like Pera Museum [13] the economic activities around the place address the temporary visitors, while in a semi-public space, such as the Çiçek Pasajı [15] or any shopping centre, the private space is offered to general public in exchange for economic interaction.

Public spaces can also be hybrids between public, private, touristic and civil spaces. One of the most important of these is Taksim Square [29], which is recognized to be the busiest and most active area of the city. It symbolizes the heart of modern Istanbul as well as political participation. Istiklal Street [30] is a 1.5km long pedestrianized street, which has become one of the most famous tourist hubs of Istanbul. The street follows the rails of the old tram between Tunnel (old funicular) and Taksim Square and connects with a variety of different places with particular uses.

3.5.2.3. Education

Istanbul is a hot spot for national and international young populations. There are 2,323,628 local scholars concentrated in 29 universities and 2,707 schools (Municipality of Istanbul 2008) who contribute to the cultural landscape.

In the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century, the area of Pera was the place for the European aristocracy. In its main street Rue de Pera (today’s Istiklal Street) the erection of buildings like embassies, schools, hotels, theaters, and shopping centers were a product of Turkish and European architects. Today some of the most traditional and prestigious universities and schools are still situated along Istiklal Street and its surroundings [17-28] (Batur 2004).

The education centres of Istanbul and particularly of the Beyoğlu Municipality have been influenced by the dominance of numerous French founded schools. By the end of the 19th century a large number of American and German high schools were founded too [17-28]. By the second half of the 20th century (after WWII), German and French cultural tendencies were common among the students, the American bias increased considerably after the implementation of the Marshall Plan (Yücel et al. 2011).

The students and institutions have made an important contribution to the significance of the place especially at an international level. Some of the graduates of these schools include; prime ministers, well-known writers, film directors, journalists, architects, and many other professionals. The former influences continue to make the municipality a magnet for the young population as well as markets like libraries, cafés, restaurants, cinemas, parks, pubs, and clubs. Education thus clearly modifies the cultural landscape.

3.5.2.4. Tourism

Tourists come to Beyoğlu because they find easy access to the traditional architecture, the landmarks, the history and all the comforts of a Euro-
The district of Beyoğlu is a great example of a cosmopolitan coexistence of different ethnic groups that mainly owe their existence to the permissive Ottoman Empire (Hackworth 2005). However, its strategic location on the European side of Istanbul and its proximity to the Historical Peninsula (former Constantinople, 272 B.C) always brought a constant flow of international visitors to the region.

Its geographic condition fostered the mixture of many cultures (Hackworth 2005). In the late 16th and early 17th century, the population of Istanbul consisted of 35 per cent Turkish, 39 per cent Greeks, 22 per cent Europeans and 4 per cent Armenians (Batur 2004). By the mid-19th century the vast majority of the population was Turkish, hence for the first time the Turkified neighbourhoods gave the impression of what is known today as a traditional Turkish city (Batur 2004).

By 1970, the tourism industry was decaying due to the lack of infrastructure, services, and the unstable political atmosphere that indirectly led to the crisis of the sector (Turkey Tourism Report 2002). Despite the introduction of a free market economy (late 1980s), a second crisis was faced in the 1990s due to earthquakes. However, in 2000, after a governmental reform of policies reinforcing the tourist sector and attracting foreign investment, 10.4 million tourists visited Istanbul (35.6 per cent more than previous year). By 2001 the sector registered revenues of about USD 8,090 million in 2001 (Turkey Tourism Report 2002).

According to these numbers, the cultural landscape of Istanbul is influenced very much by the tourist sector, especially in tourist areas like Beyoğlu. By importing new cultural behaviours, consumerist needs and local competitiveness, the overlapping activities between locals and visitors merge with the physical landscape and modify the original culture.

Beyoğlu physical context offers a wide variety of architecture, hotels, museums, public places, mosques, churches, markets, historical sites, and monuments [2]. Those tourist targets, which are part of the landscape, become a stimulus for the development of the local economy.

The hospitality market had been growing continuously for the last 50 years. According to the data released by the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, during 2012, Istanbul’s total rooms and beds capacity was 59,637 and 119,539 respectively and 89% of the room capacity was situated on the European side. Due to insufficient hotel capacity in the city, the investment on the Asian side has also increased, and now 30% of the new hotel projects are located there (Cin, 2013). The big share of the tourist industry promoted Turkey to 34th place in the list of the world’s largest economies in terms of domestic product. According to the latest Brookings report (2010), Istanbul is responsible for 27% of Turkey’s GDP (Global Metro Monitor n.d.).

3.5.3. Important Buildings and Sites of the Cultural Landscape

The following map of Beyoğlu shows several cultural places related to the text above in order to illustrate the area more precisely. The six categories of places include: historical landmarks, religious places, museums and culture, universities and schools, public open spaces, and international diplomatic offices.

**Historical Landmarks**
2. Monument of the Republic: A notable monument to commemorate the formation of the Turkish Republic, built in 1923.

**Religious**
4. Arap Camii: A mosque based upon a former Roman Catholic Church, converted into a mosque by the Ottomans between 1475 and 1478.
5. Sokollu Mehmet Paşa Cami: A mosque, built in 1571, many consider it to be the most beautiful of the mosques that the master architect Sinan built under the direction of Süleyman the Magnificent.
6. S. Antonio di Padova: The largest church of the Roman Catholic Church in Istanbul, the current building was built in 1912.
7. Cihangir Mosque: A mosque originally of a wooden structure designed by Sinan in the 16th century then demolished by a fire. The existing building was built in 1889-90. This Mosque’s garden has the best view of Bosphorus and Istanbul.
8. Nusretiye Mosque: An ornate mosque. While its architecture is influenced by Islamic elements, it retains a Baroque style, making it unique to the city. It was built in 1823-1826.
10. Maria Kilisesi: Established in 1584, the church is one of the most ancient Roman Catholic parishes of Istanbul.
11. Yeraltı Camii: This mosque is housed underground in a crypt belonging to what was once The Castle of Galata. The building was converted into a mosque in 1757.

Museums / Culture
12. Galata Mevlevihanesi: The Galata Mevlevihanesi houses a courtyard and displays Sufi musical instruments and the tombs of notable Ottoman Sufis. It was established in 1491.
13. Pera Museum: A private art museum and gallery, which was established in 2005 by the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation.
15. Çiçek Pasaji: Originally called the Cité de Péra, it is a famous historic passage. Opened in 1876, Çiçek Pasaji is a covered arcade with rows of historic cafes, winebars and restaurants.

Universities / Schools
18. Saint Benoît Fransız Lisesi: One of the oldest educational institutions in Turkey, and also one of Istanbul’s most well-established Latin-Catholic institutions. Founded in 1783.
19. Deutsch Schule Istanbul: One of the most prestigious high schools in Turkey. It was established in May 1868. Among the alumni are a number of very famous Turkish artists, scientists and politicians.
20. Santa Maria Draperis Church (university, church) (see no.10): A Roman Catholic Church in Istanbul, important for historical reasons. Established in 1584, the church is one of the most ancient Roman Catholic parishes of Istanbul.
21. Beyoğlu Anadolu Lisesi: One of the most prestigious and selective high schools in Turkey. The school is also one of the oldest foreign high schools in Turkey.
22. Italyan Lisesi: Although considered a private school under Turkish law, the Italyan Lisesi receives financial support and teachers from Italy.
23. Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts: A Turkish state university dedicated to the higher education of fine arts, established in 1882.
24. Zografeion Lyceum: One of the remaining open Greek schools in Istanbul. The school was founded in the late 19th century.
25. Galatasaray Lisesi: One of the most influential high schools of modern Turkey. Established in 1481, it is the oldest Turkish high school in the world and the second-oldest Turkish educational institution after Istanbul University, which was established in 1453.
26. İstanbul Atatürk Anadolu Lisesi: An Anatolian High School located and one of the most prominent high schools founded by the first Prime Minister İsmet İnönü in Turkey. The primary languages of instruction are Turkish and English. The secondary foreign languages are German and French.

27. İTÜ Makina Fakültesi: A compound of university buildings.


Public Open Spaces

29. Taksim Square: A major tourist and leisure district famed for its restaurants, shops, and hotels. It is considered the heart of modern Istanbul, with the central station of the Istanbul Metro network.

30. Taksim Gezi Parkı: The biggest remaining green public area in Istanbul’s downtown. It holds around 98,000 meter-squares of green space and 606 trees.

31. İstiklal Street: The most famous pedestrian street in Istanbul. It is 1.4km long and visited by nearly 3 million people in a single day.

International Diplomatic Offices

32. German Consulate
33. French Consulate
34. British Consulate
35. Norwegian Consulate
36. Italian Consulate
37. Russian Consulate
38. Swedish Consulate
5.3.5. Conclusions
Throughout history visitors along time have modified the cultural landscape in Beyoğlu. The former cultures that established their settlements among the “Turkish minority” transformed the society into a reproduction of imported models from Western cultures (Çelik 1986). Additionally, in the 20th century, after the foundation of the Republic, the country kept dividing its identity between the Asian and European cultures, which did not help to unify the country in a single framework.

According to Tekeli (1994), this lack of identity was a consequence of the high pressure from the planning organizations to achieve a certain level of development (comparable to European cities). Therefore the general process of planning in Istanbul has not been successfully implemented throughout the last 150 years. The current physical landscape resulted from this process, and currently reflects the overlapping trends acquired during the last century.

The cultural landscape of Beyoğlu relies highly on the area’s religious potential. In fact, the most common international image of the city is the mosque followed by its cultural variety. The international movement of visitors have addressed the religious public places as one of their favourite targets of tourism. The fact that Turkey is an Islamic country with a democratized government opened the door also for international investors and influenced young minds with ideas of an equal society. The city grows as fast as the power of its people; something noticeable in the manifestations of opinions around the public places like Taksim Square [28].

When understanding a culture becomes a matter of a “variety of cultures”, the places that are related to the ethnological and the social integration have the potential to create the cultural landscape. From religious or tourist places, to public, historical and educational institutions, there are enough reasons to believe that the most crowded places are a direct representation of the inhabitants’ interests and of what they would preserve in the future. For example, the current potential of the educational institutions is a reflection of the Istanbul goals for 2023. The comprehensive approach is to promote the city as the principal hub for academic knowledge and technology of Turkey. This economic activity is and will be, especially for the youth, one of the major motivations to participate in the economic development of Istanbul.

On the other hand, if understanding the culture is a matter of history and space, the shape and identity of the city and the society itself will depend on how the inhabitants appropriate the public space in concordance with their needs. The potential of public spaces depends directly on this appropriation and will perform an important role in the evolution of social and economic activities. The government has a big responsibility in the way they need to create, maintain and promote the correct use of the different religious, civil, touristic and semi-public places that made of Beyoğlu the great cultural hub it is today.

It is clear that the growth of Istanbul and also Galata and Pera overcame many critical variations in several cultural periods. The transmission of knowledge, experiences, skills as well as beliefs, is tangibly represented on the architecture, street networks, district planning, foods and religion. Nowadays, Beyoğlu is seen as a unique part of Istanbul through the landscape and its surroundings, but more important because of its singular and evolutionary culture.
3.6. Urban Infrastructure and Economic Landscape

Swasti Paramita, Andrés Pérez and Diego Duarte Guerrero

3.6.1. Introduction

After the Second World War, Istanbul became an important city for Turkey and its development process. Until the 1960s the economic force came from the rural areas and agricultural production, and less than 20% of the population lived in urban areas. Globalization was an external factor that reconfigured urban developments. Its many constraints and opportunities made Istanbul a global city.

A global city has to be central. The transformation process involves an interaction between politics, economic flows, and social experiences. The liberal economy became visible with the government of Prime Minister Turgut Özal (1983-1989) that increased the municipalities’ budgets, granting them more autonomy in terms of urban infrastructure and productive investment. The Justice and Development Party (AKP) became influential with neo-liberal policies that opened Turkey up to the rest of the world. As Mayor (1984-1989) Bedrettin Dalan started the spatial transformation of Istanbul by creating new boulevards, tearing down old manufacturing buildings, laying out new parks and waterfront spaces, and creating incentives for industry to move out of the city. During the 1990s, populism was interrupted, the imposition of neoliberalism was resisted and rights were given back to the immigrants. In 2002 the AKP came to power and integrated the economy into global networks of capital flows (Keyder 2008).

The physical development required foreign investment in new business sectors, luxury shopping, cultural centers, museums, commerce, restaurants, transportation, and housing; however, this urban regeneration stopped investing in urban infrastructure, metropolitan transport, water system, and sewage issues. Nowadays the new Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality is capable of investing in urban infrastructure, metropolitan facilities and mass transit systems through a Public and Private Partnership (PPP) model.

After the historical context and a brief understanding of urban infrastructure and the economic landscape, it is important to map the existing urban infrastructure and economic facilities in the Beyoğlu case study area: transportation, commerce and water system.

In terms of transportation it is important to mention that different activities are affected by this topic. Unfortunately, during the last decades transportation has become a big problem for the city of Istanbul. Istanbul with a population around of thirteen million has suffered the negative effects due to the lack of a correct provision in transportation, where private automobiles have been given priority over public transportation modes.

The city decided to implement diverse transportation master plans in 1985, 1987, 1997 and 2007 with the support of The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). Despite the efforts made, a great deal remains to be done. In the near future the city has to be ready to confront the real problem about transportation because the consequences of this would be disastrous for the citizens and their quality of life.

The implementation of the last transportation master plan has to be done with the cooperation of different stakeholders with the main objective to integrate all the transportation modes including waterway, buses, tramways, metro, taxis and bicycles to provide a balanced, healthy and affordable transportation system.

1 The Study on Integrated Urban Transportation Master Plan for Istanbul Metropolitan Area in The Republic of Turkey and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), August 2007
In the economic landscape, the greater metropolitan region of Istanbul accounts for more than 20% of the total population of Turkey. The city generates 50% of the tax revenues of the entire country. The most significant economic activity in Beyoğlu is manufacturing goods and providing services. Beyoğlu district has been the most progressive community in Istanbul, Taksim Square used to be the financial center of the Ottoman Empire and part of the banking district remains in Karakoy. Less than one quarter of the population in Beyoğlu is Muslim as the majority of the population was of European origin in 19th century (Dökmeci and Çiraci 1999). Afterwards, modernization started to slow down and Beyoğlu struggled with economic and social decline during the second half of the 20th century. Tenants live and work in the same area, creating a symbolic village in the most fashionable district of Istanbul.

A common economic activity comes from the commercial, services and manufacturing uses on the ground floor of the five storey buildings, with living units in the rest of the building. Real estate has played a gentrifying role to profit from these historical buildings and transform them into cosmopolitan boutique hotels, designer shops, trendy restaurants, as part of a global high-class economy. The local economy is linked to the proximity of all services; inhabitants find the best place to live because their jobs are close to their homes, as well as the urban facilities such as hospitals, schools, markets, transportation, and public spaces. The economic landscape is shaped by a village economy based on relationships, family bonds, trust and reputation. The mapping exercise shows the concentrated forces of manufacturing and living, with mixed uses for most of the tenants, focused areas of only commerce mainly due to the tourism activity, and creative neighborhoods. Further research reveals the issues of exclusion of a locally embedded economy, due to the private-investment forces of gentrification.
3.6.2 Arterial Roads in Istanbul

In Istanbul, the rule for organizing roads was based on the idea of providing more roads to increase the number of private vehicles. This has resulted in huge traffic congestion, isolation of neighborhoods in terms of accessibility, pollution and unhealthy quality of life. In Istanbul almost 90% of private and public transportation journeys are made by road vehicles, which necessitates an extensive road network (Gerçek and Demir 2008). The most important highways are the Trans European Motorway (TEM) and the roads connected to the Bosphorus Bridges. These axes are congested most of the time.

To link the Asian side with the European side, two highway bridges were built over the Bosphorus Strait. The first bridge (Bosphorus) was built between 1970 and 1973, and opened in October 1973; the second, the Fatih Sultan Mehmet Bridge, was built between 1986 and 1988. One aspect to take into account is the urban morphology, which creates problems in terms of accessibility to the center of the city and also has a low for receiving an important amount of traffic from the highways. According to the study of Urban Mobility by the French Development Agency and the Municipality of Istanbul, for 2007 the length of the road network was 26,853km. The road network includes 63% (16,800km) on the European side and 37% (10,053km) on the Asian side. This is an unequal distribution for a city where a big part of the population lives in the Asian side and works in the European side. Different types of roads coexist in Istanbul, such as: freeways, arterial roads and other roads.

3.6.3. Public Transportation in Istanbul

In general terms Istanbul has different modes of public transportation, the main characteristic of which is an open-ended linear system that links different points around the city. It is relevant to explain the different amount of public transportation alternatives on the European side, where there are more efficient infrastructures than on the Asian side, where the access to public transportation is limited, as we can observe in Figure 3.6.3.

One of the issues is the lack of decisions made to react to the enormous growth of urbanization and the insufficient transportation infrastructure to meet the needs of the population to move from their dwellings to their work or school, or to access financial, commercial or recreational services. The national government has shown an interest in improving the quality of transportation for all the cities in Turkey, in the case of Istanbul there was the intention to integrate the different buses, ferries and rails into a unique mass transportation network. This is the length of different transportation modes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>39.0km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>19.6km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramway</td>
<td>33.8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgic Tramway</td>
<td>4.5km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel</td>
<td>0.6km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funicular</td>
<td>0.6km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>72.0km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170.1km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Prof. Dr. Haluk Gerçek, interviewed 19th April 2013)

Unfortunately this public transportation network is not sufficient for a city like Istanbul, where private vehicles are increasing and carrying an unsustainable role, As Haluk Gerçek states, “traffic congestion is diminishing the quality of life in Istanbul, with almost two million automobiles choking its roads”.2
According to Gerçek (2013) “TomTom’s 2012 Congestion Index covered 58 European cities and showed Istanbul to be the most congested city of the lot. Average journey times are 57% longer than when traffic in the city is flowing freely, and 84% longer during the morning rush hour. Being based on real-time travel data captured by vehicles”.

In order for the public transportation network to function, it is necessary to link the core of the city with the remote areas, but it is also important to limit the growth of the city and create housing infrastructure close to the main activities. The case of Istanbul is very interesting to study in terms of the different visions of the authorities and academia (urban planners, transportation planners, sociologist, historians, engineers and others experts involved in city issues). The authorities intend to build a third bridge over the Bosphorus Strait, as a part of the solution to improve the conditions of the existing road network and reduce traffic congestion, but according to the experts “This argument ignores a crucial factor in transport planning – the ‘induced traffic’ that results from changes in land-use and activity patterns following road construction. Thus, construction justified as a remedy for congestion only creates congestion in its own right” (Gerçek 2013).

Establishing an agreement in terms of support to resolve the traffic issues seems one of the best possibilities due to the impact in terms of quality of life for the commuters and also environmental aspects such as carbon emissions, noise, land management, etc.

To have a better understanding of the public transportation network in Istanbul, it is important to explain each metro line, light rail, modern tram, funicular and suburban rail in the metropolitan area of Istanbul.

---

2 Prof. Dr. Haluk Gerçek, consulted by the transportation team of the Urban Management Program.
Officially classified as a ‘tramway’ (T4), it uses the same rolling stock as Metro M1. A 2.3km extension was added in 2009, providing transfer to line M1 and the tramway.

There are currently two suburban rail lines, one on the European side (Sirkeci - Halkalı, 27.5km, every 20 min), and one on the Asian side (Haydarpaşa - Gebze, 44km, every 20 min), which will be linked by the Marmaray tunnel in 2013.

Figure 3.6.5: Map of Marmaray Project. 
The implementation of a plan to introduce other modes of transportation (walkability and cycling) could contribute to improving the commuting process and support the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) between the Asian side and the European side. In addition, creating an eco-friendly city in terms of transportation could bring more benefits for the population.

### 1.6.3 Public Transportation in Beyoğlu

In general terms there is a good transportation service, with different modes that connect the district of Beyoğlu with the city.

The following lines are present in the district:

- The M2 line was finished in 2000. All stations of this line have escalators and facilities for disabled people. The metro was built by the cut-and-cover method to withstand earthquakes of up to magnitude 9. The platform length is 180 m. Total length of the metro line in 2011 was 20km with 13 stations (www.urbanrail.com). The M2 line passes through the district of Beyoğlu.

- Nostalgic Tramway or T5 between Taksim and Tünel is the heritage tram line (1.5km) from Taksim Square until Tünel. The modern tramway line T1 (18.2km) was opened in 1992 between Sirkeci and Topkapı and subsequently extended from both ends. The modern funicular subway opened in June 2006.

### 3.6.4. Pedestrians in Beyoğlu

Istiklal is a unique pedestrian street in Beyoğlu. This axis represents part of the history with the Nostalgic Tramway or T5 between Taksim and Tünel (Tunnel) as a structural element in terms of transportation and also to reinforce the strong vocation of this pedestrian street. This street is a vital area for commercial activities; at the same time it is the central point of interaction between the old city and modern Istanbul.
One of the great values of Istiklal Street is the social diversity and the architectural landscape where locals and visitors find commercial services and governmental functions. It is also the place to discover the local history by the interaction with people. Istiklal Street has a great value as a pedestrian promenade with different sequences of pedestrian paths from one historic place (Taksim Square) to Tunnel. Pedestrian connections to the port and the north are not easy to find, and the topography is one of the aspects that limits the accessibility in some points of Beyoğlu.

### 3.6.5 Green Spaces

The most representative space in Beyoğlu is Maçka Park in the north of the district. This park is one of the most important green spaces, formerly in the grounds of Dolmabahçe Palace. In the rest of the district there are only a few green spaces, thus it is relevant to mention some green spaces in Taksim Square. The high density that has covered the district in brick and concrete means that the lack of great green spaces is huge.

Unfortunately, the lack of policies to create new green spaces is one of the topics that are not included in the master plans for the future of the city. In the Beyoğlu area there are no spaces of interaction to enjoy nature, even in the streets the absence of trees is a predominant condition.

### 3.6.6 Commercial area

**Main Street of Beyoğlu**

Istiklal Street (Independence Street), arguably Istanbul’s most famous street, is located in the city’s Beyoğlu district on the European side. Formerly called Cadde-i Kebir (Grand Avenue) or the Grand Rue de Pera, its name was changed following the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Literally millions of people visit this wide and elegant pedestrianized boulevard each day to enjoy the multitude of shops, cafes, bars, art galleries, restaurants, cinemas, churches, synagogues, mosques and embassies. In 19th-century Pera (Beyoğlu), a traditional tram trundled along the Grande Rue de Pera (Istiklal Street) for 1.64km (1 mile) connecting Taksim Square with Galatasaray and Tünel Square.

---

Figure 3.6.9: Commercial Aras in Beyoğlu, Exclusively Limited to Services
Source: Plan Made by Andrés Pérez Based on: http://archoptiany.blogspot.de/2011/10/beyoglu-district.html

Figure 3.6.10: Shopping Malls and bazaar Markets in Beyoğlu District.
Source: Plan Made by Andrés Pérez based on Google Maps
Tourism, which is concentrated in the Old City and Beyoğlu, is an important economic driving force for the case study area of Beyoğlu. Creativity and Cultural Heritage Tourism is the new concept that is changing all major global cities. The tangible historic cultural heritage with the buildings and the intangible heritage with the traditions and customs make Beyoğlu a creative cluster for innovation. The new creative force is offering a new experience for this existing local economy. Using the local manufacturing of goods (handcrafts) as a historical background to represent the soul of the city, this could be the basis to find different mechanisms of sustainable economy. However the consequences could be gentrification, which would affect the older residents who are able to keep pace with the change (Durmaz et al. 2009).

Manufacturing areas
The building functions in the case study area are concentrated as small-scale manufacturing of goods, storage and trade-storage. Most of the commercial functions have their manufacturing functions in the interior parts of the area or in basement floors. This activity has been established for many years giving the place a social character. The ground floor of the buildings are used as commercial, small size functions of the following kinds of manufacturing: lighting equipment producers, household appliances producers, furniture makers, clothing makers, jewellery-makers, the wholesale of construction materials and of car parts, etc. Another issue identified for further analysis is that “these are all set to move (or, rather, be moved) out of the area. In their place will be new up-market leisure and consumption spaces” (Aksoy and Robins 2011, p.13).

As a consequence of globalization there is an economic disintegration in Beyoğlu as well as the greater central area of Istanbul. As mentioned above, the mix used of manufacturing and residence has resulted in several complete workshop buildings without the right working conditions.
and safety regulations. The conflict is between the commercial and trade uses for tourism activities. Further analysis will concentrate on how the tourist investments are gradually pushing the local commerce out of the neighbourhood (Lobo and Evren 2006).

**Mixed-use Revitalization Areas**

The land use changed between 1999 and 2005. Ground and upper floors of residences have been used to open restaurants, bars or galleries. The rest of the 4 storeys are kept as living units. Most of the residents that take the spaces and renovate them belong to middle and high income groups with a different lifestyle that is reflected in the buildings, most of which were decaying. But the socio-economic structure and its characteristics will finally set the market activities, tendencies, and actors in this economic landscape.

The revitalization process for some neighbourhoods (Gümüşsuyu and Cihangir) located in the northeast area in the map, became attractive for academics and artists that wanted to preserve the historical value with a mixed residential and commercial use. As Evren and Dökmeci (2005, p.152) put it:

More than a half of the buildings in the area are in average conditions. The buildings in bad condition generally have historical value. Approximately one third of the housing units have historical importance and have been designated as architectural heritage sites. 17% of the units are older than 100 years. The age of housing units is generally between 20-60 years.
The revitalization process has caused social, economic, and spatial transformations in Beyoğlu as a consequence.

### 3.6.7 Educational Facilities

The educational facilities have been played an important role for the case study area of Beyoğlu, because of the European influence since the beginning of migration from the West. The most important traditional schools and universities are located in the area. The revitalization process, which has seen an increase in a new type of high-class well-educated inhabitant, is creating difficulties for the middle-income working class to reach the education infrastructure. Nowadays, the working middle class struggles to survive with the gentrification process and the rent issues. The youth population follows the cultural tradition of manufacturing or services without the equal access to education. However, the Beyoğlu municipality is promoting vocational training to incorporate the cultural heritage into the skills learning process. In the process of globalization lower middle-income families are the most excluded from private education infrastructure and they are looking for new ways to take their children into the school (community based organizations) due to the expensive facilities for them to get in. The new wave of privatized education will cause a huge confrontation within society, because of the mixture of classes and the fear of contact (Esen 2009).

### 3.6.8. Water Supply and Sanitation

About 97% of the water supply (drinking water) in Istanbul comes from surface water collected from reservoirs. The Ömerli-Darlık on the Asian side supplies 51% of water needed and the Terkos-Alibeyköy system on the European side provides 31%. Those are the most important sources, and both systems consist of dams, reservoirs, water treatment plants and pipelines. The Beyoğlu area is supplied from the Terkos Lake water source. In 1993/94, Turkey faced severe water quality problems, where the water from the Elmalı reservoir contained a high rate of ammonium, and this problem caused a shortage in water supply.

The public facility responsible for water supply and sanitation, ISKI (İstanbul Su ve Kanalizasyon İdaresi), was created in 1981 and built new reservoirs located outside the city to solve the severe water problem. Seven water treatment plants located in the outskirts of Istanbul ensure the quality of the water. The waste water system in Istanbul consist of sewers, 17 pumping stations, 7 pre-treatment plants and 5 biological waste-

Figure 3.6.14: Map of Water Sources (Reservoirs) and Water Treatment Locations in Istanbul
Source: Made by Swasti Paramita
water treatment plants, to ensure the wastewater is treated before being discharged into the Bosphorus where the flow moves towards the Black Sea in the north.

3.6.9. Waste Management
Waste collection is the responsibility of İstaç A.Ş (İstanbul Çevre Yönetimi San ve Tic AŞ), an Istanbul Municipal affiliation that collects municipal solid waste, medical waste, recycling of packaging waste, and also operates the sanitary landfill as the final destination of waste.

3.6.10. Food Supply
To some extent Istanbul’s agriculture is within the metropolitan area itself, as it has a wide range of agriculture, from household gardens to commercial greenhouses. Some citizens of Istanbul also have their own agriculture sites in their backyards. In commercial terms, Istanbul depends on its surroundings and the South Mediterranean region for food supply. Istanbul is also known for bostans, the traditional market gardens which are set up irregularly inside the city, as one source of food supply. They usually consists of skillful gardeners in families and close relatives. Today, only a few bostans remain due to the high urbanization rate. Every bostans was known to specialize in different crops.

Because of the high price of the land, and the rapid urbanization, almost every supermarket in the Beyoğlu district is a small scale supermarket.

Figure 3.6.15: Map of Transfer Station and Sanitary Landfill in Istanbul. Solid waste collected by truck is sent to 6 transfer stations. Source: Swasti Paramita
3.6.11. Conclusion

Istanbul as a global city has a good infrastructure system, which can be considered as comprehensive and well managed. But considering the growth of the city in social as well as in economic terms, some aspects require development. In the public services area, which includes public transportation and green spaces, there is a problem with traffic congestion, which is caused not only by the lack of the public transportation availability, but also because of the continued prevalence of private cars.

In economic terms, Istanbul has a promising future that is supported by many small-scale economic activities by the inhabitants, and it also receives a major number of tourists from all over the world. Its designation as the European Capital of Culture in 2010 and the related type of economic development somehow is the key attraction for tourists, besides the physical and non-physical culture that is being preserved. In order to be able to adapt to the future development, many experts argue that Istanbul is lacking policies in some aspects.

Figure 3.6.16: Supermarkets’ Location within Beyoğlu.
Source: Plan Made by Swasti Paramita
1. Planning Process and Three Cases: Kohalpur, Panchkhal and Lekhnath

2.3.1 Interviews
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4 Public Space in Taksim Square
Alejandro Martín Rodríguez; Ana Luisa de Moraes Azenha; Daniel Wagner; Dylan Roman; Guilherme Henrique Braga Klaussner

Taksim, since the events of the last days of May 2013, is the epicentre of a nation that insists on defying the prevailing economic and political forces. In the eyes of many, such events seem like the actions of people who suddenly regained consciousness, not considering that the mass action is an evident zenith of the frustration that could no longer be held and therefore needed to challenge the increasingly authoritarian and uncompromising tendencies of the government. Although the demonstrations have raged in every corner of Anatolia, Taksim, with its historical and political significance, fulfils the role of the matriarchal soul and its trees spread the seeds of a growing dissatisfaction.

This research, conducted in the moments that preceded the protests reported on every continent, reveals the core of an atmosphere, the culmination of which was definitely not a surprise, although the tragic aspects should have been avoided. It is not a function of our debate therefore to describe or even report the events themselves, but to understand the context in which they are presented as inevitable.

4.1. Introduction: Taksim in Istanbul

Taksim Square represents one of the most significant public spaces in the whole of Turkey. It is considered more than a meeting point or a transport hub. We could say it is a place that reflects political intentions and it is the materialization of a complexity of multifaceted aspects. Therefore, understanding Taksim is entering in an atmosphere where disciplines, experiences, identities, cultural approaches, political intentions are mixed to shape a particular public place. The objective of this chapter is to understand this complexity, going through different aspects that are crucial to recognize the iconic character of the place and its political relevance.

The first sections “Historical evolution: Istanbul in Taksim” and “The Project” show Taksim as a dynamic place in terms of aesthetic changes and cultural impositions, before finalizing this conceptual phase in the new project for Taksim Square. These topics are centred on the description of the phenomena without entering a representative debate. In the following sections the main hypothesis and the methodology are defined. After constructing the common knowledge about the research objective and the variety of forms that would take us to elucidate the main question, the chapter enters in the theoretical framework. The theoretical anchors are defined in connection to the main topics surrounding the debate: “public space” and “identity”. Finally in the section “Understanding Taksim’s Identity” and “Physical and social transformations in Taksim: the game of politics and public space” the main findings are described in a heterodox format, empowering our ideas based on recognized urban intellectuals and with contributions from Turkish specialists to reach original conclusions that exceed the usual one-dimensional debates present nowadays in the media.

Before entering into the main content of the chapter, it is important to refresh some concepts in terms of location and spatial distribution. Taksim is situated in the European side of Istanbul exactly on the other side of the Historical Peninsula crossing the Golden Horn. It is located in Beyoğlu district. In some cases in the chapter the area of Beyoğlu is referred to as Perá, as this was its historical name. In spatial terms Taksim is a heterogenic unit. This means that is shaped by many spaces but is one square. Taksim includes the Gezi Park, the site of The Monument of The Republic and its surroundings, the Old Water Reservoir and the Transportation Hub. But as we will demonstrate, Taksim represents more than that.
Figure 4.1: Location of Taksim Square
Source: Authors based on Google Map

Dimensions of Urban Re-development: The Case of Beyoğlu, Istanbul
4.2. Historical evolution: Istanbul in Taksim

The plateau that sustains the current area where Taksim Square lies was the stage of repetitions and superpositions of cultures produced by distinct social groups. Throughout history, this process of creating space can be observed in notable ruptures or continuities through a series of meanings whereby a particular place/space becomes evocative in symbolic, political and social terms for individuals or for social groups.

One way to understand the process of historical evolution is to observe the various appropriations performed when producing space by different players and how they sought to instate their symbols at the expense of previous appropriations.

4.2.1. The Ottoman Period

The topography of Beyoğlu was never suitable for a rapid expansion of the urban areas. The first dense settlements were squeezed along the narrow coastal strip constrained by steep escarpments intersected by a set of carved valleys. The current position of Taksim, 100 meters above the waters of the Bosphorus Strait, is the culminating point of a system of crest lines that mostly follow the pattern of the fault where the strait is embedded. The narrow plateau, which today serves millions of passersby on a daily basis, was appropriated by man for the first time even before the Ottoman period, serving as a graveyard for different groups. Until the 16th century, the whole area of Péra was an ancient rural settlement where, eventually, graveyards started to appear on the eastern and northern stretches. There were Armenian Gregorian, Armenian Catholic, Latin Catholic, Protestant and Greek Orthodox cemeteries as well as a Muslim cemetery on the slopes of Ayaspaşa (Polvan and Aydin Yönet 2010, Laqueur 1993).

From the 17th century the place gradually changed its use as the features of the location started being valorised. The steep slopes culminating in a smooth plateau with its superb position overlooking the Bosphorus Strait became unrestricted promenade grounds where people strolled along the paths separating graves of Muslims and Christian sects. According to Polvan and Aydin Yönet (2010, p.2):

graveyards in the East, unlike the Western tradition, are integral parts of daily lives. This peculiar approach, coupled with the arboreous green graveyards’ beautiful view and their proximity to the narrow streets of Péra, facilitated the area’s transformation into a public strolling place.

It was only from the 18th century that the site received structural intervention with the construction of a water reservoir, using the privileged morphology to perform the services of water distribution. The main water lines from the north forests of Istanbul were collected and branched off to settlements hitherto limited at the foot of the cliffs and at the convergence of the valleys. Taksim takes its name from the stone reservoir and its function, which means division and distribution. With the conjunction of other crest lines Taksim was seen as a strategic point for the defence of the main administrative centre of the Ottoman Empire, the Dolmabahçe Palace. The palace, located at the bottom of a glacis landform was provided with a natural stronghold fortified by a complex of mili-
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**Figure 4.2:**
Inner façade of Topçu Kışlası (Artillery Barracks), early 20th century.
tary buildings erected along the crest lines. Taksim hosted the most stately of these military buildings in size, function and architectural richness. The building consisted of an artillery barrack from the middle of the 19th century, built after partial removal of the graveyards.

Another important feature of Beyoğlu’s early days that is also reflected in Taksim’s identity is its role in the gathering of multiple cultures. As the historical peninsula on the opposite shore of the Golden Horn was a more suitable place for settlements because of its softened geomorphology, the steep hills of Beyoğlu were used as a fortification area relegating the plains on its foothills to commercial and trading functions. The area evolved and specialized in foreign trades making the Beyoğlu region “the trampoline that enable the city to trade with the outside world.”

The city’s population in 19th century was 300,000. Less than one hundred years later the population reached one million inhabitants. The city began to force an urbanization process on the areas of steep slopes that prevented urban sprawl, thus generating increased density of settlements in Galata and Karakoy.

The most feasible solution was to technically overcome the topographical barrier of Péra, making use of the available flatlands along the crest line from Tünel to Taksim. In the last quarter of the 19th century a French engineer had the idea of creating a funicular system between Galata and the hilltop. “This is the beginning a long process of development and with Istiklal as the dividing line of the urban fabric.”

Istiklal Street, by that time known as Grand Rue de Péra, strictly follows the watershed between Galata and Taksim and is the guiding axis of the urbanization process of the Beyoğlu segment. Here were three important communities that made Beyoğlu cosmopolitan: Jews, concentrated in Galata, Greeks, occupying the slopes immediately adjacent to the plateau and Armenians, who occupied Taksim’s vicinities.

By the end of the First World War Taksim was the limit of the urban area. The site itself was about to suffer a great transformation with the end of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Republic, representing a brand new vision for the recently created nation and more specifically to the shape of cities.

4.2.2. The First Aesthetisation: Prost’s Plans

“Histories of space are built on moments of fracture after which neither the space nor its symbolic meaning will ever be the same” (Baykan and Hatuka 2010, p.56)

The idea of transforming Istanbul based on a westernized urban fabric model was not new. Many aspirations and a few small plans were conducted during the Sultan Selim III, Tanzimat and Topuzlu periods of the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, the formation of a culture to transform Istanbul into a ‘civilized, beautiful city’ was passed to the future generations (Yıldırım 2012) and made possible with a great rupture: the arrival of the new Republic.

The foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the dismantling of the Ottoman Empire and the subsequent proclamation of Ankara as the new capital deprived Istanbul of its important status as imperial capital. Istanbul was experiencing a physical, economic and symbolic decay. The population of the city decreased from 1.2 millions in 1900 to 700,000 in 1925. The former provinces controlled by Istanbul were now independent states. Istanbul, once at the spotlight of an important empire was demoted to the role of a lighthouse at the corner
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of the Turkish domain. This scenery served as a fertile terrain to promote a breakthrough in the shape of the city and Istanbul, which even at this moment of decay was still representative, due to its symbolic relation to the West.

In 1926 Taksim was the first square with the first monument to be planned and designed in the new republic. Street names in Beyoğlu changed to suit new thoughts, The Grand Rue de Péra became İstiklal Caddesi i.e. ‘Independence Street’, the former ‘Barracks Street’ became Cumhuriyet Caddesi, the ‘Avenue of the Republic’ (Baykan and Hatuka 2010).

By the year 1933, an invited competition was organized, "not only to shape a civilized urban environment and to generate a modern visage of the city, but also symbolically to transform the radical Muslim Ottoman realm into a secular national one" (Yıldırım 2012, p.2; Bozdoğan 1994). Although never implemented, this attempt explicitly showed the will towards the West, as the invited planners were carrying the ideological baggage from Germany and France of the 1930s.

By the time Prost came to head the planning office, Istanbul was a city with a decreasing economy and population. Paradoxically, however, it was geographically extending, which, in turn, caused difficulties in the urban circulation system (Bilsel 2004). Many planning projects were implemented at different scales - made possible by changing the urban law. Prost tried to find consistent solutions to a variety of problems like constructing a modern infrastructure, providing sanitary conditions, easing transportation and offering better living conditions for women, all mottos in accordance with the modernization reforms of Atatürk, the most emblematic leader for the creation of the new republic.

What was meant by the modernization of the cities was also the arrangement of settlement areas conducive to modern life-styles and hygiene, and the creation of open public spaces that would contribute to the flourishing of a civic public realm. (Bilsel 2004, p.4).

Although Prost attempted to preserve most of the fabric conditioned by the unique topography, and some of the historical monuments of the city, those were carefully selected, preserving the linkage with secularization at the expense of the Ottoman aesthetic. He displayed almost a destructive attitude towards the old narrow city fabric, and gave priority to transforming the historic city into a modern one. He states in his letter to Hautecoeur: “I force myself to preserve the most characteristic of the Roman and Byzantine civilizations” (Prost, 1943, cited in: Yıldırım 2012, p.4).

Taksim, or by that time The Square of the Republic, features as a classic example of Prost’s comprehension of preservation. He preserved just the Independence Monument and the circular square around it, opening and widening their surroundings by destroying the historic urban fabric. This approach was fortified by the symbolic function of the Republic Day celebration site that
Taksim Square inherited, given the impossibility of executing it in similar areas on the historical peninsula. This is a relevant feature which ended up altering the design of the square not incorporated in the initial planning. The square gained a terrace for spectators to accommodate large crowds (Yıldırım 2012).

Prost foresaw the prominence of Taksim as a central place, even though the square, until that moment, marked the edge of the urban sprawl. His 1939 Master Plan was designed with the conception of, among other notions, connecting the dispersed city. Having Taksim as a hub, the urban circulation network was organized around a spine that crossed the city from north to south connecting the newly developing settlement areas on the north, to the old city (Bilsel 2004).

The most important intervention in Taksim was the demolition of the military barracks in order to cede place to İnönü Esplanade, now Gezi Park. Despite the buildings have lost their military function at the end of the First World War, and being in a state of abandonment since the establishment of the republic, this architectural ensemble still represented the aesthetics of the Ottoman period.

Before this intervention, the dismantling of the military functions of the barracks provided the first opportunity for the re-adoption of Taksim as a public space for the masses. Since 1921 the area had served as Istanbul’s first football stadium, hosting matches between the local teams like Galatasaray, Fenerbahçe and Besiktas. During the stadium years, other sports, such as athletics, boxing and wrestling were also performed and the building prepared the ground for the flux of crowds (Yıldırım 2012).

In a wider perspective, Prost used the former glacis as free land, establishing a complex interconnection of green corridors with Taksim at the peak, traversing the ridges and scarps until reaching the lower plains in Dolmabahçe.

Prost saw in Taksim’s location, at the top of a 100-meter plateau, the potential to explore one of the most beautiful vistas of Istanbul due to the southward orientation view, something that was scarce even for a city blessed with hilltops. This suggested not only a notable place for a promenade, but also for the houses of the bourgeoisie around the new city shape. “If you have a house constructed looking south it is well warmed in the winter time because the sun runs low and it is cool in the summer time because the sun doesn’t come to your entrance.”

“The design of the original park was a landmark for a period, for that kind of urban landscape utopia”. It was through parks and promenades, so-called espaces libres, that Prost helped the Republic forge secularization and citizenship, making urbanism and public space the showcase of modernity.

4.2.3. The Appropriations of Taksim: From the Liberal Ara to the Social Movements and Informality
4.2.3.1. The Economic Appropriation: Populist Modernity
1950 marked the beginning of the post-WWII era: the multi-party regime, the liberalization of the economy, Marshall-aid and new highways
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Istanbul was redefined as symbolic capital boosted by industrialization, rapid urban growth, and radical social change with the inflow of rural immigrants from Anatolia and the outflow of non-Muslim Istanbulites to European countries. In this period the population rose from 1,150,000 to 1,880,000 (Akpınar 2010).

During this phase the influence on the production of space came from the liberalization of the economy in a process that can be understood as Americanization. Long boulevards were opened in historic areas, appropriating space for the motor traffic.

Taksim was in the maelstrom of this process of high modernist urbanism that was appropriating and producing new space. The fast rising buildings around Taksim Square and its focal function of connecting the old and the new settlements of the city together with the construction of cultural buildings, especially the Opera, which took 15 years (1946-69) to be constructed and now is the Atatürk Cultural Centre, contributed to the place’s new characteristics. (Polvan and Aydin Yönet 2010).

The construction of the Hilton Hotel was one of these emblematic interventions. The construction physically appropriated part of the square “making the park that was at the entrance of the hill to lose its importance. It became an appendice”. Besides the physical appropriation, this building represented a new era of Western influence in the ruling political ideology, the dictates of the liberal world of which Turkey had become part. Taksim was at the core of this wave, proof of which was manifested in the internationalist style of architecture of Turkey’s first international five-star hotel.

4.2.3.1. The Social Appropriation: Sprawl and Informality
Since before the republic, Beyoğlu preserved and represented Istanbul’s cosmopolitan spirit and heterogeneity. Along İstiklal Street and around Taksim Square lived Jews, Armenians and Greeks. It was a colourful neighbourhood with western tastes, and embassies and consulates unsurprisingly settled in the vicinity.

However, what seemed like an endless and continuous climbing toward a space determined by economic elites had its momentum shaken in the mid-1950s. Events in September of 1955 marked the straining of Turkish-Greek relations over the Cyprus dispute. These episodes drove many Greeks to leave Istanbul (Polvan and Aydin Yönet 2010). In parallel to these events the country was dealing with an economic crisis in the 1960s. “Some of the residents of the region had also to leave for economical difficulties hindering the upkeep of their houses. The rich shops, restaurants, cafes, theatres closed up and the splendour was no more” (Polvan and Aydin Yönet 2010, p.5).

The subtle depreciation of property and consequent abandonment of houses and apartments paved the way for migrants from the countryside who occupied the vacuum left by the affluent population. The new inhabitants “brought with them their ways of living, their habits, their memories all of which amalgamated with the remnant urban manners to result in a new sub-culture” (Ibid.). Those were the new Taksim-goers who made the square their point for meeting, entertainment, cultural and political expression, or just passing by. The inability, or unwillingness, of the urban economy to absorb this contingent of job-seekers led to the strengthening of an atmosphere of informality, not only for the daily livelihood of these people, but also in the feasible housing conditions that were offered.

This is a dual stress pendulum between two flows and two circuits of the economy that has endured until this day. The flows of capital as opposed to the flows of people. And the circuits of the superior economy, luxury hotels, mass tourism and finan-
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cial capital in duality with the lower circuit of the economy, the informal and micro business income. Since the 1980s the will to recapture the glamour of the 1950s gained momentum with investments in Beyoğlu region that generated speculation, rent increase and finally a gradual abandonment of the low-income dwellers from historical Péra. Nonetheless the transformation is not complete and some inhabitants insist on defying the will and power of progress.

4.2.3.3. The Political Appropriation: A Place of Demonstrations

“Change life! Change Society! These ideas lose completely their meaning without producing an appropriate space” (Henri Lefebvre 1991, p.59).

According to the concept of urban design, when thinking about the western agglomerations, the arrangement of what is commonly called a square historically propitiates a high degree of control of the inner space, as the delimited area was encircled by facades. This concept differs from the direct translation into Turkish: meydan.9

Meydan evades the rigidity and the intentionality of the plaza or square’s structural form, and is more correlated to the notion of “a junction of axes which brings together structures and spaces that were not design intentionally to define one integrated spatial entity” (Baykan and Hatuka 2010, p.51).

It is important to observe this distinction to understand this step in the history of Taksim—not as a fixed concrete form, but one open to different forms of representation not necessarily attached to the will of political power or the imposed design. In this sense, although indoctrinated through the historical process, Taksim subversively is a meydan rather than a square.

As the city with the largest population and number of social organizations, Istanbul was inevitably the stage for demonstrations of all kinds, which, during the 1970s, were frequent, large and well organized. New roads and transport facilities made Taksim accessible as a focal stage where people would converge. “Taksim Square, with its expanding borders, became the venue for social events, protesting crowds and demonstrations as well as for official ceremonies and parades” (Polvan and Aydin Yönet 2010, p.5).

Celebrated almost all over the world, the International Labor Day on May 1st has a strong relationship with the cycles of appropriation, construction of public space and power disputes in Taksim Square, always attracting hundreds of thousands of nationwide participants, from unionists, to professionals associations along with students, teachers, professors and artists in a very heterogeneous crowd.

The year of 1977 was not different except for the tragic result. The crowd, estimated at 400,000 people, initially scattered in different activities through Istanbul in order to promote a citywide demonstration that had Taksim as the final meeting point. In the Square, a stage with microphones, flags and posters had been set up, located at the entrance to the park, thus creating a focal point in the vast space (Baykan and Hatuka 2010). A shot ended with the minute of silence after the speech of President Kemal Turkler and initiated a battle. Instantly the police came from many directions:

The bombs and the continuous sirens of the armoured vehicles created a mass panic with the result of several people being trampled by the crowd and others falling under police vehicles. There were 34 deaths and an uncounted number of injured (Baykan and Hatuka 2010, p.63).

This event set in a punctual time/space embodies the perfect oxymoron of the eternal moment, changing the face of Taksim forever, no matter if all
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visible traces of the episode have long since been eradicated.

The very next year the crowd turned out in greater numbers, and again in 1979, however this time a massive May Day demonstration was prevented by a curfew imposed on the city and the stationing of a regiment of soldiers in the Square (Baykan and Hatuka, 2010). The first of May of 1977 served as an important watershed, once and for all establishing a dual atmosphere of social forces in the clash of the appropriation of the public space in Taksim Square. Although it was something that had already existed, from now on it was engraved in the collective memory.

4.2.4. The Second Aesthetisation

“Knowledge holds in front of itself the historical city already modified, to cut it up and put it together again in fragments. As social text, this historical city no longer has a set of prescriptions, of use of time linked to symbols ad to styles” (Lefebvre 1977, p.148).

Taksim Square is now under a second important period of anesthetisation. At the moment that this research was undertaken, major construction sites could be seen in the place, turning the square, during the construction, into a very unpleasant place to walk through. For the first time Prost’s plans were being completely altered. A more detailed explanation of the project will come in the next chapter, but changing the European influenced aesthetics of the square 70 years after it was completed has a strong impact and has to have a reason.

The main object to be introduced to the area will be the (re)construction of the old Ottoman barracks demolished by Prost. In a time where global influence is being rapidly given and received, Istanbul authorities seems to be trying to bring back a piece of Turkish history and culture through this action. Rebuilding an old Ottoman barracks on top of a more secular orientated park, has the clear intention of changing the aesthetic configuration of the square by opposition. In this particular point, Lefebvre argues that any attempt to bring back something from the past of a historical city is an action embodied in the present and reflects the present society’s modus operandi. People do not use the reconstructed space as it was used before, a historically reinvented structure cannot be seen by society as it was before by the simple fact that the times and values have changed. So bringing back an old and long gone building does not automatically bring back history, on the contrary, it only states and represents the ideals and aspirations of the present day. The new(old) Ottoman barracks surely won’t serve the same purpose they once served. “The city historically constructed is no longer lived and is no longer understood practically. It’s only an object of cultural consumption for tourists, for aestheticisms, avid for spectacles and the picturesque” (Lefebvre 1977, p.149).

This is clearly an attempt to promote a second, Ottoman oriented aesthetization on top of a first, more European orientated one. The question of how the people will deal and appropriate this new space and how the society will be affected by this transformation is yet to be seen.
4.3. The New Taksim Square Project

The new project for Taksim Square was announced in 2011. Before the beginning of the works, the surroundings had been experiencing several changes, an example of this is Tarlabası area, a case addressed in detail in this publication. The machines finally arrived in the area on 29th October 2012. Therefore, in November 2012 the physical intervention for new Taksim Square project began. Currently, the works are in the first stage (Figure 4.3) and the construction is progressing quickly, as far as it could be observed through the panels that are blocking part of the square. The official duration of the construction project is estimated at two years and approximately eight months for the first stage. As part of the contingencies, possible archaeological findings could delay the completion of the whole project.

Describing the new Taksim Square project is comparable to looking through a tempestuous fog generated by the lack of detailed information about it. There are a few official images that consist of less than ten rendered images and just one building plan. The building plan shows us the connections proposed for the tunnels and the location of the new building on top of the Gezi Park (Figure 4.4). In addition, it is possible to find an official interactive video that takes the audience through the project.
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through the underworld of the transportation hub. It also shows the spatial qualities of the proposed square including the new pedestrianization and the new building for Gezi Park. Section drawings are not available for specialists or the community. It is thus impossible to develop a multi-dimensional description of the project in terms of design, planning and technical aspects by looking only at the current information. Due to this complex situation, the description will be completed based on personal observations at the site and the contributions of many Turkish specialists that were interviewed.

This sub-chapters is divided into sections dealing with the three main interventions that shape the project: The Solution for the Traffic—the underground system, the Pedestrianization of the whole Taksim Area, and the Rebuilding of The Old Military Barracks.

4.3.1. The Solution for Traffic – the Underground System

Taksim Square is one of the most important transportation nodes in Istanbul. Nearly a hundred bus lines depart from Taksim while others pass through the area. The nostalgic tram is also part of Taksim’s atmosphere rounding the Monument of the Republic and passing through İstiklal Street. Moreover, Taksim has its own metro station. Thousands of commuters, tourists and shoppers pass through Taksim every day. This mélange gives the place a particular identity, a place that is always alive with a particular rhythm. The lively atmosphere is reinforced by the strong identity as a meeting point.

In terms of vehicular traffic, seven converge in the square adding more complexity to its nodal nature. The intention of the new project is to resolve and order this complexity. Governmental authorities believe that by taking all the networks underground and creating a huge transportation hub is the best and most feasible option. The first phase of the project includes the viaduct that would connect Tarlabası Boulevard with Cumhuriyet Street (Figure 4.4). On the surface level, the new infrastructure would promote the connection of Taksim and Talimhane, which is described in the following lines as a will to pedestrianize.

The urban planning debate is centred on the existence of a transportation hub and the idea of mixing people and cars underground. Comparisons with other solutions and best practices around the world are commonly heard. In London, the solution for Trafalgar Square was basically removing the idea of making a gigantic bus stop area and making the buses shuttle instead\(^\text{12}\). This last idea is a counterpoint to the official project that enhanced the characteristic of the node. Mixing cars and people in the underground is another dilemma in terms of creating a healthy built environment.

\(^{12}\) Akpınar J. Interviewed on 18th April, 2013
In architectural terms this does not seem to be a viable solution due to the isolation of the created space. It means the lack of contact with the natural environment (Figure 4.5) and the coexistence of persons with exhaust gases. However, it is possible to think that an accurate architectural design could deal with this matter, creating a connection with the surface environment. This sensibility for architectural matters does not seem to be embraced by the new project.

4.3.2. The Pedestrianization

The project proposes the pedestrianization of the whole square (Figure 4.6). The creation of a homogeneous surface would promote interaction and the intensification of pedestrian flows between the areas that converge into Taksim. Thus, Taksim’s quality as an interactive node would be enhanced. Tourists coming to Talimhane and from other hotels surrounding the area would have a direct contact with the square and the proposed new commercial uses. The natural connection to Istiklal Street would probably be intensified as well.

The pedestrianization means clearing the rest of Gezi Park, as the main area would be overlapped by the construction of the military barracks. Pedestrianization generally has positive connotations for urban planners. In the case of the Taksim project the situation is not as simple as creating only a “user friendly” pedestrianized surface. It is promoting two layers of experiences. One is the dark underground system and the other is the open surface connected with the sky.

This first experience is part of the ambivalent culture of the underground city described by Mumford in the 1930s in relation to New York. There was a creation of a city composed of tunnels, subways and other underground infrastructures where people spent a big part of their lives (Mumford 1946).

It is necessary to consider that the new pedestrian surface seems to be designed as a simple lid with only functional connections to the new transportation hub. The existence of a dense, dark atmosphere for the thousands commuters that would experience this space in their daily lives seems to be a likely possibility. In the academic debate there are also some sceptical visions about the proposed pedestrian area.

“My speculative reading [of the] pedestrianization of the whole square is a sort of cold Kremlin Square. Do you have the image of the Kremlin Square, in Russia, in Moscow? Large, I mean it is ordered, it is very clean, it is for ceremonies and there is no room for public demonstrations or celebrations.”

While the debate is concerned with the coldness of the square, other opposed academic visions believe in the creation of a “Piazza” as at San Marco in Venice. It is said that even though the architectural design would not reach high standards, giving a border and delimiting the dimensions of the square would create a place for encounters, a place that would highlight the cosmopolitan identity of Beyoğlu.

These two visions are somehow confronted with the ideological vision of public space. Talking about the official project, Ayşegül Baykan stated the following: “...they truly believe they will make a beautiful square where there will be no traffic, where people come to engage in a café event, you know and so forth. So that is one vision that they think they will see in Taksim and that everybody will be happy, and many people will be happy because you have seen what they call the French street in Beyoğlu, that’s what happened, it’s a very very artificially created entertainment zone.”
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4.3.3. The Barracks

The project includes rebuilding the old military barracks that were in Taksim until 1940 when they were demolished to create the Gezi Park designed by Prost. The idea basically consists of rebuilding the old Ottoman building in the Gezi Park (Figure 4.7). The barracks would contain mainly commercial uses. Therefore, cafeterias, trendy clothing stores and other services would dominate the new development. This intervention will result in the elimination of the Gezi Park green area. It is important to understand Gezi Park as a survivor in a context of the loss of green areas in the whole Beyoğlu area by the advance of market-oriented urban renewals. Even though the shape of the building as a cloister could manage to leave a green area in the centre, this enclosed area would no longer be a permeable public space. It is possible to find images around the web showing a huge “ice rink” instead of a green area inside the cloister.

Rebuilding the barracks is a controversial issue within the local community and among urban specialists. The debate is about eliminating the green public space and the question of the “anachronism” of rebuilding an old construction with unclear, or undisclosed, intentions.

4.4. Research objectives

4.4.1. Hypothesis

There is something special in Taksim, something that surpasses the square’s borders. The great fuss, the controversy, and the fact that Taksim Square is now on the (inter)national agenda, are signs of the symbolic importance of this particular square for the residents of Istanbul. In this scenario, understanding the identity of the place, and how people relate to it was crucial for the start of the research process.

Different parts of the city are appropriated differently by the people living within them. This appropriation is deeply related to the identity of the place, or its role as a public space. In that sense, understanding how people use Taksim is a step towards understanding its identity. Another important issue that led the research was to try to understand the square’s less tangible identity. It is about what kind of things or activities people relate this particular space to. What is the feeling, or the main characteristics people think of when talking about Taksim Square are crucial questions related to understanding how the Square is placed in the collective imagination of Istanbul’s residents.

However, the physical form of Taksim Square is currently undergoing radical changes. Prime Minister Erdoğan was re-elected in 2011 with an agenda of renewing or transforming the square. He made the following promise during his election campaign:

“We are working to bring back history that has been destroyed. We will unite Taksim with its history.”

Now the important question is: how is it possible to understand the identity of a place that is a construction site? In methodological terms, currently the most relevant question about the public space in Taksim is how the new project will affect its identity.
Thus, it is possible to extract from this scenario the main question of this research, which is: How will the physical transformation of Taksim Square affect its role and its social use as a public space? To answer this question, first of all it is necessary to understand Taksim’s original identity or, as stated, its role as a public space before the beginning of the construction. Only from there is it possible to advance on the issue of the impact the new project will have.

Another subsequently important step will be understanding the project itself, its contents as well as its process. How and by whom was it designed? Since the construction is in its initial phase, besides analyzing plans and drawings, a valuable part of the research is the interviews with authorities and specialists on the matter. It is only with this double analysis, the project and the opinion of people in direct contact with the issue, that we may grasp the intentions of the transformation that Taksim is going through, and how its identity could be affected by this change.

Furthermore, supporting questions should enhance the reaches of the main hypothesis. They are:
- Does Taksim Square need a transformation? Will a physical transformation promote a social transformation?
- What are the physical dimensions of the transformation? What are the social dimensions of the transformation?

4.4.2. Methodology
During our fieldwork, our first main concern was to experience the space: to see how people use it, to take pictures and notes. So, our own personal impressions are a valued part of the whole information gathered.

Other qualitative data includes the information collected through the interviews with specialists on the matter. Here the aim is try to get different profiles of people, e.g. academia, public authorities as well as civil society groups, involved in the issue.

Of course depending on the profile of the interviewee, different questions could be directed towards his/her area of expertise, but to be able to confront opinions, a standard set of questions was also designed to be a part of each and every interview. Key points were addressed to take specific information from the interviews. These ‘transversal questions’ were:
- What is public space and what is it for?
- What is the importance of Taksim Square at a local and national level and what is its identity?
- What are the main present needs of Taksim Square and how should they be addressed?
- How does the current project contribute to, enhance or diminish the square’s potentials?
- What would the main social impact of this physical transformation be?

Analyzing interviews is an important source of qualitative information, but not enough for the purpose of the research. Understanding Taksim Square’s identity and how people use the square was also important. And no one knows better how the square is used than the people who use it! In order to find out the process of appropriation of this particular part of the city, a quantitative source of information was needed. To achieve this, a careful questionnaire was designed and 265 people that actually use Taksim Square took part in the interviews.

The questionnaire consisted of four basic questions: the first two were to find out for what purpose and when the respondent uses the square, while the last two questions were related to the main goal of the research on discovering Taksim Square’s identity through understanding how and why people use the square; and maybe more importantly, what people relate the square to.
Since the square was a building site when we conducted the questionnaire interviews, we did not ask about people’s opinion of the project. Since the project is not yet complete, the opinions of lay passers-by could be based on gossip or the mood of the moment and would be misleading. Instead, in order to understand the identity of the place, it seemed more valuable to try to know what kind of activities people relate Taksim Square to and how they feel when they are at the square.

The main method of analyzing the different types of data collected will be then, comparing specialists’ opinions, questionnaire responses, personal impressions and bibliographical information. Only then it will be possible to draw some conclusions and relate the findings to the research as a whole.

Taksim Square is currently at the centre of a huge debate in Istanbul’s society. Politicians, academics, civil society groups and ordinary people on the street - everybody has something to say about Taksim and the project that the square is being submitted to. Out of this melting pot of opinions and arguments, the aim of this research is to try to identify the most relevant questions and look for possible answers.

4.5. Defining Public Space

4.5.1. Basis of Production of Identity in the Urban Space

“Considering the city as a projection of society on space is both an indispensable starting point and too elementary an approach” (Castells 1979, p. 115). In this sense, in order to try to understand a specific part of the city, one must surely understand the society that supports this particular space. Urban space is not organized randomly; the social process at work in it, express the different types and different times of social organization (Castells 1979). That is to say that people do not just use a part of the city for no reason, there is a collective behaviour that thrives from a common understanding of a particular space within the urban area. This common imagination is closely linked to the identity of the place. So identity is necessarily something that surpasses an individual impression, but is rather deeper rooted in a collective experience or idea of the subject, which, in our particular case, is an urban area. Peter Herrle also stresses that the “identity depends on a certain level of cohesiveness, on a common shared values (…), and thereby allows a reassurance from the other” (Herrle 2008, p. 12). So it goes beyond a mere sum of individual understanding and depends on a coherent perception by a group of individuals.

There are several ways in which the identity of a given place can be described. Kevin Lynch suggests that this common perception is the consequence of a physical encounter between the space and its user, and this encounter generates a certain image. For him, the physical condition of a given urban area is crucial for the formation of the identity of this place. “There seems to be a public image of any given city which is the overlap of many individual images. Or perhaps there is a series of public images, each held by a significant number of citizens” (Lynch 1964). In this case, the image of a place formed by a group of individuals gives, in its turn, a picture of the place’s identity, which is
be divorced from the question of what kind of people we want to be, what kinds of social relations we seek, what relations to nature we cherish, what style of life we desire, what aesthetic values we hold” (Harvey 2012).

In urban planning, the term “public space” has been traditionally defined as an “open space”, more discussed historically in terms of its construction and management. More recently, though, sociologists, geographers and political scientists have been addressing more of its social, economical and political character.

According to Neal (2010), public space can be analyzed through three different perspectives. The first one is the legal-economic, which addresses who is paying for the space; the second is the socio-spatial analysis, which focuses on the design and usage of space; the third is concerned with the political aspect of public spaces, and what role it plays in a democracy.

Jane Jacobs in her article “Downtown is for people” (1958) argued that for every new plan for the city, the planner should ask himself if the new project mixes different types of activities together, or if it mistakenly segregates them. For Jacobs, mixed uses, permeability, variety in the built environment, and high density that should determine the character of the city and the social functions of places was the most critical point to analyze. She also defended that the spatial layout is intimately linked to the social and economic vitality and safety of a neighbourhood. She then suggested that urban planners should first study the elements that determine how places work and then try to enhance them, instead of trying to design a plan to define how a place should work. Places should be unique and reflect the identity of the people who lived there.

4.5.2. Public Space and the “Right to the City”

“The question of what kind of city we want cannot for Lynch derived from its physical form. Here, as states Herrle on cohesiveness, Lynch also points to the possibility that a certain city or part of a city may have a variety of identities, each one held by a different group of people with shared values.

According to Lewandowski (2005), for theorists such as Engels (1844) and Simmel (1971), the imperatives of modern capitalism destroy groups of shared values and social life – the “collective”. The result of collective actions, for them, is not the consequence of group cohesiveness, but is created and controlled by urban planning in a capitalist system. In contrast, Walter Benjamin (1940) believes that the modern metropolis can be an administratively structured ‘objective’ site, with before-hand planned relations, but is simulaneously a reflexive ‘subjective’ space of collective appropriation and transformation. The interiorization of urban space, for Benjamin, is a dialectical process. Urban structures become deep-rooted in certain practices, and these incur in new forms of usage of these structures. A new type of collective, an entrenched, effervescent sociocultural group, is formed by its own appropriation of space based on innovative forms of shared social life - despite the functionalism of capitalist urban planning (Lewandowski 2005).

Another way of describing the identity of a place is less tangible, not so dependent on the physical form, but rather on the social historical process that made the place. In this case, a political dimension should also be included in the analysis (Herrle, 2008). Likewise, identities can also be forged by external forces, and can actually be both imposed by a ruling power through a series of physical transformations or brought about by a collective appropriation, in a bottom-up style, and also transform the way people understand a given place, thus its identity (Harvey, 2012).
space, but more in terms of access (or lack of access) to it. In “The Right to the City”, he defends the individuals’ right to access not only physical public spaces that allow gatherings and interaction, but also spaces that allow discursive public spheres of political participation (Lefebvre 1996). Lefebvre argues that the right to the city becomes a right to urban life, where not only a mere free access of a public space automatically grants access to an urban life for a certain group of individuals:

“The Right to the City (...) can only be formulated as a transformed and renewed Right to Urban Life. It does not matter whether the urban fabric encloses the countryside and what survives of peasant live, as long as the ‘urban’, place of encounter, priority of use value, inscription in space of a time, promoted to the rank of a supreme resource among all resources, finds its morphological base and its practico-material realization” (Lefebvre 1996, p. 156).

Lefebvre then calls for a need to restructure the power relations that determine the production of urban space, mainly by shifting control away from capital and the state, towards the hands of the city’s inhabitants, saying that “only the working class can become the agent, the social carrier or the support of this realization” (Lefebvre, 1996).

In line with this idea, David Harvey stresses the importance of people’s participation in the production of public space. Here, he goes beyond Jacobs and argues on behalf of a planning of public space as a factor exterior to the public itself. Like Lefebvre, Harvey underline the need for the people’s involvement in the process of making public space, not only in a participating role, but being the primary force that drives the urban transformation:

“Only when politics focuses on the production and reproduction of urban life as the central labor process out of which revolutionary impulses arise will it be possible to mobilize anti-capitalist struggles capable of radically transforming daily life. Only when it is understood that those who build and sustain urban life have a primary claim to that which they have produced, and that one of their claims is to the unalienated right to make a city more after their own heart’s desire, will we arrive at a politics of the urban that will make sense” (Harvey 2012).

Both perspectives relate to a discussion about the future of public spaces. It is a general opinion that there is an ongoing process of shrinkage of the public realm. The role of the government in providing goods is decreasing, while the private sector is growing, and market liberalism is gaining more strength (Banerjee 2001, cited in: Tonnelat 2010). The privatization of public space provokes, among other things, an ordination of public behaviour, and this generates a space that becomes more monofunctional (Sennett, 2011). In this sense, the disorder of behaviour, more likely to happen in a public space, “is something that provokes the impulse, the freedom to be disorderly in public, and provokes more vivacity in public space” (Sennett 2011).

This phenomenon is linked to another, more current definition of public space, described as an area that, in principle, is open to all members of the public of a society – but in practice might not actually be (Orum and Neal 2010). And is also relates to Sennett’s idea on how people behave in the urban space, public or private. In this case, places with different identities can provoke different behaviours in certain groups of people, or in certain social classes, leading to a real physical social segregation in the realm of the public space. That is to say that even open spaces with free access can be non-inviting for certain social classes. Sennett emphasizes,

“the ways in which conventions of behaviour with others in public depend on people dealing with and acknowledging the difference of others in terms of age, race, class, sexual preference and so
on. In this case, the notion is that people are self-
dramatizing with respect to their differences in the
public realm” (Sennett, 2011).

So, in a mono-functional space, these differences
can become so large that the self dramatiza-
tion starts to become uncomfortable, and certain
groups just avoid the public space in a kind of
“blind” spatial segregation.

On the other hand, Sennett continues, developing
Habermas’ ideas: “if you have a vivid public realm,
eventually if there is enough public interaction,
a poor black will feel himself/herself entitled to
speak openly to a rich white. So, for Habermas, the
whole politics of the public realm is to make that
kind of entitlement, that kind of growing together”
(Ibid.). But Lefebvre in his way is not as optimistic
concerning the role or the powers of policies that
“politics of the public realm” can play. For him, the
only way to guarantee this kind of entitlement is
through society:

“Although necessary, policy is not enough. It
changes during the course of its implementa-
tion. Only social force, capable of investing itself
in the urban through a long political experience
can take charge of the realization of a programme
concerning urban society. […] The political
meaning of class segregation is clear, whether it is
a ‘subject’ for analysis, whether it is the end result
of a series of unplanned actions, or whether it is
the effect of a will. For the working class, victim of
segregation and expelled from the traditional city,
deprived of a present or possible urban life, there
is a practical, therefore a political problem, even if
is not posed politically” (Lefebvre 1996, p. 151).

4.5.3. Contrasting Turkish Intellectuals’ Opin-
ions on Space and Identity
For Baykan and Hatuka (2010) economic relations
and forces of production, social, political and
cultural histories and the agents of these histo-
ries have an impact on the form of space and are
crucial to determine its meaning.

Spaces are a social property whose symbolism
and iconography are constantly being redefined
and recreated by their users (Baykan and Hatuka
2010). Baykan agrees with Lefebvre’s statement
that social space is a social product, which means
that any change in the form of social relations
necessarily implies the production of a new space.
The identity of a society, as well as their claims,
according to her, are intimately related to the
transformation of space. Every space, therefore,
has multiple layers of identity being constantly
redefined throughout time, separated by points
of fracture15. Ipek Akpınar also believes that the
city is a mélange, with overlapping layers in one
space depending on its history. Once a new layer
is developed, it is no longer possible to recover the
previous one from the past.16

The attempt to rearrange an urban space in order
to give it or to recover a certain function is some-
thing seen as passé by Baykan: “all these function-
a llist, rationalist ideas, organizing the traffic, orga-
nizing the space and sort of limiting the functions
is passé, it is no more seen as the life of a city […].”17
Even so, examples of this type of urban design can
still be seen, carrying a particular significance as
a link between space and power. The relationship
between both is quite evident: “The first thing you
need to show that you are in power is to create your
own space. That is Lefebvre.”18 By imposing your
own mark in space, you show who is in power.19

The usage of aesthetics as a tool in politics, creating
a direct link between aesthetics and power, was,
in Walter Benjamin’s analysis, a common practice
in Fascism – which is what makes it so dangerous
to be seen elsewhere, according to Akpınar. The
beautification of a space can be very problematic
for it is also a way to control the use of space.20

15 Baykan, A. Interviewed on April 18th, 2013
16 Akpinar, I. Interviewed on 18th April, 2013
17 Baykan, A. Interviewed on 18th April, 2013
18 Baykan, A. Interviewed on April 18th, 2013
4.6. Understanding Taksim’s Identity

In this section Taksim Square will be depicted in two layers in order to better understand the complexity of the place’s identity. The first layer will be a counter-position of Turkish specialists’ experience (Erfahrung) in the field, related to Walter Benjamin’s narrative ideas. Although the opinions or experiences might differ from one expert to another, the cultural values embedded in the particular world view remain unchanged. This narrative is understood in this context as a socio-cognitive process of selection, transmission, and conservation of cultural values, in this case, related to Taksim Square. By doing this, we are attempting to reconstruct Taksim Square as an object of representation.

The second layer is based on the questionnaires made during the fieldwork in Taksim Square at street level. For Walter Benjamin (Benjamin 1999, p.423 cited in: Lewandowski 2009): streets are the dwelling place of the collective. The collective is an eternally restless, eternally moving being that – between building walls – lives, experiences, recognizes, and invents as much as individuals do within the protection of their own four walls.

For Benjamin, as the street encompasses the collective improvisational dwelling and struggling, the dwellers themselves make “transformative use of the structures”. Through our questionnaires we will try to compound the users’ experiences (Erlebnisse), perspectives, feelings and relation to Taksim Square in a quantitative analysis of the interviewees’ responses.

Through the compilation and superposition of these two layers we will try to understand Taksim Square as a microcosm of the city, which we understand as described by Keith (Keith 2008) as simultaneously both real and imagined: “the city was the outcome of a variety of technologies of representation; an accumulation of statistical constructs, panoramic views and appropriated places, objects of government and both fascination and fear, all held together by a narrative that foregrounded the fairy tales of capitalism.”

4.6.1. Experience of Taksim Square: The Reconstruction of a Representation

Whose Taksim Square is it? “The first thing you need to show that you are in power is to create your own space”21 With this reference of Lefebvre, Murat Güvenç explained his own understanding of the “symbolic war of positions” around Taksim Square. For him the destruction of the existent space and the construction of a new one dislocate the historical ownership of Taksim Square as public space. The symbolic value of Taksim was described by Yapıcı as “the notion of Republic”22. For her, the area, the park and the Cultural Centre is one of the first urban planned areas of the Republic. As mentioned before, the plan for the area was designed by Henri Prost with clear modernist ideas similar to what had been constructed before in some European cities e.g. Paris. Whether these ideas and values were imposed or not, is not addressed in this document, but some of the implications of this drastic intervention will be depicted, as for example Ipek Akpınar’s experience of Taksim: “in the daily practice the secularized reforms served. Men and woman finally got together in public spaces. We are part of it, and have been affected by that. Thanks to that I can teach in this school.”23 This understanding of the Europeanization of the city contends that urban space was not only given to the public but it was also an opening to women. Since then the area has been used by many minorities “If you were Kurd you were there to protest, if you were radical Muslim you were there to protest, if you were student you were there to protest. If you want to celebrate some-
thing you were there”. This description already takes us to the next question. In the experts’ opinions what has Taksim Square been used for or is still used for that gives the space a special value? As already described by Ipek Akpınar one of the uses of Taksim Square has been historically that of public expression. We will come back later to this use of the area, but before we will discuss about other aspects related to Taksim experiences.

4.6.1.1. Transportation/Access Point
As mentioned previously, Taksim has historically been related to distribution. As its name suggests, Taksim was first a water distribution point for dry Beyoğlu. Now one of its uses is indisputably that of transportation distribution. A metro-line, a funicular line, a tram line and bus stations and taxis meet in Taksim Square. Inevitably this accumulation of transportation and people results in congestion.

Apart from the public transportation, seven streets meet at Taksim Square, which makes the transportation problem even more drastic. According to the Metropolitan Planning Office, the first concern of the people in Istanbul is transportation but, as Baykan mentions, the discourse that Taksim Square is “just a place where people cross-cut each other or transit through” is not what is typical about Taksim Square. Taksim is more an “access point” to the city, as described by Cakmaklı. So, Taksim Square is a place that people definitively use as a transportation hub, sometimes to change transportation means or to access Beyoğlu. But is this transportation activity, as pointed out by Baykan, specifically what characterizes the square? To find out, other activities related to Taksim square will be evaluated.

4.6.1.2. MeetingPoint
Even though Taksim Square itself is not an area with many cafes or restaurants for people to meet, other than the Marmara Hotel and other small cafes, “in the last few years there have been huge events taking place very peacefully and entertainment factor is also included in it.” It is possible to understand Baykan’s reading of the place as an area to which people relate and where people gather in big groups detached from the possible consumption of the area. For big encounters, such as football celebrations, Taksim has been the indisputable meeting point. But due to its use as transportation hub, that eases its access and the entrance to Beyoğlu, it has also been used as meeting point. It is a point, where everybody can come (Baykan), “for example, here, all the young people with scarves [...] also come on Saturdays, for entertainment [...] you see they are from the conservative area but there are a lot (wearing) a head scarf for political claims. But it doesn’t stop them (from) acting like any other young person.” Detailed information about people’s usage of Taksim Square will be described later in this chapter in a quantitative analysis.

4.6.1.3. Entertainment
It has been pointed out by Baykan that social gatherings in Taksim Square also have an entertainment factor. In this sense, entertainment will be understood as an idea or a task that “holds mutually” the attention and interest of an audience, or gives pleasure or delight. This definition leaves an open interpretation of from which activities entertainment could be constructed: from walking through the city, to shopping, from sitting passively around a monument to expressing political dissatisfaction towards Turkish or international politics. Historically, even before the Prost Plan, the area was used as a stadium, where not only military, but also civil society used to gather to be entertained by the sport competitions of those days. Afterwards, as Taksim Square and Gezi Park were constructed, the public entertainment use
remained. This time it was open to women and children, as already mentioned by Akpınar. People were given the opportunity of show themselves and see the others more openly in a public space. “There were some cafes and restaurants where families could sit together openly”30. It was maybe during this period that people started consuming goods or food specifically in this area in relation to social gatherings and/or to entertainment. This behaviour will be discussed more in depth later.

4.6.1.4. Unique Activities in Taksim

Some of the main uses and activities related to Taksim Square based on the experience of Turkish specialists have now been depicted. It is difficult to detach a transportation hub from a meeting point, as one enhances the other, just as a meeting point enhances entertainment. But can the identity of a space be described by some of its regular characteristics? Would not that be similar to determining someone’s identity by describing his or her transportation to work or supermarket consumption, in other words, his or her regular everyday activities? So, what are the experiences or values of Taksim Square that distinguish it from other spaces? What is it in the common imagination of people that gives Taksim Square a special value?

One aspect that traversed all the specialists’ opinions on Taksim Square, was that of public expression. “Struggle” was not the main characteristic of Taksim in every case, but to some degree all agreed that Taksim Square has historically (since its construction) but also still actively been determined by social expression and movements appropriating the space for their own activities. In Yapıcı’s understanding there are just two places for “democratic movement”31 in Turkey. Taksim Square is the only one in Istanbul and for her it is also the most important “because on May 1st, all labour and workers come to Istanbul for demonstrations.” Today the first of May is the International Workers’ Day which celebrates the labour movement and which has become a national holiday in more than 80 countries worldwide. The international connotation of this specific date is important in order to understand the unique identity of Taksim Square, as Taksim was designed as the Place of the Republic. Now it is the “place of people”32. According to Baykan it is not only a place of Turkish people but “historically a space of cosmopolitism: it is the history of the Christian minorities, it is the space of bourgeoisie elites, it is the history of Western culture, and it is the history of migration to the city.”33 This also reflects the historical development of Istanbul’s citizens and structure, as Yapıcı points out; Istanbul is a city where you can find a lot of different layers of different cultures, beginning from the Neolithic era.

One of the technical aspects that have allowed this multicultural expression has been Taksim’s reachability from different points of the city and to different ethnic groups. As Baykan puts it, “the thing with Taksim Square is [that] you can come from the Anatolian side, […] with a ferry you can come from the European side, you can come from south, you can come from north.”34 As already mentioned before, it is possible to reach Taksim Square easily on foot, but also by tram, subway, funicular or bus. This richness allows the interaction of any expressive movement with a large amount of people or “public”. Any demonstration or celebration is seen and might be joined by thousands of people or passersby. In this sense Taksim indirectly becomes a meeting point too, as the voices can be summed up easily by the urban dwellers.

4.6.2. Quantitative Interpretation of People’s Experience

Until now a summary of the specialists’ experiences, ideas, and interpretations of Taksim Square
has been made. A rational (cognitive) understanding of the place was intrinsically depicted by the comments of Turkish specialists. How are these opinions related to the common understanding of the urban dwellers? It is not the attempt of this chapter to determine comprehensively the common imagination of Taksim Square, but through a quantitative analysis to determine some tendencies of what users of the space relate Taksim Square to and on how people use it.

What are the main uses of Taksim Square? According to the field research described and explained in section 4.4.2, 66% of the interviewees relate Taksim Square to entertainment. This raises the question: What is commonly understood in Taksim Square by entertainment or in Turkish eğlence? First, it is important to note that a large amount (75%) of the people who were ready to answer the questionnaire were below 35 years old. This already sheds some light onto what could be behind the term "entertainment". Directly in Taksim Square one of the few places for formal cultural entertainment activities would be Atatürk Cultural Centre (ACC), which has been closed for two years. Other cultural activities are not physically present in Taksim Square, although it has been mentioned by Akpınar that Gezi Park is “full with cultural activities”35. This aspect of entertainment will be related to the common association of Taksim activities in people’s perception.

The second most common answer is "as a meeting point" (57%). This answer seems to be clear on the first sight but could be imprecise if questioned if people stay on the place after they meet. This answer can also be related to the first one, and by that create the relation of people that meet in Taksim Square for entertainment. Just 38% of the interviewees responded positively to both of these questions. This means that less than half of the people that meet in Taksim are also there for entertainment. The third most common answer was “shopping” although besides a few flower stands and some small bread or corn stands, no other shops were identified directly in Taksim Square. This imprecision could be related to the people that use Taksim Square as a meeting point or as transportation hub and that understood shopping in Taksim as shopping in İstiklal or Beyoğlu. In fact, almost 70% of the people that chose shopping also use Taksim as a meeting point. Fig 4.8 shows the complete distribution of answers to the question “How did you normally use Taksim Square before the construction began?”

Although the percentage of people that used Taksim Square for political demonstrations is relatively low, the amount of interviewees that related Taksim Square with political demonstration is six times higher than those who actually perform political activities there. The low percentage of people responding negatively to the question if they used Taksim Square as a place for political demonstration could be related to lack of confidence towards the interviewers. This could distort the real percentage value.

The next question is to what people relate to Taksim Square. It already became evident that there is a distortion between what people use the place for and the activities that people relate the square to (only one sixth of the people that related Taksim Square to political activities also use it for that same reason).

The activities which were most related to Taksim Square where social gatherings such as New Years Eve or sport celebrations (70%) and as a meeting point for parties, etc (67%) followed by historical relevance and shopping with 43% respectively. But when the answers to this question are put under the light of social gatherings, this means the people that use Taksim Square as a meeting point with other people, the values become less polarized, as shown by Figure 4.8. In this reading, the

34 Ibid
35 Akpınar, I., Interviewed on the 15th of April of 2013
share taken by shopping drops, as does commerce, while the historical relevance and political demonstration rises. As shown in the chart, tourism, political demonstrations and commerce have almost the same share under the light of use as a meeting point. An important aspect to mention here is that, none of the interviewees who use Taksim Square for political manifestation relate the place to violence. This could be interpreted as Taksim being a meeting place with, among others, a political role but a pacifist one, since three out of four of interviewees that relate Taksim Square to political demonstrations also use Taksim Square as a meeting point. During our fieldwork in Istanbul we witnessed more than ten demonstrations, on average more than one per day. Five of the demonstrations took place in just one day and during which no violence was used either against the demonstrators, or between different political groups who were present at the same time.

The people that use Taksim Square as a meeting point evidently see social gatherings as the main connotation of the place. The next most important connotation, even before commerce, tourism or shopping, is Taksim Square’s historical relevance. This answer gives a significant value to the historical value of the place. A possible interpretation of this answer is that people not only relate the historical value of Taksim Square only to the Atatürk Memorial but that its historical meaning is already in the common social imagination.

As described the fourth question is related to users’ feelings about the square. This question, in contrast to the others, was meant for people to rate how they feel about Taksim Square between two extremes for example oriented or disoriented. One extreme always had a positive connotation and the other was always its opposite. The possible positive answers were relaxed, safe, joyful, oriented, welcomed, integrated and free. Although at the beginning the interviewees had some difficulties to understand how they should rate their feelings, after a little help from the interviewers most of them could answer the question fluently. Nevertheless not all answered to all of the ratings in this question; therefore, the percentages are related to the total of people answering that specific sub-question.

The feeling to which most of the interviewees related completely was freedom: 60% of the interviewees rated free highest and 77% of the interviewees felt more free than repressed. Half of the interviewees that linked Taksim Square to political demonstrations also felt very free in this place and most of them (65%) also felt more free than repressed. This could have an influence on the decision of people to use Taksim Square for political demonstrations, as the probability for people
to express themselves publicly rises as the majority of the interviewees disregarded repression in this area. After freedom, the feeling to which people most likely related was joy (56%) followed by welcomed (55%). As mentioned before, these percentages are directly from those interviewees that rated that specific feeling with the highest value, but in order to understand how the majority of the interviewers feel it is interesting to take a look at the sum of the values with more inclination towards one extreme. In this light 82% of the people feel welcomed, even more than free or joyful. A vast majority of interviewees also feel integrated (72%) and oriented (71%).

The only question with a relatively high negative answer is if people feel disturbed in Taksim Square. The fact that a relatively high amount of people (27%) felt disturbed about the place could be related to the traffic jams in the area or to the bus station. One notable fact is that 66% of the people feel more secure than threatened in the area and only 13% felt really threatened. This contrasts with the government argumentation that Taksim Square is an unsafe place to be and therefore needs to be redeveloped.

4.6.3. The Mosaic
Taksim Square’s identity seems to have many faces, many masks, and many layers. After a confrontation of different aspects that are related to Taksim, not only in the dwellers’ imagination, but also directly related to its uses and the feelings towards the square, it becomes evident that the deeper the research goes, the higher is the complexity of different times and cultures, overlapping in Taksim’s history and present. It is its fragmented identity that gives Taksim its special symbolic value. Its variety goes from “place of the Republic” to meeting point for shopping, from its historical relevance to “access point” to the city. It is a place where most of the people feel free even if repression has taken place there historically and recently: is possible to hear many voices and many struggles at the same time and at the same place. There are Syrian demonstrations, left and right wing party demonstrations, street musicians, young and old, and children playing around. It is, in any case, a lively area where history is taking place today, “as classes are still being made, and are still clashing”. It is a place for encounter for many different activities that go from commerce and shopping to political demonstrations and football celebrations. Maybe Walter Benjamin would describe it as a living room of the city. It is a space “under the pressure of the global economy” which will soon be transformed to something still undefined. It is also unknown to us how people will appropriate the new space but we can already assume that people will still come to Taksim since it is a “layered and layered space of alternative meanings” which cannot be erased in one moment. As Baykan describes it, “in these post-modern times, every protest is also an entertainment. People want to do as part of an entertainment, as part of encounters, so they want to be a part of these layered fragments of happenings”. They will still want to be a part of Taksim.

36 Baykan, A., Interviewed on the 18th of April of 2013
37 Akpınar, I., Interviewed on the 15th of April of 2013
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4.7. Physical and Social Transformations in Taksim: the Game of Politics and Public Space

4.7.1. Transparency and Participation

In 1999, a protection plan for Beyoğlu began to be developed, but was only concluded ten years later, in 2009. In that year, a transformation project in Taksim Square was already being envisioned with the pedestrianization of the square, but with no mention of the rebuilding of the barracks. In 2011, the plans were approved by the Istanbul Greater Metropolitan Parliament, after which the Istanbul No. 2 Regional Agency for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage Sites passed the bill. The Local Conservation Board however, rejected the plans for Taksim. Prime Minister Erdogan stated that the plan would realized anyway, and so the higher conservation board “rejected the rejection”. At the end of 2012, construction work began.

The importance of Taksim Square, as a symbol of the secular state, the “physicalization of power, of the Republican state”39 is for many a clear motive for the insistence of the Prime Minister in undertaking the project. The “visibility and symbolic significance within the broader public imagination” (Reclaim Istanbul 2012) of this particular square is the reason for the government to want to “leave its mark” there, according to Mücella Yapıcı, member of the Chamber of Architects.40

The importance of Taksim Square is the very motive for many architects and city planners to insist that the plans for its transformation have to been done in consultation with the public (Reclaim Istanbul 2012). For Şükrü Aslan, a sociologist from Mimar Sinan University, it is only humane to hear what institutions that represent the workers who lost their lives there have to say when planning to change the square. The metropolitan government, however, did not open the project for public discussion (Taksim Platform 2011).

A lack of transparency was pointed out as another central issue in the planning process. The details of the new design for the square were never clear. Even now, six months after construction work has begun, no one who is not directly involved in the project knows exactly what will become of the square and Gezi Park. According to İpek Akpınar, she and a group of architects and city planners requested an appointment with the mayor several times in order to get clarification on the project, and only managed to arrange a meeting after they had made their opinions public in a newspaper. They still did not obtain much more information than what was already on the project website.41

The attempts to stop the project from being implemented have been frustrated. Apart from the criticism towards the central government during the decision-making process, it is also being said that complaints made after the plans were made public have been ignored. Some activists, such as Mücella Yapıcı, still have hope that something can be done to prevent it. Others academics such as Ayşegül Baykan, are sceptical. For her, civil society groups in Turkey have very limited power to do something once the political decision has been made - nothing can be done now to stop the project in Taksim. The weakness in the discourse of the political opposition, who for her normally stand on grounds of cliché slogans, is also an aspect that diminishes the struggle against the project.42

The Taksim Square transformation project is only one example of a series of projects in Istanbul in which lack of public participation and transparency are being criticized by the civil society and academia. The unilateral decision-making process is sustained by the Turkish legislation, which does not encourage participation.43 Decisions in urban planning are taken in accordance with a top-down

39 Akpınar, I. Interviewed on April 18th, 2013
40 Yapıcı, M. Interviewed on April 19th, 2013
41 Akpınar, I. Interviewed on April 15th, 2013
42 Baykan, A. , Interviewed on 18th April 2013
43 Unsal, F. Interviewed on April 19th, 2013
approach, the central government being assured that they know what is good and necessary. That is, according to Aysegul Baykan, a characteristic of Turkish politics that can be traced back to the end of the Ottoman Empire.\(^{44}\)

The lack of participation and transparency have made many demand more democracy. Betül Tanbay, defines the decision-making process in urban planning in Turkey as characteristic of an autocracy. For her, democracy in the country ends at the elections\(^ {45}\) – a statement others, such as Baykan, also agree with.\(^ {46}\) A struggle for a more just, participative and transparent planning process is, therefore, also a demand for a more democratic state.

4.7.2. Anachronism – Inside the Production of Symbols

The phases of the image of simulation…

“it is the reflection of a profound reality; it masks and denatures a profound reality; it masks the absence of a profound reality; it has no relation to any reality whatsoever; it is its own pure simulacrum” (Baudrillard 1994 p.6)

Anachronism as a concept is intrinsically connected to the production of space by the hyperreal society. It is possible to consider part of the architectural materialization as one of the manifestations inscribed in the production of the simulacra space. Rebuilding the old Ottoman barracks does not escape the image of simulation. A government rebuilding an Ottoman building that in the 1940s contained a football pitch, filling it with contemporary shopping mall functions, perhaps also a cultural centre and, if that was not enough, putting an ice-rink in the centre, contributes to the possible mosaic identity. As it is impossible to find the original materials to reconstruct the Ottoman building, the materials would be contemporary ones maybe with a “rustic” nostalgic style. Even if the government tries to enhance the past, all real references to it are erased in this simulacra production.

It is really difficult to imagine how a fake Ottoman military building including a shopping mall could work in Gezi Park and how a public space could be commodified in this way. Everything could be justified by everything in a meaningless reality, in simulacra. Every materialization could address random labels independent from history, traditions and meanings. Overall, this aesthetization of the meaningless could be observed as a Machiavellian tool in the political discourse. The situation is possible because there are some values that are shared symbolically between politicians and most of the community even if these values do not have the authentic meaning. As Eco (1986, p. 19) puts it, “But for the reproduction to be desired, the original has to be idolized, and hence the kitsch function of the inscriptions and taped voices, which remind you of the greatness of the art of the past.” Therefore, rebuilding the Ottoman construction could be understood as the imposition of an aesthetic sign of a glorious Islamic but blurry ideology, or a simple justification for creating a consumption container. We could conclude that in the vague possibilities of architectural aesthetics politicians find the potential instruments to justify and impose a variety of actions in hyperreal times.

4.7.3. Private Appropriation of Public Space

David Harvey (1990) pointed out that the economic and technological transformation that has accompanied the decline of industry formed the concept of the post-modern city, thus undermining the notion that modernity brought by industrialization could lead cities to a more equitable future. This new approach provided fresh impetus for the social, economic and cultural changes brought about by the globalised new economy. At the forefront of these changes is the growing determination to sell the public realm. This is not new, nor outdated. The strategy results from the urge to
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be integrated into the process of globalization by producing spaces that are attractive to the global circulation of capital. The city has increasingly become a space completely built around consumerism.

According to Harvey (1989) and his impressions about North American cities in the 1980s, this phenomenon was pushed by the necessity of competition fostered by local governments and related to:

1. The implementation of specific benefits to ensure competition within the international division of labour. This can be understood as selling the city’s image, spaces, revenues, etc;
2. Increased competitiveness through spatial division of consumption (urban requalification);
3. Local power struggle to take over command and control of financial transactions making heavy investments in transport and communications, which enable the implementation of large private equipment;
4. Competition for the redistribution of surplus generated by the central and regional governments.

To Harvey these four strategies are not mutually exclusive and characterize what the author called the passage from traditional management to urban entrepreneurship.

The public spaces of the post-industrial city thus have a blurry definition that flirts with the private space, thus it can also be referred to as quasi-public space. This is characterised by the strong emphasis on economic, symbolic and aesthetic roles.

Akkar Ercan (2007) in his surveys sees three major phenomena in this shift:

1. The privatization of public space, meaning the shifting of management of public spaces from the public sector to the private sector (Loukaitou-Sideris 1988; cited in: Punter 1990);
2. The commodification of public space, which refers to the recognition of the public realm as a commodity to be bought and sold, just like other any other good (Loukaitou-Sideris 1988; cited in: Madanipour 2000) and;
3. The commercialisation of public space, which means that public realm is used in order to produce profit rather than to improve the quality of urban space and life (Tibbalds 1992).

This process is evident in Taksim Square as well as other areas of Istanbul: “there is a constant demand in Istanbul to create new centres, new areas to open for the consumer culture”47. One of the major motivations that forms the new urban landscape, is that investors and developers have realized the economic contributions promoted by a well and specifically designed public space.

The barracks fits this intention precisely and contributes to legitimizing it. There is a need to insert the project into the historical code of Taksim, the notion here is that by appropriating the aesthetics “into their already existing image, history can be created in a fixed moment, through physical space.”48

Actually, by re-creating the barracks it is possible to generate a space to emphasize their distinctive social, cultural and historical characteristics, thus creating a safe, attractive and exclusive environment to attract developers, investors and their employers, tourists and affluent groups (Akkar Ercan 2007)

As a facsimile of a lost heritage, the barracks, once reconstructed, will play an influential and catalytic role in urban regeneration, transforming Taksim into a vehicle of legitimacy for local authorities, and symbolising their commitment and effectiveness in urban regeneration and city-marketing.

47 Baykan, A., Interviewed on the 18th of April of 2013
48 Ibid.
For some, it is related to Taksim Square's symbolic value. It is not unusual that groups in power want to leave their mark on an urban space, giving a sort of imposed physical identity to the place. Atatürk himself did this in Taksim, once called “Republic Square” after the republican revolution. As the board member of the chamber of architects of Istanbul, Mücella Yapıçı says, “Taksim Square has a huge symbolic value for us. It is really important because of the notion of republic, republican architecture. That area, the park and the culture centre, is one of the first planned urban areas of the republic.”

Years later, the detachment from the Ottoman period and the embracing of new Western ideals was formalized by the imposition of Prost’s plans.

In the same way, Taksim Square also became related to democratic public manifestations. “Everything happens in Taksim” says Yapıçı. The democratic history that it embodies and its function as a transportation hub make Taksim the place in Istanbul where the majority of political demonstrations happen. “Taksim was designed as the Place of the Republic. Now it is the place of people. Whenever we wanted to protest against something we go there, whenever we want to celebrate, we got there,” says Akpınar.

“Architecture is never architecture; Architecture is the physicalisation of the power game,” states Akpınar. In this context, Prime Minister Erdoğan is willing to stamp his mark on Istanbul’s urban space. And Taksim is of course the most representative place for that. “[The] government of the party of the state, want to build the sign of their power, on the square. It is a very old traditional thing, from the beginning of the Republic of Turkey.” Yapıçı continues. The reconstruction of the Ottoman Barracks is often viewed as sign of révanchiste by the Prime Minister. In this particular case, it serves a double propose, it is a way to suppress the oppo-
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now we have the power wanting to set up a non-secular bourgeoisie." Says Akpınar. This is well reflected in Lefebvre’s words, “In a period during which ideologies pronounce abundantly on structures, the destructuration of the city, manifests the depth of phenomena, of social and cultural disintegration” (Lefebvre 1996, p.148).

For others, the lack of transparency and the level of non-participation the whole project embraces, reflects problems with the Turkish democracy as a whole, especially in the last 10 years. And the kind of imposition of a physicalization of an ideology that Taksim is going through, also reflects the balance of power of current Turkish national politics, a struggle between secular movements, the opposition, and a more conservative traditional thinking, represented by the party now in power and the Prime Minister. “The society is extremely segregated. […] [There are] two groups: the secular and non secular one. Side by side the social pyramids. These exist parallel together.” Says Akpınar. The fact that this project is being completely imposed, without public consultation or making even the most basic information available, is a pure reflection of the power that this political group has over Turkish national politics at this moment. “Nobody can talk of this project in front of the prime minister. […] There is only one voice, and no criticism is allowed.” she concludes.

Taksim’s physical transformation can be seen, thus, as the embodiment of an ideology in power, a power that has little political opposition and wants to stamp its mark on the urban space. This transformation goes beyond a mere physical one and can be understood further, as a tentative shaping of Turkish society itself, where any physical transformation has an impact on the society that is the aim of this transformation. “In the 30s, the aim of the state was to set up a secular bourgeoisie, and

4.8. Conclusion
When we decided on our main research question “How will the physical transformation of Taksim Square affect its purpose and its social use as a public space?”, we already suspected that there would be no means to obtain a clear answer, since the transformation project in Taksim Square has begun just a few months ago, and precise information on the final design are still not available. Nevertheless, we decided to concentrate our efforts to understand the identity(ies) of the square, the decision-making process up to this moment and then envision the possible effects of the new project through different perspectives.

To understand Taksim and its symbolic representation in the social life of Istanbul it was crucial to recount its historical evolution that began with Henri Prost’s vision to transform Istanbul into a secular, modern, civilized, European city. This evolution forged the overlapping of tiers and produced the mosaic that sustains its identity(ies).

By going through Taksim’s history and comparing it to the results from the questionnaires and interviews, we were able to understand why the population associates certain ideas with the square – its identity in the minds of the citizens of Istanbul. These ideas correspond mainly to its importance as a concentration point for diverse activities: political demonstrations, social gatherings, or as a meeting point, especially for whoever wants to go shopping in Beyoğlu. This is justified by the accessibility of Taksim, and is also one of the main reasons for its role as a major transportation hub for the city.

The effects of the project on the social usage may be substantial. If the park is replaced by the shopping mall barracks, and the streets that connect to Taksim are placed underground, the square will most probably lose its function and identity as a spot for celebrations and political demonstrations. There will no longer be direct access between Taksim and its surrounding streets. The project will also probably select and restrain the public that will frequent the square, whose main purpose there will be to consume – products and the space itself.

The anachronism behind the proposal for the new barracks, that will have no connection to the Ottoman barracks’ usage or material, can be viewed as part of an ever-growing demand for new consumer centres and, in a wider perspective, the commodification of spaces. This last phenomenon is linked to two others: the shrinkage of public spaces worldwide, and city marketing in order to make these more competitive. Istanbul is the perfect example of the combination of these elements, but has its own particularisms. By analyzing the elaboration process of the Taksim Square transformation project, the fragility of a democracy that limits public participation and transparency, and the strong symbolic connection between power and space can be pointed out as two significant aspects of the scope in which this global city is developing.

Finally, it is necessary to understand the change of Taksim Square as another fracture point in its history, one of the many to come. In a few years, the population will probably associate it with other images, usages and feelings – hopefully without forgetting its history and symbolism of former times.
5 Participation in Urban Renewal Project of Tarlabası
Participation of local inhabitants in urban renewal projects has been a contentious subject within the academic field for a substantial period of time. Arguably, the issue has mostly been about clarifying what is deemed to obscure the factors that promote or inhibit inclusion of all citizens in decision-making. It is also a subject of importance within the local governance discourse as it opens the question about who is included in the decision-making processes that shape living environments of the less privileged that are undergoing change. “These changes in urban areas were growing in time and space over the last decades. As a result, the urban pattern is transformed often in short periods – considering the life cycle of real estate. Those alterations of urban areas have great influences onto the people living and working in these areas. Not only is the physical environment changing, but also social, ecological and economical alterations will often follow the transformation of urban areas” (Sakarya 2010, p.1).

The research focus will look at urban renewal project within the area of Tarlabası, in Beyoğlu. The report has been divided into five different sections that document relevant aspects of the study area. Following the introduction, the second section will bring an understanding of factors contributing to the historical evolution, social and urban characteristics of the study area. The third section sets the objectives and central questions that direct the enquiry at hand. The next sub-section will outline and review the theory to which the approach to participation will be formulated. The research methodology sub-section will indicate what strategies and methods were applied in the research in accessing information before and after the field study. The close of this section will indicate how the collected data has been processed to generate findings. The limitations encountered in the study will also be listed here. The fourth section reviews the case study, and detailed analysis of the study area and some of the important aspects affecting processes of the project are presented. This section is divided into 3 sub-sections that analyse different aspects pertaining to the study area such as the legal framework that gives powers to certain actors in the process of the project. The process of the urban renewal project from its inception to its current state is also analysed to understand who the main project drivers are. The main actors involved in the project and study area will be analysed to their level of engagement and influence within the project through a stakeholder analysis. The fifth section will draw findings together from the processed data. This section aims to compare the findings about participation within the project and other related matters with the theory. The outcome of the research will then be used to set up some key lessons that will hopefully generate more discussion on the advancement of participatory planning within urban renewal projects. The last section will provide succinct points that have come out of the research exercise as set out from the objectives and discourse.
5.1. Tarlabası Neighbourhood

5.1.1. Historical Evolution
Located on the slope to Dolapdere, Tarlabası is part of the Beyoğlu sub-province of Istanbul, on the European side of the city. The quarter is located on both sides of Tarlabası Boulevard, which begins at the intersection of Taksim Square and Cumhuriyet Road and ends where Refik Saydam Road starts (Saybaşılı 2003, p. 103).

In the Ottoman city, Tarlabası, became a residential area with new human settlements since 1535, when non-Muslim diplomats began to build their houses. In the middle of the 19th century the residential area hosted the middle and lower middle classes; its architecture was a modest version of the architectural style of Pera, where the higher class used to live and embassies were located. The population consisted of non-Muslim, Greeks, Armenians and Levantines (Tonbul 2011).

After a fire consumed large swaths of the wooden buildings in 1870, the municipalities applied Western standards in the city planning; therefore most of the houses were built in stone to diminish the danger of being consumed by further fires (Letsch 2011, p. 2). By 1942 the “Varlık Vergisi” or Wealth Tax particularly affected the non-Muslim citizens, who had to pay a higher tax than the Muslim citizens:

“The revenue added up to 80% of total government budget in 1942. It had sound effects and thousands of buildings in Beyoğlu (Pera’s new name) and Tarlabası were sold, mainly to Turks (67%) and to state offices (30%). Many were also confiscated and sold” (Tonbul 2011, p. 4).

Many of the merchants and craftsmen in Tarlabası were unable to pay it, some of them went to jail and others left the area abandoning their properties and businesses.

Between September 6th and 7th 1955, the Turkish government, under Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, orchestrated a pogrom in which minority groups were targeted, especially Greeks. The buildings suffered physical degradation because of the riots and the non-Muslim population was evicted from the area. After this eviction the rural migration phenomenon repopulated the area (Tonbul 2011).

In the 80s the neo-liberal policies implemented in Turkey resulted in a radical restructuring of the neighbourhood. In 1986 Tarlabası Street was extended and now connects Taksim and the historical peninsula with the western border of Galata-Pera region. The construction caused the demolition of 1100 19th century buildings (some 300 of which were listed) and the displacement of 5000 people (Kocabaş 2006). This might have been an attempted solution to the illegal social mixture of the area. The urban structure in Tarlabası neighbourhood was segregated, economically and historically, from Beyoğlu (Tonbul 2011; Letsch 2011; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development 2008; Kocabaş 2006). Tarlabası began to receive a large number of Kurdish migrants in the early 1990s, and about 80% of Tarlabası inhabitants are migrants from the Southeast (Letsch 2011). Tarlabası is characterized by its socio-cultural heterogeneity in terms of its resident population. Its attractiveness is due to its central location, affordable rents and available abandoned housing stock. Its history reflects the constant flows of migrants and changes. The area is likely to be affected by further developments in Beyoğlu.

5.1.2 Urban Characteristics
Tarlabası is located approximately 0.2 km from Taksim Square and within a short walking distance of the CBD, İstiklal Street and Talimhane. Officially Tarlabası comprises six neighbourhoods: Bostan, Bülbül, Çukur, Kamer Hatun, Kalyoncu Kulluk, and Şehit Muhtar.
In terms of the built environment of the neighbourhood, Tarlabası consists of very narrow streets with many dead-ends. The neighbourhood is characterized by three or four storey small buildings ranging between 50 to 100 square meters (Ünlü et al. 2000). This area also hosts several listed buildings with high historical value, such as the Greek Orthodox Church, the Syrian Church and the Central Mosque (Önder 2013). (Figure 5.1)

The houses in Tarlabası are unique examples of turn-of-the-century Levantine architecture in Turkey; the ground floors often served as stores or workshops – a very large percentage of the furniture in Istanbul at that time came from carpenters in Tarlabası (Letsch 2011).

According to Alper Ünlü (2010) the following aspects can describe the urban aspects that characterize Tarlabası:

+ Its advantageous proximity to the central business district: the walking distance to Taksim Square is approximately 0.2km, therefore commercial and touristic areas are nearby.

+ District with a unique topography and urban pattern: with its narrow and labyrinthine streets, it resembles aspects of Mediterranean cities.

+ Great value of architectural heritage: the housing units correspond to the late 19th and early 20th century, an example of cultural mosaic with unique facades.

- Buildings of the 19th century are tending to collapse: the physically degraded row houses are the result of poor maintenance, which might be a product of the lack of financial strategies for upgrading the building by its inhabitants, due to the fact that the residents are a vulnerable population with a lower economic level.
Regarding the last point, Inceoğlu and Yürekli (2013) describes two main problems:

“The main problem in such areas today is twofold: quality of buildings and quality of the urban pattern. The quality of buildings in these areas is very low, both in terms of their structures and the quality of construction. They do not comply with the existing codes about structures of buildings, making them very vulnerable in the expected Istanbul earthquake. They also do not comply with new standards of thermal insulation, resulting in very high carbon emissions. Due to unplanned and incremental growth, urban qualities are also very low. These areas, once at the fringes of Istanbul, find themselves today at or near the new financial and recreational centers of the city through current developments. These areas are becoming strong targets for urban transformation” (Inceoglu and Yürekli 2013, p.2).

5.1.3. Social Characteristics
Even though its positive urban characteristics locate Tarlabası in the centre of the city, the social aspects place it in a neglected area. Nowadays, Tarlabası is usually known for its bad reputation, stigmatized by crime, poverty and physical dilapidation (Önder 2013).

According to Alper Ünlü (2010) the following aspects can describe the social characteristics of Tarlabası:

+ An important node of westernization period: in the era of the Ottoman Empire.
+ Mixed heritage of the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian cultures: this provides a multinational ethnicity e.g. Turkish, Kurdish, and Roman inhabitants and African or Asian immigrants live together in the district.
- Lower socio economic level: is reflected in the deterioration of the environmental quality. This is related to two main aspects: the poor maintenance of the physical environment and social degradation, an increasing crime rate that labelled the area as a “slum” by the authorities and media.

The topography is also reproduced in the social structure, the well-to-do classes are located along the main street and the upper part of Tarlabası (Şehit Muhtar neighbourhood) and the lower classes settled downhill. Tarlabası Boulevard sets a physical division between these upper and lower class areas, segregating the social classes. Throughout history people that settle in this area represented the working class and most vulnerable classes.

The total population of the neighbourhood according to the census data (SIS Census 2000) is 31,004 in Tarlabası, though estimations are around 35,000-40,000 (Sakızlioğlu 2007, p.147). According to Tarlabası strategic social plan the project area’s population is approximately 2000 (Kentsel Strateji 2010).
5.2. Research Objectives and Structure

5.2.1. Goal of the Field Study and Central Questions
The research seeks to understand the current urban renewal project in the area of Tarlabası within the Beyoğlu District of the city of Istanbul as driven by the current dynamics. The questions are: how inclusive are the decision-making processes that are used in this project, and what lessons can be learned from the processes of participation in urban renewal projects.

Sub objectives:
• To understand the legal framework that re-enforces the Tarlabası Renewal Project and how it affects the roles of stakeholders involved and in turn determines the outcomes.
• To understand the Tarlabası Renewal Project participation project based on the theoretical framework of citizen participation in terms of how inclusive the process leading to implementation is (was).
• To define applicable lessons based on the case study as a way to further develop tools that could be used within the contexts of urban renewal projects.

Hypothesis
The main hypothesis of this research is that the current urban renewal project policies and processes that are being utilised do not take the wishes of residents of existing neighbourhoods within the targeted development area into consideration. Participation is a misconceived process that has been used to achieve certain goals of a few in power positions. As a result, exclusion from the decision-making processes could lead to social disintegration of the community as they have a lesser voice in decision-making.

5.2.2 Theoretical Framework
This section of the paper will create a theoretical background that will guide the discourse of this paper on citizen participation. The participation that we refer to is that of all included citizens in decision-making relating to processes of change that determine their livelihood in relation to the current phenomena of urban renewal projects in Beyoğlu. Academics both from within the context and abroad, have addressed this pressing problem of the exclusion of certain parties within the framework of decision-making in relation to urban renewal projects. The argument centres on the processes that determine the relocation of people from their existing communities, existing social networks, and existing lifestyles. More important, the affected people have generally been those who have less access to decision-making.

On the mechanism of urban renewal projects Mutman and Turgut (2011, p.5) write: “Through this capability, a municipality assigned private firm according to the projected development planning of the areas, prepares the projects. This on the one hand brings more actors on site development and regeneration, however on the other hand little consideration to existing cultures, societies and local communities were given”. The statement above shows us a glimpse of contradictions on the part of government that become evident as a result of change processes. The process of change that we refer to here is that relating to changes of the urban fabric, social fabric and socio-economic make-up of neighbourhoods as affected by policies and regulations that are structured for transformation. The OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: Territorial Reviews 2008) report states that these processes are directly linked to Istanbul’s strategic vision of becoming a ‘major economic centre and the central node for international trade flows’. However the OECD report does outline some social considerations that ought to be addressed with equal pertinence as that of economic growth: “For instance, it is essential that current urban regeneration policies, in particular the relocation policies for families and small-scale...
industries, be implemented without disrupting socio-economic ties and community relations, and with sufficient infrastructure to support the newly planned neighbourhoods” (OECD Territorial Reviews 2008).

The report from the OECD does elaborate the need for the local public sectors to create more platforms of inclusive decision-making processes to “enhance the role of civil society in decision-making processes” (OECD 2008). The standpoint of the paper will therefore adopt the viewpoint that looks to more inclusive processes in decision-making processes that can enhance democracy.

5.2.2.1. Ladder of Citizens Participation

Our discourse will therefore look at the participation of all parties concerned in these processes of change. The term inclusion will refer to participation of all affected citizens in decision-making processes. Sherry Arnstein’s ladder of citizen’s participation provides a framework for understanding what factors of consideration are to be drawn into the path leading to participation. Firstly, Arnstein addresses the issue of power as the key entry between different parties in engaging in this process: “It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future. It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared…” (Arnstein 1969, p.1).

Arnstein also affirms the position that there is a lot of misconception about what participation is or ought to be. She de-mystifies the certainty of participation concepts at different levels of powers distribution in decision-making. In this paper the levels are also used as a measure of likening the existing concepts to a framework of theory. However it must be noted that this theory only points to concepts and not concretised situations. Hence reference is made to Innes and Booher’s Public Participation in Planning: New Strategies for the 21st Century. This theoretical discourse moves beyond the conceptual understanding towards the more operational concepts of participation in our current period. In our discourse this theory will be used to re-enforce the concepts and try to concretise them in reality. The aim is to correlate what processes of participation are claimed to exist and scrutinise them using these parameters as tools (Figure 5.2).

No participation: Sherry Arnstein refers to ‘non-participation level’, as little or no consultation with the people. This means one party might not be willing to part with information due to the power that the information entails.

“These two rungs describe levels of “non-participation” that have been contrived by some to substitute for genuine participation. Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable power holders to “educate” or “cure” the participants” (Arnstein 1969, p. 1).

Tokenism (between placation & informing): Moving forward to a dispensation of government where democracy is founded as a pillar of society. People should be consulted about needs and information should be given when requested. The variance at which this information is shared between actors is of great importance as it shapes the relationship between actors. Where more information is shared in a manner that seeks to promote dialogues, one can assume that a certain level of two-way communication may exist. According to Arnstein’s theory,

![Figure 5.2: Participation Levels](Source: Authors based on Arnstein Innes & Booher Theory)
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5.2.2. Collaborative Planning
The categorical levels defined through the theory above are key issues in understanding and defining how this flow of information and engagement is present in society. This then equips one with analytical tools to determine if the processes presented are participative or not. However, limitations to Arnstein’s theory are evident as it presents a simplified explanation of real life processes. The assumption is that people must assert a position to gain power and be in control. However the ladder of participation gives little descriptive analysis of how one might apply these scenarios and therefore it remains a guideline. Innes & Booher have moved more towards concretising the processes and pointing out the technicalities involved that may lead to no participation. Innes and Booher identify problems with traditional methods of participation. The main criticism is that these normative methods of participation have become ritualistic, in the sense they have failed to relate to change within societies. The ritualistic processes by which planners and public officials have undertaken conform to policies that give rights to participation of citizens, but the actual practical actions are somewhat different.

“This may include in different processes public hearings, written public comments on proposed projects, and use of a citizen based commission with quasi-judicial and/or quasi legislative power” (Innes and Booher 2000, p.7)

Innes and Booher argue for processes of participation that are present and more distinct to how they give more democracy or less. The criticism is mainly directed at structured bureaucratic systems of rights that have become more involved with processes that give rise to the following:

- No genuine participation in planning or decision-making
- No provision of information
- Representation not reflected in the whole spectrum of communities
- No transparency or lacking access to information process

5.2.3. Research methodology
5.2.3.1. Strategy for Research
The Tarlabası Renewal Project was selected as a study area affected by the urban renewal policies within Beyoğlu jurisdiction. The emphasis is on understanding the processes, relationships and account of events that have guided the project and determined the evident consequences. To that end, a qualitative analysis approach has been selected to explain the social, political, and legal factors that have been derived from the project. The main qualitative data collection methods applied were classified according to Kitchin and Tate (2000, pp.212-28) as follows:

Primary sources: The data is collected on a first-hand basis, through interviews with different stakeholders and driving actors (municipality, developer, conciliation manager, residents in the neighbourhood).

Secondary sources: secondary sources are of two kinds:
- a) External actors, including academics, activists, and the Chamber of Architects and Urban Planners. The aim is to understand the perceptions of
various involved stakeholders (local experts who have in-depth knowledge of local dynamics).

b) A study of academic and non-academic publications that cover the processes, procedures and events related to the project (bibliographical references).

Other secondary sources such as: blogs, social media posts and publications by relevant stakeholders have also been reviewed in order to understand community dynamics (See Figure 5.3).

### 5.2.3.2. Conducting the Field Study

The three main research methods for data collection in the field were: documentary analysis, observation and interviews (See Figure 5.4).

The first stage of the research study was through documentary analysis and the gathering of secondary information, in order to gain an overview. This also served to identify further tools that could be utilized in the field. Since the aim was a qualitative analysis, semi-structured interviews were chosen to provide a clear understanding of the perceptions of the involved actors within the defined project area of interviews conducted (See Figures 5.4, 5.5). Limitations of communication were evident, hence the assistance of a graduate research student who translated questions and established direct communication in the local language.

The observation part was conducted in the field in order to see the current situation of the urban renewal project. Secondly, the aim was to establish whether people were still living in the study area or had already been relocated. Thirdly, to experience other issues that could not be experienced through a documentary analysis. Fourthly, to document the area in photographs, mapping locations of interviews carried out and not carried out (due to refusal by prospective interviewees).

Limitations of the research study: Initially, the study was envisaged as the collection of data from the people living within the demarcated project area, but that was widened to include residents on the boundaries of the project area. The language barrier created a challenge to correlating questions and answers in sequence. The aim was to engage each participant in a conversation that would produce answers in a natural manner, creating a flowing conversation. Breaking up the conversation in order to translate would have sacrificed the natural flow and limited the information flow. A second limitation was the accumulation of information by the local person who had to translate afterwards, creating an indirect break in transfer of information.

### 5.2.3.3. Data Collection Analysis

In order to familiarise ourselves with the data, recordings of interviews and lectures were listened to several times and transcribed. Notes were reviewed and first impressions written down. We prepared semi-structured interviews with twelve questions designed to elicit perceptions about the project and its decision-making processes. Of these, only six provided responsive answers as per our main objective.
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### Figure 5.4: Research Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of data</th>
<th>Place of Source</th>
<th>Data collection method used</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Documentary collection and analysis</td>
<td>1. Şevki Sirma</td>
<td>Conference organized by the key public authorities and round of questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beyoğlu Municipality</td>
<td>1. Ulaş Akin, 2. Arif Kökü</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITU Faculty of Architecture</td>
<td>1. İpek Yada Akpınar</td>
<td>Conference organized by academic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yıldız Technical University</td>
<td>2. Zeynep Enlil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap İNŞAAT</td>
<td>Nilgün Kıvircık+Project provider</td>
<td>Conference organized by developer agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GALATA DERNEGI</td>
<td>1. Cem Tüzün, Taksim Platform</td>
<td>Films and videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAK- Tarlabası Renewal Project &amp; Innovative Practices</td>
<td>1. Faruk Göksu, 2. Şila Akalp, 3. Ömer Kanıpak</td>
<td>Strategic social planning realized by the agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber of Architects</td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Observation in Tarlabası area</td>
<td>Visit to Tarlabası project</td>
<td>Observation, photographs, phases of the project</td>
<td>To document and understand the phases of the project, and current characteristics of the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td>Tolga İslam professor, Alper Ünlü professor, Ahmet Gün- The Association: “Tarlabası Homeowners and Tenants Social Solidarity and Development Association” with the chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber of Architects</td>
<td>Visit to Chamber of Architects, interview and collect data with Arch. Cem Tüzün, IMECE interview (activist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with inhabitants in Tarlabası study area- 5 interviews (community in total 15 people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors*
In the second phase, data was organized in tables correlating each question to each interviewee’s answer. For each answer, a category was generated according to preconceived processes as per ladder of participation theory. After comparing the categories, recurring answers that matched the same category were analysed. The findings revealed how the community perceived the decision-making process.

5.3. Analysis of the Case Study

5.3.1. Understanding the Urban Renewal Project in Tarlabası
The urban renewal project is located 10 minutes’ walk from İstiklal Street and is connected by the Tarlabası Boulevard to the CBD. It is bordered to the east by Keresteci-Recep Street, to the north-east by Tavla Street and Atlı Ases Street, to the north by Paşa Bakkal, Karanlık Bakkal and Babacan Streets, and to the west by Çukur Street (See Figure 5.5). The project is located within three neighbourhoods: Bülbül, Çukur and Şehit Muhtar, encompasses an area of 20,000 square metres and consists of the renewal of nine blocks, namely blocks 360, 361, 362, 363, 386, 385, 387, 593, 594 and 278 plots (See Figure 5.6). The project is based in a public-private partnership, in which the private company (GAP) is responsible for the execution of the project, granted under the headship of the Beyoğlu municipality (GAP iNSAAT, p. 9).

The renewal proposes to merge narrow plots and create larger buildings, with the purpose of providing more liveable residential areas with safe spaces, and providing the residents with a variety of facilities, such as stores, restaurants, cafes and offices (GAP iNSAAT) (See Figure 5.7).

The design proposes a change to the historical pattern, creating a uniform height in the buildings and inner courtyard. The proposal sees car parking as a problem and parking lots are planned in the basements of buildings and by changing the dimensions of the streets (Ünlü 2010, p. 55).

The project has provoked criticism and resistance, one of the main reasons being the very close relationship between the developer and the government. The Chamber of Architects insists that there
is no public welfare in the project, only private and commercial interests. The public view is that the renewal will result in the complete gentrification of the area. There is also criticism of the architecture and urban design, based on the principles of joining plots, demolishing original buildings and building replica facades and thereby destroying historical value (Inceoglu and Yürekli 2013, p. 6). (See Figures 5.8-5.11)

One of the main reasons for the new Tarlabası project is the social and physical deprivation of the area. From a social perspective, the municipality presents the project as the rehabilitation of a slum area inhabited by a vulnerable population with a very low economic level. On a physical level, the main reason cited is the abandoned buildings, poorly maintained and hazardous, which are causing a dilapidation of the urban environment. Within the nine blocks, approximately 30% of the total 1057 units in the project area are vacant (Kentsel Strateji 2010, pp. 12–13). The Beyoğlu mayor, Ahmet Misbah Demircan, affirms that 70% of the buildings are unoccupied: “Why these 278 buildings? We picked the buildings that had fewer inhabitants and were about to collapse at any minute. We should first solve the most gangrenous areas. If we can solve this part, we think the rest will be solved more easily with new enthusiasm. There are about 500 property owners here, but 70% of these buildings are unoccupied.”

**5.3.1.1. Legal Framework**

One of the most important characteristics of Tarlabası is its historical and architectural value which led to it being declared a preservation area in 1993. 85% (210 out of 246) of the existing buildings in the urban renewal project area are registered as historical buildings, and therefore, up until 2005, lay mostly within the legal scope of law 2863/5226 – the 1983 “Law of Protection of Cultural and Natural Assets”. As a tool to protect the urban and architectonical features of the area, law 2863 defines the concept of “Protected sites” in its Article 3. “Protected sites” are cities and city relics from various civilizations, extending from the prehistoric era to the present day, that reflect the social, economic, architectural and similar characteristics of their period, places where important historical events have taken place. These sites should be protected and their natural characteristics preserved.

Within this conception of conservation, law 2863/5226 sets out in a very restrictive way all the regulations governing any kind of intervention (renewal and repair, amongst others) concerning registered historical buildings, as in the case of Tarlabası. The physical deterioration of the area was in part an effect of these restrictions which impede the improvement of buildings. This was one of the main reasons that the Municipality proposed an urban renewal project.
It was not until 2005 that the legal framework was changed with the enactment by the Council of Ministers upon recommendation of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, to national law 5366 (in 2005), the so-called law for the “Preservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalizing of Deteriorated Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties”. The main objective of law 5366, as is set out in its article1, is: “by reconstruction and restoration in line with the progress of the area of zones which are registered and declared as conservation areas by boards of conservation of cultural and natural assets which have been worn down and are tending to lose their characteristics”. Hence this legal tool is applicable for a renewal project in a historical area such as Tarlabası. According to the law, the restoration zones can be determined by the decision of the metropolitan municipalities, the district municipalities or the first level municipalities and then, as in the case of Tarlabası, submitted to the Council of Ministers. In 2006, the Council of Ministers Decision no. 2006/10172 declared 6 renewal polygons within...
the Beyoğlu District, including the nine blocks that are currently the Tarlabası Renewal Area.

The most relevant aspects for the case of Tarlabası renewal as defined by the law are: objectives and scope, the identification of zones, implementation, and the restrictions on dealing with immovables and expropriation.

Objectives and scope: This act covers the terms and procedures relating to the determination of the restoration areas to be created in line with the foregoing objects: the setting of technical infrastructure and construction standards, the formation of drawings and the application, organization, management, supervision, participation and use thereof (article 1).

Identification of zones: The restoration zones shall be determined by district and first level municipalities, metropolitan municipalities and provincial special administrations by the approval of their
respective assemblies. These decisions should be submitted to the Council of Ministers who will decide within three months whether the project should be implemented or not. All the immovables within the boundaries of the zone shall be subject to the provisions of the restoration or renewal project prepared in accordance with the law.

Implementation: In this aspect the law determines the different actors that can implement the renewal projects, which could be: district and first level municipalities, the provincial special administrations and municipalities, public agencies or organizations, the Mass Housing Authority (TOKI), natural and legal persons, or private administrations. The restoration projects in some cases can also be carried out by the owner.

In terms of conservation, the law sets out that the renewal project will determine the specific treatment (not necessarily according the Conservation Law) and criteria (repair or reconstruction) for the immovables within the project.

Where there is a risk of natural disaster, appropriate measure must be taken into consideration.

Restrictions on dealing with immovables and expropriation: To implement an urban renewal project on a block scale the capacity for action amongst all the properties, buildings and plots is needed, hence, in article 4, the law establishes how the tool of expropriation can be applied to cases where the municipality or private administrator fail to reach an agreement with the property owners.

The same article makes reference to Law 2942 – the 1983 Turkish Expropriation Law – according to which expropriated properties can be used for tourism purposes. This complemented previous articles which set out that the future use of the renewed areas can be as residential, commercial, cultural, tourism or social facilities. Real properties within the boundaries of the restoration zone owned by the Treasury can be transferred upon request to the municipality or the private administrator conducting the project without requiring any further process. Such transactions are exempt from taxes, duties and charges.

5.3.1.2. Process and Stages of the Project

In the previous section, Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project has been shown as the pilot project consequence of renewal law 5366 for the Beyoğlu district. Only a few months after the approval of the law in 2005, the main promoter of the project, Beyoğlu District Municipality, determined the six restoration zones within its boundaries and submitted them to the Council of Ministers.

In February 2006, the Council of Ministers Decision no. 2006/10172 declared the nine blocks, already defined in previous sections, as the Tarlabası Phase 1 Renewal Area (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.2). Beyoğlu District Municipality prepared, at that time, a tender to which several construction companies were invited. On 16 March 2006 the GAP İNŞAAT proposition was delivered, and on 10 November 2006, the Municipal Council Decision no. 63 selected this proposal (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.2).

Between April and August 2006, the first General Meetings between the Beyoğlu municipality and the property owners were held. The administrators of the municipality provided information on the project and its implementation model while the property owners voiced their expectations and opinions (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.19; Dinçer, I. et al. 2008, p.4). In the course of these meetings the municipality offered the property owners the option of renewing their buildings by themselves, with the help of World Bank credits, if needed.

In March 2007, the contract between the municipality and the selected developer, GAP İNŞAAT, was signed and it was established that a public-private partnership would carry out the project. A Board for
Renewal Areas was founded in May 2007. Between July and December 2007, discussions about the renewal plan and its design were held by the board. In December 2007, the Board for Renewal Areas approved the plan (Dincer, I. et al. 2008, p.4).

In 2008, Beyoğlu Municipality hired Kentsel Strateji as Conciliation Manager, to coordinate the so-called Reconciliation Process, which started in February. The Reconciliation Process is the term used by the developer to refer to the negotiation process with the property owners to obtain their acceptance of the design project conditions, in a first stage. In a second stage, on the advice of the conciliation manager, this negotiation process was extended to the rest of the stakeholders in the project (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.8).

In February 2008, the second General Meetings took place, again with the presence of Beyoğlu Municipality and the property owners (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.20). The neighbours and the Association claimed in their interviews (Neighbours Apr 2013; Gün Apr 2013) that in these meetings the developer’s renewal plan was shown to them, with no option to renew their buildings by themselves, in contradiction to what they had been previously told.

In response to this change of perspective, on 16 March 2008 the Tarlabası Homeowners and Tenants Social Solidarity and Development Association was established to “defend their rights against the construction company [developer]” (Dincer, I. et al. 2008, p.4). Since then, the association has been working with lawyers and have taken the project to the Turkish Court (Kuyucu and Ünsal 2010). They have also appealed to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR).

Between February and October 2008, a Strategic Social Plan (SSP) was developed by the conciliation manager to complement the Reconciliation Process. Its main objective was to contribute to the alleviation of the social and economic problems of the resident population and to ensure an equal share in the opportunities generated by the project, especially for the low income groups. This Strategic Social Plan (SSP) included a Conciliation Management Process, to be applied in the Reconciliation Process developed between February and July 2008, conceived “with the principles of ‘social responsibility’ and ‘participatory planning’” and structured in a number of stages to achieve the SSP main objective, explained above. These steps are consecutive strategies involving the diverse stakeholders: (See Figure 5.12)

1. To inform the stakeholders about the legal framework, preliminary designs, value assessments and shares,
2. To educate and raise the awareness of stakeholders with respect to value sharing, historical heritage, construction risks, quality of life, social and economic development,
3. Uniting the stakeholders in order to increase the level of participation and reach conciliation,
4. To manage the expectations of the stakeholders. These mainly concern sharing, rent aid, job opportunities and loss of income,
5. Removal of uncertainties through proper identification of problems and opportunities, about duration, loss of rent and income, school registrations, commercial activity and social housing, and
6. To ensure that the Project and SSP are adopted by the stakeholders. (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, pp.6-7)

The application of the Conciliation Management Process in the Reconciliation Process required further meetings with the owners, this time on a one to one basis. These were the so-called First Talks, in which “the shareholders were informed of their share rights and of the alternatives regarding the amount of independent units they could acquire at the project site.” (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.20). In the Second Talks the shareholders chose locations in the projected area and signed contracts with the developer.
Since the SSP scope included all residents in the area, meetings with tenants were also required, to inform them about the project and its impact on their lives, primarily in the realms of relocation and unemployment. The SSP vision is stated by Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. (2008, p.15) as follows:
“Seeing the Renewal Project as an ‘Opportunity for Economic and Social Development’ for those who live in the project area below the deprivation and poverty line, and implementing the principal of ‘equal access’ to public resources to the degree that the resources allow.”

Moreover, Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. (2010, p.15) defines the SSP purpose as:
“While thoroughly assessing the problems and opportunities of the project area and remaining within the scope of the vision that was put forth, to give priority to maximizing the expectations of the poor residing in the project area and to provide the social planning and implementation processes with wide participation in order to shape their futures.”

Four Strategic Objectives (SO) are set out in order to realize the vision and purpose of the SSP:

SO1. Development of solutions towards achieving relocation,
SO2. Creation of an environment suitable for new income creation and improvement,
SO3. Social development and integration,

The principle outcomes linked to SO1 were the Social, Economic and Spatial Fabric Study and the Recommendations for relocation of a variety of residents. Concerning SO2, the main parts were the Job-Oriented Training Programs and the Action Plan for Income Generation and Improvement. The important points of SO3 were the Social Plans for Alternative Areas and the Action Plan for Urban Regeneration. One of the outcomes of SO4 was the creation of the Strategic Social Plan committee. A meeting of this committee is referred to in the SSP (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008a, p.39) in which “the action areas and objectives of the ‘Strategic Social Plan’ were disclosed.” Considering the limitations of the plan, which was not legally binding, we were unable to confirm the actual application of this Strategic Social Plan.

In 2009, the Reconciliation Process continued and the first contracts for flats in the renewed area were signed by the developer and the owners. At the same time, a number of criticisms were voiced and attempts made to fight the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project. Since the approval of law 5366, there has been a great outcry from some academics concerning the negative impacts of the law and its implementation in different locations, like our case study. The Tarlabası area and The Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project have also been the focus of several Master Theses and PhDs, analyzing the previous situation and the transformation. In 2009, in a report to UN-Habitat (AGFE 2009), the Advisory Group on Forced Evictions in Istanbul raised the alarm regarding potential evictions within the project area.

In 2010, the demolitions began. In the same year, Tarlabası Homeowners and Tenants Social Solidarity and Development Association applied to UNESCO to stop the project (Hürriyet Daily News 2010). The ‘Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects TMMOB’ with the ‘Chamber of Urban Planners’ filed a suit in a local court against the project.

In 2011, residents and tradespeople were evacuated or evicted from the area. Beşiktaş Municipality claimed that they were now living in the TOKI settlements proposed. However, interviews with the inhabitants of surrounding areas (Neighbours Apr 2013), revealed that some of them had returned to their place of origin, most had moved to near neighbours (See Figure 5.13) and only a few had gone to the TOKI settlements.
Activists in Istanbul have also raised their voices against the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project and other similar projects. In 2012, a Right to the City meeting was held. This included lectures on the Zero Evictions Campaign.

The Reconciliation Process has continued, chalking up 198 contracts for flats between the developer and owners. The demolition process has also continued, as confirmed by our field trip. The developer estimates that the project will be finished in two and a half to three years’ time (See Figure 5.15). As far as lawsuits against the project are concerned, both Tarlabası Homeowners and Tenants Social Solidarity and Development Association and The Chamber of Turkish Engineers and Architects (TMMOB) with The Chamber of Urban Planners are currently awaiting court verdicts.

5.3.1.3. Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project Stakeholders

Stakeholder Analysis

“The actors of these regeneration projects can be generalized as Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, local municipalities, Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKI), local public, technocrats, academics” (Sakarya 2011, p.3). (See Figure 5.16)

While following the established logic of urban renewal projects, the Tarlabası project boasts its own peculiarities. We have customized the stakeholder analysis diagram in order to explain them clearly.

According to Dincer et al (2008), “there are two opposing views about the law [Renewal Law 5366] and its implementation procedures”. In line with this thinking, we have divided the diagram into

**Figure 5.12:**
Conciliation Management Process
Source: Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti.
two parts: the actors supporting and the actors opposing the project. We have also considered neutral actors.

As previously mentioned, the main actor in the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project is a public entity, but Sakarya (2011, p.1) claims that “in the context of neoliberal economy, based on the pull factors of cities, when municipalities contribute capital to invest in their urban areas, they also increase the land values in their provinces. For this reason, new neighbourhoods have been declared urban regeneration areas”. In our case study this is even more obvious because of the public-private partnership. For these reasons, we have divided the diagram into three parts: public, who promotes; private, who develops; and civil society, who is excluded from the process.

We have divided the diagram into three levels: neighbourhood, local to regional and national. Only a few stakeholders fall beyond these levels and these are in an international level. The divisions also relate to the spheres of power.

Let us now look at the role of the stakeholders.
A) Supportive Stakeholders
A-1: Public
At national level, there is the Central Government, responsible for the approval of the delimitation of the project area. There is also the Supreme Board of Protection (for Cultural and Natural Assets), an institution framed within the previous protection law 2863 and therefore responsible for protected areas until the approval of law 5366. The Turkish Ministry of Housing Development Administration, TOKI, has been involved in the relocation of residents process.

At local level, the main actor is Beyoğlu District Municipality, the promoter of the project. The “Beyoğlu Renewal and Implementation Unit is the agency established to carry out the procedures with regard to renewal areas” (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.2). A Board for Renewal Area was created at the start of the project and has been involved in its design and approval.

A-2: Private
At national level, another main actor is GAP İNŞAAT, the developer of the project. We have considered as supportive media the diverse newspapers and radio and TV stations – national, regional and local – which have sustained the project. At local level, a key actor is Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti., the conciliation manager.

A-3: Civil Society
Dincer et al (2008) state that there is a supportive civil society in these renewal projects, implementations of law 5366. These are “some of the academicians, architects, planners, local residents and NGOs”.

B) Unsupportive Stakeholders
B-1: Public
At international level, we have considered UNESCO
as an actor. Their Advisory Group on Forced Evictions submitted a report to UN-Habitat.

At local level, we include Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. Semih Turhan, Head of the Department of Earthquake Risk Management and Urban Development explained that they were not involved. The previous protection law 2863 establishes the Board of Protection (for Cultural and Natural Assets), but we have understood from Kentsel Strateji (2008a) and Dincer et al (2008) that it was not part of the project.

B-2: Private
Unsupportive media, at national, regional and local level.

B-3: Civil Society
At international level, the International Alliance of Inhabitants (IAI) has been involved in the Zero Evictions Campaign. At national level, the Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects TMMOB and the Chamber of Urban Planners joined together in a lawsuit against the project. At local level, a number of academics have written papers opposing the project. Some activists are involved in the Right to the City movement. A number of Istanbul residents are also against the project.

At neighbourhood level, the Tarlabası Homeowners and Tenants Social Solidarity and Development Association, the only grassroots movement in the area, is fighting the project. The residents of the area were a mixture of cultures, but for the purposes of our research we will classify them according to their role in the project. First, are the property owners, who can be divided (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008a) into those who lived in the area, those who lived outside the area, and those with commercial spaces in the area. The tenants can be classified as those who paid and those who didn’t pay (occupiers). The inhabitants of the surrounding area are also affected by the project. There are two organizations at neighbourhood level which seem to be uninterested in taking up a position against the project, but which work with the residents of the surrounding area. One is the Tarlabası Community Centre and the other a community kitchen.

C) Neutral Stakeholders
The courts to which some actors have delivered lawsuits have been considered as neutral. At international level, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) has received a lawsuit from the Association against the project. At national level, the Turkish court has received lawsuits from both the Association and from professional chambers.

5.3.1.4. Stakeholder Relationships
In this section we will analyse the stakeholders, taking into account their influence over and interest in other stakeholders. This will help us understand the relationships between the main actors and their

---

**Figure 5.15:** Project Area in April 2013
Source: Natalia Garzón Arredondo
attempts to achieve their objectives concerning the project. (See Figure 5.17)

Directions of influence:
Looking at the diagram, we observe Beyoğlu District Municipality attempting to influence both public and private stakeholders. The most important relationship in this case study is the Public-Private Partnership (PPP), described by Dincer, I. et al. (2008, p.4) as a “protocol signed by the main actor, Beyoğlu District Municipality, with a private company, GAP İNŞAAT, which is responsible for both the preparation of the renewal project and its implementation”. Personal relationships link both the central and the Beyoğlu governments to this company. Academics also claim government-media links which serve to spread propaganda in favour of the project.

Interest groups: We consider the methods used by non-power groups to accomplish their objectives, whether to improve or to fight the project. Key actor, Kentsel Strateji, an important component of the SSP, set up the Strategic Social Plan Committee to bring together the main stakeholders. As previously highlighted, neither this committee nor the SSP in general were legally binding.

Tarlabaşı Homeowners and Tenants Social Solidarity and Development Association was set up by some of the residents of the area to represent their interests and make claims for their rights through such national and international organizations as the Turkish court, ECHR and UNESCO. TMMOB and Urban Planners joined forces to fight the project in court.

Figure 5.16:
Stakeholder Analysis
Source: Authors
5.3.2. Field Study Findings
5.3.2.1 Preliminary Observations
A participant observation method was used to gather information for the qualitative analysis. Environmental characteristics were documented through pictures, which also helped provide an understanding of the current situation and stage of development and allowed us to interact with people living in the study area.

The area was visited between the 14 and 21 April. The first visit was to familiarise ourselves with the site and observe how people behaved in the presence of the researchers. Our first impression was that it was a very close community that habitually used the streets as a common space for shared activities, including a variety of economic activities (See Figure 5.18).

The reaction of the people to our presence was curious and sensitive. Our initial impression in some areas was of empty, abandoned, half-demolished buildings, but the people who lived there would soon appear at the unglazed windows (See Figure 5.19).

As far as implementation of the renewal project is concerned, the demolition process is very slow. In the plots adjoining to Tarlabası Boulevard, we observed only one demolition machine and very few workers (See Figure 5.20, 5.22).

In addition to the poor state of the buildings, we observed an absence of public infrastructure and social equipment and a lack of connectivity with the rest of the city, despite the area’s location in...
the city centre. A clear divide exists between the different social classes in the area and there is much tension among the residents on the boundary of the project as they see the neighbourhood being transformed.

5.3.2.2. Analysis of the Legal and Institutional Framework

In order to understand the implementation of the urban renewal project at Tarlabası several aspects of law 5366 need to be analyzed in more detail.

Objectives and scope: The objectives and scope of the law cover only the physical dimension of this type of project, leaving aside the social, economic and conservation dimensions.

Identification of zones: It should be stressed that, although new renewal zones can be proposed by the districts to the mass housing authority, there are no clear guidelines as to the criteria for the selection of these areas and no representation of the Conservation Boards in the chain of decisions. This points to a clear lack of hierarchically binding laws and plans for urban renewal projects in a historical city such as Istanbul.

Implementation and decision-making processes in urban renewal projects: The legal framework establishes stakeholders’ involvement in the decision-making processes for urban renewal projects. These processes include choice of site and its approval, and approval of project. The law awards power of implementation of these projects to districts and first-level municipalities.

Dincer et al. (2008, p. 2), describe the decision-making process determined by law 5366 thus:
1. Determination of a site as a renewal area by the professionals working in the district municipality
2. Approval of the proposal for the renewal area by the Council of District Municipality.
3. Approval of the proposal for the renewal area
by the Council of the Greater Metropolitan Municipality.

4. Approval of the proposal for the renewal area by the Council of Ministers within three months and publication of this decision in the official gazette.
5. Preparation of a renewal project by the municipality or a company assigned by the municipality.
6. Approval of the renewal project by the Board for Renewal Areas
7. Approval of the renewal project by the Council of the District Municipality.
8. Approval of the renewal project by the mayor of the Greater Metropolitan Municipality.

In this process the presence of government, from district to national authorities’ level, is clear, but the law makes no mention of the community directly affected by the project. Also missing is the participation of consultants, such as academics or social-civic organizations or even the heritage conservation boards. In terms of implementation, the law states that approved projects may be implemented by private administrators or the municipality.

Restrictions on dealing with immovables and expropriation: The legal framework applied to renewal projects on a block scale such as Tarlabası, allows for the use of expropriation in cases where there is no agreement has been reached between the executors of the project and the owners of the properties.

Three aspects of law 5366 are particularly controversial. First, the use of expropriation by a private administrator. Second, the possibility of using expropriated land for private interest. Within this framework, the expropriated land can be sold by the municipalities for new residential or tourism purposes, thus distorting the original purpose of the expropriation. The third controversial aspect is that the law does not set the time or conditions for the agreement with the property owners, and tenants and other inhabitants of the area are excluded from the negotiations.

5.3.2.3. Perception of Different Stakeholders
In this section we will describe the diverse perceptions of different stakeholders. We have classified this information according to three groups which refer to three topics: conditions in Tarlabası before the renewal; the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project and participation in that project; project supporters and unsupportive stakeholders.

Perceptions of conditions in Tarlabası before the renewal
According to Dincer et al (2008), supportive stakeholders see Tarlabası as one of the ‘problem areas’ that pose a threat to society, mainly due to security concerns thanks to the bad image of the areas, but also because of the unsound state of the building stock that could collapse in an earthquake. On the other hand, academics who have studied Tarlabası are in general unsupportive stakeholders, considering the area a vivid neighbourhood with a great mixture of cultures.

Perceptions of the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project
According to Dincer et al (2008, p.10), supportive stakeholders “highlight the need to intervene in these ‘problem areas’ and act towards the threats they pose to society.” They state that unsupportive stakeholders “claim that the negative consequences of these renewal projects will outweigh the benefits. They criticise the law and the renewal projects, saying that they violate property rights, displace disadvantaged people, are not backed by social policies and do not involve the local residents in crucial decisions about their neighborhood” (Ibid.).

Perceptions of participation in the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project
Supportive stakeholders consider the reconciliation process as participation, because it includes the property owners, the only residents with legally binding rights. This is reminiscent of Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti’s claim that participation equals negotiation. For them, it is a real estate project, and stake-
holders are required to negotiate in order to benefit. Unsupportive stakeholders claim that there was no participation in the project, only forced evictions.

5.3.3 Linking theory to praxis: Participation in the Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project.
In this section the theoretical framework presented in section 5.3.2 will be linked to the facts obtained in the research. The theory states that collaborative methods work as tools for the exchange of knowledge between those who have the power to implement planning policies and the users or citizens who are aware of local needs and dynamics. An exchange of knowledge between the two sides facilitates the achievement of a common welfare and more effective planning. Ignoring people’s opinions places the participation level in the lower leader of Arnstein’s theory (1969) to the detriment of the development of the project.

The Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project is characterized by top-to-bottom decision making, which has led to protests, disagreements and the slow development of the project. The people evicted from the original environment perceive the decision-making process as being riddled with social inequality. According to community interviews, the results of these centralized decisions are failing to promote equality. People relocated to the outskirts of the city are moving back to the centre and are scattered in the vicinity of the project, trying to preserve old networks. The lack of legitimacy of public decisions creates an unequal environment. In the following section an analysis will be made of the participation approach, taking into account the legal framework and the facts that determined the development of the project.

5.3.3.1 Law 5366 and its approach to “participation”
As mentioned in previous chapters, law 5366 takes into account only the physical dimension of the territory, but in areas such as Tarlabası the social and economic dimensions are equally important in evolving strategies that will lead to more integrated renewed neighbourhoods and more socially successful projects. In article 2, the law establishes the power of action and participation, stating that they “shall be determined by regulation”. It does not, however, define what this regulation should consist of nor how the participation of the stakeholders involved will take place.

The previous binding law, the Conservation Law, did set a framework for the participation of the community affected, searching to improve the economic and social conditions of these communities.

Another problem with law 5366 is that the relevant community is defined as only the property owners, excluding, in the specific case of Tarlabası, 75% of the population (tenants and occupiers). Although the property owners have the right to repair their buildings, they have to do this without disrupting the project which has been approved by the municipality. The municipality also has the right to decide to what use the property will be put.

In the case of Tarlabası a Strategic Social Plan (explained in previous chapters) was formulated as a tool to reflect the needs of the community and their concerns about the project. However, this plan is not legally binding and its implementation power does not go beyond the level of recommendation. The law does not determine the framework for citizens’ participation, but it does not deny it either. In terms of formal planning, there are no rules laid down for urban renewal projects in Turkey. They depend on the application of experts’ recommendations and the political will to implement them.

The general conclusion for the participatory process within law 5366 is that there is a lack of necessary participation and involvement of the various stakeholders in the process.

“Participatory methods including the communities and the citizens directly interested and concerned should be built in the formulation, the design,
the implementation and the control phase of the whole process. This ingredient, as demonstrated by various international practices will be an important ingredient to prevent evictions and reach creative and positive solutions for the benefit of the city and of its citizens” (Report to the Executive Director of the UN Habitat Programme Mission to Istanbul, June 2009 Unesco p.43).

5.3.3.2. Facts in the Process of the Project
In this section we are going to review the main points which have cropped up in the process of the project and can be related to participation, or the lack of participation.

Firstly, Tarlabası Urban Renewal Project is being developed within a public-private partnership scheme. This initial condition excludes per se from all the important decisions every stakeholder except Beyoğlu District Municipality, the promoter of the project, and GAP İNŞAAT, the developer. Secondly, the decision-making process for the design of the project was realized within the Board for Renewal Areas. There were “workshops which took place between Beyoğlu Municipality, private sector, experts, academics and vanguard architects” (GAP İNŞAAT n.d.). There is no reference to the residents at this stage of the process. Thirdly, the developer refers to the negotiations with the property owners as a reconciliation process (refer to 5.4.1.2). At this stage, only a very few residents are involved and they are not included in the decision-making process. The property owners are simply informed about the project and their rights and options to participate in it, options which were evaluated and decided previously.

Fourthly, the recruitment of Kentsel Strateji as conciliation manager implied an essential change in the planning approach to the project, from a top-down decision-making process towards an attempt at participatory planning. Kentsel Strateji designed a Strategic Social Plan, which, for the first time in the whole process, included all stakeholders, and consequently, all residents of the area. The SSP vision is specifically focused on “seeing the Renewal Project as an ‘Opportunity for Economic and Social Development’ for those who live in the project area below the deprivation and poverty line” (Kentsel Strateji Ltd. Sti. 2008, p.15). As mentioned before, this was an attempt to improve participation, but as it was not legally binding, we were not able to confirm whether it was implemented.

Finally, in response to the lack of participation, violation of property rights and potential (and subsequently executed) forced evictions, the excluded stakeholders have used different ways to try to be included and considered in the project. Research conducted into the neighbourhood and the project has helped the academic community to be aware of the implementation of projects based in law 5366. Activists’ campaigns and meetings have tried to make governmental decisions and actions visible to the public at a local level. However, the Zero Evictions campaign is an international fight, and our case study has been brought before a public at an international scale. Both the Chamber of Turkish Engineers and Architects and the Chamber of Urban Planners went to court against the project, in the hope of achieving a verdict similar to that in the Sulukule case. Moreover, the Tarlabası Homeowners and Tenants Social Solidarity and Development Association has issued lawsuits against the project in both Turkey and Europe.
5.4. Concluding remarks: Lessons learned from the processes of participation in Urban Renewal Projects

A few important points have been raised in our quest to understand the participation of citizens within the Tarlabası Renewal Project. It is clear that participation as a mechanism for brokering dialogue that brings the interests of all affected citizens to the table is not yet attainable in this project, which serves as a pilot project for urban renewal. The question that has to be carried forward into a broader discussion is what the results will be in other communities outlined for similar renewal processes. Judging by the trends seen in the previous and current projects in Sulukule and Tarlabası, one can only imagine the magnitude of social repercussions to be encountered in the other outlined areas. The following points have emerged from the exercise as the key challenges to real participation.

A. The urban renewal law in its current state is ambiguous in affording the local residents their rights from being evicted from their neighbourhoods. The law misappropriates the use of expropriation as a tool for attaching property for private entity projects. In turn, these laws affect the less powerful tenants, who have become the vulnerable groups in this project as they have little stake in decision-making. This repudiation of rights extends to the owners. Under this law they have little chance to impose their wishes of how they would like to shape their environment. This view is shared by a number of international organizations critical of the level of protection the law currently provides for its civilians.

B. It has become clear that laws relating to urban renewal projects have been utilised by the state as a tool to change the historical quality of the building fabric through reinterpretations of conservation that are vague. Through these laws the state has the power to effect changes to these conservation areas that affect not only the physical fabric but also the social part of it. These processes are driven by top-down initiatives that appropriate the final say regardless of the common consensus on the ground.

C. Based on perceptions from the community and a breakdown of the sequence of events, it has been revealed that participation processes are still lingering within the lower rungs of the Ladder of participation, whereby the powerful entice the community to a power sharing platform in order to learn about their ideas, but are not willing to share power in finding common solutions. As a result, the inhabitants are asserting their rights by raising their voices through lawsuits. This can be seen as a bid to access power to decision-making.

It must also be noted that other brokers of negotiation have joined the fray, which suggests the possibility of bringing in more stakeholders to act as a bridge.

We therefore confirm that one of the lessons to be drawn from this research is that participation must be fully supported from the legal side and should feature in planning policies and in interaction channels between power holders and civilians. Collaborative planning should be adopted through which, as Healey (2006) puts it, people could acquire a voice and get listened to, and the applied policies are so that resources are distributed and rule systems devised and practised. It is through this interaction of different stakeholders with different interests that the level of participation can be raised, enhancing the community and keeping it intact.

Figure 5.22:
Life in Tarlabası
Source: Blanca Villar Mateo (2013)
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Talimhane is considered to be one of the most vibrant in Istanbul and is definitely the busiest region in Beyoğlu. Specific sites of interest are Taksim Square, Istiklal Street and Congress Valley. Set amongst these areas of high activity is the Talimhane district, mainly a hotel area, with some commercial activity. Its development from a commercial zone into a hotel district is an interesting process. Development of this type is normally instigated by non-local investors, but Talimhane’s development appears to have grassroots origins, having been spurred on by local actors who seized an opportunity.

A pedestrianisation and renovation project took place in Talimhane to make it more tourist friendly. Part of our research is to analyse the success of this pedestrianisation project. An interesting aspect of this project is its participatory planning facet as the pedestrianisation was requested by the hotel owners. Talimhane can also be considered an area of rapid and constant urban transformation. The area started out as a military barracks, was turned into a planned high-income residential area, then a low-middle income commercial area and finally the tourist area it is today. This transformation took place in just under fifty years, an aspect we focused on in our research.

In this chapter the research will look into several features of Talimhane and the transformation process that happened there. The location of Talimhane as a key to its development and potential development will be analysed. The historical development of Talimhane and the different spatial transformations that took place will be discussed. An overview of the socio-economic factors will be given, followed by a possible theoretical framework, to investigate which urban or development theories apply to the transformation process of Talimhane. There are also key research questions, as well as a presentation of the research methodology and the findings.

6.1. Urban Transformation of Talimhane Area

6.1.1. Location
The Talimhane district is situated north-west of Taksim Square. A tourist hotels district featuring gated pedestrian streets throughout, it was shaped partly in order to support an important NATO summit in 2004. The flat area of approximately 67,000 square metres was planned as grid-dotted streets back in the 1930s and now consists of 42 hotels, ranging from 2-5 stars, bars, restaurants, shops, banks and exchange offices. The few old art-deco buildings that remain have mostly been transformed into modern-looked hotels and commercial buildings. Taksim Gezi Park, the Republic Monument, Istiklal Avenue and Congress Valley are all within walking distance. Galata Tower and Dolmabahçe Palace, as well as the Bosphorus-side Kabataş and the Golden Horn-side Karaköy metro station are less than two kilometres away. (Figure 6.2)

6.1.2. Timeline of Urban Transformation of Talimhane
Galata was the first settlement in Beyoğlu, thanks to its international port and status as an important commercial center. Tradesmen were drawn to the area and settled there and opening shops. In the middle of the 19th century a small number of embassy staff and their families, as well as Ottoman Greek, Armenian and Jewish citizens populated the area.

Due to the economic prosperity, Beyoğlu’s borders started expanding, in one direction towards Galatasaray, and in the other direction towards the...
Figure 6.2: Location of Talimhane and Attractions
Design: L. Swangpol 2013
Figure 6.3: Graphic of Marking the Borders of Talimhane Neighborhood with Tarlabasi Neighborhood

Design: L. Swangpol 2013
In 1830, minorities in Beyoğlu numbered 13,000 and by 1848 this had increased to 40,000 (Akın 1998; Dökmeci and Çiraci 1990). The fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Declaration of the Republic, followed by the capitulations of the Lausanne Treaty of July 24 1923, forced big foreign companies, tradesmen, insurance firms and bankers to leave Beyoğlu. In 1939, Henri Prost was invited to devise a modern plan for the city. He demolished the Artillery Barracks and planned Taksim Park and the Talimhane area on a piece of empty land (a former drill field). The Talimhane project was planned as a middle-upper class residential area, with 6-7 Art Deco-style buildings.

The 1950s were marked by another heavy migration of minorities, who left the country for political reasons. This left room for some of the Turkish rural population to move into the abandoned residences of Tarlabası in Beyoğlu. They turned the deserted shops into small workshops, such as car repair shops (Yakar, 2000) and in 1970, this led to another migration as the residents of the Talimhane area, disturbed by these activities on the Tarlabası border, sold their properties and moved to Şişli, Nişantaşı or to the Anatolian side.

The urban image and socio-economic structure of the neighborhood was in decline until the 1980s, and what was once the most modern and lively part of the city was lost to low-quality entertainment places. In the wake of the deterioration caused by the shift of car repair shops in Tarlabası to Talimhane, the area was taken over by spare parts sellers, black marketeers and criminal groups (See Figures 6.3). In addition, the opening of Tarlabası Avenue in 1968 caused a split between the Talimhane neighborhood and Taksim Square and the other economically-rising parts of Beyoğlu, such as Istiklal Street. It was left to decay, facing serious security problems.

It was only towards the end of the 1990s that projects were put into motion to turn Istanbul into an important global city. Efforts were made to steer Istanbul into international markets, towards a finance and tourism-oriented urban economy. Because of its strategic position, near Taksim Square, Istiklal Street and close to Congress Valley, Talimhane attracted interest and was gradually transformed into a tourist district.

This transformation was accelerated by the “Talimhane Area Pedestrianisation Project”, implemented in 2004, and by the NATO summit hosted by Istanbul the same year. At present, the Talimhane area boasts 42 hotels and 89 commercial establishments, having once again changed again its land use, ownership and socio-economic status.

We would stress that all four major changes, in land use, ownership, socio-economic level and image, were triggered by local initiatives. On the strength of its special location, the Talimhane area changed in turn from military practice field to housing area for the rich to an area for lower-income citizens with different lifestyles and priorities. Small workshops appeared, and these in turn became shops. Gas stations opened, as did low budget-hotels. The tourism initiative was a local one, but was also embraced by the government at the end of 1990s, via the national agenda to steer Istanbul towards a finance- and tourism-orientated economy. This last transformation in ownership and land use is considered to have reinstated Talimhane’s original image and economic status, but did it miss the social capital aspect? Were old ways of life lost in the transformation process? And how truthful was the restoration of the architectural buildings? are questions that should be asked. There is no doubt that gains were made in the urban fabric in terms of security, but it still it has to be proved who benefitted most from these processes.
6.1.3. Current Economic and Social Aspects in Talimhane, Beyoğlu, Istanbul

The urban transformation concept is basically defined as a comprehensive and integrative vision with the purpose of ensuring development or improvement in the economic, social, physical and environmental spheres of an urban area subject to change. Urban transformation projects should not be considered as partial operations for the purpose of fixing problematic urban areas; they should be handled as comprehensive integrative processes, spreading to the whole city.

The physical decay of the environment is also a factor in urban transformation. Physical features of a region include the basic substructure, housing stock, the physical conditions of structures, transportation networks within the relevant province, electronic connections, and environmental quality. When these wear out with time, they can no longer perform their functions and need to be renewed. Developments in technology have led to social and economic changes and city centers have been affected by them. They no longer have an industrial function and have been turned instead into arts and entertainment centers. This can be considered a type of gentrification process, with both positive and negative aspects, such as:

- Positive outcomes: Stabilization of collapsed regions, increase in real estate values, decrease in empty lots, increase in local tax income, promotion of new initiatives and increased financial capacity.
- Negative outcomes: Displacement due to higher rents and land values, psychological problems due to displacement, social upheaval, destruction of ability to purchase cost-effective housing, increase in rates of local services or changes in the location of those services, pressures on poor regions and surroundings due to displacements and increased housing demand, loss of social diversity, occupation of gentrified regions and loss of population in such regions.

The visions of Istanbul for 2023 are tourism, finance and knowledge. In order to pursue these ambitions, the number of tourism shareholders, or service providers, has increased. There has likewise been an increase in tourism audits and controls, in information access and sharing, as well as new payment options or possibilities. One crucial aspect of the tourist industry relates to the economic issues that play a vital role in that industry in each country or city. Taking a broader view, it is important to mention that tourism helps introduce the history, religion and culture of a city or country to people from other parts of the world.

Currently, the tourist industry is the heart of the Turkish economy, being responsible for 23 per cent of the GNP (Gross National Product) in Istanbul. The city is open to international financial markets and has an urban economy oriented towards tourism. This was helped by the tourism promotion laws that designate certain areas as tourist centers, which allow for the development of businesses and shopping/commercial areas within these tourist locations. The city also handles half of Turkey's exports and imports. For example, approximately half of the 18,000 foreign companies active in Turkey are based in Istanbul.

Istanbul is a city with a unique historical and cultural heritage. It has 54 museums, 170 libraries, 52 theatres and concert halls, and with 22 synagogues, 126 churches and 3113 mosques is a showcase for religious coexistence. It also has a center for all three monotheistic belief systems (Judaism, Christianity and Islam) and is also the capital of the three longest-lived empires in history: east Roman by zonetime and Ottoman. These strengths have contributed to the the rise of the city's economy.

The two international airports of Istanbul report that between January and March 2013 the number

1 The information and statistics are provided from TURSAB and TUROB that mentioned in the Findings Part.
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As mentioned, the tourism-oriented transformation in the Talimhane area was accelerated by “Talimhane’s pedestrianisation project”, implemented in 2004 (the initial plan was proposed by a French architect). The first two hotels were established in 1990 and by the year 2000 that number had increased to 42, offering a bed capacity of more than 10,000. In addition, 89 commercial establishments, including stores, agencies, banks and exchanges, opened for business. Around 85 per cent of the area is given over to these activities, making it one of the most important and profitable centers in Istanbul.

6.1.4. Formal and Informal Economy in terms of Tourism in Talimhane

Prices in Talimhane, particularly as regards the hotels, vary a great deal. For example, in high season (high season covers two periods, from March till June, and from September till November) room rates rise around 50 per cent. Considerable variation is also found in the price of clothes and food etc when comparing tourist areas with other parts of the city. The following table shows the variation in prices in different sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In tourism district (avg.)</th>
<th>In other places (avg.)</th>
<th>In Asian part (avg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food (sandwiches)</td>
<td>8 tl</td>
<td>4 tl</td>
<td>3 tl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (main dishes)</td>
<td>17 tl</td>
<td>7 tl</td>
<td>6 tl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>30 tl</td>
<td>12 tl</td>
<td>10 tl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Talimhane was the most beautiful residential area in Beyoğlu and was located in a spectacular and unique downtown location, close to just about everywhere (shopping center in İstiklal Street, pedestrian area and public transport in Taksim Square, even easy access to all consulates). This helped convince people, especially commercial companies, of the potential value of the Talimhane area as a hotel and tourism investment. After the area was declared a tourist zone, the number of cafes, restaurants and giftware shops increased considerably. According to the ground floor & upper floor functional analysis carried out in the area, 80% of the area hosts commercial activity. Next in line are offices and hotels.

Figure 6.4: Talimhane after Pedestrianisation Project in 2004
Source: Swangpol 2013

Figure 6.5: Formal Jobs (Stores) in Talimhane
Source: Soltanzadeh 2013

Table 6.1: Price Comparison Between Tourist Area and the Others
Design: Soltanzadeh 2013

of visitors to arrive in Istanbul was 1,149,741. This accounts for 48.47% of all visitors to Turkey. In addition, Istanbul habitually hosts world congresses and other international events and there are 43 congresses and conference centers, with a total seating capacity of 30,000. The 73,836 bed capacity of the 410 hotels covers these numbers of visitors.

Talimhane was the most beautiful residential area in Beyoğlu and was located in a spectacular and unique downtown location, close to just about everywhere (shopping center in İstiklal Street, pedestrian area and public transport in Taksim Square, even easy access to all consulates). This helped convince people, especially commercial companies, of the potential value of the Talimhane area as a hotel and tourism investment. After the area was declared a tourist zone, the number of cafes, restaurants and giftware shops increased considerably. According to the ground floor & upper floor functional analysis carried out in the area, 80% of the area hosts commercial activity. Next in line are offices and hotels.
Tourist activity creates different kinds of formal and informal jobs, not just in Talimhane itself but also in the whole area affected by tourists. There are many formal jobs in Talimhane, but those most influenced by tourism are: 1. Employment in hotels (at least 250 people work in each hotel); 2. Shop work (an average of 3 persons in each shop); 3. Taxi services (one taxi station works only for the hotels in Talimhane. Three taxis are released every 10 minutes); 4. Bus transfer of passengers from the airport to Taksim Square. (The service is every 30 minutes between 4 am and 1 am. Each bus carries around 40 people and the trip costs 10 tl a head).

Informal jobs are divided into two categories. One category works for a formal organization, but their activity is informal (like the person who works for a restaurant or café to invite people inside, or the “car park man” who provides valet parking at the hotels). The other group includes those who have are self-employed in an informal or semi-formal activity (like street musicians, shoeshine boys, or “cart hawkers”).

We conclude this section with the observation that all these jobs and activities are involved in a two-way relationship with the tourist industry. The jobs were created or exist as a result of the growth of tourism in the area, but tourism also increases as a result of the presence of these jobs and services that help to enhance the tourist experience. Without them, the industry would face limited growth.
6.2. Theoretical Framework

“Geographic concentration magnifies the power of rivalry where the more localized the rivalry, the more the pressure for constant upgrading” (Porter 1990, p.85).

Taking into consideration tourism as an industry in Talimhane, Michael E. Porter’s theories of Clustering, National Advantage and Competitiveness can help give a summarized explanation of the hows and whys of the development of the area and its economic stability. In Porter’s discourse, competitiveness is driven by governmental policy as well as by targeting, protection, import promotion and subsidies; which would actually be the case of Talimhane.

Financial mechanisms such as subsidies and cost recovery strategies have facilitated the possibility of investment parcels to develop new hotels. Once the first investments started, competition through a highly localized process became an advantage through pressure and challenge, just as in Porter’s theory. According to Porter:

“Productivity is the prime determinant of nations long run standard of living, it is the root cause of national per capita income, where a nation’s companies must relentlessly improve productivity in existing industries by raising product quality, adding desirable features, improving product technology, or boosting production efficiency. They must develop the necessary capabilities to compete in more and more sophisticated industry segments” (Porter 1990, p.167).

An important aspect in this case study which relates to the framework is the so-called: ‘Home-base’; area where the industries are located and which provides the factors necessary for their productivity. This specific location tends to be chosen because of its abundance of resources, generating sustainability and providing essential competitive advantage. Talimhane (hotel home-base) is located at a central point between Taksim Square and Gezi Park, and at the same time itself connects Beyoğlu’s Congress Center and Istiklal Street. “The presence of the home base in a nation has the greatest positive influence on other linked domestic industries and leads to other benefits in
Firm strategy, Structure and Rivalry – National circumstances and context create strong tendencies in how companies are created, organized, and managed, as well as what the nature of domestic rivalry will be. The goals a nation's institutions and values set for individuals and companies, and the prestige it attaches to certain industries, guide the flow of capital and human resources.

These four attributes define a point on the diamond of national advantage for achieving competitive success where the effectiveness of one point often depends on the state of the others. Weaknesses in any one determinant will constrain the tourism industry's potential for advancement and upgrading, the diamond operates as a self-reinforcing system. Applied to Talimhane, the system would indicate a progressive economic and attraction growth, derived from the vertical and horizontal relationships of its main factors.

Regarding the four attributes presented previously, it can be said in conclusion that success in the tourist industry can be achieved when these four elements work in a coherent way, meaning that the effect of any one determines the state of the rest. A weakness in one may constrain the potential for advancement and upgrading of the whole. This diamond operates as a system of self-reinforcement. If it were to be applied in Talimhane the results might be an improvement in the economy and increased attractiveness of the area.
6.3. Methodology

In an attempt to create a methodology for the collection of information regarding Talimhane (a topic on which we had a limited amount of data) we established a set of Tools and Techniques for Strategic Urban Planning which included such techniques as brainstorming, clustering, SWOT analyses and stakeholder analyses.

These techniques allowed the group to identify missing pieces under our scope and the questions we wanted to address once we started the field study. While doing these exercises prior to the trip, we identified a number of shortcomings within the case study, starting with the apparent lack of a master plan for this area. In an effort to manage these shortcomings, the team designed an interactive stakeholders analyses game, where each stakeholder interviewed helped by participating in it. The game will be explained in the course of this chapter.

In order to create a good understanding of the processes that the team followed for obtaining information, the tools and techniques used will be explained in depth in the following paragraphs.

6.3.1. Brainstorming

Following Alex Faickney Osborn’s method of group thinking, our first encounter with Talimhane came about through a brainstorming session with the team. In order to obtain maximum efficacy from this method, we adopted Osborn’s principles:

1. Firstly, we tried to generate the biggest amount of ideas as we could by putting no limit on quantity and by trying to extend these ideas as much as we could.
2. Secondly, it was agreed that all types of ideas would be accepted and included; the elimination process would come later, again in a group session.

6.3.2. Clustering

After the Brainstorming and the elimination of ideas were finalized, the next step under our methodology for the definition of topics to address in our investigation was the Clustering method (See Figure 6.10). In this step we grouped the ideas that seemed similar or seemed to come from the same line of thought, which allowed us to understand what our perceptions regarding Talimhane area were, and which would be our principal interests to focus on. In the initial phase of the clustering process we were able to identify four topics: Rents, Income, Economy and Image. These four topics became the starting point to identifying which issues we should address and where to look for information that could help us go more deeply into each topic.

After the number of ideas to analyze was reduced and the clusters were defined, we established a SWOT analysis per cluster (rents, income, economy and image) in order to identify the most crucial ideas and to create a linkage between the ideas in each cluster. Doing this made it easier to create a set of questions, which were developed throughout a brainstorming process. After a set
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6.3.3. Stakeholders Analysis
Once the questions were defined it was only a matter of knowing who to ask the questions to. Again, because of lack of information, our options for the stakeholders were extensive, but the number was substantially reduced after a SWOT analysis was applied to each group of stakeholders.

6.3.4. Measuring Talimhane’s Success
The group was interested in understanding which set of factors could be attributed to Talimhane’s success, and how to define “success” with regard to Talimhane. In order to help us identify what type of information we wanted to collect and from whom, a very basic flow chart was created (See Figure 6.11). Under the methodology of the flow chart, the strategy created by the team was of trying to measure Talimhane’s success under the previously defined clusters: rents, income, economy and image by looking at the differences between the past and the present.

What we learned from this study of past and the present was expected to forecast the future of the area in terms of sustainability, influences and linkages; but after the field trip the term “success” was questioned because of the geopolitical administration and the constant land use changes. Therefore our main approach became: Measuring and Describing the Recent Spatial Transformation in Talimhane.

6.3.5. Recent Spatial Transformation in Talimhane
Following the same structure, our present investigation was defined by 4 main features: the current economic and social aspects, the legal framework and the grassroots initiative implemented in the
6.4. Findings

6.4.1. Talimhane; Heart of Tourism and Economics in Beyoğlu

Under the research methodology for the field trip, a set of tools was established for the purpose of recording people's opinions regarding the area. Initially, a set of questionnaires was developed in order to gain an understanding of the current situation in Talimhane as regards tourism and the socio-economic situation. The target groups were generally divided into: people who lived around the area, tourists, and people who did not live around the area. One hundred and twenty questionnaires were distributed and the response rate was nearly 40 per cent for the first target group, 40 per cent for tourists, and 20 per cent for the last target group. The main questions focused not only on the subjects of economy and tourism, but also on Talimhane's relationship with its surrounding areas, especially Taksim Square.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Motivation of Each Target Group to Visit Talimhane</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Pleasure</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living nearby</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living nearby</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.2. Survey Results

As seen in Table 6.2, some of the results from the questionnaires suggested that the greatest number (60 per cent) of people who passed through the area during the surveys were locals and people with business interests, while the second greatest number (40 per cent) were tourists interested in pleasure. The least number of people (10 per cent) were defined as “others” or people who did not live nearby and who were mostly interested in pleasure.

When people's perception was measured under the scope of whether or not the Talimhane area was beneficial to Beyoğlu (See Figure 6.12), surveys suggested that 30 per cent of the people thought that the area was mostly beneficial. Since the majority of people questioned were locals with business or investment interests in the area, this result was expected. When asked about the changes that have been occurring in the area, a majority said they approved of them, with 30 per cent answering that they had made a big difference. For these measurements, the opinion of non-
locals was not included as only people who previously knew the area would be able to offer a valid answer for the purposes of the study.

6.4.3. Unclear direction and Doubtful Future
Under the same methodology as for the collection of data in the field, several professionals closely related with the topic of tourism and economics in Talimhane were interviewed, such as: Günnur Özalp, TURSAB (The Association of Turkish Travel Agencies), Dursun Özbek, TUROB (Touristic Hotels and Investors Association), and Gulden Arsal, KTVKK (Cultural and Natural Assets Conservation Board). The information obtained through these interviews was important in allowing the team to understand the position of Talimhane within the area of Beyoğlu. Part of the information gleaned was used as backup for some of the arguments employed in the Socio-Economic and Legal Framework chapters.

In terms of income generation, Talimhane is undoubtedly one of the most important areas in Beyoğlu, but the interviews revealed that most of the stakeholders felt that, thanks to top-down decision making and planning methods, they had no say in the future of the area. The lack of a defined plan for the area leaves in doubt what its future will be.

6.4.4. Big Changes, Big Challenges
In order to collect more visual-physical data, pictures of the whole area were taken and mapped: a corner-by-corner approach (Figure 6.15-6.16) was employed in order to capture the different uses of space and the diversity of its users. In addition, we verified the previous land-use map of Talimhane (2009) with the current situation. Currently, 4 entrances next to the Taksim Project were closed due to the construction work and there were some temporary shifts in the main vehicle circulation in the area. Due to the high privacy control, just one entrance and two exits were in use and only taxis, hotel cars and food supply trucks were allowed to enter the area.

Furthermore, a number of existing buildings were largely vacant. According to the Transformation in Taksim Project, a new set of changes may be on the cards in the near future.

6.4.5. Legal Framework
Our research has included an analysis of the laws and regulations directly related to Talimhane and the transformation project that occurred there, as well as a macro analysis of the laws pertaining to Talimhane’s transformation in general. Accurate results were difficult to attain as this type of research is largely qualitative. Another difficulty which presented itself was the varying responses
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given to the same questions from equally authoritative individuals who had been interviewed. Official documents were also limited in their availability and language barriers were a constant obstacle.

On 7 July 1993, most of Beyoğlu was declared a protected area by decision number 4720, issued by the conservation board known in Turkish as the Koruma Kurulu. The conservation board has the legal right to declare their own protection zones under law 2863, which is the Conservation of Cultural and Natural Assets Law. Almost all regulations regarding protection of heritage property stem from law 2863 and most actions regarding protected areas must be in compliance with this law. However, there is a rule that once an area is declared a protected area, the municipality should design and release maps of the site within one year of the decision. This did not occur until 2009 when the land use maps were finally completed and Talimhane received a tourism function designation.

In 1999 the Cultural and Natural Assets Conservation Board issued decree number 11437. This stipulated that since many buildings in Talimhane are considered early republic era, the board must analyze each building parcel individually before any changes or development could be approved. This meant that no general approval is given for the district and an approval for a hotel project or any other type of alteration is not extended to all potential projects. The board is allowed to differentiate between buildings if some buildings are registered or protected by the board.

---

2 Interview with Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevkiye Sence Turk
within a protected area, which gives the board more control over these specific buildings. Figure 6.23 shows the current registered or protected buildings within Talimhane highlighted in brown. Some buildings are allowed to have ten floors plus one ground level, while others are restricted to the older seven plus one ground level maximum height. In 2007, decree number 850 was issued by the conservation board stipulating that any and all construction or renovation in the area must result in the conservation of the original heritage quality of the building.

In 2009, a land use plan with a tourism function designation for Talimhane was issued by the municipality. The conservation board studied the plans and approved the land use plan in 2010. However the conservation board also conducted some field research in the Talimhane area in the same year 2009, possibly as a measure to support their approval of the land use plan. The board then documented all buildings with height or facade violations and all the changes that had occurred in the area. Some buildings were above legal height, which would normally require that the illegal floors be destroyed; however it was unclear if any legal action has been pursued. Figure 6.24 shows a maximum allowable building height in purple, clearly indicating a building violation. Lines in gold indicate the old building heights and also reveal that three buildings have been amalgamated into one.

---

3 Interview with Gülden Arsal from Cultural and Natural Assets Regional Conservation Board
In figure 5.16 the different types of buildings are shown as well as the different forms of amalgamation. Almost all instances where building amalgamation was altered enough to unite two or more former parcels into one were hotel developments. Some hotels amalgamated a number of normal parcels into one, while others combined two or more historical parcels and others still combined a normal or unprotected parcel with that of a historical building.

Because the area is protected, any building or hotel developer wishing to start a project has to apply to the municipality and to the conservation board for approval, whereas in unprotected areas municipal approval is all that is needed (See Figure 6.25). Converting a building into a hotel would change the function of the building as well as altering the structure, so potential projects must be studied and approved by the conservation board. According to the conservation board no approval has been given by them for any of the hotel projects already completed or pending. This means that the current projects are of questionable legal standing. We use the term “questionable” rather than “illegal” because they have municipal license or approval and it would be difficult to determine the legal standing. There are currently two main legal issues in the area: the current legal status of building projects in general is a vis a vis the license and the actual building height violations documented by the board. Hotel owners and members of the Talimhane Hotels Association (Talimhane Otelciler Dernegi) are aware of the current legal issues. They have spoken about several legal options that are available to them if they face legal problems. The first legal option would be to raise the issue with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The ministry can then appeal on their behalf and request the moderation of the Higher Conservation Board of Cultural and Natural Assets in Ankara. Another option is to declare the area as a tourism center again. This would transfer the planning authority to the central government while simultaneously diminishing the authority of the conservation board. A third option is to seek legal mediation from the higher court or Danıştay in Turkish (See Figure 6.26).

Although not mentioned by the hotel owners, a possible fourth legal option is at the disposal of the municipality of Beyoğlu. This option would also keep the planning authority at the municipal level. The option is considered because it was used in the very nearby location of Tarlabaşı and the legal text of these laws will be more closely analysed in the Tarlabaşı chapter. The main laws involved here are laws 5366, 5393 in 2005 and law 5998 in 2010. The first law 5366 authorizes the renewal of protected and historic land for use. The other two laws 5393 and 5998 allow the munici-
principal authorities to declare their own renewal sites within protected areas. Under this scheme individual building owners can renovate their own historic buildings if they are within the renewal sites. A renewal site is no longer under the jurisdiction of the conservation board but under a special conservation board or renewal conservation board named Yenileme Kurulu in Turkish. This option would erase any legal or building problem. In 2004, law 5226 was released to amend conservation law 2863. The amendments increased the scope of development and renovation as well increasing financing sources for such projects, easing the Talimhane situation. This might explain the lack of legal clarity in the area and could mean a weakening of the conservation laws.

One date that was difficult to determine is the exact declaration of Talimhane as a tourism center by the ministry of tourism. This declaration would have transferred the planning authority from the municipal government to the cabinet or central government. According to one thesis, it was in 1994, while according to separate interviews conducted with a hotel owner and a municipal member, the declaration was in 1988-1989. This declaration by the cabinet ministry was rejected by the municipality, which turned to the court to settle the dispute. The court ruled in favour of the municipality, which essentially returned the planning responsibility back to the city.

The legal situation of Talimhane appears to be unique. Whereas legal infringements would normally warrant prosecution, the buildings alterations in Talimhane are seemingly without opposition. If we were to conduct an economic analysis of the law we might discover that “sanctions imposed for non-compliance with the rule provide agents with thesole, prudential reasons to conform to the legal rule. Independent of those sanctions, however, the agent had no non-prudential reason to obey the law.” (Kornhauser 2011) The building height limitations offer a serious drawback to a potential hotel developer, possibly limiting the number of rooms he can offer. Therefore the possible sanctions if any must not outweigh the benefits of infringing the law. On a wider level, the legal tools available to the central and municipal government offer us a view that these laws are somewhat malleable to the government’s will. This view is not unique to Turkey or Istanbul but is reinforced in the general economic analysis of law as laws are “drafted by agents with political and economic interests that they seek to forward when they create the basic social, economic and political institutions of the society” (Kornhauser, 2011). Another view is that “Legislation results from the interplay of interest groups that do not reflect all interests within society. Even if the legislature did reflect all interests within society, each interest does not have an equal (or proportionate) say in the formulation of the statute” (Kornhauser 2011). According to Kornhauser, even in cases of adjudication the judge will rule based on the policy he wishes to promote. In the case of Talimhane there does not seem to be a political will to obstruct the development there in favour of historic or cultural concerns for it seems no one is willing to stifle the economic development. Talimhane was also an area which was arguably developed by the local community, and the current hotel community has the full support of the municipality. The mayor used to visit the pedestrianisation project daily to monitor progress (Gamm, 2007).

6.4.6. Stakeholder Mapping Exercise

Defining and mapping stakeholders was one of the vital and most interesting and challenging tasks of the research process. A definition of stakeholders, according to Bryson (2004), pictures them as those individuals or groups who have the power to affect the future of an organisation or project, implying that those who do not have such power

---
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do not qualify as stakeholders. Another definition, which he argues in favour of, has a clear ethical dimension. Stakeholders here are a wider range of individuals and groups including the “nominally powerless” (p. 22) to whom certain responsibility is owed.

For us, the stakeholders are those who have a certain power, but also an interest in a project, in our case, the Talimhane area and the broader Beyoğlu. We designed an exercise and the aim of this study was to find out the beliefs of different important actors from academia, public institutions, nongovernmental institutions, tourism sector and private sector regarding the stakeholders and their position in the area of Talimhane and Beyoğlu concerning the following topics: tourism, economy, culture, linkages, and public space. The outcomes of this exercise were valuable in terms of understanding the power of the institutions in people’s minds. We proposed some stakeholders that we decided were of great importance, but the participants of this study could also add new stakeholders. They had the opportunity to rate the stakeholders in terms of high and low interest in the area and in terms of high and low power in the area. The results placed the Municipality of Beyoğlu in the top position concerning high interest and high power and this pattern was repeated with every person that completed the stakeholder mapping exercise.
6.5. Concluding Remarks: Rapid Urban Transformation of Talimhane Area - Lessons to be Learned

Assessing the constant rapid urban transformation of the Talimhane area in the Beyoğlu district of Istanbul led to interesting and original findings that made us question our position as urban managers of a city.

Talimhane’s shift in just 54 years from a residential area to a tourist area had a complex story behind it. We completed the story through interviews and the study of documents and other papers. We also focused our research on who triggered the transformation process and for whom the changes were most beneficial at every stage of the process. Since Talimhane was planned as a residential area for the rich, every function was decided by its residents or owners according to their needs. This is how it developed gradually in terms of economic status from a residential and small production workshop area into a more commerce-orientated one and, finally, into an area designed for tourism. Those who gained overall were the residents or owners, the same category that triggered the changes.

It should be taken into consideration that each land use scenario had its positive and negative aspects, but each was beneficial for the residents. Some claim that previous land use led to security problems, informal economy and even criminality, and others say that the most recent changes are negative, submerging the area in the detritus of tourism. In order to judge the most recent changes and assess their success, a study of the current socio-economic situation was made.

In any country, formal jobs help its industries survive and expand, and the tourist industry is no different from any other. In Talimhane, it is very apparent that the formal jobs that have been created are supporting the tourism economy in a positive way. Conversely, informal jobs and black...
market activity, which operate outside government control and contribute no taxes, are not beneficial to the industry or its economy. This category of jobs can be considered a negative aspect of the socio-economic picture.

In conclusion, it must be acknowledged that Talimhane is one of the most important areas in Beyoğlu. Its economic influence is considerable. However, due to poor top-down political decision making and a lack of targeted planning, the future of Talimhane is uncertain. This view is reflected in the significant number of vacant buildings and empty plots awaiting the completion of the Taksim Square project and future plans for the Talimhane area in order to gain a clarification of the situation. The legal situation in Talimhane points clearly to the participatory planning nature of the development. The local hotel association maintains strong links with the municipality, which in turn supports local initiatives, such as the lobbying of the hotel owners for a tourism plan and their request for the pedestrianisation of Talimhane. The lack of legal prosecution in the case of apparent building infringements indicates a similar level of support. A difficult question to answer but definitely one worth pondering is whether the lack of legal prosecution is because there are no institutions willing to stifle economic growth, particularly when it began at grassroots level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spatial Transformation and Land use</th>
<th>Who triggered the Change?</th>
<th>For who was the change most Beneficial?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Commerce &gt; Hotels &gt; Offices at the boarders &gt; Banks</td>
<td>Hotel owners + Municipality</td>
<td>Hotel owners + Tourists + Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Commerce &gt; Hotels &gt; Banks &gt; Vacant buildings &gt; Manufacturing + Housing &gt; Fuel stations</td>
<td>Land owners</td>
<td>Land owners and shop keepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Manufacturing + Housing &gt; Commerce &gt; Banks &gt; Hotels</td>
<td>Poor / rural population (from Anatolya)</td>
<td>Poor / rural population (from Anatolya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Rich population of Istanbul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.29:**
Land Use transformation of Talimhane Area from 1955–2009
Source: Kızıldere 2010 and İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi
7 Commuting Dynamics in Istiklal Street
Swasti Paramita, Carlos Reyes, Diego Duarte, Hector Rojas, Andres Perez

The economic development of Istanbul has been supported by a rapid growth in accessibility. The transportation infrastructure became one of the priorities for the metropolitan area “...approximately 40 per cent of government’s yearly budget goes to transportation...”1 The district of Beyoğlu has become the showcentre for Istanbul as a global city. A political decision to pedestrianize Istiklal Street was linked to an economic development strategy: to re-active the case study area (Beyoğlu) within an interaction of overlapping activities (economic, social, movement, political.)

The focus of this chapter is mobility and transportation issues in Istiklal Street, considered to be the busiest, most crowded street in Istanbul. To investigate its transformation from a decaying thoroughfare to a vibrant pedestrianized street, a comprehensive mixed research methodology has been implemented. Among the techniques used to collect data were the ‘gate method’ and surveys; this will be explained in the body of the report. An analysis of the data collected allow for an improved understanding of the urban dynamics of mobility. The research questions are the first step to developing a process of analytical thinking. However, during the field study, the questions often evolved, providing a new perspective to the analysis. For example, “What effects have resulted from the pedestrianization of Istiklal Street?” became “How does a transportation mode based on walkability become an urban practice?” The aim was to understand the variables interconnected with the decision to pedestrianize Istiklal Street. The scope of this study is to contribute through practical knowledge the implementation of future urban pedestrianization projects. The driving force for this research is the desire to discover relevant information and characteristics of walkability as a mode of transportation. The findings enhance a holistic strategic vision within the framework of accessibility and urban development in an emerging country.

A brief explanation of the structure of the chapter. It is divided into 5 areas of study: First, the context in which the study area is located. A timeline explaining the processes by which Istiklal Street became an urban strategy towards economic development. Second, the research question and hypothesis will narrow the study to a more specific understanding of mobility. Third, an explanation of the methods used to collect the inputs and analyze the outcomes. Fourth, the ‘observations’ will elaborate in more detail the concepts of users, accessibility, walkability, pedestrian movements, physical environment, spatial analysis, lighting and security, land use and perception aspects in the qualitative conditions. Finally, recommendations for future urban pedestrian development.

1 This information stated by Züver Cetinkaya, the Secretary General of Marmara Municipalities, Istanbul during the short seminar held for the author in the field study, April 2013.
7.1. Context

Since the early 16th century, Beyoğlu belonged to the part of Istanbul dominated by western influence. Many European embassies were constructed along the Rue de Pera, known today as İstiklal Street (Çelik 1986). Occupied mainly by Europeans and minority groups of local people, the street was a host to western culture. During the 19th century, under the influence of western culture and trade, the city grew and stores opened that reflected the new higher standard of life. It could be said that the Beyoğlu area reached its pinnacle of development during this period. In the 1960s, the area decayed due to the rapid multi-centre development of the city. The city developed mainly in the peripheral area; housing, offices and retail centres created new centres outside the old Central Business District (CBD). Beyoğlu was part of the CBD (Dökmeci and Berköz 1994). People living in the area were moved to the new centres. Land values dropped and the old CBD received a new type of dweller: the low-middle income people. Between 1960 and 1990, the percentage of Istanbul’s firms located in Beyoğlu dropped from 30.4 per cent to 15.5 per cent (Dökmeci & Berköz 1994). During the 1980s, local city officials realized that Beyoğlu was on the edge of becoming significantly revitalized, primarily by middle-class individuals, banks and hotels. Today, Istanbul has grown from monocentric metro-region into a polycentric mega-city characterised by a dominant core and multiple urban centres. Its unique geographical location at the junction of Europe and Asia has made the city ambitious to become the innovative and knowledge-based centre of Turkey as well as the regional hub in the Euro-Asia region (global gateway city between Europe, Asia, the Middle-East and the former East European countries). This vision has indirectly brought about rapid urbanisation growth and a large influx of domestic and foreign migrants to Istanbul, raising issues that threatened the city’s sustainability and social cohesion. One of the problems is transport congestion.

In the 1990s, in response to the development of the city and in an effort to accelerate the process of change in Beyoğlu, the government pedestrianized İstiklal Street, the main street in the old CBD of Istanbul (Dökmeci 2007). This was just one of the early steps in the process to revitalize the area and attract more tourists.

One of the first four tramlines, built in 1869, during the Ottoman period, was reintroduced as a heritage element, using old wagons taken from the museum. Today, people can use the Nostalgic Tram to travel from Taksim Square to Tünel. The revitalization process did not stop there. During the early pedestrianization, many of the stores in the street suffered. The area’s reputation as degraded meant that only a small number of people came to spent time there. In 1988, in order to give İstiklal Street another chance, the government opened Tarlabası Boulevard, which is parallel to İstiklal Street on the north side. This had the effect of supporting trade in İstiklal Street and giving people easier access to it. Finally, the area was booming. İstiklal Street, now considered the most famous street in Istanbul, became a tourist area, boasting a huge number of stores, restaurants, clubs and offices.

In spite of of its success, however, the opening of Tarlabası Boulevard created a slight problem for İstiklal Street. At several points along the street are junctions with other streets used by motorized vehicles, which made pedestrians uncomfortable. However, by the time we arrived to do our field study, tunnels had been constructed to relocate the street junctions.

Three Transportation Master Plan studies have been conducted, in 1985, 1987 and 1997. In the light of the rapid population growth and increase in private car ownership in the previous 10 years since 1987, the 1997 study plan was the most comprehensive. The two main reasons for the new Transportation Master Plan (TMP) were the long trips required to connect people with the city’s
multi centres and the need for highway network improvements, such as the construction of the two bridges. The 1997 Transportation Master Plan played a very important role in Istanbul’s transition from developing city to global city. The main focus of the TMP is the concept of ‘integrity’. Three phases were implemented: land use, transport modelling and economic valuation (Keiichi 2003).

Land use development patterns and transportation interaction are crucial concepts for spatial planning policies. Istanbul is developing the necessary level of integration between the two processes of land use and transportation. The last two TMP studies were very important in initiating policies that would lead to a well planned city and environmentally sustainable transport. In 2010, the Department of Spatial Planning of the Greater Municipality of Istanbul proposed a land use policy with these very aims and out of this grew a transportation model to fulfil this demand.

The identity of Beyoğlu, especially Istiklal Street, has changed significantly since the pedestrianization. Revitalization of the area was crucial, not only to improve the quality of life but also to boost the socio-economic well-being of the city. Following the success of the project, there is now a municipal government plan to pedestrianize other streets in the surrounding area to further develop Beyoğlu. For example, Gatala Tower, a tourist area at the south end of Istiklal Street, was pedestrianized several years after Istiklal Street. And there will be more to come.

7.2. Research Question and Hypothesis

At the beginning of the research, attempts were made to develop a well-structured question. However, during the process of field trip and analysis, the research questions began to shift their aim. This evolution was influenced by personal perceptions, interactions and stakeholders’ feedback. The initial research questions leant towards urban infrastructure in transportation and understanding the physical effects of pedestrianizing Istiklal Street. Single variables were taken into consideration to ask questions requiring one-way answers and with no link to one another.

As mentioned in the introduction, the research question evolved from: “What effects have resulted from the pedestrianization of Istiklal Street?” to “How does a transportation mode...
based on walkability become an urban practice?" The first question was looking for general effects that were consequences of the decision to pedestrianize Istiklal Street, but many of these effects fell outside the aims of the research. To strengthen the question, several secondary questions were developed. People were asked: What mobility mode do you use to access Istiklal Street? In terms of sustainable mobility, is the urban quality of Istiklal Street appropriate for commuting? How has Istiklal Street evolved in terms of land-use? What elements of Istiklal Street represent the identity of Istanbul? However, none of these support questions widened the narrow scope, so it was decided to formulate a new specific research question. As a result, the preliminary question changed completely.

A new research question is formulated with a narrow objective. In addition, the research team developed a new strategy using a graphic formula (shown above) to describe the new selected question. The new research question is: How does a transportation mode based on walkability become an urban practice? Every word will be explained in the following paragraphs.

Based on the graphic above, the study will explain the meaning and interpretation of every word of the formula. It is important to visualize the process-oriented method used to create the new research question. First, the word 'How' starts the question to discover new findings in an urban transformation process in Istiklal Street. Then the words 'transportation mode' represent the awareness of different ways to mobilize people within the city. In the past years, Istanbul has developed new transportation modes to answer the increasing demand to connect people with different regions. These include funicular, metro, tram, ferry, and pedestrian lines. Next, is the word 'walkability' representing the main mode of transportation in Istiklal Street. That is followed by the word 'become', which indicates the evolution of an urban decision. Finally, the words 'urban practice' suggest the implementation of this project in future urban proposals: it could be implemented in public spaces, social housing, tourism and urban renewal, among others.

The main hypothesis of this research is to demonstrate that the pedestrianization of Istiklal Street contributes to the dynamics of urban development. The hypothesis is a starting point for further investigation from facts contained in the previous sub-chapter. Istanbul's vision of becoming a competitive city turns everything into a single objective of economic growth through transportation.

A mixed research methodology is the vehicle to understanding the complex social issue of mobility and transportation. Within this mix are three types of research methodologies: descriptive (qualitative), correlation (quantitative) and evaluation (qualitative). Descriptive research attempts to examine the situation via human observations and responses. Data collection is based in interviews, questionnaires and selected observation of events. Correlation research is an analytical survey that describes the statistical measure of associations and the relationship between factors. Evaluation research seeks to represent meaningful findings rather than to describe 'what things are' or 'why they work'. It recognizes the value of and the links between physical, psychological, social and cultural contexts. It involves three steps: data collection (in our case, identifying issues from people involved in the street); evaluation of the findings; suggested changes, or recommendations based on the findings. This can otherwise be described as breaking the problem into researchable parts, separately evaluating those parts, then aggregating the evaluations into an explanation of the whole (Clarke 2005).
Complementary information in the shape of the Urban Mobility Plan (UMP) has been taking into consideration. This is an important reference in the process of understanding mobility and transportation. The baseline is to understand how to tackle urban transportation problems through environmentally friendly solutions that optimize the mobility of people. The policies established in this planning process are intended to address all modes of transport (public and private, moving and parking, motorized and non-motorized transport (NMT). The UMP encourages a comprehensive approach to developing an urban transportation project. The three main advisory steps are:

A participatory approach: involving citizens and stakeholders from the outset and throughout the process of decision making, implementation and evaluation. Building local capacity for handling complex planning issues, and ensuring gender equality.

A pledge for sustainability: balancing economic development, social equality and environmental quality.

An integrated approach: regarding practices and policies between policy sectors (e.g. transport, land-use, environment, economic development, social inclusion, gender equality, health, safety), between authority levels (e.g. district, municipality, agglomeration, regional, national, EU), and between neighbouring authorities (inter-municipal, inter-regional, transnational, etc.).

These three recommendations are key and provide the basis for the design of the present work.

### 7.3. Methods, Outcomes and Results

The research question – How does a transportation mode based on walkability become an urban practice? – defines the approach to be implemented in the analytical stage. Moreover, the district of Beyoğlu and specifically the case study, Istiklal Street, became the focus of analysis for evaluating such an urban practice.

The case study investigation is very ambitious and involves a huge amount of work. Therefore the scope of this investigation limits the study to the selected area (Istiklal Street). The aim of this chapter is to examine the results derived from the data collected through the methods selected to test the hypothesis. The research question is supported by these methods, as well as by the secondary research questions: 1. What is the motivation of the users who go Istiklal Street? 2. Has pedestrianization improved the conditions of a walking city? 3. What is the evolution of Istiklal Street in terms of land-use and heritage? 4. What elements of Istiklal Street represent the fast changing identity of Istanbul? These secondary research questions will provide a holistic understanding of the transportation and mobility issues.

As mentioned above, there are three types of research methodologies: description (qualitative), correlation (quantitative) and evaluation (qualitative). The decision to choose multiple methods was made with the aim of strengthening the final findings, and to test the assumption made in the hypothesis.

Measuring walkability is a part of the method that will allow a better understanding of pedestrian patterns and flows along Istiklal Street. The ‘gate method’ is used to count the number of people (users) walking along the street every day. Moreover, learning about the motivations of the people to walk along the street explains the relationships between the pedestrians and the land use evolution. By means of surveys and interviews with the
According to Bührmann et al (2011), the following steps should be carried out:
• Identify all relevant stakeholders and map out their aims, power, abilities, and resources.
• Determine which stakeholders may be weaker, less engaged, and in need of empowerment.
• Establish a cooperative planning alliance of all key stakeholders; find potential synergies between actors, and work to avoid power conflicts wherever possible.

Following the analysis, a power-interest matrix is implemented in order to configure the strategies and surveys. Each stakeholder has different potential and different interests in the specific field that can either foster or block the project’s evolution.

Independently of the selection, some stakeholders may care about the research, but might not be influential in the planning or decision processes.

stakeholders, the necessary local information will be compiled in the research.

7.3.1. Stakeholders Interview (Analysis)
As part of the methodology, stakeholder analysis is a determining tool to draw in the qualitative data. The reason for selecting stakeholder analysis is to learn from the individual roles involved in a specific urban decision: to pedestrianize İstiklal Street. The way to apply this method is to set the level of power and influence of each actor. The selection of relevant parties maps out the strategies to be implemented in stakeholder interviews. A list of important representatives from the government, civil society, academia, institutions and NGOs are selected. In addition, users and residents are taken into account as stakeholders.
Furthermore, some stakeholders may not care about the research, but might have a big influence in the decision-making process.

After identifying and classifying the actors in the Influence-Interest matrix, it is necessary to prioritize the stakeholders in order to plan how to approach them: those who will be included in the interviewing cycle. The willingness of the stakeholders to participate in the research is a relevant factor in the selection stage; hence it will influence the following analysis.

As shown above (Figure 7.3), most of the stakeholders who expressed the highest interest in the pedestrianization lacked power in the decision-making process. Furthermore, the powerful government of Istanbul expressed high interest in the full pedestrianization of Beyoğlu “...We do not want cars in the area... (Arif Köklü, The Acting Deputy Mayor of Beyoğlu Municipality, BIMTAS, Istanbul, April 2013)”. The private sector and NGOs have more power than the community.

7.3.1.1. Interviews
During the interviews the following questions were asked: What is your opinion about urban pedestrian spaces? Do you know what led to the decision to pedestrianize İstiklal Street? What are the benefits of the pedestrianization decision? What are the disadvantages of the pedestrianization decision? What is the role of the Nostalgic Tram, in terms of heritage? The Following is a list of stakeholders interviewed by the research team: Ms. Dr. Ayse Sema Kubat, Professor Istanbul Technical University; Mr. Arif Köklü Acting Deputy Mayor Municipality of Beyoğlu; Dr. Haluk Gercek, Academia (ITU) and private consultant; EMBARQ Turkey, NGO; and Civil Society with 164 surveys.

After the interview, the points of view of the interviewees (stakeholders) were compared with the previously developed stakeholder analysis. Among the outcomes of this process, the interviewees revealed important information relating to the way the stakeholders interact in Beyoğlu mobility projects. For instance, it was not expected that the academic sector would be very interested in the development carried out in the entire city. According to lectures and interviews with the professors of Istanbul Technical University, it appears that the government does not require a society-participatory engagement to make most decisions. Moreover, the lack of a clear methodology that guarantees transparency and reliability of development projects, might be the key to improving communication within the community. Some exceptions were also revealed, where academicians sometimes actively contact their government for discussion of key issues. A growing social power, coming from disadvantaged communities and academic concerns, has been perceived.

On the other hand, EMBARQ Turkey (NGO) appeared as a strong player with major interest in development projects side by side with the government, although they do not have a big influence in the decision making. According to the interview, this NGO produces (independently) useful information for the municipality in terms of mobility. In fact, this information has already been used to develop some projects that aim to improve the living conditions of the inhabitants. The air quality, integrated transport, safety, urban development and sustainability are some of the claims of this organization. According to EMBARQ representatives, there are a number of well-advanced projects for cycling routes and pedestrian streets in the Beyoğlu district. Some were shown to us during our visit. These projects follow successful examples from around the world and seek to implement them according to local conditions. The role of the NGOs in Istanbul is mainly advising, in a very neutral way, the government’s actions, but not making decisions.

The Istanbul government plays a big role in regulating and developing the municipality, partic-
ularly in the case study site in Beyoğlu. One of the plans of Mr. Arif Köklü (Acting Deputy Mayor District of Beyoğlu) is to create a pedestrian district in what corresponds to the old Galata. It is not clear if this plan comes from the community, or if it is another strategic move from the government to attract investors. The final perception of stakeholder analysis was later changed and is described in the picture above (Figure 7.3).

7.3.2. Surveys
Relying on the qualitative data from the questionnaires, quantitative data is needed to support the analysis. The reason this survey method is selected is because it helps the investigators understand the walking dynamics of the people in situ when they move through, to and from Istiklal Street. The main goal of this method is to identify the most representative groups that visit the street, their relationship with the infrastructure, their commuting dynamics, their activities regarding the land use, and their personal understanding of what the street and the area represent for them in terms of identity. These concepts are part of a general social behavior approach. The objective is to generate quantitative information that can be analysed as inferential statistics. To explain in more detail, it means that reality is represented by a random sample (a minority percentage of people). Approximately 30 per cent of the surveys were taken on 20 April 2013 and the rest on 22 April 2013, on both days between 9:10 hours and 18:40 hours, all in Istiklal Street and particularly at gates A, B, C, D, E and F (See Figure 7.4). The decision to conduct a general survey instead of a specific one for certain groups of people was in line with the preparation time and fieldwork characteristics of this research. A fuller explanation of the data collected will be given in the following paragraphs. For the questions relating to motivation, improvement, etc. the researchers wanted to know the frequency of any specific answer, so the question was formulated so that people could select one to three options and were allowed to add any other option they could think of.

In order to get the most accurate information through this quantitative analysis, the survey data was divided into three clusters: a) local people b) Turkish tourists and c) international tourists. The first cluster represents 70 per cent of survey respondents, the second cluster represents 10 per cent, and the third cluster represents 18 per cent. Two per cent of respondents failed to provide this information and are marked as ND (no data answers).

The study chose these three clusters to reflect Istanbul's goals for 2023, namely: tourism, finance and knowledge (TAK, NGO. Mr. Faruk Göksu, April 2013).

In the first group of local people (Figure 7.5), 44 per cent were between 18 and 25 years old, 60 per cent of them students and 32 per cent employees. In this same group, 23 per cent were between 26 and 35 years old, with 81 per cent of them employees.
Men represent 63 per cent and women 37 per cent. The gender ratio is 1.7 men to each woman.

In the second group of Turkish tourists (Figure 7.6), 59 per cent were between 18 and 25 years old, 80 per cent of them students, clearly attracted by the bars, clubs and restaurants. 71 per cent were men. The gender ratio here is 2.4 men to each woman.

In the third group of international tourist (Figure 7.7), 40 per cent are between 26 and 35 years old and of these 75 per cent are employees. 30 per cent of those between 36 and 45 years old are also employees, and in the 46 to 60 year old group 89 per cent are employees. It would appear that the remarkable commercial impact is due to the economic activity of this specific group. The gender ratio in this group was 1.1 women per man.

The most common reasons for visiting Istiklal Street according to all three groups of pedestrians was recreational activities followed shopping activities. The most common answer for the Turkish and international tourist was ‘tourism’ (Figure 7.8).

Another result from the question: what do people like most about Istiklal Street? The answer depends on gender and place of origin. The statistics split the variable in two: local gender and tourist gender. The preferences change for each gender according to geographical origin (Figure 7.9).

As is visible in the graph in Figure 7.10, the bus is the most used method of transport for the locals in Istanbul, also when traveling to Istiklal Street, second in popularity is the metro. For the tourist, walking is the most common mode of transport. This is due to different levels of knowledge of the place. Locals use the methods they know, whereas tourists prefer the easy way.
As seen in Figure 7.11, 60 per cent of people spent less than 46 minutes traveling from their place of origin to İstiklal Street. Those for whom the trip took more than 3 hours came from another city.

For both origin and destination (Figure 7.12 and Figure 7.13) more than 50 per cent of people come from home and planned to return there.

In terms of what improvements people would like to see in İstiklal Street, among the suggestions made were trash cans and toilets (Figure 7.14).

Almost 50 per cent of survey responders said that they planned to spend one hour at the most in İstiklal Street. 25 per cent said they would spend between one and two hours, and the remaining 25 per cent that they would spend between 2 and 12 hours in the street (Figure 7.15).

7.3.3. Gate Method

Initially, a ‘gauging method’ was used to count pedestrians, but after a stakeholder’s interview with Prof. Ayşe Sema Kubat (Faculty of Architecture,
Istanbul Technical University (ITU) a new method was adopted, namely 'gate method'. The reference is taken from a study by PhD student Özlem Özzer (Plan-Art Ltd) and Prof. Ayşe Sema Kubat (Faculty of Architecture, ITU) entitled “Walking Initiatives: A quantitative movement analysis”, for the 6th International Space Syntax Symposium, Istanbul, 2007. The reason the investigation implemented this method was because of the detailed analysis of pedestrian flows. In the following there is a fuller explanation of how this method developed in İstiklal Street. The steps were:

1. Select points to be observed: Based on site observation, 6 points considered to be crucial junctions were selected along İstiklal Street. The points are marked as gates: Gate A, gate B, gate C, gate D, gate E and gate F (Figure 7.16).
2. Create an imaginary line: The people counted were those who crossed the line.
3. Observed positions: With the aim of identifying the point where people originally accessed İstiklal Street, each selected junction was observed from 3 positions: one imaginary line on the main street and two lines where the junction street crossed İstiklal Street (Figure 7.17).
4. 5 minutes counting: At each point, a 5-minute video was recorded simultaneously from 3 positions (north, west and south). The number of people crossing the street during that time was multiplied by 12 to get the number of people in one hour.
5. 4 times a day: The counting was carried out 4 times a day during times when the street was busy. The time selected was 8:00-9:00, 12:00-13:00, 18:00-19:00, and 22:00-23:00.
6. Weekend and weekday: To differentiate the flows of pedestrians during weekend and weekdays, we selected one day in the weekend (Saturday, 20 April 2013) and one week day.
The decision taken during the data processing to use only 3 points instead of 6 because of a time constraint narrowed the analysis. The gates selected were: Gates A, D and F. Gate A marks the entrance to Istiklal Street from Taksim Square, Gate D is at the tram stop in the Galatasaray School, and Gate F is the entrance to Istiklal Street from Tünel. A change to the age categories was also made, the teenager category being eliminated due to lack of knowledge of their exact age. A final change was made with the decision to use only the data for a weekend day, namely Saturday, 20 April 2013. The outcomes are explained in more detail below, but
additional statistics can be found in the appendix. These show the number of users entering or leaving the street during a specific time and also the intersection of vehicles at each gate.

The graphs below (Figures 7.18 and 7.19) show the total users of Istiklal Street (all age categories) during one hour. They show that the peak hour in Istiklal Street is in the evening between 17:30 and 18:30. The number of people heading towards Tünel increase until almost midnight. The three main axes (Gates A, D and F) host a mixture of informal economy, with street vendors at every corner. They also receive the pedestrian flows from the neighbourhoods close to Istiklal Street, as well as the input of vehicles crossing from one side to the other. At these connections there is a conflict of three flows: pedestrian, vehicles and street vendors. However, the richness of the finding is in the interconnectivity and cultural exchanges at one specific point. The graph below demonstrates that these connections mark important entrances to and exits from Istiklal Street. They act as a spatial support to evacuate or welcome pedestrians. The volume of pedestrians dominates the flow, but the vehicles are not respectful when they cross the road, indicating the need for an improved cultural education. A fuller explanation is given in the next chapter.

7.4. Observations

The field work identified the current situation in Istiklal Street in terms of walkability, including its accessibility to both walkers and the public transport system. A pedestrianized street in the city centre promotes the local economy and could reinforce the idea of walking as an environmentally friendly alternative to the use public transport, so reducing traffic congestion.

7.4.1. Pedestrians

Cities are made for people by people. In that context, the study of pedestrians as users of public transport is a priority for a better understanding of the walkability dimension. In the process of commuting people may switch to other transportation modes.

In general, the aim is to discover the behaviour of pedestrians, how they interact with the physical space and how the quality of public space could be improved in order to consolidate pedestrian corridors in a city like Istanbul. Pedestrians have to confront a number of important challenges in Istiklal Street due to the quality of the pavement, the delivery trucks, and the difficulties involved in crossing at junctions. There are no policies to protect pedestrians at junctions, and the volume of traffic coming from Tarlabası Boulevard, added to the topography of the place, increases the speed of the vehicles. As a result, the quality of the space at the junctions is not ideal for a pedestrian corridor.
7.4.2. Accessibility

It is essential to mention the role of Istiklal Street as a link with the whole public transport infrastructure of Istanbul. Accessibility can be defined as a factor in reaching a specific destination in different contexts (urban areas and rural areas); to accomplish this task, citizens use mobility alternatives such as public transport or private vehicles to do their commuting.

Istiklal Street became a pedestrian corridor in order to facilitate personal movement, so it is important to explain the attractiveness of the street as a centre for services and commercial uses, as well as an historical axis for the district of Beyoğlu and a showcase for the beautiful architecture between Taksim Square and Tünel.

Taksim Square is a hub which contains the funicular line (F1) between Taksim and Kabataş. This line was opened in June 2006. At the same time, the metro line (M2) connects the district with the north of the city.

The Nostalgic Tram (T5), part of the heritage line which extends 1.5 kilometres, is a major attraction in Istiklal Street. Some tram stops are designed to connect with the whole system. One of these is Şişhane station, the first station on the M2 line and the second stop for the Nostalgic Tram coming from Tünel.

The Nostalgic Tram (T5) terminates at Tünel, where passengers can connect with Karakoy Station on the funicular line or via modern tram (T1). Due to its proximity with Galata Tower and Galata Square, Tünel has several different distributions of flow. Tarlabası Boulevard affects accessibility due to the high volume of traffic coming from the Historical Peninsula. Travel opportunities in Istiklal Street are
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Source: Diego Duarte
7 Commuting Dynamics in Istiklal Street

diverse, and the mix of land use activities and the proximity to the historical monuments create a unique space of flows.

Through pedestrianization, this axis of the city connects the interior streets of the neighborhood and provides an alternative for moving between south and north. As a public space open to all without restrictions, it also promotes social inclusion. It is therefore an important example of walkability as a transportation mode (See Figure 7.20).

7.4.3 Walkability

This concept refers to more than just the action made by pedestrians. In recent years walkability is being promoted as part of a comprehensive plan to create a new experience for people during the commuting process. In addition, a walkable city is less subject to congestion and carbon emissions.

Walkability includes the principle of conferring top priority to the walker during the commuting process in a pedestrian street. The research team believe that a pedestrian street can be compared with a highway where only vehicles are the protagonists and that unique space is designed for speed. Pedestrian streets are different only in terms of speed.

Working as part of a transport system, the pedestrian network creates alternatives to modes of movement within the city, in the shape of spaces where pedestrians are the priority. In building this type of project, it is important to assure comfort, safety and excellent physical conditions in order that different destinations in the city can be reached quickly.

"The shape of the city is a factor in generating a good quality of movement" (Professor Dr. Ayşe Sema Kubat, Istanbul Technical University, April 2013). In the case of Istiklal Street, physical conditions affect the performance and the fluidity of movements. For example, the uneven streets and the impact of the morphological structure due to the organic grid.

With an important physical dimension, Istiklal Street is a reference for walkability due to its size and the fact that it lies between two important public transportation links. Also, the various day and nighttime activities create a pedestrian vocation. Nevertheless, there are threats for pedestrians, such as: vehicle crossings, delivery trucks, the poor condition of the paving stones and lack of security.

7.4.4 Pedestrian Movements

Istiklal Street is used as a corridor for many different reasons: during the day, to go to work or school; at night, to find friends or to enjoy various leisure activities, such as restaurants. The movements create intensities and hierarchical points along this street. Pedestrians create new routes to avoid congestion, so that they can reach their destinations quickly.

As Dirk Helbing (2001, p. 363) puts it: "Pedestrians show a strong aversion to taking detours or moving in the opposite direction to the desired walking direction, even if the direct route is crowded". This observation touches on an important aspect of pedestrian behavior.

Speed of movement is a factor which either improves or otherwise affects the pedestrian environment. In other words, if the physical conditions of the street are good, the pedestrian can move with ease. Our observations and studies suggest that this is not the case in Istiklal Street.

7.4.5 Physical Environment

Based on observations of the physical environment in Istiklal Street made at different times during the field study, it seems that the pedestrianization process had as its only principles the desire to move the traffic congestion to another area and to change the pavement by installing grey concrete paving stones.
To explore this observation further, it is relevant to mention that over the entire route there are no elements of streetscape such as vegetation, composition, street furniture or ground plane. Few concessions are made to comfort. There appear to be no effective urban design policies to ensure a good performance as a pedestrian street.

“The structure of the city creates the pedestrian movements” (Professor Dr. Ayşe Sema Kubat, Istanbul Technical University, April 2013). In other words, the morphology is a relevant parameter in guiding the intensities of pedestrian flows, for example, the facility to move quickly.

Our research team discovered that a number of physical improvements were desired by the street users. Among the suggestions were: new trash cans, public toilets, benches and trees.

7.4.6. Spatial Analysis

Due to time constraints, three gates were selected to analyze mobility intensity in detail. Gate A was selected because it is the main entrance to Istiklal Street from Taksim Square; Gate D because it is midway down the street, at the second tram stop, in front of Galatasaray school; Gate F because it is at the last tram stop and near the entrance to the funicular line between Tünel and Karaköy. The three chosen gates have different spatial configurations and specific urban characteristics. Each gate (intersection) will now be explained.

Each crossing will be explained according to the typology of the buildings configuring the corner, the type of secondary streets adjacent to it, pedestrian flows and motorized flows. Data was collected at four times during the day: 8:00-9:00, 12:00-13:00, 18:00-19:00 and 22:00-23:00.

Gate A has a corner configuration of four buildings, each with the same typology of 7 floors, giving the corner a confined shape. The ground floor of all of the buildings have a commercial use. There is a perpendicular continuous street with one-way vehicular entrance coming from Tarlabasi Boulevard. The name of the street is Zambak Cadessi (4.5 metres wide). This first vehicular crossing conjunction creates conflict between the users (pedestrians) and the vehicles trying to cross Istiklal Street. In the mornings, Zambak Street is used by many suppliers (using trucks, vans and pick-up cars) to make deliveries to the stores, but during the day it becomes a normal connecting street for regular automobiles. Conflict arises because there is no traffic control to regulate the two different flows, so that the cars get into the pedestrian street...
without proper care for the users. In addition, there is a proliferation of street vendors, which serves to increase the flow intensity. Flow intensity increases every hour throughout the day (Figure 7.21, 7.22).

Gate D has a corner configuration of 2 different types of building: First, Galatasary High School is the most important reference for locals and foreign users, with a high fence at the entrance and gardens with an atrium-style typology in the back. Type two comprises three buildings, each with the same typology of 8 floors and commercial use at ground level. The morphology of the corner is irregular, due to two factors: 1) Istiklal Street becomes wider in front of the School because of the second tram stop. 2) Between the buildings is an irregular public square where many public demonstrations take place. This square can host intense pedestrian activity. There is a perpendicular continuous street with one-way vehicular entrance coming from the area of Boğazkesen Street (French Palace, Kuloğlu Mh.) towards Tarlabası Boulevard. The name of this street is Yeni Çarşı Caddesi (5 metres wide). It is midway down Istiklal Street with another crossing conjunction that creates conflict between the users (pedestrians) and the vehicles trying to cross the pedestrian street. As was found at Gate A, the cause of the conflict is that there is no traffic control to regulate the two different flows, so that the cars get into the pedestrian street without proper care for the users. The informal economy, in the shape of street vendors, use these open intensive-flow spaces (Figure 7.23, 7.24).

Gate F has a corner configuration of 4 different typologies of buildings: First, a continuation of the buildings stretching from Istiklal Street to Galip Dede Caddesi (towards Galata Tower), each with 3 floors. Second, is the last building on Istiklal Street, which has 5 floors. Third, the historical buildings at the entrance to the Tünel funicular, the first with 8 floors, the one next to it with 4 floors. Fourth, configuring the open space at the end of Istiklal Street, are the buildings in front of the historic Tünel building with 5 floors. All of these, with the exception of the historic building at the funicular, have commercial use at ground floor level. The spatial configuration creates an irregular public square intended to facilitate the exit and entrance of pedestrians between Istiklal Street and Tünel, but there is a second pedestrian street connecting Galata Tower (Galip Dede, 4.5 metres wide). Most of the intensity flows are pedestrians, but it is important to mention that Gate F is used for access by suppliers in the mornings, until 10:00 am (Figure 7.25, 7.26).
As a final observation, the configuration of the physical environment shapes the movements and flows of the people and urban activities. The urban morphology created during different urban planning periods offers as a consequence many irregular residual open spaces. These open public spaces are considered ‘squares’, but the most important analysis is that, based on this physical shape, the intensity of flows increases or decreases. In the specific case of the three gates selected along Istiklal Street, the morphology encourages more activities to increase the capacity to hold several variables in one place: (informal economic activities, pedestrian lines, vehicles crossing, public demonstrations and commercial land uses). This concentrated diversity creates powerful urban landmarks of reference and motivation.

7.4.7. Lighting and Security
Pedestrians need to be safe. The presence of certain security elements, such as police, security cameras, and police stations are useful in changing perceptions about insecurity. At night, lighting is vital to prevent accidents and to prevent thefts or assaults. Along the street, there are several problems in this area.

7.4.8. Land Use
“Urban land use comprises two elements: the nature of land use which relates to the activities taking place, and the level of spatial accumulation, which indicates their intensity and concentration” (Rodrigue et al 2006, p. 180).

The intensity of urban activities is a factor in measuring pedestrian flows. Commercial activity is strongly supported in Istiklal Street with a wide choice of shopping outlets and the services to support them. On working days, activity increases after 6pm; this is the time for buying and spending. On Saturdays, the pedestrian flows increase because this axis is also a place for entertainment, a meeting point and the place where everyone wants to see and be seen.

Commercial areas affect the local economy and create points of interest for the public as places of exchange. In addition, the role of land use is an essential factor in analyzing accessibility and pedestrian flows.

In areas where the stores have an important reputation, pedestrian flows increase. The arrival of tourists also affects the mobility of specific places in Istiklal Street. Pedestrians’ attention is captured by certain types of activity. Points with less intensity of flows include consulates, embassies and public buildings.
As a central point in the district of Beyoğlu, Istiklal Street has a high level of spatial accumulation. This characteristic implies modes of transportation, and in this case walkability appears again as an important issue: “The main impact of land use on urban dynamics is its function as a generator and attractor of movements” (Rodrigue et al 2006, p. 185).

7.4.9. Perception Aspects in the Qualitative Conditions
Henri Lefebvre (1996, p.227) writes about the different relations of immediacy, calling this “the music of a city”, with multiple speeds and movements: people walking along the street, crowds of people pursuing different aims, cars crossing, types of noises and smells. This fast speed is the rhythm of the urban sound, however, it is not the only rhythm to be found in a city. There are many other hidden rhythms, operating at different speeds. The concepts of presence and absence are simultaneously combined, and rules that regulate the movement of the users, e.g. opening times for schools and stores, the itineraries for churches and mosques, rules governing traffic control etc., present themselves without being present. These rhythms combine to give the actors an urban experience. Throughout the day, the city is in constant negotiation with the rules that control movement through devices such as traffic rules.
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and opening times and patterns of movement, e.g. people walking and cars crossing. These movements are laid down in hundreds of urban spaces in a multilayer of complexity. At night, the city becomes uni-dimensional, and complexity is limited to a few activities: pleasure and vice or terror and illicit activities. Different sets of rules control movement, e.g. police regulations, morality and drink laws. There are many rhythms omitted from the big picture of urban mobility and transportation (Lefebvre 2004, pp.16-17). With this brief introduction we want to analyze the rhythms of movement in Istiklal Avenue and to create a metaphor city.

The public space of Istiklal Street is ruled by hidden forces that shape the activity of moving. The showcase stores, brands, products, and consumption are, according to Lefebvre (1996, pp.224), a closed window for spectacle, a perspective with obstacles, allowing the unknown to be perceived as the city. This means that the windows allow the city to be read. “...The windows are both a real site to view varied rhythms juxtaposed together, and a tool for speculation...” (Lefebvre 2004, pp.18-19). Commercial land use became the municipality’s main strategy for reviving a decayed area. By launching a street in service to stores, which is not a bad thing insofar as it provides employment for a few beneficiaries, the result is a street with no sense of identity. This is the starting point of rythmanalysis: “the city and the urban cannot be recomposed from the signs of the city” (Lefebvre 1996, p.143). A perception of a city does not come through commercial use. Istiklal Street is the busiest street in Istanbul, as well as a must-see destination for foreigners. So this phenomenon of pedestrianization does not reveal how the rhythm

Figure 7.28:
Intensity Flows Transit per Hour
Source: Carlos Reyes
of a city is combined, dissolved or overlapped to generate certain urban synthesis. Therefore, daily life rhythms do not provide information about a process that took place in earlier times, e.g. the rapid transformation of a walkable public street, a place to enjoy, into a massive crowded street.

The interpretation of the crowd and the reason to walk through Istiklal Street is to perceive the exteriority of an overload of information, but to be able to understand that exterior a certain amount of time and attentiveness is required. And you do not find it in Istiklal Street. First, Freud in 1912 published a technical rule for analyzing this behaviour dubbed ‘evenly suspended attention’ (this describes a self-conscious strategy of not directing one’s notice to anything in particular and maintaining evenly suspended attention). Later, Crary formulated this technical rule: “to make knowable a space to everyone might choose to look at the representations that contain characteristics of a place: maps, images, descriptions and so on. A city identified in certain ways becomes that city through the practices of people in response to labels”. Further to understanding

The importance of this statement is the capacity to analyze the perception of the users (pedestrians). The power to redistribute one’s attention so that nothing is ignored, and everything is considered in low-level focus, but without the risk of schizophrenic overload (Crary 1999, pp. 367-8). Up to this point, the study interprets the users’ attention as a label brand of Istiklar Street: ‘It is obvious to see without seeing’. In the next paragraph the second part of the rhythm analysis in terms of labels will be explained.

According to Kevin Hetherington (1997, p.189) “to make knowable a space to everyone might choose to look at the representations that contain characteristics of a place: maps, images, descriptions and so on. A city identified in certain ways becomes that city through the practices of people in response to labels”. Further to understanding

**Figure 7.30:**

Land Use in Istiklal Street 2013

Source: Diego Duarte
7.5. Concluding Remarks and Recommendations

The hypothesis of this chapter is to demonstrate that the pedestrianization of Istiklal Street contributes to the dynamics of urban development, under a main research question: How does a transportation mode based on walkability become an urban practice? However, the conclusion is that there is no specific yes or no answer, but rather several findings with analytical explanations mentioned above in the ‘observation’ chapter. The summary of this finding is that different issues make this urban practice happen: users, accessibility, walkability, pedestrian movements, physical environment, spatial analysis, lighting and security, land use, and perception aspects in the qualitative conditions. The mentioned findings are concepts that explain the most relevant information that can influence the characteristics of the pedestrianization project of Istiklal Street. Based on this detail analysis, the research study is able to produce final recommendations. Nevertheless, pedestrianization can be implemented as an urban practice for future projects with the following recommendations to be addressed.

- Based on the Spatial Analysis, it is important to include in the process of an open space the facilities to appropriate more these residual spaces. The rapid urban transformation must to go along with everyday activities and be flexible enough to adapt easily to changes. For instance, do not offer an open space without seating, or proper lighting for the nighttime. Future urban pedestrianization proposals need to consider intersections as important triggers of mobility and transportation.
- Pedestrianization policies should assure good physical conditions to facilitate the flows of users.
- Taking into account users’ opinions it is vital in integrating new elements of streetscape such as: benches, signaling and vegetation.
- In managing the interaction between vehicles and pedestrians at different crossings, priority should be given the to the pedestrians.
APPENDIX: Result Graphs of the Gate Method (sources of all pictures: authors)

GATE A – Weekend (20 April 2013)

**Figure 7.31:**
GATE A - position West
Total of Users leaving Istiklal Street

**Figure 7.32:**
GATE A - position West
Total of Users entering Istiklal Street

**Figure 7.33:**
GATE A - position South
Total of Users leaving Istiklal Street

**Figure 7.34:**
GATE A - position South
Total of Users entering Istiklal Street

**Figure 7.35:**
GATE A - position North
Total of Users leaving Istiklal Street

**Figure 7.36:**
GATE A – position North
Total of Users moving towards Taksim Square

**Figure 7.37:**
GATE A - position North
Total of Users moving towards Tunel

**Figure 7.38:**
GATE A - position West
(direction 1)

**Figure 7.39:**
GATE A - position West
(direction 2)
GATE D – Weekend (20 April 2013)

Figure 7.37: GATE D - position West (direction 1)

Figure 7.38: GATE D - position West (direction 2)

Figure 7.39: GATE D - position North (entering the street)

Figure 7.40: GATE D - position North (leaving the street)

Figure 7.41: GATE D - position South (entering the street)

Figure 7.41: GATE D - position South (entering the street)
GATE F – Weekend (20 April 2013)

**GATE F - position West**
Total of Users moving towards Taksim Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>ELDERLY</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-9:00</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>3708</td>
<td>1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00-23:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GATE F - position West**
Total of Users moving towards Tunel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>ELDERLY</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-9:00</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GATE F - position North**
Total of Users entering Istiklal Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>ELDERLY</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-9:00</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00-23:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GATE F - position North**
Total of Users leaving Istiklal Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>ELDERLY</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-9:00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GATE F - position South**
Total of Users entering Istiklal Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>ELDERLY</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-9:00</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00-23:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GATE F - position South**
Total of Users leaving Istiklal Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>ELDERLY</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-9:00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00-23:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.43: GATE F - position West (direction 1)
Figure 7.44: GATE F - position West (direction 2)
Figure 7.45: GATE F - position North (entering the street)
Figure 7.46: GATE F - position North (leaving the street)
Figure 7.47: GATE F - position South (entering the street)
Figure 7.48: GATE F - position South (leaving the street)
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Intersection with vehicles

Figure 7.49: Intersection with vehicles at GATE A
Figure 7.50: Intersection with vehicles at GATE D
Figure 7.51: Intersection with vehicles at GATE F
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8 TAKSIM, THE METAPHOR
The name “Taksim” comes from its function as the distributor or divider of water. Literally meaning “division” or “distribution”, Taksim is the place where “water” as the essence of life was provided. In this sense, Taksim divides while giving life. On the other hand, due to its strategic location, where different flows – flows of cars, flows of people, flows of economic and cultural activities - culminate, it becomes a collecting point: it distributes while collecting. And exactly this contradictory meaning and function of Taksim gives it a metaphoric association; Taksim becomes the microcosm of Istanbul. The following addresses different dimensions of this metaphoric function, while addressing the topics already touched on by the researchers in this book.

**Taksim-Flow**

Taksim distributes and collects different flows: flows of people, flows of cars, flows of economy, flows of classes, etc. Istiklal Street, in itself, is an amazing route that incorporates all these kinds of flows: everyday hundreds of thousands of people pass through this street, and hundreds of thousands of dollars are exchanged there. It is not only a place to pass through, but a place to confront and spend time in. This street, called “Grande Rue de Péra” in the 19th century, is the place where the “West” was present through the dominant European lifestyle practiced by its foreigner population and domestic intellectuals. The “image of the West” was manifested by means of modern institutions and public services. This East-West confrontation was exacerbated after the time Istiklal Street was pedestrianized, which changed the dynamics of the place; it became safer and more attractive for the visitors, and of course more interesting for service sector investors.

As this study shows (see Chapter 7), walkability as a mode of transportation becomes an urban practice, and different issues make this urban practice happen: users, accessibility, walkability, pedestrian movements, physical environment, spatial analysis, lighting and security. This urban practice, however, is a multifaceted phenomenon, covering a range of issues such as land use and identity. Moreover, the pedestrianization of Istiklal Street contributes to the dynamics of urban development. This is reflected in the results of the conducted surveys: recreation and shopping are the most important reason for visiting Istiklal Street; the majority of the interviewees would like to spend several hours in this area; and pedestrian flows increase where the stores have an important reputation, or decreases where the building types are less attractive (like Consulates or Embassies).

However, to enhance the flow of people some threats must be fixed: pedestrians feel unsafe at some intersections because of the drivers, or in some places because of the quality of the pavement, the delivery trucks, and the difficulties in crossing the junctions. From the physical point of view, as the researchers have pointed out, some principle elements of streetscape are missing, including vegetation, composition, street furniture or ground plane.

**Taksim-Land Use**

Taksim distributes and collects different land uses: greenery, commercial, cultural, religious, residential, etc. At the same time, the continuous transformation of land use in spaces/places around Taksim reflects the dynamic nature and significance of this area. Talimhane is an excellent example of this kind.

Talimhane’s development from a residential area to a commercial and later hotel district shows how local developers and investors started to gradually transform the area without any top-down development plan. In this sense, it is a place of constant urban transformation. Originally a military training area, within around 50 years it changed into a planned high-income residential area, then was
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transformation of the area: the fire of 1870 obliged the residents to change their construction style to more durable materials, and the Wealth Tax of 1942 forced the non-Muslims to re-locate. This resulted in a change of population and ethnicity: Turks were gaining the majority. This process was accelerated during 1955 as the result of Adnan Menderes program, which targeted minorities. Both the construction of Tarlabası Boulevard, during which 1100 buildings were demolished and the area became isolated from Beyoğlu, and the neoliberal policy of the 80s gave rise to a drastic trend of immigration to the area so that Tarlabası was populated by the Kurdish migrants. Nowadays, it houses diverse ethnicities and minorities (Kurds, Roma, Africans, etc.) and marginalized people such as homosexuals.

However, what brought Tarlabası to the centre of attention was not its heterogeneous character, but the Urban Renewal Project which targeted a part of the area that suffers from physical as well as socio-cultural deterioration. To solve this problem, a part of the neighbourhood, consisting of nine blocks, was declared as an Urban Renewal Project based on a public-private partnership. As mapped in this book (see Chapter 5), the project has been widely criticized from different perspectives, whereby the most important criticize the lack of an efficient participatory approach in the process of decision-making and design. But a more indirect effect of the project will be how it changes, again, the population fabric and re-locates, or forcefully evicts, the existing minorities and inhabitants and thus realizes a subtle process of homogenization, very similar to what happened in Sulukule some years ago.

Taksim-Minorities
Taksim distributes and collects different minorities. The history of Taksim and Beyoğlu is the history of continuous change of the inhabitants with different ethnicities. This constant change is easily observable in the case of Tarlabası.

Tarlabaşı experienced dramatic growth when the non-Muslim diplomats (Greeks, Armenians and Levantines), who served in the Beyoğlu area, began to build their houses in the middle of the 19th century and thus changed it to a middle and lower middle class residential area. Consequently, Tarlabası became a multi-ethnic residential district. Some events played a vital role in the transformation of the area: the fire of 1870 obliged the residents to change their construction style to more durable materials, and the Wealth Tax of 1942 forced the non-Muslims to re-locate. This resulted in a change of population and ethnicity: Turks were gaining the majority. This process was accelerated during 1955 as the result of Adnan Menderes program, which targeted minorities. Both the construction of Tarlabası Boulevard, during which 1100 buildings were demolished and the area became isolated from Beyoğlu, and the neoliberal policy of the 80s gave rise to a drastic trend of immigration to the area so that Tarlabası was populated by the Kurdish migrants. Nowadays, it houses diverse ethnicities and minorities (Kurds, Roma, Africans, etc.) and marginalized people such as homosexuals.

However, what brought Tarlabası to the centre of attention was not its heterogeneous character, but the Urban Renewal Project which targeted a part of the area that suffers from physical as well as socio-cultural deterioration. To solve this problem, a part of the neighbourhood, consisting of nine blocks, was declared as an Urban Renewal Project based on a public-private partnership. As mapped in this book (see Chapter 5), the project has been widely criticized from different perspectives, whereby the most important criticize the lack of an efficient participatory approach in the process of decision-making and design. But a more indirect effect of the project will be how it changes, again, the population fabric and re-locates, or forcefully evicts, the existing minorities and inhabitants and thus realizes a subtle process of homogenization, very similar to what happened in Sulukule some years ago.

Taksim-Minorities
Taksim distributes and collects different minorities. The history of Taksim and Beyoğlu is the history of continuous change of the inhabitants with different ethnicities. This constant change is easily observable in the case of Tarlabası.

Tarlabaşı experienced dramatic growth when the non-Muslim diplomats (Greeks, Armenians and Levantines), who served in the Beyoğlu area, began to build their houses in the middle of the 19th century and thus changed it to a middle and lower middle class residential area. Consequently, Tarlabası became a multi-ethnic residential district. Some events played a vital role in the transformation of the area: the fire of 1870 obliged the residents to change their construction style to more durable materials, and the Wealth Tax of 1942 forced the non-Muslims to re-locate. This resulted in a change of population and ethnicity: Turks were gaining the majority. This process was accelerated during 1955 as the result of Adnan Menderes program, which targeted minorities. Both the construction of Tarlabası Boulevard, during which 1100 buildings were demolished and the area became isolated from Beyoğlu, and the neoliberal policy of the 80s gave rise to a drastic trend of immigration to the area so that Tarlabası was populated by the Kurdish migrants. Nowadays, it houses diverse ethnicities and minorities (Kurds, Roma, Africans, etc.) and marginalized people such as homosexuals.

However, what brought Tarlabası to the centre of attention was not its heterogeneous character, but the Urban Renewal Project which targeted a part of the area that suffers from physical as well as socio-cultural deterioration. To solve this problem, a part of the neighbourhood, consisting of nine blocks, was declared as an Urban Renewal Project based on a public-private partnership. As mapped in this book (see Chapter 5), the project has been widely criticized from different perspectives, whereby the most important criticize the lack of an efficient participatory approach in the process of decision-making and design. But a more indirect effect of the project will be how it changes, again, the population fabric and re-locates, or forcefully evicts, the existing minorities and inhabitants and thus realizes a subtle process of homogenization, very similar to what happened in Sulukule some years ago.

Taksim-Minorities
Taksim distributes and collects different minorities. The history of Taksim and Beyoğlu is the history of continuous change of the inhabitants with different ethnicities. This constant change is easily observable in the case of Tarlabası.
Taksim’s role as a public space is well reflected in the surveys of the book (see Chapter 4) where different activities are concentrated in this place: political demonstrations, social gatherings, and transportation services. Taksim was the testing ground for the implementation of the modernist approach to urban planning by Henri Prost during the 1930s, which was basically in line with the vision and wishes of the secular Republic and modern Turkey; “Ottoman” was replaced by the “Republic”. Consequently, the former military Barracks at the center, which had been used since 1921 as football stadium, was transformed into a park in 1943. Later, construction of cultural buildings such as the Opera (Atatürk Cultural Centre) and the Hilton Hotel gave Taksim a symbolic meaning as the heart of modernization and progress. In fact, as the researchers correctly point out, Taksim Square’s identity is multifaceted and multi-layered. It is a place of confrontations: social, cultural and political.

The scholars interpret Taksim as an established place with diverse associations, and hence any drastic change of this established identity appears critical, as the interviews conducted in this book prove. This intellectual interpretation has been proved by the on-site field studies. The entertainment character of Taksim and its function as a meeting point have also been confirmed by interviews.

The loss of the “Ottoman” is probably a main reason for the governors to start a new development project for Taksim: a return to the lost glory. It is through precisely this approach that the new project intends to “re-build” the “image” of the Barracks, though its interior accommodates the components of the neo-liberal economy: a modern shopping mall. History is going to be re-constructed. Gezi Park, as a modern intervention, is going to be demolished. Again, like the case of Tarlabası, this project has been criticized for its top-down character to which neither related stakeholders nor the public have contributed. The lack of information and transparency, as has been mentioned in the book, makes it difficult to create a clear image about the future of the place. Critiques escalated. Protests began.

**Taksim-Birlik**

Taksim distributes and collects “protest”. As mentioned, Taksim Square has traditionally been the place for political protests and demonstrations, sometimes ending in violence like the case of 1 May 1977. A few days after conducting field studies for this research, on 28 May 2013, a crowd of protesters gathered in Gezi Park to contest the urban development project in Taksim Square. It was, at first glance, a non-political reaction to an urban project. The police reacted brutally, and supporting actions took place across Turkey. The demands of the protesters escalated to cover a range of political issues such as freedom, transparency, and principles of secularism. Social media played a vital role in distributing the message of the protesters world-wide. Taksim was no longer a place that collects and distributes the flows of its immediate surroundings; it collected and distributed a clear message to the world. Taksim was the center of the world attention.

New and creative methods of protest were practiced, such as the “standing man”. But a more promising part of the entire protest was the role Taksim played in “unifying” the people; the protesters represented diverse political approaches from leftists to rightists, and different ethnicities and minorities. “Her yer Taksim, her yer direniş” (everywhere is Taksim, everywhere is resistance) was the main cry. Taksim represented the whole of Turkey as a unified entity. For a while, Taksim abandoned its original meaning (distributor, divider) and was a place for unity and solidarity (Birlik).
However, it is difficult to predict if Taksim will continue to practice its original function (divider, distributor) or follows its new task of unification and solidarity. Whatever happens, Taksim is the metaphor for the past Istanbul. Whether it is still a metaphor for the future remains to be seen.
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