



## PLANNING, URBAN MANAGEMENT AND HERITAGE IN TURKEY AND CHINA

**John PENDLEBURY\***, **Osman BALABAN\*\***, section editors

This journal special section contains a number of papers from a project called Planning, Urban Management and Heritage (PUMAH). PUMAH was a project that ran between 2012 and 2016, financed by the European Union under its Framework 7 programme and specifically Marie Curie Actions – International Research Staff Exchange Scheme (1). The overall aim of the project was to develop a joint networking and advanced research programme on critical issues of planning, management and urban heritage to strengthen the research partnership between a number of research institutions in Europe and China; namely Newcastle University (UK), Groningen University (Netherlands), the Italian National Research Council, Middle East Technical University (Turkey), Politecnico di Milano (Italy) and, in China, Wuhan University, Peking University and Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology. The project worked by resourcing researcher mobility and exchange between Europe and China.

The project sought projects to achieve more rapid progress in advancing current knowledge, both conceptually and in terms of practical strategies of management, of the challenges of managing heritage as part of a wider process of spatial planning in the very different contexts provided by Europe and China. Its focus was upon the role of heritage in continuity and change in the city. Urban areas were the critical sphere of investigation as it is cities and urban regions that are subject to the greatest pressures for change and transformation and conflict and potential complementarity with heritage protection most acute. At the same time it was realized connections had to be made with understanding urban change alongside how such issues played out in rural areas.

\* School of Architecture,  
Planning and Landscape,  
Newcastle University,  
Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

\*\* Department of City and  
Regional Planning, Middle East  
Technical University, Ankara,  
TURKEY.

1. Research funded by the European Seventh Framework Programme [under the grant number 295045], Marie Curie IRSES project, Planning, Urban Management and Heritage [PUMAH].

Underpinning this project was an understanding of heritage as a process and an outcome. The process of shaping heritage is undertaken consciously or unconsciously by many different agencies including urban planners, managers and political decision-makers. Heritage as the contemporary use of imagined pasts is mobilised for a wide variety of present purposes including the political, the social, the cultural and the economic. However, this project focused upon one application of heritage, namely its diverse roles in the planning and management of cities and urban regions for collective objectives.

Heritage as a process is rarely the only instrument used by local planners and policy makers in the execution of the above policies. It generally is applied in combination with many other quite different investments and activities. A wide range of strategies and policies are used to frame heritage management activities which are framed in turn by international and national value-based guidance. For example, bodies such as the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the Council of Europe (CoE) produce between them a variety of guiding instruments to inform heritage management processes. In varying degrees these inform national, regional and local policy frameworks.

Heritage as an outcome is often not the only, or even the most important, anticipated result of the planning process, on occasion it can even be viewed either as a mechanism to achieve other policy goals or as more of a windfall gain by-product. Conversely it can be considered a barrier to achieving planning or other area- management policy objectives. It has costs as well as benefits and the asymmetry in the distribution of these, between the public and private sectors, spatial scale jurisdictions, between economic sectors and even between socio-economic groups necessitates this being a major consideration in planning policy. The legally protected designated buildings and districts impose direct and indirect costs on their owners and users and upon the opportunity costs of alternative uses that are foregone. In extreme cases there is a denial of the capacity for the city and the urban region to change and adapt to changing circumstances, leading to extensive vacancy and even a fossilisation. The search for adaptive economically viable reuse remains central to good urban management.

Europe and China are, broadly speaking, polar opposite examples of the rate of urban change. In Europe the pace of urban change, in part due to heritage designation, is often very slow and we may be building up a "heritage time-bomb". In China, by contrast, rapid economic and demographic growth has made urban change an astonishingly rapid process, with the risk of heritage erasure. Whereas in Europe the ways that the present approached the past in urban planning have evolved over about a century and a half, evolving from a preservation, through a conservation to a heritage paradigm, the tempo of change in China seems likely to shorten this process to less than a generation. This threatens to overwhelm and in some cases has already overwhelmed the buildings, morphological ensembles and historic patterns that are major resources and vehicles in the transmission of heritage experiences. Paradoxically such a tempo of change and especially its social consequences, renders heritage as especially desirable as an anchor of reassuring stability and continuity for an uncertain and unknown future. The contrast between a Europe which, as a broad generalisation, can be viewed as tackling the problems of success in heritage protection and a China facing the quite different challenges described above was an important part of the project as we engaged with critical questions about the study of time, speed and urban development

2. Other PUMAH outputs include special issues of *Urban Planning International* (UPI) Vol. 29 2014; *disP* 50(3) 2014; *Urbanistica* 158 2016; *Journal of Urban Design* 22 (4) 2017; as well as many other individual papers.

and the institutional responses to these. The papers presented here (2) focus upon a number of case studies by European authors focused upon China and, on the European side, from Turkey specifically. As PUMAH evolved it became clear that Turkey presented a particularly interesting case, sitting somehow the mature systems of heritage management in the west of Europe, with their risks of stasis, and the rapid urbanisation and emergent heritage management processes we saw in China.

These five papers primarily relate to two of the six work packages within PUMAH that dealt with, first, spatial planning, urban design and heritage and, second, issues of heritage, activity and place. The spatial planning theme encompassed issues of supra-national planning frameworks, a comparative understanding of national and regional approaches and relationships with emergent policy priorities (such as climate change) and planning methodologies. This is a broad field encompassing issues of how heritage is valued within spatial planning frameworks and heritage goals are realised. Three of the papers presented here fall within this broad sphere, encompassing within the Turkish context issues of finance (Ulusan and Ersoy) and relationship between urban renewal laws and the protection of the historic environment (Özçakir, Bilgin Altınöz and Mignosa). The third paper focuses on a very particular Chinese context, Hong Kong, with its own distinct position and distinct institutional frameworks (van Dijk and Weitkamp).

Heritage, activity and place explored the role heritage performs for different urban activities and how the spatiality of the city, and its different urban spaces, may utilize heritage in different ways for varying social, cultural, economic and political outcomes. This included, for example, investigations of older buildings as potential spaces of opportunity for new urban movements (e.g. social and artistic movements) and, more broadly, the examination of the use of parts of the city as defined historic or culture quarters. The papers by Law and Qin and by Sepe investigate these issues in the context of China; Law and Qin in terms of city marketing activities in the city of Wuhan and Sepe explores issues of place identity in relation to two key creative industry clusters.

**JOHN PENDLEBURY**; BA, MA, PhD.

He researches how historic cities have been planned in the past as well as undertaking empirical and conceptual work on the interface between contemporary cultural heritage policy and other policy processes. John.pendlebury@ncl.ac.uk

**OSMAN BALABAN**; BCP, MSc., PhD.

Received his bachelor's degree in city and regional planning in 1996 and MSc. in urban policy planning in 2000 from Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Architecture. Earned his PhD in city planning in 2008 from the same university. Between 2009 and 2012, he was a postdoctoral researcher at the United Nations University, Institute of Advanced Studies in Yokohama, Japan. His research interests include climate change, urban policy analysis and construction sector.

