

# FRAMEWORK STATEMENT FOR DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

'Organizational Approaches to Preservation and Regeneration Projects in Historic Urban Quarters: Toward an Applicable Model for Turkish Towns'

Ege Yildirim  
April 17, 2007

<b>Background and Point of Departure .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Making preservation happen in policy and in practice.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>The conversation between preservation and planning.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Globalization, post-modernity, values-based preservation and effects in Turkey .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Key concepts and keywords.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>Main question .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Definition of an organizational mechanism.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Actors .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Roles and relationships .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Strategies and tools.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Stages and actions.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Management and evaluation of the process .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Measurement of 'success'.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<b>Typology and Case Studies .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>Typology of urban context.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Case studies.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>The significance of comparative research.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>Hypothesis.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>14</b>

## Background and Point of Departure

### Making preservation happen in policy and in practice

The driving motivation behind undertaking this dissertation has been a belief in the need for **bringing together issues of historic preservation and urban public policy**, to facilitate a better understanding and more successful practice of preservation in Turkey, and to help solve contemporary urban problems in historic Turkish settlements.

There are a great many historic sites in Turkey, and the legislation and official institutions for their preservation have been in place since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, one too rarely sees instances of the successful preservation of these sites in practice. I believe that at the root of this problem lies an array of other factors, encompassing the socio-economic, cultural and political, beside the technical, legislative and administrative. Some critical challenges can be observed particularly in the areas of education, funding and organizing/ inter-agency coordination.

The subject of cultural heritage cannot be divorced from these other issues, which can be grouped together in a meaningful way under the umbrella of **urbanistic preservation** [the term 'urbanistic preservation has been used similarly in the literature by Randall Mason (2004: 142)]. Within the vastly broad range of this umbrella, a particular framework around which all factors can be addressed is the **implementation process** of preservation, a further focus being the **organization of actors** involved in this process. The process of historic preservation becomes all the more complex on the **environmental/ urban scales**. By analyzing the full range of urbanistic forces acting on historic environments, taking into account the particular local contexts of each place, **guidelines for feasible mechanisms** of implementation may be developed, both on a universal level and on a customized, case-by-case basis.

### The conversation between preservation and planning

Upon a general look at the problem of failed implementation, one can diagnose the needs of making historic preservation accessible to the larger community, embraced as a viable option by the public, politicians, developers and other parties. As a preservation-friendly society evolves, the historic preservation constituency can also become a **'real player'** at the table of **decision-making in urban policy**. This is a **mutual effort** of bringing more comprehensive urbanistic outlook to the historic **preservation agenda** without sacrificing specialized concerns like authenticity, character and values, while also bringing more historical and cultural values into the urban **planning agenda**. Thus, the different agendas can work together in a **balanced symbiosis**, rather than as rival alternatives, as the political and **institutional obstacles** are overcome to enlarge the **middle ground** between preservation and development. Many of the obstacles come from within the historic preservation sector itself, as it is usually not compromising enough to have a true 'seat on the table', and needs to bring itself forward in innovative ways. (Interview with Erica Avrami, March 2007) This balance is also often precarious, as those more outgoing preservationists sometimes attempt to embrace this innovative approach at the expense of alienating their conservative colleagues (Wallace 1986: 193-99). Perhaps some lessons can be drawn from the allied movement of environmentalism, which has made more progress toward public and political acceptance.

## **Globalization, post-modernity, values-based preservation and effects in Turkey**

The way our societies work today is becoming increasingly **globalized**, as a result of advances in communication, exchange of knowledge and mobility; global market economies fostering new relations of competition, trade and consumption patterns; and the spread of participatory democracies. As these forces are changing communities around the world, the policies of government intervention in the fields of planning and preservation are also undergoing **shifts in paradigms**. One of these shifts is a new emphasis on **values-based preservation**, where assessment of significance acquires new challenges stemming from the subjectivity of values in the **postmodern era**. The questioning of values reveals the need for more **holistic conservation** (or preservation), integrating decisions of 'what to conserve', 'for whom' and 'why' with 'how to conserve', in turn integrating independent professional spheres with each other and with society at large. The issue of **expertise** is re-addressed at this point, as organizations (eg Place Matters, City Lore in New York) work to facilitate the 'people's agency' in forming new historical narratives. (interview with Erica Avrami, March 2007) Cultural heritage thus acts as a **medium of evolving social values**, and its conservation can help **manage rapid social changes** and mitigate their negative effects (Avrami et al 2000: pp.3-4). For this, conservation is required to engage more actively in cultural politics, to assess social and economic, or use and non-use values together, and to quantify the qualitative aspects of 'cultural capital' (Throsby 2002: 103). By engaging more actively in the **political economy of space**, historic preservation will also be better able to address the issue of places being devalued/ disinvested into empty space, then revalued for reinvestment. (David Harvey, Neil Smith) It is noteworthy that historic preservation has not started to move toward the urbanistic, values-based approach all by itself, but was rather prompted by the emergence of **values-based planning**. (interview with Erica Avrami, March 2007), another insantace of the planning-preservation conversation.

Reflecting these wider trends, there have been important **new developments in Turkey** over the last few years concerning the preservation **legislation** and the **perception of society** regarding cultural heritage. Many are related to the accession for European Union membership and **EU-compliance** reform, entailing the **devolution** of government power and **localization** of preservation services, whereby increased roles, responsibility and funding resources are given to local authorities, as well as **incentives** to private persons and bodies for cultural and natural heritage protection.

Since 2003, about 10 new laws have been passed in the Turkish parliament, followed by subordinate regulations, which have direct and indirect implications for historic preservation. These include new funding sources and responsibilities given to special provincial directorates and municipalities; the establishment of municipal Offices of Preservation Implementation and Regulation (KUDEB), the streamlining of bureaucratic procedures and tools for compensation of historic property owners such as transfer of development rights, and an expanded scope for urban regeneration and tourism-related investments. This legislative reform coincides with other trends including an increased general interest in heritage preservation, fed by media coverage and the realization of economic value through tourism, especially by local governments; a shift away from centralized, modernist planning toward strategic planning and the emergence of site management plans, particularly in the context of World Heritage Sites; increasing international sponsorship evident in EU programs and projects supported by American-based bodies such as the World Monuments Fund, Global Heritage Fund and the World Bank; and the strengthening of non-governmental organizations, including citizen groups and professional chambers. This all helps to produce an **increased number of actors** in the preservation sphere, coming together both in

terms of their **conflicting** interests, such as in preservation battles and campaigns, and in terms of **collaborations**, in terms of both international and public – private partnerships.

In this new era of democratization, the **two most important implications** emerge that need to be monitored, managed and harnessed for positive outcomes. Firstly, the relaxation of authoritarian government will give way to more varied and **contested views of preservation**, as is happening elsewhere like the USA, and to **less strict applications** of preservation principles. Secondly, the **view of preservation as an economic revenue generator** presents intensive initiatives for projects to preserve and reuse historic fabric on one hand, and potential abuse through misguided interventions and adverse interests on the other. In response to these challenges and opportunities, some **basic measures** can be proposed, including **staff and technical assistance** to the highly underserved local authorities to provide guidance in interventions; the **community sector** to rise to challenge of **checking speculative interests** in the private and government sectors empowered by the new laws; and forming the **'right' type of partnerships** in preservation projects.

### **Key concepts and keywords**

The following is a basic list of key concepts to be followed throughout the dissertation, which are open to additions as further research may necessitate. Firstly, those keywords that are directly associated with historic preservation and the focus of the dissertation are listed, followed by other relevant keywords with broader scope of meaning and use.

- Historic preservation/ heritage conservation
- Historic urban quarters/ neighborhoods
- Integrated conservation/ urbanistic preservation/ values-based preservation
- Socio-economic, cultural and political factors in preservation
- Preservation – development balance
- Implementation process
- Organizational framework
- Actors in preservation
- Partnerships
- **Governance**
- Site management/ project management
- Stewardship and public participation
- Public benefit and ethics
- Legislative framework
- Culture-based urban regeneration
- (Re)distribution of urban economic value
- Tourism

A useful method for exploring this 'middle ground', which is also part of the dissertation methodology, is the pursuit of **common keywords** signaling areas of overlap between historic preservation and broader planning issues. These common words and concepts are bound to show variations in different countries' literature (a prime example being the American 'preservation' versus British and European 'conservation'); the keywords below reflect a predominantly American context, which can evolve into a more hybrid terminology of Turkish, American, European and other influences, as the more specialized preservation concepts above reflect.

- City centers, downtowns, neighborhoods and districts (the neighborhood and district concepts as interpreted by Duany and the New Urbanists are noteworthy [2003])

- Revitalization, redevelopment, rehabilitation and regeneration
- Character, quality of life/ livability and sense of place
- Density and zoning
- Urban design, smart growth and New Urbanism
- Sustainability and resource conservation
- Real estate and economics of preservation
- Housing
- Community, identity
- Cultural politics
- Gentrification and displacement
- Equitability and social/environmental justice
- Incentives
- Regional dynamics of cities
- Local government
- Governance and negotiation of interests

## Main question

The issue of 'right partnerships' brings us to the main question that this dissertation is specifically setting out to answer: ***“What are the organizational mechanisms for successful preservation projects in various urban contexts in Turkey?”***

### Definition of an organizational mechanism

Various attempts of analyzing and interpreting **urban regeneration** can be observed in recent literature, which are worth examining for their application to the historic site context. One proposition defines it as 'a multi-dimensional **process** which occurs as a result of conscious and unconscious **actions** reaching a certain intensity of interaction, which **distinguishes itself from spontaneous urban evolution** by being **more rapid** and in a **different direction**. Its **trigger** is the set of urban **actors** (such as local government, central government, private and community groups) and the **dynamics** that they present (such as capital accumulation and speculative expectations, social narratives and tendencies). These actors and dynamics are **effective** in the urban regeneration process to the degree that they have a high level of organization, potential mobility and energy intensity, in other words **power in urban politics** (Altay et al 2006).

In a similar approach to the above, this dissertation chooses to define the process of preservation and regeneration in a historic quarter in terms of an organizational mechanism, and breaks it down into several, functionally interconnected but distinct elements: The **actors** who are involved in the preservation process, the **roles** that these actors play and the **relationships** that these actors sustain with each other, the **strategies** these actors follow and the technical, administrative, political and other **tools** that they use to implement their strategies, and the **stages/ actions**.

At this stage, it is felt sufficient to keep the definitional framework confined to the description of its elements, and the hypothesis to the main actors and their respective roles. As the basic literature review and outline development approach completion (see Methodology), it will be possible to achieve a more fully developed framework, feeding off existing theories such as the above-cited

proposition, to produce a more specific and well-grounded hypothesis. In turn, the theoretical framework will be attempted to be **customized** according to the typologies and respective case studies in an appropriate way, taking into account an urbanistic, multi-actor view of preservation on urban neighborhood level, and the hypothesis will thus have been tested.

### **Actors**

A basic sectoral grouping of actors yields the public, private, community, academic sectors. By institutions and the roles/ functions they perform, the following generic list of actors can be made.:

- Public: federal/ central government; state/ province government; local government
- Public/ Academic: professors serving on public boards
- Public/ Community: advisory bodies
- Private: landowners; tenants; investors/ developers; funding bodies (eg banks)
- Public/ Private/ Community: non-profit funding bodies (eg
- Private/ Technical: professional firms
- Academic/ Technical: universities, schools
- Community: national, regional and local citizen organizations (associations, societies)
- Community/ Technical/ Private: professional organizations

**Definition of the public and private** spheres is an **evolving** issue, with considerable scope for interpretation. For instance, a slightly different grouping of actors can be encountered In the US, where the private sector is implied to take in community groups/ non-profits (see Participation in the Global Community Panel 2006), and the public sector as taking in large foundations and advisory groups. In the Turkish and European contexts, these would more likely be placed under the community sector.

Two major players are usually portrayed in the planning and preservation context in all countries, in a coexistence of balance and tension. In more socialist countries, this pair is **public government authority and private market forces**; in more capitalist countries, the private market forces remain, but their counterpart shifts from government to the **community**. This is an essential assumption which influences many levels of this subject's study, and is supported by the trends of globalization seen in countries like Turkey.

Actors have the important attribute of being **stakeholders** in the future of each site, with different roles within the framework of each project process. Actors can also be evaluated in terms of project processes according to their **longevity**, ie whether they are bodies formed particularly and temporarily for a project, or they are more permanent, thematic organizations.

### **Roles and relationships**

Of all the elements defined here, perhaps the most critical one is the way the roles and relationships of actors are laid out in a preservation project. This is the point where the **political and human factors** play themselves out most clearly, and where the degree is best determined of **how competently and ethically the tools will be employed** by the actors.

Roles are an important factor in defining the relations, as there are **essential functions** that need to be performed for a project to move forward, and to be **distributed among the parties** involved, such as funding, decision-making, regulating, monitoring and advising. Whether or not roles are shared with balance and agreement, divided in ways complimenting each other, or overlap in

repetitive and competitive ways, affects the project process, in terms of criteria like **efficiency and inclusiveness**.

The types of relationship encountered among actors distinguish themselves in aspects like the **level of institutionalization** and the **convergence of parallel or conflicting interests**. In terms of institutionalization, it is possible to speak of '**organizations**' and '**meta-organizations**', meaning each separate actor being an organized unit as opposed to a super-structure composed of different actors, itself becoming a loose entity. The 'meta-organization' can be conceived much like a constellation of stars (actors), structured around the concept of the project entity, which is like the glue holding this constellation together. An example cited is the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, as a redevelopment agency that has been established to spearhead the World Trade Center rebuilding project. (interview with Erica Avrami, March 2007). This recalls the previously mentioned issue of project-based/ temporary versus thematic/ permanent actors. A proposition might be that meta-organizations have a general tendency for the former, while actor-level organizations for the latter. The relationship of distinct projects versus constant processes emerges here as a relevant point (being discussed below under Management and evaluation of the process).

The level of institutionalization is interesting to consider in terms of **community participation** in historic preservation as well. Community groups, which can participate in the process on levels varying from active partnerships to just information sharing, by their organization, become a full-fledged political institution with their distinct agenda, which is now quite different from the general public as an amorphous mass.

The subject of political agendas can tie us to the second important aspect of inter-actor relationship, of parallel and conflicting interests. Relationships can be viewed on a **positive to negative scale**, where coalitions, partnerships and coordinated action exists side-by-side with opposition campaigns, lawsuits and obstruction of other actors' efforts. The challenge here is how to achieve more **consensus and coordinated positive action while accepting and resolving conflict**. The post-modern, strategic planning and values-based approach of **negotiating stakeholder interests** and manoeuvring institutional and cultural politics comes back into the picture as an essential issue.

### **Strategies and tools**

In the context of values-based preservation, two views of preservation are defined: the conventional, **curatorial** approach and the progressive **urbanistic** one, with their characteristic sets of tools. The wisest and best strategy for all kinds of preservation project in historic sites can be expected to be a combination of the two types, according to the local needs of each site. Schuster and de Monchaux (1997: 9-10) put the different types of tools on a scale going from the most conventional and interventionist to the most liberal, engaging more urbanistic dynamics: these are ownership, regulation, property rights, incentives and information.

Some conventional historic preservation tools that can be cited include designation (US)/ listing (UK)/ registering (Turkey) of individual landmarks (US)/ buildings (UK)/ cultural properties (Turkey) and historic districts (US)/ urban conservation areas (UK/ Turkey); regulation of physical interventions/ alterations and reuse, or development control (UK), of these structures and areas through preservation boards (the Landmarks Preservation Commission in New York City through the federal standards and its local ordinances/ the Regional Cultural and Natural Heritage Protection Boards in Turkey through centralized standards, their local ordinances and any existing approved conservation plans). The British policy approach of the Planning Policy Guidance

documents (PPG 12, 15, 16) also outlines national standards, but provides a more flexible framework to be applied locally according to local variations and interpretations; in a sense it can be termed more urbanistic in its grasp of planning policy.

Augmented to these conventional tools over the course of the development of historic preservation, the use of local zoning (eg. downzoning, contextual zoning) ordinances determining height, density and building forms; grants and loans; tax incentives for rehabilitation; tax-based refinancing projects; special funding programs (eg. Main Street Program); special status zones; transfer of development rights and redevelopment partnerships can be considered.

To understand the relationship of tools to actors, one can consider how the tools are used by which 'subject actors' (classically the government, increasingly private and community actors), and on which 'object actors' (usually private or non-profit owners/ tenants/ users).

### **Stages and actions**

This element implies the distinct stages/ phases of the process governed by different types and levels of activity, and the decisive actions taken by the actors which change the status of the sites and separate the stages. A generic procession of stages and actions can be described as follows:

- Project initiative
  - o publicity, promotion, networking (eg for funding), funding applications
  - o procedures for land acquisition/ lease, agreements/contracts between partners
- Plan/project funding
  - o plan/project design: technical work, public participation (eg charrettes)
  - o publicity, promotion
- Project approvals
- Plan/project implementation
  - o (further project funding, design, approval on lower level, eg projects for single buildings)
  - o Construction
- New projects to build on previous works

As each stage and action has a distinct identity and denotes a different situation, the order of predominance of actors, their relationships and the strategies and tools they use can vary in each of them, to a degree that does not alter the main characteristics of the whole process.

Constant, mundane activities which do not present a change in stages/ phases are also an essential part of the process, as is the supervision and coordination of the actions taken. These are ongoing management and administrative works, such as monitoring, responding to new developments and unexpected events by facilitating relevant actors/ stakeholders to convene and make relevant decisions, updates/ revisions of plans and projects, site maintenance, site operation, etc. and are performed through time-consuming meetings and communication which lead to decisions.

### **Management and evaluation of the process**

The constant routine activities mentioned above are a part of the management issue, expressed in contexts such as 'managing change', project management and site management. Management is



a key aspect of the implementation process, coordinating the different elements of the organization mechanism and overseeing the flow of process stages.

The issue of discreet stages and actions versus constant activities also prompts us to further consider the preservation process in the following terms:

- **Process** versus **outcome**
- **Deliberate** intervention versus **natural** evolution
- **Wholesale, one-time** versus **incremental, continuous** intervention
- **Historic preservation** versus **urban regeneration/ redevelopment**

Looking at the first criterion, the values-based approach in keeping with the current times suggests that the emphasis should be primarily on the **process**, and secondarily on the **outcomes**. To be borrowing from the sister literature of environmental sustainability, Stephen Wheeler suggests an approach to sustainability that tries to avoid the problematic debate of 'end states' and emphasizes 'the process of continually evolving towards healthier human and natural communities' (2003: 438); this definition seems easily applicable to the case of historic preservation as well). However, this is not to undermine the need for indicators for measuring outputs. For instance, EU-funded projects are subject to detailed evaluations of logframe ('logical framework') consistency and specific project outputs. What is needed seems to be keeping the expected outputs in small and modest in unit size and large in number, with short time intervals of measurement, to monitor incremental change and projections for the long term.

On the issue of deliberate intervention versus natural evolution, this takes us to questions like the nature, speed and direction of growth, as expressed at the beginning of the section 'Definition of an organizational mechanism', and to the debate of what is sustainable and healthy for the city. A prominent voice in this debate in the American literature is that of Roberta Brandes Gratz, putting forth the duality of '**Project Planning** versus **Urban Husbandry**' (1998: 2), reflecting the influence of Jane Jacobs' objection to the planning profession's flawed attitudes (1961). The same debate is also connected to the question of 'wholesale/ one-time efforts (which seem to coincide with 'Project Planning') versus incremental, continuous processes. On one hand, **gradual change** that carefully minds the continuity of place history **suits the concerns of historic preservation** quite well, and seems necessary to embrace. On the other hand, I personally do not feel it wise to make too rigid a separation of 'good and bad' between these two approaches to intervention, as sometimes the **extreme situations** that historic sites find themselves in, such as severe physical and economic decline, may call for **strong interventions**, albeit as **triggers** of a larger, continuous process. The key is to **integrate the two approaches**, as with integrating process and outcomes, in a way appropriate to the local contexts.

In Turkey, historic sites often find themselves in the 'extreme situations' mentioned above, where the natural urban dynamics are taking them either in directions of gradual destruction by decay ('**slow death**') or rapid and brutal destruction by demolition or radical alterations ('**fast death**'). Therefore, I suspect that a large part of the dissertation will address cases **of wholesale site intervention**, as an aspect of urban preservation practice that is popular among local governments, and seen by some as the only way to 'save' such historic urban quarters. This said, **relating such interventions to the larger process** of site evolution and **distinguishing the incremental, small-scale activities** that are encompassed within the interventions are also important. After all, neighborhood designations, ordinances and conservation plans invariably need to address the repair, restoration and reuse on building scale.

Lastly, on the distinction between **historic preservation and more general urban planning**

**actions** like **urban regeneration/ redevelopment**, it is useful to be make this distinction with caution, firstly for the purpose of keeping the connection of historic neighborhoods with the dynamics of their urban surroundings and the whole city. Planning actions like regeneration can sometimes be directed just as easily on historic areas as other dilapidated sections of the city, as seen in the example of the Turkish Urban Regeneration Law 5366, which was passed as limited to historic areas after being proposed as a bill for all existing urban fabrics. Furthermore, one should remember that the separation of the 'historic' environment from the 'non-historic environment' is a relative/ interpretive and value-based thing, and things *become* historic by way of our perceiving them as significant.

### **Measurement of 'success'**

The concept of a '**successful preservation project**' stated in the main question of the dissertation is highly open to interpretation and broad enough to mean any kind of outcome desired by any of the actors and stakeholders. To render this concept more attuned to the generally accepted principles of historic preservation and sustainable, equitable urban planning, one can form the initial basis of evaluation according to the following generic criteria:

- Impact on physical and cultural fabric
  - o cultural/ architectural and historical significance, artistic/ esthetic values
  - o historic settlement pattern, streetscape and architectural character (with existing and new buildings)
  - o height, density and carrying capacity
  - o technical infrastructure
  - o transportation
  - o natural and open space
- Impact on land use, ownership and socio-economic patterns
  - o Integrity of historic uses, diversity of uses (mixed-use)
  - o demographic and ownerships shifts, social stability, gentrification, housing needs and equitable access
  - o Economic vitality and competitiveness, relationship with real estate market and the tourism sector
  - o balance of cultural/ social/ non-use values with economic/ use values
- Nature of the political process
  - o Democratic community/ stakeholder participation and inclusiveness
  - o Interpretation of the political history
  - o Sustainability of the organizational model
  - o Level of bureaucratic and legislative procedures
- Connectivity with larger context
  - o Compatibility with wider urban processes and policies
  - o Compatibility with natural environmental/ geographical context (eg.natural disaster response/ management)
  - o Continuity with or effects on previous planning and preservation efforts

Some of these indicators can be contradictory to one another, with particular actors defending the relevant causes. However, most of the concerns are shared by several actors, and most actors have several concerns at once, creating opportunities for negotiation and deciding on optimal solutions of mutual compromise.

# Typology and Case Studies

## Typology of urban context

Urban environments in Turkey and elsewhere have different circumstances, requiring customized approaches to be devised, utilizing available resources to maximum effect. Research such as that intended in this dissertation will feed the scientific pool of information resources for local governments, private initiatives and other actors who attempt preservation actions.

Thus, a typology of the 'various urban contexts' needs to be made, based on case studies and practices in different countries. In each context, different actors, roles, relationships and tools will be found, and it is important to find a meaningful typology to examine how they vary. A comparative analysis is intended, both within Turkey (between the main types of contexts defined), and between Turkey and other countries, including developed Western countries (USA, European countries) and developing countries with similar regional or social contexts (Mediterranean, Middle East).

Many elements and aspects of the preservation process have been outlined in the previous section, and they all merit typologies of their own. However, for the purpose of manageable simplicity, the **typology of places** (sites/ cities/ urban contexts) has been chosen as the most meaningful factor in differentiating case studies.

The **unit of observation** for case studies has been determined as particular '**neighborhoods and districts**' of cities. (The ideas of Kevin Lynch and New Urbanism are relevant for this issue.) In small cities, this would basically equal the main city center/ core, have parts of both residential and commercial use, and take up a large part of the city fabric. In large cities, this would be one of many neighborhoods (predominantly residential) or districts (with commercial/ cultural/ or other special uses and their mixture). The Central Business District of large cities can also have historic qualities, although a high level of urbanistic complexity makes them difficult to generalize in these terms.

The **predominant use** is a valid typological criterion –distinguishing residential neighborhoods and non-residential/ commercial districts – and a 'mini-hypothesis' can be formed, these two types of sites require slightly different tools; but I expect that a hybrid mix of the two will prove more favorable.

As for the **main criterion of site typology**, the **growth pattern of the** cities where the neighborhoods/ districts are located emerges as the best choice. This yields the duality of growing/ booming/ strong market cities versus shrinking/ declining/ weak market cities. The criteria of city size is not the same as growth dynamics, as declining areas in large cities can also be found; but connections between them can be found. This is a point to consider in more detail later on.

The important differences between pressures of too much growth and too rapid change (the 'fast death') and the threats of insufficient growth and consequent decay (the 'slow death') were hinted at in the section on evaluation of the process. The growth dynamics can actually be interpreted as parts of the same system on a macro level, as cities located within the same regional system can

differ in terms of their places in the urban hierarchy, and their shifting functions within the regional and national economies over time. (This shift of functions and dynamics calls to mind the way roles are distributed and can shift among actors of the same organizational mechanism.) The different responses to regional dynamics consequently produce different effects on their historic neighborhoods. Historic districts in cities experiencing lack of economic vitality face threats of under-utilization and disrepair, while those in cities with intense development activity face demolition or over-use.

### **Case studies**

The determination of case studies are still a work in progress, although many cities are being considered at this stage of the dissertation, mainly comparing US and Turkish cities. As large cities, Istanbul and New York emerge easily as good candidates for comparison, although the particular neighborhoods and districts to focus on remain unresolved. For Istanbul, the Beyoglu district as the complex cultural heart of the city, and neighborhoods in the historical peninsula such as Fener and Balat are noteworthy for their historic character and the current agendas being played out in them.

For New York City, sites that catch the attention include SoHo (hailed by Brandes Gratz as a flagship of urban husbandry), Tribeca (criticized by Michael Sorkin for being “scrupulously preserved [for] architectural character ... but at the expense of its human character” [2003: 34]), Chinatown / Little Italy (cited by Sorkin as as the only surviving place of vibrancy [2003: 34], but not yet apparent in terms of any significant preservation initiative).

The current dynamics of New York City exhibit intense growth, with the central borough of Manhattan spilling over its pressures of use into the outer boroughs, most notably Brooklyn. Thus, areas such as Fulton Street Mall in Downtown Brooklyn are interesting for their potential for growth. On 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, Brandes Gratz contrasts the success of urban husbandry in Bryant Park while criticizing the redevelopment of the Theater District between Broadway and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue (1998: 68-77).

As for the wider context of the New York metropolitan region, New York City, as a booming major hub city, and center for commerce, services and culture, can be compared to Newburgh, as a small industrial town with a shrunken job base, once-thriving but currently struggling to overcome its state of decline. At the midpoint, Stamford, Connecticut, may be interesting as a ‘medium-level’, satellite city with a growing job base (see below for these types of intermediate cases)

Some cities with interesting preservation contexts are poised midway along the scala of growth dynamic and size. Still, an assessment can be made about whether or not their growth dynamics are positive, albeit in a desirable and moderate rate, or whether or not they emerged from decline, albeit they are now a beacon of promising growth. In Turkey, the Kayakapi neighborhood in central Turkey, abandoned in itself but located in the middle of a thriving regional milieu of cultural tourism is an interesting candidate. The Asian-shore neighborhood of Kadikoy, not subject to the pulsating urban dynamics like Beyoglu on the European bank, is nonetheless witnessing progressive community organizing on a neighborhood level. In the US, places that may qualify as such include Charleston and Savannah, with their long-established and praised historic preservation practices with both curatorial and urbanistic aspects, as well as Austin, Cleveland and Louisville.

### **The significance of comparative research**

International comparisons of urban and regional contexts, such as the Turkish-American one cited above, may not be as conducive to making meaningful analogies as originally expected, particularly *vis a vis* the culture of privatism and capitalism in the US. However, in the age of globalization, some degree of shared universal impacts on urban settlements everywhere can be counted on. The global regional system is actually a shared phenomenon in different countries, 'central/developed' ones like the US/ NYC and 'peripheral/emerging' ones like Turkey/ Istanbul. In the case that the larger context is not sufficiently analogous, seeking more particular tools that are applicable is a way forward. In any case, in the face of Turkey's indigenous set of conditions and traditions, problems and potentials, Turkish professionals, authorities and stakeholders in the preservation process must develop their own culture of policy and practice.

## **Hypothesis**

The working hypothesis of the dissertation is that “there is a basic tri-partite set of ingredients for a successful preservation effort in an urban context: the public sector, mainly local government, with the role of legitimizing public authority; the private sector, mainly investors, with the capital, and the community sector, with local groups lending democratic legitimacy and support to the process. The weight and nature of their roles and their strategies need to be tailored for different urban contexts, depending on the nature of their growth dynamics”. A more tentative component of this main assumption is that “smaller, more disinvested towns favor wholesale revitalization of one distinct area, with local government- private investor partnerships as an anchor triggering community-wide change, while larger, more economically active cities favor multiple, piecemeal projects with more complex and diverse collaboration models, and an important role for strong regulatory enforcement.” The hypothesis will predictably need adjustments, hopefully without shifting the argument's center of gravity, as the research process unfolds.

## **Methodology**

The following steps have been envisioned as a tentative methodology, to be developed and modified as needed during the course of the dissertation process.

- Formulating the **basic argument** and submitting the **initial proposal** of the dissertation
- Making the **basic literature review** (determining main references) and **refining proposal** accordingly
- Forming the basis of main dissertation text, ie the basic **outline**, with a general description of the chapters' contents
- Making the **main literature review** (accumulating a list of references and using them to develop the basic outline and to set the philosophical/ theoretical background; using the '**common keywords**' as a guideline). The philosophical/ theoretical underpinnings of the dissertation are first to be explained as a preamble, but also to be referred to throughout the case studies. Some other fields that may need to be drawn on to support this include management (administrative/ business); political science and organizational behavior.

- **Developing the discussion of organizational mechanisms** for preservation and their elements, and urbanistic issues affecting these mechanisms and the preservation process (using literature review and note-taking to **develop dissertation chapters**)
- Establishing the **typology** and identifying representative **case studies** for each type (as scanning the literature of cases can also affect the typology, this is envisioned as an interactive, simultaneous process). This will involve evaluations of the areas' **location**, **historical evolution**, the current or recent level and type of **preservation activity**, and the type of **actors and relationships** present. There is likely to be two major case studies from Turkey, reflecting the main types of urban contexts, accompanied by a multitude of minor case studies, from Turkey, the US, Europe, the Mediterranean region and the Middle East.
- **Analysis of the case study areas** (detailed and intensive focus on the major case studies, and general overview of the minor case studies) in terms of the criteria described above as well as issues discussed in the previous sections. The elements (actors, roles, relationships, strategies and tools, stages/ actions) and attributes of the organizational mechanism and the implementation process will be identified for each case.
  - o **Literature review** on cases
  - o Conducting **field research** and integrating results into dissertation text (using data-gathering / surveying techniques of the social sciences, inc. observation, interviews, questionnaires, statistical evaluation methods, etc.)
- **Appraising the process and outcomes** (evaluating strengths and weaknesses, making recommendations for improvement and future action)
- **Testing the hypothesis** and finalizing the dissertation text

## References

- Altay, Deniz, Özgün Balkanay, A. Burak Büyükcivelek, Ayşegül Eriçok, Ebru Kamacı, Cenk M. Oğuzsoy, Esin Özdemir, Mehmet Saner, Ebru Sinan & A. Ege Yıldırım. (2006). *Kentsel Dönüşümün Temsiline İlişkin bir Önerme ('A Proposition Regarding the Representation of Urban Regeneration')*. Paper produced for the course 'Space Concepts and Organization in the New Age' by İlhan Tekeli, Bulletin of the Turkish Chamber of Architects – Ankara Branch, No. 40, May/June 2006
- Avrami, Erica, Randall Mason, and Marta de la Torre. (2000). *Values and Heritage Conservation*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Brandes Gratz, Roberta & Norman Mintz. (1998). *Cities Back From the Edge: New Life for Downtown*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Duany, Andres & Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk. (2003). 'The Neighborhood, the District and the Corridor' in LeGates, Richard T. & Stout, Frederic (eds.). *The City Reader*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Jacobs, Jane. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.
- Mason, Randall, 'Historic Preservation, Public Memory and the Making of New York City'. in Page, Max & Mason, Randall (eds.). *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Participation in the Global Community Panel. (2006). *Participating in the Global Preservation Community*, Panel Report, Preserve America Summit 2006, ACHP

- Schuster, J. M., J. de Monchaux, & C. A. Riley, (eds.). (1997). *Preserving the Built Heritage: Tools for Implementation*, Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Sorkin, Michael. (2003). *Starting from Zero : Reconstructing Downtown New York*. New York, NY : Routledge.
- Throsby, D. 2002. "Cultural Capital and Sustainability Concepts in the Economics of Cultural Heritage." In *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, ed. M. de la Torre, Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Trust.
- Wallace, Michael. (1986). 'Reflections on the History of Historic Preservation'. In *Presenting the Past: Essays on History and the Public*, Susan Porter Benson, Stephen Brier, RoyRosenzweig (eds.). Philadelphia: Temple University Press. pp. 165-199.
- Wheeler, Stephen. (2003). 'Planning Sustainable and Livable Cities'. in LeGates, Richard T. & Stout, Frederic (eds.). *The City Reader*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Yildirim, Ege. (1998). 'What Are the Likely Ingredients of a Successful Policy for the Preservation and Use of the Built Heritage? – With Special Reference to Pressure Groups', *Essay on Policies for the Conservation of the Cultural Heritage*, University of York.