



Planned development versus unplanned change: The effects on urban planning in Turkey



Neşe Yılmaz Bakır^{a,*}, Umut Doğan^a, Merve Koçak Güngör^a, Bülent Bostancı^b

^a Erciyes University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of City and Regional Planning, 38039, Talas, Kayseri, Turkey

^b Erciyes University, Faculty of Engineering, Department of Geomatics, 38039, Talas, Kayseri, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Urban development
Planning systems
Master plan amendment
GIS (geographical information system)

ABSTRACT

Considering the planning systems introduced by different schools throughout the world, it can be seen that the flexible and participative approaches gained importance when compared to the traditional approaches, and that different implementation types mediating these approaches are being developed in the new order. In the master plan experience of Turkey, where the traditional approach plays dominant role in practice, the local governments are given the authority of making master plan amendments, as well as the right to prepare the plan itself. But, this practice enabled for the sake of public interest has become one of the frequently used planning instruments; it moved away of urban plan and a new challenge resulting in the rent has come to the forefront.

Within the scope of this study, Kayseri province becoming prominent during the planned development of Turkey since the declaration of Republic was chosen. Within this context, the amendments made to actual master plan of Kayseri province since 2006 until 2016 were taken into consideration by their subjects, and the maps examining the plan amendments were prepared by using geographical information system. In conclusion, it was determined that the specific micro amendments deteriorated the holistic planning decisions made at the beginning, and that this deterioration mainly focused on the public spaces. It was observed that, independently from the urban plan, the urban development was shaped with the focus on rent and in parallel with the private purposes. This is on the contrary with sustainable urban land management approaches.

1. Introduction

Today's classical planning approach is being criticized from various aspects such as lack of harmony between spatial development and economic and social development, difficulty in establishing the contact between regional, urban, and local planning frames and scales, lack of integration between short-, mid-, and long-term projects, and the problem of having an inert structure.

In countries such as Turkey, where the economic and politic pressures are frequently observed, the continuity and integrity of long-term planning approach are constantly deteriorated via plan amendments¹ and plan revisions². But, the master plans are regulatory administrative acts in Turkey and they become legal regulations, to which one shall obey once approved. The plan amendments, limits of which have been

set by the laws and regulations, turned into a planning instrument that is frequently utilized. Especially the road expansion requests regarding the expropriation for public space, increasing the height, and altering the structural organization and the requests indirectly related with increase in number of floors lead to increase in density in rural areas and significantly change the distribution of urban rent. As a result of these amendments, the structural integrity of plans is constantly deteriorated.

In Turkey, significant changes occurred in planning system and organization structure since 1980 s. In literature, there are many studies carried out in order to monitor this rapid change and to explore the new dynamics emerging as a result of these amendment proposals [Ersoy, 1997; Ersoy, 2000; Bademli, 1998 (Case of Ankara); Ulusoy, 1999 (Case of Ankara); Ünlü, 2005 (Case of Mersin); Bal, 2005 (Case of İzmir), Demir (2009) (Case of Zeytinburnu-İstanbul); Altın (2006) (Case of

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: nyilmaz@erciyes.edu.tr (N. Yılmaz Bakır), umutdogan@erciyes.edu.tr (U. Doğan), mervekocak@erciyes.edu.tr (M. Koçak Güngör), bbostanci@erciyes.edu.tr (B. Bostancı).

¹ Plan Amendment: Plan amendments are defined as plan arrangements that are made in the event that the law obligates the public interest without damaging the nature of the plan's main decisions, continuity, integrity, technical and social equipment balance based on scientific, objective and technical justifications.

² Plan Revision: Revision is the renewal of the current plan in urban and environmental areas by making a series of necessary corrections and refurbishments to the implementation plan on the plan without changing the basic policy decisions of the current plan because of determining that the plan is in an effective implementation phase but that this plan is insufficient to direct implementation on changing conditions and when it is deemed necessary to correct it collectively.

Istanbul), Sesli and Karadavut (2009), (Case of Muğla)]. In previous studies carried out on this subject, the plan amendment process and the factors playing effective role in this process were analyzed or the proposed suggestions were discussed in terms of public interest. Moreover, it was attempted to resolve the deficiencies and problems related with the process. Generally the district-specific examinations were made in studies. At the end of studies, the decisions about the development plans of relevant municipalities were made.

The aim of this study is to define the problems that are observed in plan implementations in Turkey and to investigate the effects of plan amendments on the urban dynamics. The types, reasons, and results of master plan amendments made within the borders of district municipalities within Kayseri metropolitan city were examined by taking the time variable into account. The data obtained were translated into a map by using geographical information system. Thus, the effects of plan amendments on entire province were interpreted by relating with the space. The present paper is one of few studies carried out on the scale of a metropolitan city, and the master plan amendments are examined here at this scale. The studies carried out within this context would be a beginning for defining the problems observed in implementing the plans in countries such as Turkey, where the politic and economic dynamics such rapidly change, and for designing the new regulations to be suggested within this context.

2. Planning system in the world

The planning systems and implementation styles vary throughout the world. The remarkable differences are related with the main purpose of planning system, the importance of regional and national planning, the authority shared between local and central administrations, the relative roles of public and private parties, the level of maturity, and the difference between objectives and results of planning (Christiansen, 1997). In a study carried out by Newman and Thornley in 1996, by referring to the study of Zweigert and Kotz (1987), the popular planning systems were described in terms of legal and administrative structures as follows (Table 1).

First of them is the Northern-Scandinavian planning system. It is the planning model adopted in countries, where the social government policies play dominant role. The Scandinavian model is based on a comprehensive planning comprehension and it aims to form the land use throughout the country. But, one of the attention-grabbing characteristics of Scandinavian model is, as in the case of Sweden, that the top level plans have no obligatory character but the obligatory regulations are the ones prepared at local level. Although it is not a legal obligation to obey the central plans, these plans are important as the guidelines for the spatial development of country. The English planning system, which is defined as the second group, defines a system, in

which there is limited number of rule and the non-governmental organizations and private sector can discuss about the rules. In German planning system, the decisions are generally made at local level. The central government play effective role in the system when the problems cannot be resolved at the local platform (Oxley et al., 2009). The fourth planning system, which has been constructed according to the Napoleonic rules and the binding and central authorities are dominant, is in force in France and also in Belgium, Italy, Holland, Portugal, and Spain as reported by Newman and Thornley (1996). Both of German and Napoleonic planning systems are the planning systems, in which the abstract rules and principles are set before the decision-making process, and they have a systematic frame.

Besides this general classification, there also are various groupings. Similarly to the classification above, Davies (1994) distinguished the English system and Continental Europe’s planning system, and they reported that the planning system of continental Europe has been shaped in accordance with the Napoleonic Legal System.

Taking the literature reviews about the planning systems into consideration together with historical developments, it can be seen that the English, American, and European models play important role in international literature in terms of plan implementation and plan amendment systems (Table 2).

In English planning system, the plans are not the fundamental determinants from legal aspect, and the suggestions about housing are discussed within their own consents. From this point of view, with their strategic and guiding context, the urban plans offer an open-minded and flexible frame for the innovations during the policy development processes and the spatial change management (Cullingworth, 1997). It is aimed to have flexible and guiding plans, and the implementation process is shaped in the way open to wide participation (Tang et al., 2000). From this aspect, the plans are not implemented in a strict manner and thus no event requiring the plan amendment occurs. Since the local planning institutions enhance their strong and effective structures by making use of the participatory planning processes, the plan amendments are not frequently necessitated. Consensus and common-sense are the most important advantages of this system, but the high level of uncertainty in planning decisions is considered as the most important disadvantage (Willis, 1995; Cullingworth, 1997). English central management avoids from being excessively normative in planning, and they keep their strict authority on the local enterprises in terms of design (Punter and Carmona, 1997).

In American system, on the contrary with English system, the laws play important role in defining the individual rights and priorities. The plan preparation and amendment are subject to comprehensive and clearly-formulated regulations and rules. In other words, the land use is clearly a subject of law (Tang et al., 2000; Willis, 1995; Cullingworth, 1997). The planning process, which is firstly executed in accordance

Table 1
Urban Planning Systems around the World by Legal and Administrative Aspects.

Legal and Administrative Planning Systems	Planning Model	Bindingness with Upper Scale Plans	Fundamental Characteristics
Northern-Scandinavian Planning System	Comprehensive planning	No bindingness, upper scale plans play directive role.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Shaping the land use is the main purpose ● The plans prepared at local level are binding
English Planning System	Strategic spatial planning	No bindingness, upper scale plans play directive role.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● These are the plans, in which the non-governmental organizations and private sector play effective role ● They have limited bindingness and are flexible.
Germanic Planning System	Comprehensive and strategic spatial planning	Upper scale plans and central decisions are of no effect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Local decisions are effective ● The central decisions play role in cases that cannot be resolved locally
Western Europe Planning System – Napoleonic (France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Spain)	Comprehensive and strategic spatial planning	Upper scale plans and central decisions are binding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is a systematic and progressive planning approach ● A strict planning approach is effective. The coherence and effect of local and central decisions are important

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6546149>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6546149>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)