Urban renewal process in Turkey

- General overview, economic and social analysis
Abstract

Turkish metropolises suffer poor infrastructure systems and weak structures due to unplanned urbanization as a result of migration waves from rural to urban. Slum clearance was a necessity to provide safe and quality life in the metropolises. Through the enaction of related laws and establishment of Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKİ) a new era started on urban regeneration. Since 90’s Turkey has been implementing several Urban Regeneration Projects (URP) due to fortify and change the urban structure. Some of those URPs are succeeded others are not. This paper elucidates the urbanization and squatter history of Turkey since 60’s in parallel with clarification of terms like urban area, urbanization and urban transformation, in order to understand the background of urban transformation in Turkey. Also, squatter areas and methods that implemented to transform them are defined. Finally, several URPs are demonstrated to discuss pros & cons.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Purpose

Industrialization, globalization and economic changes in the world since 60’s caused a rapid urbanization process that has determined the form of big cities. As a result of industrialization, massive immigration has begun from rural areas to big cities of Turkey. Increase of population in metropolises has been very high and consequently urbanization process has been experienced in a short time span, thus, demand for urban land and housing raised to a very high level. In order to meet that urgent need for shelter, immigrated population have built slums which is shack that put up quickly without proper permissions on seized lands. Therefore, those immigrants changed the structure of the big cities and they created slum settlements. It is known that the unplanned and uncontrolled area development has created negative life and sheltering conditions with many infrastructure and social problems that could not be solved yet.

Since 60’s Turkish governments have endeavored to find a solution for the urbanization problems of the cities. However, many trials have been failed until 90’s. After that new strategies and approaches have been embraced in order to fix squatting and urbanization problems. Urban Regeneration Project (URP) strategies such as; urban rehabilitation, urban redevelopment, urban revitalization, urban regeneration have been taking an important place in the public discussions and urban planning agenda especially for the last two decades (Mutlu, 2009). Therefore, these days Turkey is experiencing a rapid cultural, structural and architectural change caused by huge URPs. Urban regeneration affects the structural, social and economic future of the city and the inhabitants; therefore, different specialists like sociologists, economists, engineers, architects and civil engineers should work together on the planning phase of the regeneration to obtain successful outcomes.

Since 80’s Turkey have been applying URPs to convert those illegal squatter settlements into well planned modern commodities through Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKİ) and private corporations. Because, squatter housing areas, old, historical quarters of cities not only causing changes in the physical structure of cities, they are also affecting the social, economic and environmental dynamics in the built
environment. Municipalities which have squatter or illegal established housing areas within their boundaries use urban transformation and regeneration projects to improve their living conditions and physical built environment with the standards of a contemporary life style while transforming these areas into prestige zones of their governmental success also by using the great economic potentials of centrality on space (Ulu, 2007). During and after the URPs many advantages are offered to the inhabitants of squatter settlements and landlords. However, due to inadequate projection, squatters faced inconvenient situations. Many of them couldn’t afford the installments of the new apartments or they couldn’t keep up to the new life style.

As an inhabitant of Istanbul I have witnessed growth of many squatter areas. Now we are experiencing the Urban Regeneration Process. Therefore, I realized that it is so important to explain the urbanization and squatting process of Turkey, in order to understand the reasons behind the urban regeneration. Aim of this thesis is to demonstrate the reasons of urban transformation process, to clarify the concepts and the actors and to explain the economic and social costs and benefits of URPs. Furthermore, the concept of Urban Regeneration has a different interpretation in diverging conditions in different countries. I explained the urbanization and squatting history of Turkey since 60’s in parallel with clarification of terms like urban area, urbanization and urban transformation, in order to understand the background of urban transformation in Turkey.

1.2 Methodology

Firstly, a thorough literature study on the subject matter was conducted due to explore the urbanization process in Turkey. Moreover, significant number of urban regeneration case studies are investigated and eliminated in order to find the most suitable ones explaining the urban regeneration methods. As a result, I decided to include 5 case studies in my thesis. Furthermore, I made interviews with the local authorities to reach the reliable information about those cases. Besides I went to several TOKİ projects to see the conditions of the apartments they built. Information concerning the definitions about the urban regeneration process and establishment of TOKİ have been obtained from international research papers and from different websites.
1.3 Structure of Paper

The thesis consists of 5 chapters.

Chapter 1 is the introduction; the aim of this chapter is to give the general idea of the thesis to readers through background and purpose part. Besides, methodology part explains the methods I used to write the thesis.

Chapter 2 is concerned with the appropriate definition and identification of the terms urban area, urban regeneration and squatter areas. The problems of slum areas are investigated. Furthermore, detailed urbanization history of Turkey is discussed and the factors are defined due to emphasize the effectiveness of the urbanization process on the dynamics of squatter areas.

Chapter 3 is focused on the policies and trials to transform the squatter housing; it provides trials to prevent squatting since 60’s and the factors that affected by an URP. Finally, i stated the establishment process of TOKİ.

In the Chapter 4, specific squatter areas and the applied urban regeneration methods like URPs and gentrification are shown. The ethnical & economic groups of the urban regeneration areas are defined so that we can understand the society there, which helps to analyze the urban renewal contracts that have been offered to them. Also, urban renewal contracts that have been proposed to the inhabitants of squatter areas are examined, than project objectives and results are compared in order to see the similarities and differences of the URPs.

The final Chapter is the evaluation of the results and the conclusion of the thesis.
2. **URBAN REGENERATION, SQUATTER AREAS AND RELATED CONCEPTS**

2.1 Urban Area

Urban area can be defined as area with a large amount of people residing in it, an area that has been significantly developed as a result of urbanization process. Also Urban is used in contrast to rural, which generally indicates a low-population agricultural-based area.

In Australia and Canada they call it urban area if there is a minimum population of 1,000 or more people with a high density.

In Norway urban settlement is described as hub of buildings that is inhabited by at least 200 persons and the distance between the buildings must not exceed 50 meters. Exceptions are allowed for areas that cannot be occupied, such as parks, sports facilities, industrial areas or natural barriers.

In Turkey, urban area is described as cluster of people more than 10000 that their sources of income are not based on agriculture.

In France, An urban area is defined as a group of municipalities, all adjoining and without enclaves, made up of an urban hub and rural municipalities or urban units (suburban rim), of which at least 40% of the resident working population works in the hub or in municipalities attracted by the hub.

In U.S.A, according to the Census Bureau urbanized areas comprises one or more places and the adjacent densely settled surrounding territory that together have a minimum of 50,000 persons. Surrounding territory generally consists of contiguous territory having a density of at least 1,000 persons per square mile.

Definitions for urban areas vary a lot; while Turkey, USA, Australia and Canada describe the urban area through population other countries included the number of buildings in their definition. In common in every definition source of income inhabitants should not be based on agriculture. Briefly we can say urban areas are the centers that people located with high density.
2.2 Urban Regeneration

The term ‘urban transformation’ has been at the centre of the public authorities’ urban discourse since the start of the 2000s – a magic term used by politicians at all levels as a tool to justify how they organize the physical sphere. Some say urban renewal is the process where an urban neighborhood or area is improved and rehabilitated. The renewal process can include demolishing old or run-down buildings, constructing new, up-to-date housing, or adding in features like a theater or stadium. Urban renewal is usually undergone for the purposes of persuading wealthier individuals to come live in that area. Urban renewal is often part of the gentrification process.

Zielenbach and Levin (2000) described urban regeneration as the physical redevelopment of shattered areas, an improvement of local infrastructure, the elimination of undesirable individuals or private organizations and the creation of additional jobs. According to Lingbeek et al. (2006) urban regeneration is used to address the rebuilding and redevelopment of urban slums, i.e. deprived, underused, and vacant land and buildings in an urban area.

Couch (1990) describes urban regeneration as seeking to bring back investment, employment, and consumption and to enhance the quality of life within urban areas.

Osuide (2004) described urban regeneration as a planned attempt to transform the urban environment through structured large-scale control of existing urban areas to increase both the present and future operations of urban people.

Urban regeneration is a comprehensive and integrated vision and action which leads to the resolution of the urban problems and which seeks to bring a lasting improvement in the economic, physical, social and environmental condition of an area that has been subject to change (Peter Roberts 2000:17).

According to Cagla and Inam (2008), urban transformation has been perceived as an era of revision of the approaches for urbanization, forming continuous and healthy places in a city, giving a new content to the current reconstruction plans by revising the plans and their applications.
You can find many definitions about urban regeneration in the related articles. Those definitions differ with their goals, strategies, visions and methods. Howsoever are the definitions made, urban regeneration simply refers to the sum of actions and strategies for the economic, communal, structural and environmental reinvigorate of the deteriorated urban areas such as squatters. Besides, as it shown in Figure 1 urban regeneration implies an integrated perspective on problems, potentials, strategies and projects within the

- Physical Regeneration
- Social Regeneration
- Environmental Regeneration
- Economic Regeneration

2.3 History of Urbanization in Turkey

Industrialization, globalization and economic changes in the world since 60’s caused a rapid urbanization process that has determined the form of big cities all over the world, besides the social transformation following the Second World War has brought important changes as well. Rapid population increase combined with industrialization and high growth rates caused a massive immigration from rural areas to the metropolises in a short time period, which have triggered increasing urbanization rates and construction of illegal settlements in Turkey.
Figure 2 demonstrates the urbanization rate and number of squats in Turkey between 1955 and 2002. As you can see the urbanization rate in Turkey was around 17% from the foundation of the Republic (1923) until the early 1950s, and it increased up to 25%, 45% and 60% in 1960, 1980 and 2000, respectively (Keleş, 2006). Based on World Bank data, Turkey ranked third among countries with the highest urbanization rates in the world between the years 1980–2000. Beginning from the 1980s, Turkey has been pursuing a market-oriented and outward-looking growth strategy, which is a fundamental shift from the previous protectionist, import-substitution growth strategy. The belief behind this shift was that the country’s development was becoming severely constrained by the inefficiencies of the domestic economy (Erkip 2000). In other words one of the main causes of Turkey’s rapid urbanization was the strict state control on economy has loosened and investments have sped up in these years. Within these conditions, the new social atmosphere has brought hope for better living conditions in cities and has attracted the rural population to urban settlements. So the primary purpose of the immigrants, who generally have economic difficulties and low educational levels, have been to get shelter and a job to settle down for a better life. (Uzun et al., 2010). However, some have argued that the main force behind the urbanization was mechanization process at rural areas (Köroğlu & Ercoşkun, 2006). Furthermore between beginning to 1960’s to 2004, the governments, politicians, municipalities and the industrialists had encouraged migration without thinking of its effects on urban space, because migrated population offered them cheap labor force, they could not provide housing in face of the ineffectiveness of the ways of legal housing provision in Turkey (Ulu, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Urbanization Rate (%)</th>
<th>Number of squats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Urbanization rate and number of squats in Turkey*

*Source:* Keles, R, 2006
Burdened with all the problems of urbanization, cities became the subject of dramatic crises as slum, low job opportunities for the growing unskilled workforce, environmental degradation, unclean water, improper waste disposal, and deterioration of existing infrastructure (Köroğlu & Ercoşkun, 2006). Historical cores of the city, industrial and storing areas which were built for a certain purpose at once, and abandoned in time, authentic neighborhoods and similar places of which structures and dwellers were changed has been losing their functions, abandoning to dilapidate and vanishing in urban area (Çağla & İnam, 2008). One of the buttresses of recent political agenda of the Turkish government has been its construction and renovation projects. The government resources fast-paced projects that range from hydroelectric stations to housing developments and to renovations of historical city quarters (Tonbul, 2011)

### 2.4 Growth of Squatter Areas

One of the most acute social problems of developing countries like Turkey is to meet available, accessible and affordable housing demand for the ever-increasing populations of the urban settlements which have migrated from rural areas. Lack of housing lead those immigrants to make up a new solution named gecekondu. In the original meaning, gecekondu housing, which in Turkish literally means “built overnight”, refers to temporary housing built in the city’s periphery that serves as the shelter of the poor (mostly rural-to-urban migrants) in the moral economy of society (Erman & Eken, 2004). In the rest of my research I used the word slum instead of gecekondu.

Besides Slums are built in a way which is not approved by the general legal provisions for buildings and construction. It is usually constructed out of second-hand material to a very low standard; it lacks utilities and, by urban standards, constitutes a health hazard (Emre Kongar, 1976). Furthermore, power and tap water theft is a very common situation in the slum areas which is an extra adding tax for all the citizens. A typical slum neighborhood shown on the Figure 3, which has no roads, green areas, car park or anything belong to a city.
On the other hand, immigration is not always the reason for squatter areas. Sulukule (water tower), for instance, is an old Roman settlement in Fatih district/Istanbul which might be considered as downtown. Sulukule served to Roman society for centuries until now but these days houses in Sulukule are in a bad condition and needed to be rebuilt. An urban renewal program has just begun in some parts of Sulukule which will be explained in the further chapters. Squatters changed the structure of the big cities and they created slum settlements with many problems that could not be solved yet. Those problems of the squatter areas are;

a) **Poor accessibility to infrastructure systems:** this is the primary problem of the slums. Those inhabitants suffer due to lack of basic services such as no tap water; no gas and some of them don’t even have electricity. Obviously since the building is unauthorized, inhabitants can’t enroll for the city water, electric and gas.

b) **Integration problems:** as I mentioned above the inhabitants of slum areas come mostly from rural areas, although some come from small towns and villages. Direct migration from the place of birth to the slum area is usual and incomers start by taking up urban-type jobs. With regard to their clothing, diet, and daily habits it seems that they have assimilated some urban patterns (Emre Kongar, 1976). The residents of slum areas in general, are economically disadvantaged and socially excluded when compared to the rest of urban society (Erman & Eken, 2004).
The social life in cities is quite different than eastern villages where they don’t know so much about communal life. For example in some slum areas they still keep going to make cultivation on their small gardens and chicken breeding which is not acceptable in the heart of city. Metropolises have different and strict rules about cleaning, traffic and shared areas that squatter people are having problems to integrate.

c) **Ethnical conflicts within the slum:** Slum areas are usually shaped through inhabitant’s hometowns and ethnicities. When rural people immigrate to big cities they prefer to settle near their relatives and familiars from hometown. Thus, most of slum areas consist of one or two main groups of people with different ethnicities. Having conflict is an expected reality for those groups due to low education levels and having different life styles.

d) **Poor quality of buildings:** Earthquakes are one of the most destructive natural occurrences that turn into disasters by man-made effects. 17 August 1999 was a tragic day for Turkish people who have witnessed Gölcük Earthquake. Gölcük is a town and district of Kocaeli Province that is 70 km away from the downtown of Istanbul, which was a 7.6 magnitude earthquake that struck northwestern provinces of Turkey. The damage was tremendous. According to United Stated Geological Survey (USGS) at least 17,118 people killed, nearly 50,000 injured, thousands missing, about 500,000 people homeless and estimated 3 to 6.5 billion U.S. dollars damage in Istanbul, Kocaeli and Sakarya Provinces (Köroğlu & Erçoşkun, 2006). That mournful experience has shown a terrifying fact that Turkey is on an active seismic zone and that most of the buildings are not in conformity with earthquake safe design codes. Cognizance of this fact has stimulated the authority to enact strict laws about construction of new buildings and renovation or rebuilding of the weak structures due to resist to the earthquakes.

Slums are mostly in bad condition and unprepared for the possible future earthquakes that entertain a huge risk for the inhabitants. Besides, low quality buildings with lack of heat and sound insulation causes low quality of life. Almost all of the people in slums have poor and energy inefficient heating systems like old
fashion stoves. Furthermore, highly sulphured cheap coal firing increases the air pollution in metropolises.

e) **Unauthorized constructions**: Facing with growing numbers of unauthorized construction, tenure security and tenure quality have also become the major issues in the housing sector. The number of illegal buildings accumulated in the three largest cities (Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir) of Turkey is estimated about 2 million. Social, economic and physical place-problems relating to this situation has increased day by day (Özer & Vardar, 2007). Firstly, unauthorized buildings don’t allow to create a reliable and accurate database in housing sector which is useful for making analysis and predictions, besides there is a huge loss in real property tax revenue due to inaccurate database. Furthermore, detection and report preparation of buildings that have earthquake risk is being impossible without having a precise real estate database. Secondly, Turkey has a big problem about illegal electricity consumption where some of households use electricity illegal ways without any payment. According to TEDAŞ (Turkish Electricity Distribution CO.) %17,7 of electric consumption is illegal in Turkey, around 8% of those illegal electricity consumption arise in squatter areas. Where average illegal consumption rate in OECD countries are around %7. If the buildings are unauthorized it is being harder to control and detect illegal electricity consumption.

3. **POLICIES AND TRIALS TO TRANSFORM SQUATTER AREAS**

3.1 **Trials to Prevent Squatting**

Previous Turkish governments had many efforts to prevent squatting since 50’s. In the period of 1950 – 1965 political rows and liberally focused economic development model resulted as the urbanization of Turkish labor force. First attempt to prevent squatters was the Demolition of Illegally Built Structures Law No. 5431 and the Slum Law No. 775, which is enacted in 1949 and 1966 respectively. The aim of those laws was to demolish slums and slums to prevent the construction of new ones. However, these laws had not been implemented adequately over the years due to social, economic and political reasons, which resulted in an increase in squatter settlements. For instance, at election time the rate of
growth of slums raised as vote-seeking politicians pave the way for building new slums by legalizing old ones and by providing utilities for them in order to get the votes of the population arriving from the rural areas (Emre Kongar, 1976).

Second legislative implementation to solve the illegal and squatter housing areas problems for integration of urban spaces is the forgiveness of construction. (Şanlı, 1976) So it was believed that if slum and squatter settlements are legalized, that would gradually improve their living conditions due to having a secure tenure. Besides, local taxes would be collected by registering the occupied lands, boundary conflicts could be eliminated, and housing sector would be encouraged. It was also considered that, while migration from rural to urban areas led to a high demand for affordable housing in cities, inefficiencies of the local authorities resulted in the adoption of illegal solutions by immigrants, and slums and slums met their housing needs. In light of these issues, the Turkish political authority put the Amnesty Laws No. 2805 and 2981 in 1983 and 1984, respectively, into force to legalize slum and squatter settlements (Köktürk, 2003; Uzun, Cete, 2004).

The legalization procedure of illegal settlements in Turkey is shown on the Figure 4, which begins with the application to the relevant municipality and to the certified private surveyors by the owner of slums that built before the enactment of Amnesty Law No 2981. Afterwards private surveyors evaluate and prepare required documentations for slums/slums, and they send them to the relevant institutions. Than depending on the slum type determination of price and the payment plan varies. As it shown on the Figure 4,

a) If slum is constructed on the owned land, where the land is belong to the builder of the slum, the construction permits will be handed out after the assessment of application. The applicant pays only the duty costs.

b) If slum is constructed on state-owned lands, the construction permits will be handed out after the assessment of application. However, the applicant must pay the value of the land, that had been determined by the relevant institution, in 4 years with 12 equal installments, and this is only valid if the occupied land is less than 400 m2 for each slum.
c) If slum is constructed on the lands owned by third parties, there are two ways to solve the determination of the land value. In case of an agreement between squatter and landowner an application made to the municipality or governorship by both parties in order to determine the land value and transfer the ownership. On the other hand, if there is a dispute between the parties the value is determined by the courts and the ownership is transferred.
Figure 4: The legalization procedure of illegal settlements in Turkey

Source: (Resmi Gazete, 1984) via (Uzun, Cete, Palancıoğlu 2010)
3.2 Who are affected by a URP?

Theoretically to accomplish an URP is a win-win situation that all the actors in the process supposed to gain advantage. However, the consequences of an URP affect every actor distinctively. These actors are:

i. **The Municipality**: Every municipality in the world is obliged to make the life better for the inhabitants through several investments and providing services. URPs allow that without any budget taken from municipalities. Besides, the municipality gain benefits from the side effects like lower crime levels, lower maintenance costs and higher real estate values which will increase the prices of lands of the municipality also.

ii. **The Contractor**: Profit is the most important goal and motivation of the private companies. URPs provide great amount of profit depending on project’s size. Shortly, URPs are good opportunities for the construction companies. According to the Turkish Contractors Association’s predictions, the construction sector, which contributes about 6% to the economy, faces decline and much fiercer competition abroad in 2012: domestic URPs, estimated to generate £250bn of profit – £55bn in Istanbul alone – are seen as a convenient alternative.

iii. **Squatters**: Squatters are the primary objective of the URPs. Those people suffer due to lack of basic services such as no tap water; no gas and some of them don’t even have electricity. So, URPs are aimed to help squatters to have better quality of life. However, some URPs are based on locating the squatters to an apartment complex that is outside of the city, which is good for the quality of life but bad for their business. Also some squatters were happy with their lifestyle and didn’t ask for a favor.

iv. **Landowners**: Squatters generally occupy the privately owned lands or state-owned lands. The landowners of the occupied lands benefit from the URPs, due to transformation of their otiose lands to valuable lands, which makes landowners the luckiest actor in the process.

v. **Environment**: I would like to say that nature is the absolute benefiter in the process; however, profit is the major concern in the URPs thus, regeneration areas look like a concrete jungle. On the other hand, installation of sewer systems, buried electric
cables, environment planning appliances, natural gas pipelines network, of course, help to the project areas to be naturally healthy.

3.3 TOKİ (Housing Development Administration of Turkey)

TOKİ is a non-profit public sector organization that is established in 1981 by the Housing Development Administration Fund Law (No: 2487) in order to solve the housing problem and to increase housing production at national level. Primary target is to produce affordable social houses for low and middle income people who are not able to own a housing unit within the existing market conditions in Turkey and to implement illegal settlement upgrading projects throughout Turkey.

The URPs of TOKİ is generally implemented to upgrade unplanned and problematic areas, occupied public lands, regions having disaster risks, and cultural and historic areas surrounded by illegal settlements. The project areas are generally located around the city centers where the land is particularly valuable. This enables TOKİ and local authorities to accomplish upgrading projects on these areas without having financial difficulties because the constructed houses remaining after allocation to the right holders are sold in a good price. There are two alternative approaches to implementing the model: (a) demolishing the illegal settlements, constructing new houses in the same area, and allocating them to the right holders, and (b) constructing new houses in a different area to transfer the right holders living in the upgrading area (Bayraktar, 2008)

Till today TOKİ has been built 480,000 estates, moreover, 20,000 estates are on auction today. In addition, approximately 100 hospitals, 700 elementary & high schools, 500 gym center, 340 mosques and 400 commercial centers are built as well. With demand often higher than supply, especially in Anatolian cities and towns, TOKİ usually sells its apartments through a lottery.

Furthermore, since 1981 the authority and the aim of TOKİ have been expanded with additional laws like The Housing Development Law No.2983 and No.2985. According to The Housing Development Laws, duties of TOKİ are listed as follows
• Issuing internal and external bonds and any kind of stocks with or without state guarantee.

• Deciding upon receiving credits from foreign resources to be used for the expenditure relating to its scope of activity upon approval of the under secretariat of Treasury.

• Taking actions aimed at ensuring participation of the banks in financing housing; providing banks with credit to this end; and establishing procedures relevant to enforcement of this provision.

• Supporting the industry related to housing construction or those who are involved in this field.

• Establishing companies related with housing sector or participating in those that have already been established.

• Subcontracting any research, projects and commitments, where deemed necessary,

• Granting individual and mass housing credits; granting credits for projects intended for improvement of rural architecture, transformation of squatter areas, preservation and restoration of historical and regional architecture; and making interest subsidies for all such credits, where deemed necessary,

• Developing projects both in Turkey and abroad directly or through the agency its participations; carrying out or appointing others to carry out applications for housing, infrastructure and social facilities,

• Implementing or appointing others to implement profit-oriented projects to ensure sources to the benefit of the Administration,

• Building, promoting and supporting construction of housing units as well as social facilities and infrastructures in locations where disasters take place, if considered necessary, (TOKİ)
As I mentioned above, primary target of TOKİ is to make housing projects for the low and middle-income families. In order to make those projects TOKİ is using its vast amount of land that is available for construction where 160 million m$^2$ of land has been transferred from the Treasury and from other public institutions and the rest has been bought with a privileged procedure or expropriation. While meeting the demands low and middle income people TOKİ has been used innovative financial mechanisms like providing mortgage loans with long maturities and low yield, to make the houses more affordable for them. Through this method, firstly contractors determine the prices of housing units with taking into account the cost of land, off-site and plot infrastructure, social facilities and technical services. Subsequent to price determination by contractors, selling process of the housing units starts before the construction period. Depending on the project type and targeted population, 10%-40% is being collected as an initial payment and the rest of the cost is spread over a maturity ranging from 75-240 months where monthly repayments are indexed to the wage increase in the public sector in every six months. TOKİ’s housing projects take approximately 14 months to be done and it costs around 180-200$ per m$^2$ including infrastructure costs, but excluding land costs.
4. EXAMPLES ABOUT URBAN REGENERATION

4.1 Portakal Çiçeği Vadisi (Orange Blossom Valley)

Portakal Çiçeği Vadisi is one of the comprehensive URPs that is implemented in Ankara and designed by Portaş Architectural Office and Şahinbaş Architectural Company. It is located (Figure 5) between Çankaya and Ayrancı districts which can be considered as nearly the center of Ankara.

There were 67 slum with 250 inhabitants and a dilapidated mosque on the project area. Half of the slums were built on public land and the other half were built on the privately owned land. Furthermore, only 4 slums were in a good condition, the rest of them were in a bad condition.

Figure 6 shows the ownerships percentages of the project area land. Municipality is the main landowner with 58752 m² lands which is the 53% of the project area, %41 of the project area is privately owned by individuals that is 46074 m². İş Bank has the minor portion (%3) of the project area with 3694 m² and the rest is the public land.
Portakal Çiçeği URP is one of the first projects that profit allocation method has implemented. The model is based on

a) Developing a contemporary green area of high urban standard for the city of Ankara without disturbing the natural characteristics of the valley,

b) Creating the funds of projects without resorting to the public funds,

c) Ensuring participation in the project without of the landowners through such a system which would not harm due to the right of development they acquired in the past (Göksu, 2007).

The project cost 45 million $ and the project area comprises 55000 m² residential area that consists of 2 apartment blocks with 180 apartments, 10000 m² shopping mall and 80000 m² green area. Green areas formed carefully concerning types of trees that is about to extinct in Ankara such as pear, berry, walnut, quince trees. In total 34000 trees are planted. Actors of the project had a deal on the distribution of the project. According to that deal, after the project costs are subtracted from revenue, the profit will be allocated as it is demonstrated on the Figure 7. So Municipality takes 49% of the project, individuals take 21% and Portaş, the developer of the project, takes 30% of the profit. Moreover, Portaş will contract the project investments to the contractors for certain percentages within a program and a period of time. Any difference between shares received from the contractors for the flats and the shares allocated to the landowners under agreement will be a plus value a Portaş (Göksu, 2007).
Portakal Çiçeği Vadisi urban development project has affected 3 different groups of people directly and indirectly. First group is the landowners that are directly affected by the project. This group may determine the fate of the project and have the right of development within the project area. The second group which is directly affected by the project is the people who have been living in the slums in the valley for years and who have no legal rights at all. After the assessments some advantages and opportunities are offered to those people. First opportunity, based on the law no 774, around 250 m² lands on the Doğantepe district/Altındağ Municipality have been offered to slum inhabitants with the condition that 1/10 of the land price must be paid in advance and the rest can be paid in 10 years. Another opportunity that offered to this group is quite interesting. Instead of destroying their slums, Portaş offered them to take down and to carry

Figure 7: Profit Distribution Of The Project

Figure 8: A View from Portakal Çiçeği Vadisi
the useful materials of the slums. Therefore they can use it when they built their new house or sell it. In this case Portaş undertook the labor and transport costs.

The third group is the inhabitants of the neighborhood and the city, who are indirectly affected by the decisions for the project. This group is not affected by the decisions for the project directly, but they are being affected by the investments in the valley.

Consequently the project is successfully started at 1994 and completed on 2000 as it is planned. The project has added value to the neighborhood and triggered other projects as a pioneer role.

4.2 Sulukule Project

Some squatter areas are formed with different dynamics other than immigration. Sulukule (water tower), for instance, is one of the oldest Roman settlements in the world and served to Roman society for centuries until now. It was famous for its entertainment houses, where the Roman performed music and dance to the visitors from in and outside Istanbul. It is located (Figure 9) in Fatih district in Istanbul that encompasses most of the

Figure 9: Location of Sulukule
peninsula coinciding with historic Constantinople, which might be considered as downtown. Sulukule consisted of various kinds of slums, some of them were in really bad conditions that made by tinplate and tarp. There were no sewage, tap water and electricity installations in those slums. As stated by the Fatih Municipality (2011), the purpose of the project was “to renew the area through healthy buildings and infrastructure that are in harmony with the urban and architectural heritage of Historic Peninsula”. Policymakers in many countries struggle to manage urban growth and modernization while balancing demands for individual property rights, historic preservation, and housing for the poor (Collins William J. & Shester Katharine L., 2013). The project has been based on the theory that the conservation of cultural heritage through the elimination of “invasion” would increase the sense of belonging through the creation of an environment where different social groups live together; the prevention of decay through the eviction of social elements who do not invest in the maintenance of these environments and who create an environment of high crime and illegal economic activity; the provision of economic development through the creation of an urban attraction zone; the protection of cultural dynamics and increase social integration with the rest of the city; and the establishment of a participatory process through public meetings (Gunay, 2012).

In 2006, it was declared as an urban renewal area. Following the declaration, the Sulukule URP was approved in 2007 by the Istanbul Renewal Areas Board of Protection and the Greater Istanbul Municipality. Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKİ) started an URP started with the destruction of Neslişah and Hatice Sultan districts of Sulukule at 06/05/2010 and planned to finish on May 2012. Project consists of 645 apartments, 45 offices, 10 streets and 3 avenues and project area is around 91,000 m², and
the total cost of the project estimated as 90 million TL. Sizes of apartments vary like 65m\(^2\), 70m\(^2\), 90m\(^2\) and 100m\(^2\). Besides, protecting the historical pattern of Sulukule was a concern for the architects, so they are inspired from classical Ottoman houses when they design those apartments. Therefore most of the buildings will be 2 and 3 floored and only %15 of them will be 4 floored like historical Ottoman Houses. Moreover a school of music will be constructed to maintain the musical tradition of Sulukule.

According to the TOKİ, as a consequence of the implementation of urban renewal policies, the new apartment units will be sold to existing property owners if they accept to pay the difference between the current value of their property, which was calculated as 600 Turkish liras (TL)* per 1 m\(^2\) living area by the Municipality. During the building process TOKİ offered 2 options to the tenants to help them for finding temporary accommodation;

✓ TOKİ guaranteed to pay 400 TL per month during the constructing process

✓ TOKİ offered apartments in Taşoluk, is a completed project of TOKİ in a suburb of Istanbul, with 150 TL monthly payments. Furthermore TOKİ provided free busses from Taşoluk to downtown for those households.

However, most of the property owners (67%), who had been granted apartments in Tasoluk, never went there due to its remote location from the central business district and due to their economic conditions (an average monthly income of €125-200), and the percentage of population (77%) who had no permanent jobs. In addition, it is clear that the lack of financial resources could even force the owners of the historic buildings to leave the neighbourhoods due to high restoration and maintenance costs (Gunay, 2012).

✓ After the project finishes TOKİ gives payment advantages to the old households such as 15 years installment buying opportunity.
4.3 Küçükçekmece Ayazma-Tepeüstü URP

Ayazma-Tepeüstü URP is another successful URP implemented on Küçükçekmece Municipality of Istanbul. Küçükçekmece Municipality (Figure 11) is a crowded suburb on the European side of Istanbul that is located around 20 km west of the downtown. The population of the area, which covers 118 km², reaches 600,000. The population of Küçükçekmece is growing fast, however in most parts of Küçükçekmece this is very much a poor, working class neighborhood and most of the housing is slum. As it seems on the Figure 11 TEM (Transit European Motorway) and E5 highway crosses Küçükçekmece. Those 2 highways are like the 2 main veins of Istanbul that carries millions of cars daily. Küçükçekmece Municipality has the problematic situations like Istanbul does, on one hand in the municipality borders there is an Olympic Park, an organized industrial zone and trade zones. On the other hand, squatter areas in the municipality have become unhealthy criminal centers without life safety and life quality.

Ayazma and Tepeüstü were 2 squatter areas with 10.700 inhabitants and 90% of the buildings were one-story insubstantial slums. Most of the inhabitants were built the squatters on the public domain; however, some inhabitants were built their squatter on their own land. Also the education level in the project area was quite low, for instance 60% of the inhabitants were unschooled, and 32% of them were illiterate. Most of them are
immigrated from eastern of Turkey. Therefore, Ayazma- Tepeüstü URP has implemented in order to ameliorate the socio economic status of the inhabitants, reintegrate them to the society and to create livable environments for everybody.

Distinctively in this project instead of constructing buildings on the demolished squatter area, inhabitants are placed on another project of TOKİ named Bezirganbahçe. Bezirganbahçe is located in Küçükçekmece Municipality as well and it is just 5 km away from the Ayazma and Tepeüştü Squatter areas. It consists of 55 blocks and 2640 apartments with some facilities like playgrounds, a healthcare center, schools, a sports hall and parks.

According to the project some opportunities are offered to the inhabitants. Such as landowners in the squatter area swapped their lands with an apartment in Bezirganbahçe (Figure 12), estimated price of a 3 room apartment was 51.500 TL (28.500 $). On the other hand, inhabitants that landed on public domain (1474 families) are offered to buy the same apartment with a reduced price of 41.000 TL, 180 months of installments and no cash in advance. Which is 227 TL (125 $) per Month.

Bizim Halk Social Development Plan is simply based on the reintegration of the people that moved to Bezirganbahçe from the squatter areas. The plan was composed of 3 categories.

- Employment Plan: The objective of the Employment Plan is to obtain skilled labor and improve their economic condition through some training programs and courses about specific professions like textile, shoe-making, accounting and office management.
- Health Plan: Through this plan it is aimed to enhance the health consciousness among those inhabitants, and to provide health services to them that they couldn't have it before. Therefore, periodical health examinations made in order to detect the health problems than treatments applied.

- Information Plan: Since 2007 many seminars have being done every week about general knowledge subjects like, adolescence, psychological consultancy, dental care and contagious diseases.

4.4 Çukurambar URP

Çukurambar (Figure 13) is a neighborhood located in Çankaya municipality on the southwest of Ankara. It has been a squatter area since 1960’s, however, it became close to the city center with the expansion of the city and important commercial investments took place in and around Çukurambar. Until 2000’s Çukurambar was one of the squatter area however, these days it is known as one of the most luxury neighborhood of Ankara that many important and famous politicians live there. The population area was approximately 2400 in the beginning of 1980s, it rose to 4919 in 2000 and these days the area reaches 40,000 inhabitants.

Figure 13: Location of Çukurambar
Çukurambar has an important and special position among the slum areas in Ankara because the area has been transformed with the revision of the improvement plan instead of the special transformation project. With this feature the transformation process of Çukurambar differentiates from the Dikmen Valley project and the Portakal Çiçeği Valley Project. On the other hand, private ownership of land is dominant in Çukurambar, in contrast to other slum examples developed on governmental land (Köroğlu & Ercoşkun, 2006). Before the revision plan, Çukurambar was covered with slums in various types that built disorderedly, unhealthy and arbitrarily. The roads and open fields were unplanned and naturally shaped by squatters; therefore, the streets of the neighborhood were considerably narrow with lots of dead ends. Population density in the area was about 170 people per hectare. Furthermore, according to the reeve of the Çukurambar district 54,37% of the population was male, 45,63% was female, 45% was single, 54% is married, 1% is widowed and only 5% is university graduate which indicates that the education level was quite low.

The revision plan emerged through the approval of the “Metropolitan Plan for Ankara” by Ankara Metropolitan Planning Bureau in 1982. The plan was aiming to decentralize the urban population towards west side of Ankara where Çukurambar is placed.

*Figure 14: Street View of Çukurambar*
According to the plan, the population density in the area has been planned as 200 people per hectare, the plot sizes in this area is designed about 3000m$^2$ which is higher than the average lot size of Ankara. Floor area coefficient is about 2, and height of building is given as 34-31 meters. So the plan itself with high buildings and high population density made the urban transformation easier due to the high urban land values at this zone of Ankara. After the metropolitan plan published, contractors came to the area and offered slum owners to exchange their lands with good quality flat of apartments that is more valuable and useful. Today, as the result of the ongoing transformation, the old one storey slums and high-rise ‘modern’ buildings are together in the area. However, in a short time, there will be no more one storey slums in Çukurambar (Köroğlu & Ercoşkun, 2006)

4.5 Tarlabası URP

Tarlabaşı is a neighborhood in the Beyoğlu district as well which is situated on Istanbul’s European side, north of the Golden Horn. It is located (Figure 15) a few hundred meters from İstiklal Street, the cultural hub of the city. The area is mostly composed 5000 buildings that are four- and five-storey historic buildings dating back to the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century. It was built as the residential site of middle and lower middle classes of the time, and its architecture developed as a modest version of the architectural style of

![Figure 15: Location of Tarlabası](image)
Pera, the parallel high street of higher classes and Embassies (Tonbul, 2011). In the 19th century Tarlabası was originally inhabited by non-Muslim minorities such as Greeks and Armenians who moved out of the neighborhood due to several reasons. One of the reasons was the population exchange agreement between Greece and Turkish Republic in late 1920’s that made after the First World War. According to the agreement Greeks who had been living in Anatolia were forced to migrate to mainland Greece, as the Turks who had settled there were forced to migrate back to Anatolia. They were replaced by rural migrants from central and northern parts of the country in the rapid industrialization and urbanization era of the post 1950s. The area attracted another wave of migrants in the 1990s: this time from the Kurds escaping civil war in the south-eastern parts of the country. Tarlabası has also become host to African migrants, Romans and transsexuals (İslam, 2009). These days inhabitants of Istanbul define Tarlabası as a dangerous place. As a 30 year old inhabitant of Istanbul I didn’t dare to go to Tarlabası. Finally, at 2006 Tarlabası is declared as a regeneration area by the Council of Ministers in February 2006 following a petition from the local municipality. The law makes the renewal of dilapidated areas in historic neighbourhoods possible through new expropriation powers given to the local authorities to implement URPs for several blocks without the consent of the property owners (İslam, 2009). Beyoğlu Municipality had already envisioned renewing Tarlabası, as it had already became visible, as the economical value of Beyoğlu developed, and it became the major point of economic and cultural attraction in the city. Yet, Tarlabası and its people were not able to fulfill the potential (Tonbul, 2011). Therefore, On April 2007, the regeneration process of Tarlabası formally began when a private development company, GAP İnşaat, won the bid for the preparation and implementation of the area’s redevelopment. The project area consists of 278 buildings, 213 of which are registered that are located on a 2000 square meter area. According to the Beyoğlu Municipality Mayor Misbah Demircan those 278 building chosen due to their dilapidated condition that could be collapsed any moment, which is dangerous for the inhabitants and the other attached buildings. Because, Turkey is located on a very active seismic zone. GAP İnşaat offered 42 per cent of the current floor area for the existing owners after renewal. For instance, if an individual has the whole building and if there are 10 apartments built after the renewal. The individual will take 4 apartments. However, the owners, landlords and renters claim that the current offer of the
development company is not fair and demand better conditions. Finally deconstruction of 4 buildings started on 2010.

Together with TOKI, the Social Housing Administration of Turkey, the municipality does offer the residents of Tarlabası an alternative: an apartment in one of the newly built high-rises in Kayabaşı, a remote development zone on the outskirts of the city, a two-hour bus ride from Taksim Square (Letš, 2012). However, the requirements of Kayabaşı apartments are not appropriate for the Tarlabası inhabitants. Because they need to pay 306 TL (approximately 139 Euros) monthly over the course of 180 months, as well as an initial 1,000 TL fee to be paid upon application. Furthermore there will be additional costs like the fees for the doorman and daily commute to work which costs 8 TL (approximately 3,5 euro) which will exceed their budget. Because the average income in Tarlabası is about 750 TL per month (approximately 320 euro). After all government and Beyoğlu government are so determined to carry out the urban renewal in Tarlabası

5. GENTRIFICATION PROCESS and EXAMPLE CASE of CIHANGIR

Gentrification is a general term for the arrival of wealthier people in an existing urban district, a related increase in rents and property values, and changes in the district's character and culture (Grant, 2003). Often old industrial buildings are converted to
residences and shops. In addition, new businesses, catering to a more affluent base of consumers and those that can afford increased commercial rent, move in, further increasing the appeal to more affluent migrants and decreasing the accessibility to the poor.

As I mentioned before at 80’s Turkish Economy experienced an economic boom that created many highly paid professionals, managers, technicians, who were employed in rising services sectors. Some members of these groups together with cultural elites became attracted to live in historical neighborhoods in inner city or along the Bosphorus coastline with high environmental amenities and easier access to central business districts and took active roles in the gentrification of neighborhoods (Sakizoglu, 2007).

Cihangir (Figure 17) is a perfect example as one of those historical neighborhoods that experienced the gentrification process. Cihangir is in the Beyoğlu district of Istanbul which is located (Figure 18) on the slope of a hill with a panoramic view of the entrance to Bosphorus. It is a dense residential neighborhood where the settlement dates back to 17th century – with many historical apartment buildings, sometimes with a view of sea – where the minorities inhabited widely prior to 1950s. The neighborhood looks nearly the same as the other neighborhoods in the Beyoğlu area. The physical environment is characterized by

**Figure 17: Street view from Cihangir**
narrow streets, and 4-6 story buildings with extravagant facades. Cihangir area is very close the city center. Transportation options and the central location in the city with highly educated neighbors make Cihangir very attracted place. Since fifteenth century Cihangir has been hosting many different cultures such as Jews, Christians and Muslims. As a common characteristic to all gentrified neighborhoods, Cihangir had experienced deterioration and devalorization with the inflow of immigrants following the outflow of non-Muslim minorities as well. The construction of apartment buildings and stone houses at the end of the nineteenth century and in the first quarter of the twentieth century turned Cihangir into a dense residential neighborhood (Uzun, 2003).

Gentrification process of Cihangir has no certain date of beginning it is the result of the trends and social transformation of 1980’s. Cihangir became popular among artists, academics and writers due to its view, proximity to city center and the nostalgic ambiance of historical buildings. After the artists and writers moved to Cihangir, transformation of residents became faster during 1990’s. Therefore, Cihangir started to have a population of a higher socio-economic and cultural status people. After new inhabitants moved to Cihangir old buildings are restored, also new art-studios, galleries, bookstores, cafes, restaurants,

Figure 18: Location of Cihangir
shops are opened by individuals. These cultural changes made Cihangir more and more popular among the artists. Proximity to Mimar Sinan University (MSÜ), which is regarded as one of the best art schools in Turkey, was accelerated the gentrification process. Students of MSÜ, who are also employed in arts-related occupations during and after their education, usually remain in the neighborhood as they grew older. According to the survey results of 1999, most of the population in Cihangir consisted of nuclear families that born in Istanbul. Also the ratio of university graduates in Cihangir rose to 45.2%. More than half of all sampled house-holds and their spouses spoke a foreign language and more than half of the employed households in the sample were artists or professionals (Uzun, 2003). In brief, as a result of the gentrification process majority of inhabitants in Cihangir are wealthy people with higher education level. These days’ an average house price in Cihangir is around 2000 dollar per m². Also rents have been rising last decade and it is estimated to keep increase next 5 years.

6. **EVALUATIONS**

6.1 Critiques

As a result of mass immigration waves to the big cities, many squatter areas occurred because of unplanned urbanization. Turkey needed the urban regeneration process urgently due to the squatter problems I mentioned before. Thus, many URP’s are applied and new ones are being constructed. One of the main problem about urban regeneration process is most of the projects are just based on profitability. Instead of that, professional associations, non-governmental organizations, the inhabitants and sociologists must participate in the process in order to meet the social and economic needs of the squatters. Because significant portion of the inhabitants of the squatters are aggrieved by the implementation of URP’s. They couldn’t afford the payments of new apartments or they just couldn’t adapt to the new life style. Furthermore, real estate developers, civil engineers, architects and geology engineers should have involved in the designing phase of the projects in order to built esthetic, strong and useful apartments. The URP’s that I have visited look like concrete jungle that consists of tall, ugly and senseless buildings with inconvenient ratio of green areas. Another issue about the regeneration process is to built nature friendly and energy efficient houses. Turkey is a poor country about the energy sources like oil, natural gas and
somehow electricity is considerably expensive. However, Turkey is rich about the solar energy which can be useful with the installation of the solar thermal energy systems on the buildings.

According to Ferda Kolatan, urban regeneration is distressing and alienate process. Because, architecture of the URPs didn’t concern about the history, the nature and the background of the squatter areas. Moreover, the projects don’t provide modern life standards for squatters, because squatters had to move to other places after the projects completed due to income and lifestyle conditions.

Professor Gülsen Özaydin, head of the urban planning department at the Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts Istanbul, criticizes the URPs: "There is no urban planning that sees the city as a whole. Projects are completely detached from one another, and take no heed of the existing urban fabric, or the people living there. That's very dangerous for the future of a city. Mücella Yapici of the Istanbul Chamber of Architects paints a similarly bleak picture: "Urban poverty will increase. People evicted from their houses not only lose their home, but also their jobs, their neighborhood, and their social ties". Tower block developments on the far outskirts of the city further isolated disadvantaged groups. "A city should bring people together, not segregate them," she says (The Guardian, 01.03.2012).

6.2 International Perspectives

Urban regeneration is a universal issue that many countries experienced. For instance in USA, at the beginning of 40’s the elimination of slums and redevelopments of central cities were prominent objectives due to housing and urban issues that occurred after the Great Depression and World War II. Government implemented a highly controversial slum clearance and urban redevelopment program consists of 2100 URPs that cost approximately $53 billion. The process started with the establishment of a Local Public Agency (LPA) that is entitled LPA to undertake urban renewal activities and to exercise eminent domain powers by US state. According to the program, urban regeneration process starts when an urban area identified as blighted by LPA and the second step is to seek approval from HHFA (Housing and Home Finance Agency) to proceed with specific project planning within that area. HHFA is created in 1949 by the Congress to assist locally planned urban renewal projects with grants of two-thirds (or in some cases three-fourths) of the net
project cost to the city, where the net cost was defined as the difference between the total cost of acquiring and clearing properties and the income received from selling the cleared land. During the urban renewal process approximately 400,000 housing units are cleared and 300,000 families, just over half of whom were nonwhite, are relocated. Political support for the urban renewal program is eroded with time after it is strongly criticized by the media. Finally new funding halted in 1974.

7. Conclusion

Due to the changing world, construction stocks and infrastructure systems became insufficient for the growing population of the cities in Turkey. Migration from rural to urban that started in the early 60’s and increased in the following decades created a new problem for the big cities named Slums due to unplanned urbanization and populist politicians. Economic and social problems are added the physical problems over time. Over time, urban regeneration was a necessity for the metropolises of Turkey due to solve those economic, social, physical problems and to obtain quality living space. Therefore, previous Turkish governments conducted laws and made new housing strategies to transform squatter areas into well planned, modern commodities; however, they couldn’t succeed until 2000’s. URP examples that I mentioned in the previous chapters proof that mistakes of previous governments and municipals can be fixed with well organized urban regeneration projects.

Nowadays, there are several URPs will be started soon in Turkey. Some of them will be done due to earthquake risk; some of them will be done for rehabilitation of the historical city centers like Sulukule. The problem is people in the urban renewal areas are not informed well. Most of the people think about URPs; “it is just another real estate project of TOKİ”. The inhabitants of the urban renewal area must be educated by civil associations and volunteers that make them participate and trust to the project. The ideas of inhabitants must be taken and the project should be based on “what kind of environment they want to live”. When physical renovations are being done, the needs of the inhabitants must be the priority. Besides the physical and social needs, also economic demands are crucial too. Employment opportunities must be provided to the inhabitants through free occupational retraining courses like it happened in Küçükçekmece Tepeüstü- Ayazma URP (Ch 4.3). Also I
mentioned about the gentrification process that cannot be considered as an urban renewal method because it is based on relocating the inhabitants instead of solving their problems. Consequently, urban renewal must not only focus on physical regeneration. Social, environmental and economic regeneration must take in to consideration while designing urban regeneration.
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