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ABSTRACT

HERITAGE CONSERVATION VIA SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY IN HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES: PRINCIPLES, STRATEGIES AND PROPOSALS FOR SAKARYA QUARTER IN ANKARA/TURKEY

Güner, Beril

M.S., in Restoration, Department of Architecture

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz

June 2015, 229 Pages

Historic urban landscapes comprehend the natural and built environment as well as the social and cultural practices, values, meanings and identification of the communities that interact with them. In this sense, historic urban landscapes, with their entire tangible and intangible characteristic, have been shaping and evolving continuously by the communities and have been transferred to present generations. Thus, providing the sustainability of the communities is necessary to provide the continuance of historic urban landscapes in heritage conservation. However, some major forces such as rapid urbanization, industrialization, and mass tourism endanger the relationship between communities and historic urban landscapes as well as their sustainability to future generations.
The aim of the study is to propose an alternative conservation approach in historic urban landscapes by linking the heritage conservation and the continuity of the communities that engaged with them via the concept of “social sustainability”. Following a multi-dimensional study on theoretical and onsite researches and evaluations, the study determines principles, strategies and proposals as a result.

A representative example of historic urban landscapes that encounters changes in physical and social structure which endanger the sustainability of its current inhabitants is selected as the case study in this thesis: Sakarya Quarter in Ulus, Ankara. The study determines general guidelines, tools and process driven by the theoretical framework on the concept of social sustainability and its role in heritage conservation. In the light of this framework, the thesis reveals the general characteristic and values of Sakarya Quarter and the relationships with its inhabitants. As a result of general assessments on the site, the thesis proposes an alternative conservation approach for Sakarya Quarter by defining some principles, strategies and actions in order to provide the development of the community and ensure their sustainability for the next generations.
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ÖZ

TARIHİ KENTSEL PEYZAYLARDA SOSYAL SÜRÜRLÜLEBİLİRLİK ARACILIĞIYLA KÜLTÜREL MİRASIN KORUNMASI: SAKARYA MAHALLESİ İÇİN İLKELER, STRATEJİLER VE ÖNERİLER

Güner, Beril

Yüksek Lisans, Restorasyon, Mimarlık Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. A. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz

Haziran 2015, 229 Sayfa

Tarihi kentsel peyzajlar doğal ve inşa edilmiş çevrenin yanında, bu çevre ile etkileşim içinde bulunan toplumların sosyal ve kültürel pratiklerini, o çevreye verdikleri değer, anlamlar ve tanımları da kapsar. Bu bağlamda, tarihi kentsel peyzajlar tüm somut ve somut olmayan özellikleriyle birlikte toplumlar tarafından şekillendirip geliştirilerek günümüz nesillerine ulaşmıştır. Buna karşın; hızı kentleşme, endüstrileşme, kitle turizmi gibi belli başlı güçler, toplumlara tarihi kentsel peyzajlar arasındaki ilişkiye ve onların gelecek nesilere sürdrilibilirliğini tehdite atlarda atmaktadır.

Bu çalışmanın amacı sosyal sürdrilibilirlik kavramı üzerinden tarihi kentsel peyzajların korunması ve bu çevrelere ilişki içinde bulunan toplumların sürdrilibilirliğinin devam ettirilebilmesi için alternatif koruma yaklaşımı oluşturmaktır. Teorik ve saha araştırmalarını içeren çok yönlü bir çalışmanın sonucunda, bu tez prensipler, stratejiler ve öneriler ile sonuçlanmıştır.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The concept of “cultural heritage” has never been static, and broadened itself throughout the history of conservation. With respect to this broadening perspective, understanding of cultural heritage and its conservation practices have been evolving gradually.

Up to 1960 “cultural heritage” was accepted as a term that generally covers the historic monuments, in the form of historic buildings, archeological sites and monuments. In the following years, the individual buildings started to be considered in combination with their environment. However, the definition and understanding of cultural heritage were still narrow and conservation practices of cultural heritage were still expert-based. In the 70s, conservation of cultural heritage was considered in the context of people’s lives. Moreover, social factors were introduced for the first time.

In the 1980s, integrated conservation was highly accepted and public awareness in cultural heritage increased. In addition, the term “sustainability” was adopted in the cultural heritage for the first time with respect to social, environmental and economic considerations. However, the social considerations were usually overshadowed by the other components of sustainability and the context of social sustainability was still vague in these years.
While economic, environmental and social factors in sustainable development were considered more balanced at the historic city centers in 1990s, the definition of cultural heritage was broadened. Cultural heritage does not any longer cover only the physical environment shaped by humans and nature, but also the non-physical elements such as traditions, beliefs and rituals, lifestyles, myths, people’s values through the generations (Jokilehto, 1990:5).

More holistic definitions for cultural heritage concerning the relationship between people and place were proposed in the 2000s. The Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society in 2005 defined the concept of cultural heritage as it follows:

“Cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of environments derived from the interaction of people and places through the time” (Council of Europe, 2005).

In addition, cultural heritage was determined as a fundamental right and value in the universal scope, and community-based approach in the conservation of cultural heritage was adopted strongly more than ever.

Moreover, one of the latest documents of ICOMOS, “The Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values” in 2014 took important steps on the community-based approach in the conservation of cultural heritage. It placed man in the center of the cultural debate where heritage conservation and landscape values represent the expression of cultural diversity.
This declaration also promoted the identification and valorization of cultural heritage by local communities, developing bottom-up approach to conservation, management and protection of culture heritage, linking heritage protection, sustainable local socio-economic and determined international principles of heritage conservation with respect to local needs, beliefs, practices and traditions (ICOMOS, 2014).

While cultural heritage has been determined in a more holistic way in the conservation agenda, the term “Historic Urban Landscape”, as a part of cultural heritage has been defined by UNESCO on 10 November 2011 as follows:

“Historic urban landscapes, is the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting” (UNESCO, 2011).

According to this definition, historic urban landscapes include the natural and built environment as well as the social and cultural practices, values and intangible dimensions of heritage. They are the reflections of inseparable interactions between people and the place throughout time. With respect to this mutual relationship, historic urban landscapes should not only reflect the past but they should also evolve and reshape themselves with people in order to respond the needs of ongoing life and sustain themselves to the future generations. Therefore, it is important to identify the values according to each specific community, as well as their needs, concerns and wishes related with the place to develop stronger bonds between people and place. Moreover, it is also important to enhance people’s quality of life and to create more liveable environment while providing a sustainable future for communities in historic urban landscapes.
1.1. Problem Definition

Rapid and uncontrolled urbanization, industrialization, mass tourism and gentrification have shown their effects on historic urban landscapes more intensely than ever before in the last decades. After the Second World War, cities started to expand to the outskirts and a huge decline in the physical structure of historic city centers began. As a result, decay of the urban fabric, loss of public spaces, deterioration of the historic buildings, loss of architectural heritage, air pollution, traffic and parking problems appeared.

In addition, some large-scale renovation projects in later years led to major demolition and reconstruction in gentrifying historic city centers, by which the traditional character of these areas was lost (Council of Europe: 2004, 21).

Problems related with social structure in historic urban landscapes have also occurred related with the physical and environment change in these areas. The number of abandoned places increased and empty properties started to create a negative effect on the neighborhood’s image. Poverty, low quality of life, unemployment, ageing of the population, low education levels, loss of the sense of belonging, social integration, acculturation and loss of social values, and increasing crime rates are still some of the major problems in the social structure of historic urban landscapes today. Moreover, as a result of large-scale projects, wealthier individuals began to move to old neighborhoods in decline, in place of its original local community. This resulted in the transformation of historic buildings into luxury dwellings which totally destroyed the physical and social character of historic urban landscapes (Council of Europe: 2004, 21).
All these problems damaged the relationship between the inhabitants and the cultural heritage while the identification and valorization of cultural heritage became weaker. Therefore, reinforcing local identities, creating a mutual understanding and cohesion, improving the well-being of residents, social equity, and social participation as well as providing a sustainable development for the future of these areas became one of the major social considerations in the conservation of historic urban landscapes (Figure 1).

The situation of the historic centers of big cities in Turkey followed a similar progress. In most of the big cities in Turkey, due to the expansion of the cities towards the peripheries, the original inhabitants left their places in historic city centers. While more prosperous population groups started to live in the new neighborhoods, historic urban landscapes were abandoned and neglected. People from small cities or villages started migrating to the big cities for new job opportunities and a better life in the 1950s and settled in those historic urban landscapes which the original inhabitants had left.

These immigrants are usually from low-income groups who have adopted a rural lifestyle and feel alienated in the historic urban landscapes surrounded by rapid and uncontrolled urbanization. In addition, the regulations on the conservation of historic urban landscapes also force them economically. They cannot build strong interactions with the place, thus their inhabitance on the historic urban landscapes becomes temporary. This situation makes it impossible to preserve the historic urban landscapes as well as keeping its sustainability for the future generations together with its inhabitants.
Ulus, the historic center of Ankara, was the most important center during the Republican Period. Due to the expansion of the city to the peripheries, it gradually lost its importance and central characteristic. The historic center of Ulus began to see rapid urbanization where the traditional fabric of the historic city centre were left in decline or forced to change. During the development of Ankara, many planning and conservation practices were applied for Ulus. However, due to the lack of an integrated and unified approach in the latest practices, physical and social character of the traditional urban fabric in some areas continued to change. In addition, because of a lack of an approved conservation plan, different institutions began to apply their projects piecemeal on the last decade.

One of the latest agenda of these projects was the Street Rehabilitation Project in Hamamönü which was held by Altındağ Municipality. Although the project was successful in enlivening the area as well as creating different job opportunities for people, it was criticized for transforming the image of the area. Not only the project changed the physical character of the area with the reconstruction of prototyped replicas using traditional material and construction technique, it also changed the social structure of the area. Hamamönü which had a traditional residential character has now turned into an attraction point for tourists. Because of the tourism-based conservation approach, owner of the houses rented their houses for commercial or touristic purposes so that the tenants who were living in that area were forced to leave their houses.
Following this, Altındağ Municipality started to apply its implementation projects on the area just across the Hamamönü area called ‘Sakarya Quarter’.

Sakarya Quarter is one of the oldest residential settlements in Ankara. As a part of a historic city center that has been exposed to several conservation practices and rapid urbanization, Sakarya Quarter remained an untouched area and kept its traditional fabric. Although it has been left by its original inhabitants, Sakarya Quarter has kept its traditional character with the inhabitants that migrated from other cities in cohesion and harmony. However, most of the landlords are not able to afford the expenses of ongoing implementations held by Altındağ Municipality so that their buildings are expropriated by various associations. Therefore, the current inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter are concerned that they will have to leave their houses like the inhabitants of Hamamönü as a result of these implementations.

While the street rehabilitation projects are currently continuing in Sakarya Quarter, Altındağ Municipality has realized that their implementation projects lack a unified and sustainable approach. Although the Municipality’s intention is to maintain the residential use of the area in Sakarya Quarter, the inhabitance of the community is still in danger due to the legal and financial frameworks of conservation practices.

In order to develop alternative solutions for the sustainability of inhabitants in the neighborhood, Altındağ Municipality organized meetings with Middle East Technical University and different experts and discussed this issue. These discussions gave a base to this thesis.

1.2. Aim and Scope of the Study

This thesis aims to determine an alternative conservation approach for Sakarya Quarter in the Ulus Historic Centre by developing principles, strategies and proposals that would empower the community and provide sustainability for the future generations via the social sustainability concept.
Within this objective, the thesis emphasizes the link between conservation of cultural heritage and the sustainability and development of the communities who interact with this heritage. As a historic urban landscape with changing social dynamics, most of the original inhabitants have abandoned Sakarya Quarter. The social profile of Sakarya Quarter is now composed of inhabitants from surrounding cities who are not native to this site. The study also deliberates the sustainability of the communities in historic urban landscapes in such cases.

The discussion about general guidelines and the process on conservation approach for Sakarya Quarter will be carried out via the concept of “social sustainability” while mentioning its role and development in heritage conservation.

Moreover, the general characteristics of Sakarya Quarter will be shaped by analyzing its physical, functional, social and managerial aspects and identifying the local values of the site with respect to the values, perceptions, needs and concerns of its inhabitants. The general evaluation of these analyses will be done in the light of social sustainability concept in heritage conservation in order to reveal the values, problems and potentials of the site.

Based on the evaluations and theoretical study mentioned above, an alternative conservation approach will be discussed to conserve the common heritage of inhabitants in Sakarya Quarter and enhance their living environment for improving the inhabitant’s quality of life and responding to their basic needs and concerns. In addition, in order to build a stronger relationship between inhabitants and their neighborhood, further suggestions will be made to increase community involvement, social interaction and sense of belonging in the community.

Moreover, different approaches for the economic development of the site will be discussed in order to keep the sustainability of the community and to create new resources for preserving their heritage.
1.3. **Methodology and Structure of the Thesis**

In accordance with the problem statement and the aim of the thesis different methods and tools are used during the thesis. The research method for the theoretical background of the thesis is mainly constituted of a literature review that includes international declarations, charters, recommendations, reports, published technical books, articles, journals and thesis.

The study also includes a comprehensive site analysis that is supported by literature and archival research, including books, thesis, maps, plans, projects, planning reports and decisions, documents related with expropriation, photos. The plans such as Jansen Plan, Lörcher Plan, Yücel Uybadin Plan, and Ankara Master are important sources in order to understand the development of Ankara and its effects on Ulus Historic Centre.

In addition, the planning reports about Ulus Historic Centre incorporated various sources together related with the conservation and planning activities of the place. They were also important sources in order to understand the physical, functional, and social characteristics of Sakarya Quarter. Especially Ankara Old City Fabric Planning, Rehabilitation and Conservation Project Report, prepared by Önen Mimarlık İnşaat Ltd. Şti. in 2000 and Ankara Ulus Historic City Centre Urban Conservation Development Plan Report prepared by UTTA Architecture, Urban Design& Consulting in 2010 are two major sources used in the content of this thesis.

Moreover, the site has been visited by the author several times to understand the general characteristic of the place, learning the inhabitants’ opinions as well as observing the changes in the site.
The first site survey was held through the collaborative work with the studio of Middle East Technical University Graduate Program of Restoration in 2014 for the content of REST 507 “Planning and Design in Urban Conservation” course.¹

Their final product titled “Conserving a Historic Urban Landscape: Sakarya Quarter/Ankara” is utilized as a source in this thesis. The maps that are derived from the Geographical Information System (GIS) and Adobe Photoshop Programs, photographs and other related information are beneficial tools that are used as a base by the author to create further maps. Some further revisions on the related maps are also made by the author of this thesis by using GIS and Adobe Photoshop Programs.

The social survey that was held with the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter is another part of the study. This study was carried out with the inhabitants from 53 buildings, 7 of which have commercial functions while the rest have residential functions. Most of the questionnaire was distributed by the author. The rest of the questionnaire was distributed by the students of Middle East Technical University Graduate Program of Restoration in 2014 for the content of REST 507 “Planning and Design in Urban Conservation” course. All the outcomes of the social survey are shared with this studio. The maps that were prepared by the studio as a result of this study are also utilized in this thesis.

In addition, in-depth interviews were held with different stakeholders in the area. The meetings organized by Altındağ Municipality with Middle East Technical University, KORDER and different professional who are experienced in the conservation and planning activities of Ulus Historic Centre, which the author of this thesis has also attended, are another important resource to understand the perspective of local municipality and professionals in the conservation and management of the site.

¹ “Conserving a Historic Urban Landscape: Sakarya Quarter/Ankara”, REST 507 “Planning and Design in Urban Conservation, Middle East Technical University Graduate Program in Restoration, Spring 2014, Executives: Prof. Dr. Neriman Şahin Güçhan, Assoc. Dr. A. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz, Res. Assist. Leyla Etyemez; Students: M. Emre Acar, Beril Binoğul, Gökhan Bilgin, Başak Kalfa, Tuğba Sağrüşoğlu, Işlay T. Sheridan, Günsel Uzgören, Mercan Yavuzatmaca, Merve Yıldız, Süheyla Yılmaz
Some further interviews were held in order to share the principles, strategies, proposals determined in the content of this thesis with different stakeholders. For this purpose; discussions are held together with personnel of Altındağ Municipality such as architects, planners who work on the conservation activities in Sakarya Quarter. UTTA Architecture, Urban Design& Consulting and the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter was another important institution in order to understand expert-based opinions related with the future of Sakarya Quarter.

Finally, in-depth interviews and discussions were held with the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter once again in order to understand their opinions and wishes. In addition, interviews were made with the children of Sakarya Quarter. They were asked to draw their perceptions related with their living environment. These drawings are also utilized in the study.

Moreover, an article related with this topic titled as “A Community Based Conservation Model for an Inviolated Area: Sakarya Quarter in Ankara, Turkey” presented at the 18th General Assembly of ICOMOS: "Heritage and Landscape as Human Values" on 9 - 14 November 2014 in Florence. The outcomes of this article are also utilized in the content of this thesis.²

The structure of the thesis is composed of five chapters according to their contents (Figure 2). In the introduction part, the evolution of the cultural heritage concept and the role of the communities in the conservation of historic urban landscapes are briefly defined with respect to international declarations and charters. Moreover, the definition of the problem, the aim and scope of the study are mentioned and the methodology and structure of the thesis are determined.

² The article titled as “A Community Based Conservation Model for an Inviolated Area: Sakarya Quarter in Ankara, Turkey” is written by the author and Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Güliz Bilgin Altnöz in 2014.
The second part of this thesis mainly covers the theoretical background of the study. Firstly, the concept of social sustainability and its role in heritage conservation is explained. In addition, a retrospective review of social considerations on the conservation of historic urban landscapes is carried out in the content of this research. As a result, the main factors for providing social sustainability in the conservation of historic urban landscapes are determined. The theoretical background of these concepts is supported by various examples and practices from the world. In the light of this study, the general guidelines, tools and process for the conservation of historic urban landscapes are defined for further studies.

In the third chapter, Sakarya Quarter is analyzed as the case study area. A brief history of the site as well as its physical, functional, social aspects is presented through site analysis and archival researches. Moreover, conservation and planning activities in Ankara and their effects on Sakarya Quarter are mentioned. Following, the current conservation practices of the local municipality of Sakarya Quarter are also determined.

To understand the social structure of the area as well as the identification and valorization of the site by its inhabitants, social surveys and in-depth interviews were carried out in Sakarya Quarter during site analysis.

The analysis on the psychical, functional, visual and social characteristics of Sakarya Quarter as well as the identification of the site by its inhabitants are evaluated through the social sustainability factors in order to reveal values, problems and potentials of the site. A general assessment is also made on the planning and conservation decisions in Ulus and conservation activities of Altındağ Municipality concerning their effects on Sakarya Quarter.
In the forth chapter of this thesis, the general approach and principles to provide the conservation of Sakarya Quarter as well as providing sustainability of its community are determined. The strategies, actions and proposals that are derived from these guidelines are given in detail with their legal, administrative and financial frameworks. The opinions from different stakeholders such as Altındağ Municipality, experts and inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter are also taken into consideration in the revision of this process.

In the conclusion chapter, theoretical background that concerns the role of communities in conservation of cultural heritage, the concept of social sustainability and the factors affecting the social sustainability conservation approach in historic urban landscapes are emphasized once again. The outcomes and general assessment of the study are determined. As a conclusion further studies and the researches are suggested for the conservation of the site and the sustainability of its community.
Figure 2: Methodology and Structure of the Thesis. Source: Author.
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CHAPTER 2

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY FOR THE CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES

The problems such as rapid and uncontrolled urbanization, industrialization, mass tourism not only affect the physical structure of the historic urban landscapes but also change the social character in those neighborhoods. As a response to the physical and social problems occurred in historic urban landscapes, sustainable urban conservation approaches have been discussed in the conservation agenda. The term “social sustainability”, which is one of the components of sustainable development, gained importance gradually in the heritage conservation for the sake of the communities.

The definition of “social sustainability” with different perspectives will be analyzed and its development in the heritage conservation will be discussed in the content of this chapter. In addition, important social sustainability factors in the conservation of historic centers will be determined. Following, some successful examples on the social sustainability will be examined. In the light of all the information from gained from theoretical research, general principles, tools and process for the socially sustainable conservation approach in historic urban landscapes will be defined.

2.1. The Concept of Social Sustainability

The term “sustainability” was introduced as a concept to draw attention to rapid environmental damage caused by human activity and poor resources management in 1960’s.
While the environmental degradation became a worldwide concern, sustainability was started to be evaluated as a common political goal (Mckenzie, 2004:1).

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was established to encourage policies for the sustainable economic growth and employment in 1960. Publications such as “Limits to Growth” (Meadows, 1972) and the Worldwatch Reports also provided awareness for sustainability in global level (Colantonio&Dixon, 2011:19).

The most common and highly influential definition for “sustainable development” was made in The United Nations Commission on Environment and Development’s (UNCED) report “Our Common Future”, also known as “Brundtland Report”, in 1987. Brundtland Report defined sustainable development as “the development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (1987). Although the Brundtland Report tried to promote economic and social concerns as well as ecological problems, it was criticized by the vague definition which may be misused by businesses to provide economic growth in the name of environmental concerns and meeting the needs of stakeholders.

The relationship between ecological, economic and social aspects of sustainability has been classified in two models (Grießler, Littig, 2005: 66). The one-pillar models suggested that ecological dimension should be at the center of the sustainable development. Economic and social matters should be taken into consideration in order to ensure environmental protection. Western Australian Council of Social Services (WACOSS) also developed a similar model demonstrated by “concentric circles”. According to this demonstration, the circle that represents ecological dimension is placed at the center of the scheme while social and economical spheres are put around it. The common scope of the different concepts that shaped around this model is to come with sensible suggestions for using the environment more equally with respect to its extents (Grießler, Littig, 2005: 66).
In contrast to one-pillar model, the second model so-called “three pillar model” does not give priority to any particular dimensions of sustainable development and considers ecological, economic and social aspects as equal.

This equality is represented as “interlocking circles” by WACOSS stating that social sustainability is as important as environmental or economic sustainability (Mckenzie, 2004:1). The widely used expression for sustainability “Triple Bottom Line” which was developed by John Elkington in 1997 also supported economic growth by maintaining social inclusion and environmental protection. According to Elkington, in order to achieve a desired level of sustainability, a minimum level of economic, ecological and social sustainability should be provided (Figure 3).

![Figure 3: Models of Sustainability (from WACOSS’s Stage 1 Report/Models of Social Sustainability, 2002).](image)

Although the general understanding about sustainable development theories promotes those three dimensions equally, social goals are not generally provided as much as economic and ecological goals in political context of the real world. While a consensus seems to exist on ecological and economic objectives, there is a clear disagreement about the definition of social sustainability as well as its relation with the other dimensions of sustainable development. The intangible nature of social sustainability makes it harder to assess certain measurement criteria for its definition.
Due to the lack of attention to social aspect of sustainable development in years, social sustainability has been under-theorized and could not find much chance to be clearly acknowledged in the conceptual framework. It was not until in the late 1990’s that social issues were seriously taken into consideration in sustainability agenda.

In recent years, social dimension of sustainable development has gained recognition and it became interrelated with urban sustainability courses. Still, there is not a consensus on what criteria and perspective should be used for defining social sustainability. Each theorist or author makes his/her own discipline-specific definition on social sustainability and it is hard to find a generalized definition (Colantonio, Dixon, 2011:18).

Sachs (1999) argued that social sustainability should be social-historical process that depends on human imagination, projects and decisions shaped by natural environment and history. Emphasizing the importance of basic values of equity, democracy, human rights, social homogeneity and employment as the key themes of social sustainability, he stated that it is a socio-historical process rather than an end state.

The Commonwealth Government’s “Social Justice Strategy” in 1992 called for social justice and social equity on which everyone has an equal right in essential services and participation in community life and decision-making. With respect to this strategy, the Australian Urban and Regional Development Review in 1995 stressed the importance of social justice in social sustainability. Koning (2001:9) also states that the social sustainability should refer “a society that is just equal, without social exclusion and with a decent quality of life, or livelihood, for all”.
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Omann & Spangenberg pointed out the lack of a consensus on the adequate criteria for social sustainability and supported that it is necessary to integrate criteria of different quality, and paid attention to the values attributed by various stakeholders in order to create a general approach on social sustainability. Defining the concept of social sustainability, they gave attention to the personal assets like education, skills, experience, consumption, income and employment as well as the interpersonal processes like democracy, participation, distributional and gender equity. They also promoted the institutional settings and organizations as a promoting source in social sustainability (Omann & Spangenberg, 2002:2-3).

Stephen Mckenzie defined social sustainability as “a life-enhancing condition within communities, and a process within communities that can achieve that condition”.

Declaring that the social sustainability should be handled independently from the economic and environmental concerns, he defined many indicators for providing life-enhancing condition based on social equity, equal distribution of services, political public participation from electoral process to local level, systems for transmitting awareness about social sustainability, communities for providing the transmission of awareness, mechanism for communities to identify their strengths and needs (2004:12).

Western Australian Council of Social Service (WACOSS) has developed and detailed understanding for social sustainability similar to Mckenzie. It points out that social sustainability should support current and future generations to create healthy and livable communities. It also promotes the terms of social equity, diversity, interconnectedness, quality of life, democracy and governance as the goals of socially sustained communities (WACOSS, 2002).

According to Littig and Grießler, the theoretical and practical challenges that lead difficulties linking environmental protection and social equity cause a vague relation between environmental, economic and social sustainability (2005:69). They also add that the lack of clear differentiation between the analytical, normative and political aspects of social sustainability causes uncertainties in defining it.
Since the word “social” is a socio-scientific subject matter and not a question of natural sciences, sustainability should be handled not only by the nature standards but also should be analyzed with respect to the social interaction and relationships with nature (Littig and Grießler, 2005:69).

Pointing out the main problems on conceptualizing of social sustainability, they defined “work” as the central element to satisfy the existing “needs” of the generations that was mentioned in Bruntland Report and the exchange between society and nature. According to the concerns mentioned above, they defined social sustainability from a strict “sociological” point of view:

“Social sustainability is a quality of societies. It signifies the nature-society relationships, mediated by work, as well as relationships within the society. Social sustainability is given, if work within a society and the related institutional arrangements satisfy an extended set of human needs are shaped in a way that nature and its reproductive capabilities are preserved over a long period of time and the normative claims of social justice, human dignity and participation are fulfilled” (Littig and Grießler, 2005: 72).

One of the first definitions of “social sustainability” with a special focus on urban environment was made by Yiftachel and Hedgcock in 1993. They have defined urban social sustainability as “the continuing ability of a city to function as a long term, viable setting for human interaction, communication and cultural development”. They also mentioned the urban social sustainability as “the long term survival of a viable social unit” (Yiftachel and Hedgcock, 1993). Their conceptualization of urban social sustainability considers the city as a backdrop for social relations that meet the social needs of present and future generations. They suggest that socially sustainable city should be marked by vitality, solidarity and a common sense of place among its residents (Yiftachel, Hegcock, 1993:140).
Furthermore a more comprehensive definition with respect to urban environment concern was made by Polese and Stren in 2000. They emphasized the relationship between social factors and the environment in the development discourse of cities. They suggested urban development programs those improve the life chances of the poor or disadvantages groups in corporation with political, social and cultural institutions. With respect to these considerations, they defined social sustainability as: “development (and/or growth) that is compatible with harmonious evolution of civil society, fostering an environment conducive to the compatible cohabitation of culturally and socially diverse groups while at the same time encouraging social integration, with improvements in the quality of life for all segments of population.” (Polese and Stren, 2000: 15-16).

Polese and Stren pointed out the economic and social dimensions of sustainability as well as the physical environment with the sustainability concerns.

Similarly, Chiu defined social sustainability with housing and built-environment perspective. According to her, unlike ecological and economic sustainability; there are more diverse views on social sustainability. She assigned three types of interpretations for social sustainability. The first interpretation equates social sustainability with ecological sustainability and it is set by social norms. The second interpretation refers to the social preconditions for sustainable development. Being an environment-oriented approach, this interpretation refers that social structure, social values and norms must be changed in order to provide ecological sustainability. The third interpretation is people-oriented and it promotes the well-being of the current and future generation. It also emphasizes social cohesion and social integrity, social stability and improvement in the quality of life (Chiu, 2003:7).
From an urban anthropological point of view, social sustainability is described as a subset of cultural sustainability, which preserves and maintains the social relations and meanings of cultural system. Related with cultural system, social sustainability should enhance history, values and relationships of contemporary society as well. It is stated that to overcome the problems related with the conservation in heritage sites, a better understanding of values and their meaning should be provided. It is also pointed out that social sustainability is depended on maintenance of cultural ecosystems and cultural diversity, which can be observed in physical environment more accurately (Low, Setha M., 2004:2, 17).

Enyedi and Kovacs specifically focused on the social sustainability on the historic city centers. They defined social sustainability as an “urban development that entails the harmonic development of the local society, shapes an environment that ensures the co-existence of different social groups enhances social integration and improves the living conditions of all groups”. They also pointed out the problems of segregation and gentrification that change the identity of the city (Enyedi & Kovacs, 2006:12).

In the light of the studies of Enyedi and Kovacs, Szirmai came up with an important concern related with historic city centers. She raised the question whether to keep the today’s population after rehabilitations or brought back the historically native residents that once out migrated from these historic centers in order to provide social sustainability. She stated that giving decisions in favor of the traditional population can neglect the interests of existing social class and rehabilitation of historic centers and focusing on the economic growth and modernization can negatively affect the current population. Emergence of wealthy groups into the centers and replacement of current lower class from regenerated central quarters may occur as the unexpected results of urban regeneration. In this situation conserving the historic urban values and protecting the natural environment become a more important consideration for the current population than tourism attraction. As a result of this discussion, she came up with an answer for harmonization of different interest and pointing out the different positions and perspectives.
Moreover, she added that experts, scientific committees, researches should be involved in defining socially sustainable development concepts and rules (Szirmai: 2005).

2.2. Social Sustainability Concept in Heritage Conservation

Before 1960’s, the main concern of the conservation practices was to raise awareness about the importance of preserving cultural heritage on international level. However, the content of cultural heritage was limited to building scale and the social aspects in the conservation of cultural heritage were neglected.

In 1960, problems concerning physical and social issues raised in historic urban landscapes. Housing conditions in historic urban landscapes got worse, urban fabric deteriorated, urban topographies began to lose their character and architectural heritage was damaged.

As a consequence of rapid urbanization and industrial development; the traffic, parking problems, air and noise pollution were occurred in historic urban landscapes. In addition, social structure of these centers was damaged. Poverty and age of the population increased. People began to move from historic city centers to the new development area so that empty properties created a negative impact on neighborhood’s image and reputation.

Loss of social values accelerated while social integration, local people’s sense of belonging and social control was lost. This situation threatened the safety of these centers.

In 1964, International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, also known as The Venice Charter, historic monuments were started to be identified with its urban or rural settings. After the content of the cultural heritage has been extended, Council of Europe has determined a series of recommendations concerning the principles, practices, implementation polices and new uses for the preservation and rehabilitation of groups of areas and buildings in 1960’s.
Vienna Recommendation on “Finding New Uses for Monuments in Their Natural or Aesthetic Surroundings, which are of cultural interest but no longer fulfill their original purposes” (Recommendation B) in 1965 promoted owners of the cultural heritage to continue maintaining their monuments and established new legislation and regulations on financial, administrative and fiscal issues for the needs of the owners about the preservation of cultural heritage. Following that, Bath Recommendation on “The Principles and Practice of Active Preservation and Rehabilitation of Groups and Areas of Buildings of Historical or Artistic Interest” (Recommendation C) in 1966, emphasized that the preservation and rehabilitation activities should be appropriate for people’s way of life.

The Hague Recommendation on “The Active Maintenance of Monuments, Groups or Areas of Buildings of Historical or Artistic Interest within the Context of Regional Planning” (Recommendation D) in 1967 stressed that besides its cultural assets, cultural heritage is a part of the human environment and it promoted the integration of cultural heritage in urban and rural life. Economic and social considerations as well as public opinion were put into consideration in the improvement of cultural heritage.

The last part of Council of Europe recommendation was Avignon Recommendation (Recommendation E) on “Implementation of the Policy for the Preservation and Rehabilitation of Groups and Areas of Buildings of Historical and Artistic Interest in 1968. This recommendation pointed out that cultural heritage which was inherited from past generation should response to the needs of man’s environment today.

One of the most important practices concerning the social aspects of conservation was “The Plan for the Historical Centre of Bologna” in 1969 held by Pierluigi Cervellati and his team. After the Second World War, the city of Bologna extended from the center to peripheries so that people started to move these peripheries and the center was left to decline. The plan for the historic center proposed the recovery of the city as an entity full of historical, cultural, symbolical and ideal values.
characterized by clear functions. The technical goals of the plan were explained as it follows:

- To preserve the historical center from ruin

- To exalt the historical, cultural and artistic heritage in the social and economic territorial context, giving it an active and consistent role

- To decentralize directional generators through the definition of new tertiary development areas outside the historical center

- To provide the historical center with all standards and fundamental services

- To rationalize chaotic city center road network, and to link it to wide territorial road network and prepare it to a substitution process of mechanized traffic with pedestrian routes (Bravo, 2009: 46).

In the light of these goals, the plan defined different typologies of buildings with respect to their repeated architectural characteristic and scale. This categorization helped to identify urban containers in the historical center, which follows homogenous patterns (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Bologna, 1969: Historical Center and Urban Growth of Suburbs. Source: Luisa Bravo, 2009.
The plan also pointed out the preservation of social character of this site as well as the physical environment. After the technical problems had been solved, planners started to think about strategies concerning the social aspects of the political program. Their main purpose was to decentralize unsuitable functions irrelevant to context and enliven the city center. Based on this strategy, they restored the present buildings in the historical centers and assign them to people who had already lived there rather forcing them move to separate districts.

The activities included production, enhancement of different facilities, university, and craftsmanship, recreational and representative functions. These functions were resulted by the sociological survey results, which aimed to identify the important patterns in the urban context as well as the buildings that would respond the specific functions (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Bologna, 1969: Urban Conservation Plan. Architectural Categories of Historical Containers
The Bologna Plan was a highly innovative in terms of social considerations and it became an inspiring model in Italy and Europe. The interventions provided the preservation of the urban fabric as well as the society including residents with low incomes. However, there were also negative criticism and oppositions. It was argued that the rehabilitations created “replicas” and properties were forced to expropriation for repair. Other criticism was related with its deprivation of new development in the center. It was stated that the great cost spent on the restorations so that new buildings was built in lesser number. However, considering this accusation was based on the amount of construction area and the cost of both practices were not that different, it can be said this opposition was not true.

Another argument was related with its social approach. The plan was criticized of keeping the inhabitants inside the historic center could banish them into a “ghetto” or inhabitants might have felt annoyed by being left with few economic sources or even embarrassed by being close to leisure groups. After the interventions, the city center became an attraction point for its citizens and living in the center of the city became popular in Bologna. Cervellatti stated about this plan that “In this way, the historical heritage, even it is not always artistic, but rather, a broad testimony to cultural expression, can be saved.

In this way, it’s possible to really get to grip with the true meaning of expression, historical center” (Bravo, 2009:50). All in all, the plan was one of the most important practices in order to identify the cultural heritage in social contents.

The UNESCO World Heritage Convention Concerning the Protection of the World and Natural Heritage was held in Paris 1972 as a response to changing physical and social conditions that continued to threaten the cultural and natural heritage. In this convention, the content of the cultural heritage was defined as monuments, groups of buildings and site. In addition, natural heritage that consisted of natural features, geological and physiographical formations and natural sites were determined. Although the definition of cultural heritage was still narrow, the convention promoted the preservation of both cultural and natural heritage as a world heritage of
mankind. In addition to this integration approach between cultural and natural heritage, the convention also supported that both heritage should be given a function in the life of the community and preservation of that heritage should be integrated into comprehensive planning program.

The Council of Europe proclaimed European Architectural Heritage Year in 1975. The principles established by European Charter of the Architectural Heritage were adopted throughout the world. In this charter architectural heritage was accepted as “capital of irreplaceable spiritual, cultural, social and economic values” and the historic city centers should represent harmonious social balance. Moreover, the integration conservation with the co-operation of all was promoted.

The Congress of The European Architectural year was the crowning event of the European Architectural Heritage Year. Amsterdam Declaration adopted at this event was the expansion of the principles that were discussed in European Charter of the Architectural Heritage. The charter pointed out the social and democratic values in urban revitalization. Moreover, it emphasized the importance of citizen participation in the integrated conservation.

As a part of Council of Europe, The Committee of Ministers and Parliamentary Assembly defined some recommendations and resolutions on the social aspects of architectural conservation. Resolution 28 defined the term “rehabilitation” as an objective to integrate the heritage into the physical environment of today’s society and adopt it to the needs of modern life. Pointing out the importance of maintaining social fabric and improving living conditions in the population, the resolution gave responsibilities to local authorities to ensure public participation. In order to prevent problems that result from the implementations of the integrated conservation program, the resolution suggested local authorities to set an upper limit for the rents and to provide financial aid to the tenants of rehabilitated properties. Moreover another document of Council of Europe, Resolution 106 focused on preserving the existing social fabric including disadvantaged groups (Council of Europe, 2009:27).
Council of Europe has also organized several symposiums on different countries as a part of “European Program of Pilot Projects”. Among these symposiums, Bologna Symposium on the Social Cost of the Integrated Conservation of Historic Centers in 1974 summed up the basic principles for the Bologna Plan. Social consideration in urban and region planning were stressed out. It was stated that the preservation of social pattern and the traditional activities of the historic centers were as important as preserving the architectural fabric. It was suggested that housing districts should offer community facilities as well as decent houses at reasonable rents. Moreover, for the participation of inhabitants information and consultation of citizens were promoted.

The following symposium titled as “Aesthetic, Economic and Social Implications of the Revitalization of the Medium-Size Austrian Town: Cooperation between Municipality and Population” in 1975 was an outcome of the revitalization project held in town of Krems. The project promoted local authorities to encourage owners to restore their own property in the light of certain consultation and technical assistance.

The municipalities were charged to co-operate with the public owners and provide them information, granting subsidies and tax relief in the conservation programs. In addition, less privileged tenants were given aid for the sake of justice and social equity. Moreover, as a part of this project, traditional houses and existing infrastructure were reutilized in order to provide satisfactory housing and living conditions as well as savings for the community.

The fourth symposium concerning European Program of Pilot projects was held in Berlin on 24 April 1976. Symposium focused on the topic of “Big European Cities and Change a Future of Their Past”. This symposium stressed out the political, economic, social changes of the big cities after the industrialization in 19th century. It was stated that small-scale buildings and the blocks of flats were introduced as a new building type in order to overcome increasing population and rise of this new building industry resulted as the abandonment and decline of the traditional
residential quarters. One of the main discussions on this symposium was that traditional housing areas had a good potential to be a safeguarding human environment and these areas were needed to be restored. In the light of these ideas, the experience in Berlin provided a reference for building techniques as well as an integrated conservation as a whole. Rehabilitation of the historic areas and keeping the local population in those places became the major consideration in the conservation of heritage. It was suggested that the implementations should be considered in a long-term process and should be designed to improve the quality of existing habitat by reducing the disruptive effects into minimum. Public participation and social objectives of the operation were also stressed in this symposium.

While the importance of the social aspects as well as the public participation in the conservation practices were begun to be discussed in 1970 by different principles, new problems arose in 1980’s. Large-scale renovation projects and development of tourism threatened the historic centers. After rapid urbanization and renovations, wealthy groups started to settle the historic center where the original inhabitant left. Both the social and psychical characters of the historic centers were in irreplaceable transformation.

Maintaining the old building environment and preserving the existing social fabric and local communities became a challenge in the conservation of cultural heritage.
### 1960’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rapid urbanization</th>
<th>1965- VIENNA RECOMMENDATION on “Finding New Uses for Monuments in Their Natural or Aesthetic Surroundings (Recommendation B)</th>
<th>promoted owners of the cultural heritage to continue to maintain their monuments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial development</td>
<td>1966- BATH RECOMMENDATION on “The Principles and Practice of Active Preservation and Rehabilitation of Groups and Areas of Buildings of Historical or Artistic Interest” (Recommendation C)</td>
<td>appropriate preservation and rehabilitation activities for people’s way of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsening House Conditions</td>
<td>1967- HAGUE RECOMMENDATION on “The Active Maintenance of Monuments, Groups or Areas of Buildings of Historical or Artistic Interest within the Context of Regional Planning” (Recommendation D)</td>
<td>integration of cultural heritage in urban and rural life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of social values</td>
<td>1968- AVIGNON RECOMMENDATION on “Implementation of the Policy for the Preservation and Rehabilitation of Groups and Areas of Buildings of Historical and Artistic Interest” (Recommendation E)</td>
<td>Economic and social considerations as well as public opinion in conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>1969- The Plan for the Historical Centre of Bologna</td>
<td>identification the cultural heritage in social contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandonment of historic centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>preservation of social character of this site as well as the physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of social issues in heritage conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1970’s

| Integrated conservation approach | 1972- UNESCO World Heritage Convention Concerning the Protection of the World and Natural Heritage | integrated approach of cultural heritage into comprehensive planning programme |
| Public participation | 1974- Bologna Symposium on the Social Cost of the Integrated Conservation of Historic Centers | Social consideration in urban and region planning |
| Co-operation of local governments and community | | social pattern and the traditional activities of the historic centers |
| Adaptation of historic center into modern life | 1975- European Architectural Heritage Year and Amsterdam Declaration | social and democratic values in urban revitalization |
| | 1975-Resolution 28 by Council of Europe The Committee of Ministers and Parliamentary Assembly | importance of citizen participation in the integrated conservation |
| | 1975-Resolution 106 by Council of Europe The Committee of Ministers and Parliamentary Assembly | integrate the heritage into modern life's need |
| | 1975-Resolution 106 by Council of Europe The Committee of Ministers and Parliamentary Assembly | social fabric and improving living conditions |
| | 1975- Aesthetic, Economic and Social Implications of the Revitalization of the Medium-Size Austrian Town: Cooperation between Municipality and Population | promotion of local authorities to encourage owners to restore their own property |
| | | co-operation of public owners and local governments |
| | 1976- “Big European Cities and Change a Future of Their Past” Symposium | Public participation and social objectives of the operation |

Figure 6: Development of Social Sustainability in Heritage Conservation in 1960’s and 1970’s, Source Author
Council of Europe organized the European Campaign for Urban Renaissance from 1980-1982 focusing on certain themes. These themes included rehabilitation of existing housing, preservation of social atmosphere of historic environments, improvement of the environment, citizen participation and the social and cultural initiatives in cities and towns.

After the Urban Renaissance Campaign, Council of Europe signed the Granada Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage in 1985. The content of this convention was mostly related with the problems in the urban renewal. Granada Convention defined the heritage as a source of cultural identity, creativity and inspirations for the present and future generations. It emphasized the development of public awareness on the value of architectural heritage from the school-age by the use of modern communication and promotion techniques.

The Resolution No: 2 on “the Promotion of the Architectural Heritage in Socio-Cultural Life and as a Factor in the Quality of Life” was one of the resolutions that were revealed in the meeting of Granada. This resolution stressed the co-operation of the sectors that are responsible for the conservation and enhancement of the heritage and the sectors that are responsible for natural and human environment. Active citizen participation, fostering the understanding and knowledge of the cultural heritage by educational programs, supporting the owners of the monuments to make it accessible to the public, integrating the historic character of the areas into the everyday life and work environment, enhancement of cultural traditions, taking advantage of the cultural heritage through a balanced tourist flow, using modern media, audio-visual and advertising techniques were the decisions related with the promoting public awareness and the access to cultural heritage. Moreover, collaboration of national, regional and local authorities as well as associations and citizens were strictly suggested.

Following the Granada Convention, Washington Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas in 1987 also emphasized the integral economic and social development in urban areas.
In addition, the concept of sustainability was introduced to the public for the first time containing the social and environmental responsibilities.

Globalization has shown its effects with the shifting political dimensions of the world after the collapse of communism in the 1990’s. Differences in social structure of countries reduced. Protecting the diversity of landscapes and cultures, implementing a social cohesion strategy and providing sustainable development for the whole Europe became major considerations in the cities. In 1994; Nara Document on Authenticity emphasized the cultural diversity and heritage as a source of spiritual and intellectual richness for all humankind. In addition, cultural heritage was defined as a concept that covered the all aspects of belief systems belonging to different cultures and societies. It was also stated that protection of this cultural diversity should be promoted for all the human kind. In 1995, Council of Europe broadened the content of landscape to an expression of the various relationships between society and the topographically defined territory as a result of natural or human factors over time and space. It also defined the term “cultural landscape” according to this content. Cultural landscape areas were identified as the “combination of human and natural agencies that reflected the evolution of human society as well as past land use activities, traditions, depiction of literary and artistic works or the historic events” (Council of Europe, 1995).

The Quebec City Declaration on the First International Symposium of World Heritage Towns in 1991 was focused on the major challenges on the cities. Citizens were determined as an important factor to define solutions and expectations related with the urban heritage. Moreover the active involvement of the citizens in conservation actions was suggested by the promotional and educational efforts.

Since 1996, UNESCO’s Management of Social Transformations Program (MOST) has started to focus on specifically social perspectives for the renewal of historic city centers. The Program was charged by UN General Assembly to promote socially and environmentally sustainable towns and cities.
As a part of this program, an exhibition of diverse renewal projects were analyzed at Habitat II Conference organized in Istanbul. In this conference, it was stated that the population should be integrated into the sustainable rehabilitation process for development of their environment. It was also mentioned that rehabilitations should protect the cultural urban heritage and local identity and should not only cover the physical enhancement but the revival of the traditions, knowhow and craftsmanship. Economic base and social mix of the inhabitants were defined as important factors in the conservation of the historic centers. Moreover, the connection of the historical and modern part of the cities by creating commercial activities and improving the quality of life were emphasized.

The Resolution Number: 2, “The Cultural Heritage as a Factor of Sustainable Development” that was determined in Helsinki by Council of Europe tried to establish a European methodology for heritage management in the sustainable development. In the light of this idea, it supported the co-operation of authorities, voluntary organizations, private firms and local communities to provide a basis for sustainable development. It was stated that the profitability of the implementation projects should not be evaluated on their economic value, but also their gains to the society. “Specific Action Plan” with “Technical and Professional Operation Programs” were launched by Council of Europe to create investment structures. In addition, new employment opportunities and cultural tourism were supported in a way that do not exploit the cultural heritage and improve the resident’s quality of life.

In 2000’s, protecting the cultural diversity of the local communities for the stability and social cohesion, and promoting the role of cultural heritage in globalization for the sustainable development and local identity of the communities became one of the concerns in conservation agenda. As a response to these concerns, the widened definition of cultural heritage and the conservation practices were strengthened in 2000’s. UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2001 defined cultural diversity as the “necessity for the biodiversity of the nature as well as the plurality and uniqueness of identities and creativity” (UNESCO, 2001).
In addition it promoted the harmonious interaction in diverse societies as well as social cohesion and participation of all citizens.

Following this declaration, UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003 defined the intangible cultural heritage in its broadest terms as “practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills - as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated there with- that communities, groups and, in some cases individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage” (UNESCO, 2003).

After defining cultural heritage as a term covering both tangible and intangible aspects in societies and promoting the role of the society in conservation of cultural heritage, one of the basic consideration of conservation agenda became how to value the cultural heritage by the communities. The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society also known as The Faro Convention in 2005 defined a holistic definition of cultural heritage as an object to improve the well being of the society as well as a human right of all people. The Convention’s definition of cultural heritage is as it follows:

“Cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time” (Council of Europe, 2005).

In addition to this definition, convention also supported the idea that conservation of cultural heritage is a shared responsibility of all people. The concept of “heritage community” was derived by this idea.
According to Faro Convention, regardless of his/her origin or where he/she lives anyone who values the specific aspect of cultural heritage and who is willing to participate the public action for the sustainability and transmission of cultural heritage to the next generations can be in the content of heritage community.

Moreover Faro Convention emphasized the universality of cultural heritage and derived the definition of “common heritage of Europe” respecting the human rights, democracy and the rule of law. According to the definition common heritage of Europe was described as the all forms of shared understanding, identity, cohesion and creativity as well as the ideals, principles and values that was derived from the experience through the time which can foster the development of a peaceful and stable society (Faro Convention, 2005).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1985</strong>- The Resolution No: 2 on “the Promotion of the Architectural Heritage in Socio-Cultural Life and as a Factor in the Quality of Life”</td>
<td>Understanding the cultural heritage by education programmes, integrating the historic character of the areas into the everyday life, promotion of public awareness and access to cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1987</strong>- Washington Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas</td>
<td>Integral economic and social development in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990's</td>
<td><strong>1991</strong>- The Quebec City Declaration on the First International Symposium of World Heritage Towns</td>
<td>Major challenges on cities, active involvement of the citizens, promotional and educational efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1996</strong>- UNESCO’s Management of Social Transformations Programme (MOST), HABITAT II Conference</td>
<td>Integration of population into sustainable rehabilitation; preservation of the traditions, knowhow and craftsmanship connection of the historical and modern part of cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1996</strong>- The Resolution Number: 2, “The Cultural Heritage as a Factor of Sustainable Development”</td>
<td>Heritage management in the sustainable development, co-operation of authorities, organizations, private firms and local communities, new employment opportunities and cultural tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000's</td>
<td><strong>2001</strong>- UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>Harmonious interaction in diverse societies as well as social cohesion and participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2005</strong>- Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society</td>
<td>Cultural heritage as an object to improve the well-being of the society as well as a human right of all people, concept of “heritage community,” common heritage of Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2011</strong>- Paris Declaration on Heritage as a driver of development</td>
<td>Cultural heritage as an important role for the sustainable development, social cohesion, well-being, creativity and economic appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2014</strong>- Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values</td>
<td>Community in the center of heritage conservation in order to provide sustainable development, valorization and identification of cultural heritage by the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Development of Social Sustainability in Heritage Conservation between 1980’s and today, Source Author
The Faro Convention tried to create a wider perception of cultural heritage respecting its relationship with community and society as well as the universal human rights. It promoted the concept of value as a tool to decide what to and for whom we protect or preserve the cultural heritage. Moreover the convention defined the cultural heritage as a dynamic concept progressing itself in time according to the relationship with the community.

To point out the relation between cultural heritage and the development for overcoming the effects of globalization on societies and heritage, The Paris Declaration on Heritage as a driver of development was adopted in the 17th General Assembly of ICOMOS in 2011. This declaration placed cultural heritage into an important role for the sustainable development, social cohesion, well-being, creativity and economic appeal. According to this definition, declaration stated that the built heritage should adapt the new uses and functions to meet the modern living standards. It suggested balanced and controlled urban development and regeneration and diversity of activities in these areas. It also highlighted the importance of traditional agricultural and craft activities to enliven the local economies and supported the traditional energy production techniques and building skills.

The development of tourism was another topic mentioned in this declaration. Raising awareness of professionals related with the tourism about cultural heritage was an important objective of this document. In addition, encouraging the participation of local community in the management plan process in order reveal the specific values of the heritage more properly was determined as a tourism strategies. Moreover, the information campaigns were suggested raising the awareness of the local community and contribution of trained professional in the conservation field; local, national and international organizations as well as universities were supported.

One of the latest documents on the heritage agenda, The Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values was adopted in the 18th General Assembly of ICOMOS in 2014.
The sub-themes of this event were sharing and experiencing the identity of communities through tourism and interpretation, landscape as cultural habitat, sustainability through traditional knowledge, community driven conservation and local empowerment and emerging tools for conservation practice. The main concern of this declaration was to put the community in the center of heritage conservation in order to provide sustainable, harmonious and intercultural development. Within this, valorization and identification of cultural heritage by the community, improving a bottom-up approach, the role of communities in heritage conservation, harmonizing the contemporary and traditional management models and developing international principles for heritage conservation with respect to local needs, beliefs, traditions and practices, ways to utilize the heritage resources for sustainable socio-economic development were discussed in this assembly (ICOMOS, 2014).

Even if the social consideration has gained importance in the conservation agenda throughout the world, the conservation measures in Turkey are still lack of an integrated approach. Starting from 1950’s migration, rapid urbanization and mass tourism has changed the balances in the historic city centers in Turkey like in many European countries.

Social structure of the historic city centers in Turkey are composed the original inhabitants who have been living in these neighborhoods for years and the people who migrated from other cities or villages for better living conditions. Since the historic urban landscapes are neglected to decline, people who live in those sites are usually low-income or disadvantaged groups with low education level which lead them fall behind in the social strata.

During 1960s and 1970s, one of the biggest problems in cities concerning historic urban landscapes was the increasing number of slums that have scattered at the peripheries of the city. Planning activities, which allow new developments that were not harmonious with the existing fabric, or destructions of the traditional fabric are another concern related with those areas.
In addition, the lack of conservation planning activities and practices, the historic urban landscapes were left to decay or abandoned. Due to the increasing population and building density, transportation, parking and environmental pollution become other major considerations (Tunçer, 2009: 3). Because of the poor physical conditions those areas did not fulfill the contemporary needs of modern world and historic buildings were abandoned by their owners or sold. Poor immigrants became the new residents of those districts. Their density increased with the division of the buildings into several households. This situation also increased the deterioration of the historic buildings. The immigrants who lived in those depressed areas cannot afford to enhance the physical conditions with respect to conservation principles (Şahin Güçhan&Kurul, 2009:30).

From 1973 up to 1983, High Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage was the only decision mechanism, which created an obstacle for those who wished to remain outside its autonomy. Even if The General Directorate of Cities Bank and Land Registry Offices were introduced for listing and conservation area designation that would be used in development plans, “Conservation Development Plans” were not issued before 1990s. When High Council was replaced to Regional Councils for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage and High Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage; local agencies found an opportunity in participating decision-making process in conservation actions for representation of municipalities. However, experts and local institutions could not be involved in the decision-making process properly, their numbers were limited and inconsistencies were occurred between different regions. Despite the non-encouraging policies, public and municipalities adopted the notion of conservation (Şahin Güçhan&Kurul, 2009:31).

After 2003, arrangement in the legislation gave important responsibilities to the municipalities in conservation of historic values. When Turkey adopted EU, important changes were made in legislation and institutional framework conservation.
With the change in the “Law on the Protection of Culture and Nature Assets No. 2863” in 2004, some important concepts such as “Conservation Development Plan”, “Management Plan”, “Nexus Point” and “Participatory Area Management” were introduced (Şahin Güzcan&Kurul, 2009:33). In addition, the necessity of integrated conservation approach in conservation development that concerned the cooperation with the inhabitants and workplaces in the historic urban landscapes were clearly stated. In the following conservation policies, it was mentioned that conservation development plans should have sustainable principles and strategies that enhance the social and economic conditions of the inhabitants and workplaces in the conservation site. 17th Article of this law mentioned that the NGO’s, chambers and inhabitants can join the related meetings.

Conservation of Deteriorating Historic and Cultural Property through Renewal and Re-use Law No. 5366 that came into operation on 05.07.2005 enabled urban conservation sites to be handled as renewal areas. This act promoted renewal and re-use of historic urban landscapes in case of necessity. Although the role of local governments in planning process were increased and participation of NGO and local people were promoted, this act threatened the identity of historic urban landscapes and the sustainability of the local people who live in these neighborhoods. This law paved the way of various renewal projects in historic centers in Istanbul such as Sulukule Renewal Project and Tarlabası Renewal Project. Lack of social considerations and participatory process in conservation, these renewal projects did not consider the needs of the low-income group who had lived in those neighborhoods but focused on creating profit-oriented new areas for the wealthier communities. This situation makes low-income groups to move their neighborhoods.

Following this change, regulations in Law No. 2863 related with the meetings during the preparation of Conservation Development Plan were removed in 2011. It was also stated that related chambers could no longer participate to these meetings as a decision-making mechanism but they can only join as an observer.
In addition to this negative change for the participatory conservation, the change in the Law No. 2863 with the law-amending ordinances No. 648 in 2011 cancelled the terms in transition period and limitations in the validation period so that the necessity of preparing a conservation development plan for the local authorities has removed in a sense. This change can be considered as a negative effect for the planning discipline (Demşek, 2012:45).

Although the basic problems in historic urban landscapes show similarities in the world and Turkey, conservation approaches to these problems diverse. Starting from 1960’s, cultural heritage has been defined in the urban context and social considerations have been introduced to the conservation agenda in the world. In the following years, more integrated conservation approach with more comprehensive planning program has been adopted. Public participation and the promotion of the public awareness were supported for the integration of heritage conservation into daily life. While heritage conservation was determined as a part of sustainable development in the cities, preservation of the social atmosphere in historic urban landscapes became more important in 1990’s. With the broadened content of the cultural heritage in 2000’s, conservation approaches not only focused on the preservation of the tangible values but the intangible values defined by the relationship between people and the place as well. In this context, cultural heritage was considered as a basic human right for all people to improve the well-being of society and the valorization of the cultural heritage by the community placed in the center of the heritage conservation in the latest years.

On the other hand, conservation measures in Turkey were not sufficient in terms of preserving physical and social character of historic urban landscapes. While historic urban landscapes were neglected and left to decay, original inhabitants abandoned these neighborhoods for better living conditions. Low-income group that migrated from other cities began to settle historic urban landscapes so that they could not afford for the rehabilitation of these districts. Moreover, increasing number of population in the cities created the necessity of new development.
However, not following a comprehensive planning approach, new settlements did not respect the traditional characteristic of the historic urban landscapes. New development and renewal projects in historic urban landscapes neglected the needs of the existing social group; instead the needs of wealthier groups were given importance. With the changes in the physical and social characteristic of the historic urban landscapes, low-income groups were forced to leave their neighborhoods.

In addition, conservation measures in Turkey were lack of an integrated approach for a long time. Although participation of public, experts and related chamber were introduced to the conservation agenda, the following changes in the regulations removed this obligation so that public voice in the conservation was threatened.

2.3. Critical Social Sustainability Factors in Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes

It was stated that for an urban conservation to be sustainable, it should not only conserve and maintain the traditional urban fabric with the group of buildings that served architectural and historic interest, but it should respond the social, environmental and economic concerns (Feilden&Jokilehto, 1998). Among these concerns, different definitions were driven for the concept of social sustainability and its development in the heritage conservation was discussed.

However, social indicators that frame the concept of social sustainability were too controversial with respect to methodology and objectives. There were not a common idea for the problem definition and data collection so that the development of studies on social indicators was not sufficient enough (Bognar, 2005). Even though the studies were haphazard, there were some repetitive key themes revealed from the various definitions of social sustainability that could be used as a social indicator for creating a systematic clarification for social sustainability. Within this, different social sustainability factors will be defined and further recommendations will be done in order to fulfill these factors (Figure 8).
2.3.1. Quality of Life

In the simplest way, quality of life can be described as the people’s social well being (Bognar, 2005; Atkins and IFA, 2004). This concept refers to how well a person’s life goes for that particular person. The theories of welfare were classified according to their being subjective and objective. The objective theories relate with something is good for a person and how that person has some attitude in favor of that thing. Endorsement, enjoyment, happiness, satisfaction, desire and preferences are related terms associated with these theories. Objective theories, on the other hand, usually focus on the normative ideals that determine the certain goods that make a person’s life better (Bognar, 2005: 3-8).

In the light of these theories, finding the objective and subjective social indicators in order to measure the welfare of the people is a concern on researches in the quality of life. The subjective indicators usually focus on the people’s life conditions and determine the particular goods that promote people’s welfare such the occurrence of epidemics, the level of environmental pollution, the crime rate, the availability of housing, the number of health services. In contrast, the objective indicators capture the people’s own perception or evaluations of their life conditions. Even though, reliability and validity problems can be occurred in the evaluations on the quality of life, there is a consensus that citizens should have the right to mention their evaluations and demands in the decision making process (Bognar, 2005: 3-8).

Figure 8: Some Critical Factors Defined by Social Sustainable Projects. Source: (Chan&Lee: 2008).
In addition, it is stated that the quality of built environment has a positive effect on the everyday life of the people. Although, there are no consensus on researches of the relationship between the quality of built environment and the user’s quality of life, some researches stated that the high quality of built environment which can affect people’s experience of urban environment in terms of accessibility, inclusiveness and sense of place (Dempsey, 2008, Carmona, et al. 2003, DTLR, 2002, Gallacher, 2005). Some researches argued that the conservation of historic places and buildings helps to create a higher degree of creativity, economic development and quality of life (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000, Hall, 2002, Chan and Yung, 2004) as well as the social well-being of different groups (Tweed & Sutherland, 2007.) Culture and identity become important elements to define and value the contemporary use of heritage.

Cultural diversity is another important component to improve quality of life. It promoted the equality of different cultural experiences that shaped in time and space, and respecting each other. It is argued that accepting diversity of cultures, societies can enlarge their values, beliefs and traditions (Chan & Yung, 2012: 400).

Moreover, it is also stated that the development of the different services such as leisure, arts and crafts, parks, sports and recreation, shopping located within 15-minute walk of the neighborhood is another important criterion to improve the well-being of the population. Encouragement of creative activities and use of the area in different times of the day by different facilities are also important suggestions in order to improve quality of life (Colantino, Dixon, 2011: 228).
2.3.2. Housing and Built Environment

Built environment includes all the buildings, spaces and products that are created of or modified by the people such as our homes, schools, workplaces, parks, business areas and roads as well as the all associated issues related with infrastructure that is needed to keep the society running (Health Canada, 1997:141). In addition, built environment can also include broad features of urban layout such as cityscapes and streetscapes with exterior and interior qualities of the architectural features.

Housing on the other hand consumes the natural resources and the products. Reflecting a major economic activity for the general economy, it is an important factor of the development in the quality of life. Moreover, it is an interpretation of the aesthetic value and the way human life in a particular setting (Chiu, 2003:1). Additionally, housing is a physical form of the inhabitants adapts the natural habitat developing with time and technology. Being a part of the culture, it reflects the aesthetic and artistic dimension, knowledge, beliefs, customs, religions as well as the way of live and social behavior. Conservation of residential buildings contributes the cultural identity and sense of place providing cultural continuity and sustaining the cultural identity of the place (Chiu, 2003:11).

In order to create a qualified built environment, master plans should be provided concerning the local and city scale. The future management of the plan should be considered in the design stage. Public and private space should be easily distinguished by the users. Public space should avoid the waste spaces and consider the areas to facilitate social gathering and public interaction. The schemes should encourage people to physical activities such as bicycling, walking and public transport etc. Environmental sustainability features and quality design and construction should be equally distributed throughout the projects. Newly built housing follows certain environmental and design protocols and respect to the existing fabric. Retrofit of the existing buildings should be provided. The needs of the disabled and elder people should be taken into consideration. Adequate parking or storage areas should be provided (Colantino&Dixon, 2011: 225-226).
The considerations related with the social dimension of housing can be categorized in 4 themes. The first theme is related with the social preconditions that enable the production and consumption of environmentally sustainable housing such as values, habits, rules, lifestyle environmental consciousness, regulations etc. The consciousness and willingness to be live in an environmentally sustainable way can affect many design considerations such as the site choice, land use of planning, the use of environmentally friendly design, building material and construction technique (Chiu, 2003:7).

The second aspect is related with the equitable distribution of housing resources and assets which is the provision of basic housing needs of every household and enjoying at least a fundamental standard of accommodation defined by the society. The equitable development should allow people to make their own choices to improve the quality of life while not jeopardizing the opportunities of others (Badshah, 1996).

The third theme covers for the harmonious social relations with the housing environment. It concerned the landlord and tenant relationship, the influence on the stakeholders on the housing area particularly on the housing price and rental, and the empowerment of less privileged ones. The other consideration related with this theme is the building up the social capital in the housing arena.

The quality of housing and the living environment is the last of the considerations related with the social dimension of housing. It may include components like neighborliness, social mix and life style affected by the housing design.

2.3.3. Employment

Employment is a social sustainability indicator that provides income to people as well as create areas for social interaction and contact. It is an important factor for improving the well-being of the populations. It is also stated that high rate of employment decreases the divorce rates, alcoholism and suicide rates (Stigliz, 2001).
According to Omann & Spangenberg arrangement of paid work, arrangements of transformations between different forms of work, arrangement of social security are the important elements for the employment. In addition, they supported the gender equity in the employment. They also suggested that social problems such as poverty, social exclusion, welfare dependence and psychological problems could reduce with employment (Omann & Spangenberg, 2002:10).

The assessment value of the social sustainability themes that was developed by Colantino & Dixon promoted to creation of local jobs, job opportunities for local graduates, allocation of commercial and production spaces, services for local business. Programs that aim to bring back the local business managers that moved out as a role model for the current community are also supported in this assessment (Colantino & Dixon: 2011: 222).

Traditional agricultural and craft activities are supported in order to create job opportunities and develop local economies. Training the communities on the traditional building technique and material is another suggestion for creating workforce. Teaching local skills and characteristic also develops people’s sense of belonging and identity.

2.3.4. Education and Skills

Historic buildings help to educate present and future generations about the history of the people, place and events so that they can feel more connected to their environment. Revitalization of historic buildings can support people to develop their technical and social skills as well as create job opportunities. Learning the traditional building technique and material they can work in the restoration projects. In addition, after educated about the cultural and historical character of the area, local residents can work as a guided tour for tourists (Atkins & IFA, 2004).
In order to develop education and skills, number of educational facilities within 500 meter or 15-min walk should be increased. These schools maintained by the local education authority should follow certain standards. Number of children enrolled in schools inside the area should be increased. The after schools and youth development programs should be organized. Training programs for disadvantaged or marginalized groups as well as women and minority groups should be arranged (Colantino&Dixon: 2011).

2.3.5. Health

World Health Organization (1946) defined health as “a state of complete physical, mental and social well being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”. Health related strategies in the urban environments was determined as the minimum intrusion into natural environment, maximum variation in a city’s physical, social and economic structure, efforts to create ecological system with attention to waste minimization and renewable water, energy and other resources, promotion of green spaces to promote the natural environment and foster recreation, optimum balance between population and resources on which the urban environment and its population must respect the fragile natural environments (World Health Organization, 1986, cited in Butterworth: 2000).

Urban conservation projects in historic urban landscapes should include the building of health and wellness infrastructure in order to host local and additional population. Minimization of noise, air and visual pollution is also necessary for creating a healthy neighborhood.

2.3.6. Accessibility

Accessibility is defined as the ability to reach services and facilities easily with proper time, cost and ease (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001:1). Because of the fact that citizens want to work, live and participate in leisure and cultural activities by travelling less, accessibility became an essential theme in developing social sustainability (Smith: 2000:22).
It is accepted that people prefer to live in the areas close to job opportunities and facilities (Che Musa: 2000) and everyone has a right to access to certain places in their daily lives. In order to access to the other parts of the city, public transportation should be provided with a manageable walking distance from the site. The disabled people should also be taken into the consideration in providing access.

The accessibility of the use should not be limited by only the certain services, but also heritage buildings in the neighborhood. Local people should be allowed to visit access to the heritage buildings. Besides the local people, the affordable access should be allowed to general public (Yung&Chan, 2013:10).

2.3.7. Safety

The perceived safety of a neighborhood is one of the important components of social sustainability. In a neighborhood without crime and disorder, residents can feel more secure and attached to the place and can improve their social interaction with other people as well as the participation to the community life (Dempsey, Bramley, Power, Brown, 2009:8). People want to live in a safety place so that they have the assurance of nothing will happen to them. This feeling of safety will improve the trust and contribute to the sense of community and sense of place in the neighborhood.

Satisfaction with features of the local built environment has an important role on the perceived neighborhood safety. The developed environmental qualities would increase the residence’s concerns on the appearance of the neighborhood and their participation to maintain collective welfare so that the neighborhood’s safety will increase (Butterworth, 2000: 16). In contrast, poor condition and maintenance of the built environment are said to have a detrimental psychological effects of people’s sense of place, which can be resulted in anti-social and even criminal behavior (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). It is also stated that women and older people are strongly affected by the safety implications of isolation. Since there is no one to observe the space and the interaction, a place becomes dangerous if it is not used (Butterworth, 2000: IV).
It is stated that the design decisions that promotes the pedestrians are likely to reduce crime. In addition provision of local shops, benches, trees, gardens and recreational facilities that encourages people to walk and exercise and as well as neighboring activities also help to increase safety.

Mixed housing that promotes cultural diversity ensures the surveillance and being safety in numbers (Butterworth, 2000: IV). Moreover, local police forces can also be consulted about the safety needs of the neighborhoods.

2.3.8. Sense of Place and Cultural Identity

The term sense of place derived from the Latin term “genius loci” and was used rather a technical term in urban literature. Sense of place is defined as meaning the atmosphere to a place and the quality of its environment. According to the definition of sense of place, it is accepted that some certain places gives certain indefinable sense of well-being to which we desire to come back (Jackson, 1994: 157-158). The term was held with the concept of “character” most clearly in discussions of conservation and was seen as a social indicator of historic sustainability and. Lowenthal (1979) suggested that the past can exist with the shared values and experiences of cultural groups. Group identity is connected with the form and the history of place that creates sense of place. With respect to this understanding, sense of place is described as:

“In the course of time the landscape, whether that of a large region like a country or of a small locality like a market town, acquires its specific genius loci, its culture -and history-conditioned character which commonly reflects not only the work and aspirations of the society at present in occupancy but also that of its precursors in the area” (Conzen, 1966, pp. 56–57).
In addition to this definition, Rodman argued that places are socially constructed by the people who live in them and know them and they are politicized, culturally relative, historically specific, local and multiple constructions (2003, 15). Visual characteristic were defined as the greatest influence on attributing meaning and constructing identity. It is also stated that we can attach our feelings and give meaning to physically distinctive and recognizable places (Lynch, 1976: 24-5).

Collective and individual relationships between place and the people in generation or between generations can be derived from the common experiences to a particular historic period. This relationship shaped the identity of a place (Ku, 2010). It is stated that strong symbolic understanding of heritage and identity can be shaped by the traditional form of towns or buildings (Henderson, 2008, Norberg-Schulz, 1985, pp. 33-35, 48).

Identity is defined as the sense of belonging expressed in the shared values, beliefs and symbols derived from a common group membership (Verma, et al., 1999; Wilpert, 1989). It is accepted that one person’s past can shape the meaning, purpose and value of one’s own identity while groups can mobilize collective memories to provide corporate identities (Lowenthal, 1985). In addition to this definition, cultural identity can be determined as the understanding of the individuals as a part of a group of characteristics including location, history, aesthetics, beliefs etc. that was shaped with a place through time (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge: 2007).

The sense of cultural identity is an important factor for the conservation of historic buildings in which contributes us to link our past. Lynch (1972) also stated that the historic built environments can be overemphasized or romanticizes by the people who do not live in there. In this case, the perception of the inhabitants of these environments can be different in which frustration or toleration may be resulted rather than love.
In order to increase sense of place and cultural identity in urban regeneration project, some principles were determined. Spaces for performing art, markets, local crafts and fairs are defined as a good way for contributing to the sense of place and identity. Enhancing buildings and areas that are culturally significant or having a heritage value, supporting commercial free public spaces and multi-faith infrastructure are defined as other important principles for these projects. Moreover, local residents should be supported to be involved in the decision on the historically and culturally significant buildings (Colantino&Dixon: 2012: 226).

2.3.9. Sense of Belonging and Place Attachment

Sense of belonging is a concept that helps people to develop social networks and association with others, increase their pride and understanding of the local area, and identify their common clustering of concern with norms, values and culture (Heritage Lottery Fund, 2009, Bramley and Power, 2009).

On the other hand, place attachment refers to the strong bonds that exist between people and place (Low&Altman, 1992). To create place attachment in an environment, people have to identify themselves in that place. Distinctiveness which is the way that people use place to distinguish themselves from others helps to determine place identity. Sense of continuity through time in a place is another factor to improve place attachment. Moreover, self-esteem, which helps people to utilize places for positive self-evaluation also improves place attachment (Twigger-Ross&Uzzell, 1996: 209).

Organizing social events like festivals, fairs in the neighborhood give a positive image of the site and increase the sense of belonging. In addition, visual appearance of the townscape design can make citizens more satisfied with the place they live and develop their sense of belonging.
2.3.10. Social Inclusion and Social Interaction

Social inclusion is defined as the ambiguity of the term social exclusion on which individuals suffer from a combination of problems, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime rates, bad health and family breakdown (Cameron & Gilroy & Speak, 2001:11). Social inclusion in the built environment was determined as the factor that helps to overcome social exclusion as well as developing citizenship, reinforcing identity and contributing social and economic regeneration. It is supported that social inclusion is shaped by developing access and education as well as cultural diversity and multiculturalism.

It is also added that social inclusion is promoted by partnership and community involvement (Pendelbury, 2004). Socially inclusive regions are defined as the places that provide range of services and facilities, which the individuals desire to participate in.

Social inclusion and interaction are important for the involvement in setting and working towards collective community goals in which everyone has a right to participate all aspects of community life. It is argued that public space should encourage the social inclusion and interaction. While various public facilities such as schools, medical centers provide the basic needs of citizens, sport facilities and community centers support leisure activity and improve the social attraction. The use of these facilities by disabled groups, elderly and children should specially be considered. Open spaces and green areas provide buffer zones for social gathering and public interaction (Chiu, 2003; Corbett & Corbett, 2000, Cuthbert & Dimitriou, 1992). It is stated that pedestrian-oriented streetscapes could encourage outdoor activities (Oktay, 2004). Porta and Renne also suggested that carefully designed street furniture and pavement increase the visual quality which has a deeper impact on social sustainability of places (2005).
Moreover, programs or projects that encourage interaction between people of varying ages, incomes, ethnicities and abilities should also be promoted. Training workshop concerning the cultural and social quality of the area for the inhabitants as well as the newcomers should be organized (Colantino, Dixon, 2011: 227).

2.3.11. Social Equity

Social equity is described as being able to access all the resources to be a participant in the community life and to have the chance to personal development and enhancement (Colantino&Dixon, 2011: 34). Due to the fact that lower levels of disparity results in longer life expectancies, fewer rates of crime and suicides, stronger patterns of civic engagement as well as more developed economic vitality, social equity is considered as an important factor for social sustainability (Great Vancouver Regional District, 2004).

Cities develop into better places if social equity and justice are emphasized and sources are distributed fairly. In order to achieve social sustainability in historic urban landscapes, disadvantaged and minorities should be given right in decision-making process in conservation (Reynolds&Bloxidge, 1976).

2.3.12. Community Participation

Community participation enables people to make decision for his/her well being and provides human development, self-enrichment and innate satisfaction (Lisk, 1985).

In order to improve community participation, local residents should be included in the design, implementation, monitoring process of revitalization projects. Local people should be employed in the community development process together with skilled and experienced workers. Common goals and objectives should be together with the inhabitants and possible concerns of the community should be taken into consideration. Moreover, local facilities should require financial, training and community development support and encourage people to participate.
2.4. Projects and Practices for Social Sustainability in Historic Urban Landscapes

Since 1990’s on which social sustainability has been discussed in the conservation theories more specifically, different conservation practices related with this issue have been applied throughout the world. Concerning the definition of social sustainability and its critical factors, five case studies are chosen from different parts of the world. According to the context they are in, those case studies can be utilized to understand the different approaches of social sustainability in historic urban landscapes. Moreover, these examples can be handled as a guide to capture how the social sustainability factors can be fulfilled as a response to specific problems in historic urban landscapes as well as determining guidelines, tools and process in further studies about the conservation of historic urban landscapes via social sustainability.

2.4.1. The Viva o Centro Program in Porto Alegre, Brazil

Viva o Centro Program is one of the 21 strategic government programs in Brazil composed of the integrated action of all Municipal Secretaries. It is one of most successful example of integrating heritage conservation in local development plans that welcomes the local communities and institutions. The aim of this program is to provide downtown revitalization by the development of urban planning relating to public space use, universal accessibility, security, social inclusion, preservation and rehabilitation of historic heritage. One of the basic concerns in the local scale is to integrate civil society and public government into the planning process and implementation (Bohrer, 2007:30)

Having different stages, the plan provides the condition for the actions in the government’s internal and external relationships, priority definition, technical monitoring by measuring the results, creating possibilities for its execution by society, establishing partnerships and creation of funding from different financial institutions (Figure 9).
One of the most important examples for the execution of this program is “Caminho dos Antiquários” which is an Antique Fair in the downtown composed of 25 antique stores. Given priority to the interest of the local storeowners, the government promoted the local physical rehabilitation by environmental and road improvements. Local government closed the roads around the square on Saturdays in order to allow storeowners to sell their products in the streets. Cultural events, musical and dance shows were also allowed by the City Hall. Storeowners and exhibitors also established an association relating to the fair. In order to develop communication strategies for incorporating free advertisement for local commercial places they prepared graphic production and agenda distribution, preparing DVD’s concerning the needs of the area. The Association was also responsible for organizing the events, hiring tourist guides for the area, taking care of the infrastructural problems of the area such as street-lights, local garbage disposal (Figure 10).
All the performance and events improved the social quality of the area without costing any money to the government as well as raised the safety of the area that was once full of criminals.

In order to improve the accessibility to the area, the central train station called Public Market was repaired by the help of a federal public company that is responsible for metropolitan train. The renovation around the central station has changed the pedestrian, vehicular and public accessibility to improve the city image.

Through the modernization of Public Market structure and pavement, the landscape with the re-urbanization of Revolução Farroupilha Square, on which the Market Station is its symbol, the station have new accesses by elevators and escalators. In addition to provision of accessibility, it became an important example in terms of the partnership between different levels of government in favor of the public interest.

Lastly, in order to create new projects for all the downtown area, an agreement between City Hall of Porto Alegre and Federal University was established. The students and teacher from the School of Architecture developed alternative projects for the downtown area on which 100 of them was selected to the exhibition at the Government’s Official Building (Bohrer, 2007:30).
In the light of these projects, it could be determined that The Viva o Centro Program was an important example in terms of integrated approach between different levels of government, institutions and local communities.

Community involvement was achieved by diagnosing problems related with the area and objectives and strategies of design and implementation phases together with local government and technical staff. Moreover, the cultural event in the Antique Fair was important in terms of preserving the physical urban fabric by maintaining antique shops and enhancing economy in order to keep the local store owner’s sustainability in the area (Elgamal, 2014:11).

2.4.2. Marseilles Forum on the Social Value of Heritage and the Value of Heritage for Society

Marseilles Forum was initiated by the four mayors of Marseilles and its region in order to counteract the different reasons of discrimination and poverty and to improve the living conditions of the inhabitants by overcoming the social and psychological distress among the populations with respect to the principles that was accepted in Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society in 2005.

For this purpose, the studies were held by the coordination of different groups such as tenants, associations, consortia of enterprises, artist’s collectives or residents who desire to protect their quality of life and surrounding.

The Forum focused on the concerns relating with human rights, cultural diversity and identity, integration of minorities and underprivileged, prevention of intolerance and discrimination. Main objectives of the forum in the light of the Faro Convention were promoting social values of heritage and the values of social society and providing a common frame for the social challenges in Europe. In addition, Forum aimed to provide a communication drive regarding the principles of Faro Convention and to determine multi-criteria indicators to be used in the implementation of the convention principles. According to the main principles and objectives of the Marseilles Forum, various actions were organized by the different actors.
One of the first actions is to define the heritage committees that would work as a management, consultation and suggestion mechanism as well as exchange information between citizens about the common heritage. These elected representatives would work together with the individuals, associations and disadvantaged groups that demand the preservation of common heritage.

The second action of the forum is related with extending hospitality. Hotel du Nord which is a co-operative founded by residents aims to economic development by their heritage of northern districts of Marseilles in order to keep their sustainability in the area as well as improving the quality of life. The actions of Hotel du Nord initiated in 1995 and after Faro Convention in 2005 their studies related with heritage-enhancement got accelerated. Since January 2011, Hotel du Nord officially started its actions as an inhabitant’s cooperative. Their working principle is “selling what they make, making what they sell in the interests of all who live, and work or spend some time in those Northern districts of Marseille” (Hotel Du Nord Cooperation). The cooperation offers 50 rooms in resident’s homes, 50 hosts and 50 itineraries for discovery of their daily life and surrounding heritage by heritage walks, heritage libraries and local products (Figure 11).

Working principles of Hotel du Nord reflects their appreciation of common heritage and social interaction between different inhabitants living in these districts. Their actions also promote the social value of heritage and recognition of their districts.
The third action of Marseilles Forum is related with the protecting and enhancing of Aygalades Waterfall which was hidden by the urban and industrial setting in one of the Marseilles’ districts. The development of this area is provided by the Street Art Center whose artist helps conduction educational work projects with local youth. In order to increase the recognition of area, collective social dynamic was created with the surrounding populations, social agencies, cultural operatives and heritage committee with the related districts.

Another part of Forum actions consists of the urban discovery workshops that were associated by the young people, artists, enterprises and residents. Revealing the true potentials and values of the site by the help of the artists, awareness of young people related with the common heritage increased. Youngsters who are educated in these workshops can obtain the qualification of walking tour leader and accompanying visitors in the sites.

In coherence with the previous action, heritage walks are organized by the residents or artists who live and work in the neighborhood. The historical documentation of the related sites is made by collaboration of residents, enterprises and associations. This collective study includes scientific sources as well as the memories, experiences and enquiries related with the sites. According to the different tour themes, visitors have a chance to experience the area in different ways.
While visitors can learn more about the area with the heritage community, they can also participate to sensitive walking sessions with the artists and experience the area in more spiritual and artistic way. The walking program was determined by Hotel Du Nord co-operative. By the help of the co-operative, the visitors also have a chance to see residents’ homes in their neighborhoods on some of which different works of artists were exhibited. In addition, audio-guided walking tours were prepared by a group of artists and residents on which different sounds and voices were captured from different neighborhoods. With the help of these audio-guided tours, they have a chance to share their experience with the visitor so that visitors can explore the neighborhoods more effectively. Provincial long-distance hiking trail around urban periphery is also offered by the Forum (Figure 12).

![Figure 12: Heritage Walks and Tours to Different Districts in Marseilles, Source: Dominique Poulain](image)

The routes to the three last standing Marseilles soap work that have an important social, geographical and historical importance. By opening industrial process and locality to tourism and culture, the program promotes heritage enhancement.

Hospitality tales written by Christine Breton with coordination of civil society, heritage communities, residents and heritage professional were another action for promoting integrated conservation.
In the light of individual’s perception of the city as well as the scientific research related with the area, seven tales were published. These tales are available in the hosting houses of Hotel Du Nord co-operative and bookshops. Similar action takes titled as Quartiers Libres on which different artists work together with residents and create works relating with intercultural heritage perception and human memory in a specific district each year.

Marseilles Forum is an inspiring example in terms of promoting the social values of heritage. Actions that were held in different districts in the city help residents to experience and valorize common heritage with the collaboration of different institutions and artist. In the light of these actions, residents and heritage communities can share these values with visitors and tourist that enables heritage enhancement and economic development of the districts.

2.4.3. Community Participation in Conservation of Historic Urban Landscape in Old City Yangzhou

Due to the rapid economic development and urbanization in China, great amount of construction in new urban districts appeared which led demolition and redevelopment of inner areas as well as loss of cultural heritage.

Yangzhou is considered as one of the most classified cities in China in terms of having historic and cultural importance. Its urban area has over 500 clusters of historic buildings and 148 sites of cultural heritage ten of which are under state protection (UN-HABITAT, 2008). Its remaining historic area of 5.1 km$^2$ that populates 110,000 residents is characterized by 1 to 2 storey courtyard buildings with narrow streets and alleys (Longbin, 2007:1).

In 1980’s hundreds of people from rural areas migrate to Yangzhou for working and better life standards. However, migration resulted as the housing shortage on which people had to live in slums or in historic buildings under state protection. Sanitary conditions of the houses are usually poor and physical conditions in the houses needed to be improved (Figure 13).
Infrastructure problems including water drainage system, drinking water misplaced gas pipe and poor electricity system have affected the inhabitant’s quality of life. In addition, due to the high building density in the area, number of public spaces that have an important role in daily communication and economic activities have reduced and accessibility to the area is limited. Because of the poor physical conditions in the buildings younger and richer has moved to new city areas. Most of the remaining population is now composed of low-income groups and elder people (Longbin, 2007:1).

![Poor Living Conditions in Old City of Yangzhou](image)

**Figure 13: Poor Living Conditions in Old City of Yangzhou, Source: GTZ-CA Project Team**

Yangzhou Municipality Government paid special interest to preserve the historic area and provide an adequate shelter for all the residents in old city. German Technical Cooperation supported the actions of Municipality and introduced the concept of “Sustainable Development Conservation” for the rehabilitation of the old city. The strategies of the Municipality Government do not only focus on the preservation of historic buildings but also improve the living conditions of residents, particularly the lower-income groups.

In 2006, a pilot area composed of 147 households was selected for the urban conservation project. The project aims to provide historical rehabilitation with the participation of residents.
International Yangzhou together with German Technical Cooperation developed “Community Action Planning” in order to raise the awareness of the residents as well as their participation to conservation process. Different authorities such as the Cultural Bureau, Planning Bureau, Construction Bureau, House Management Bureau, and Environmental Protection Bureau also participated to develop strategies.

The first action of the planning is to categorize the interventions in the area with respect to their scales and physical characteristic. Categories were defined as inner streets, facades and houses and different intervention strategies were developed with respect to each category.

After defining the intervention strategies, Community Action Planning workshops were organized with the participation of 30 residents and 20 representatives from different institution. In the content of the workshop studies, a common understanding of cultural heritage and building environment as well as future planning and implementation were determined. In addition to concerns relating with families and city, budgeting implementations and negotiation requirement were discussed altogether. After these discussions, the workshop group held a field survey of updating data on street and buildings to prepare a detailed inventory. Together with the experts, families determined the type, location and number of the elements relating with streets and buildings for a detailed technical development (Figure 14).
In the light of the field study, the workshop group discussed the issues related to the enhancement of the area, financial sources as well as distribution responsibilities. After the workshops, a detailed design guideline was prepared in order to create a common understanding between residents and professionals for the standards and models to be followed in the implementations. 30 houses were renovated with these guidelines. In addition, selection and location of the plants, street furniture and other related things decided together with the residents (Figure 15).
As a result of Community Action Planning, active community participation and a common understanding between residents and professionals were successes. Being more aware of the environment, communities were involved more effectively in the planning and implementation process. The decisions of the master plan of the pilot area were made with respect to the concerns, wills and suggestions of the residents. In addition, some young members who migrated to new city have come back after the renovations. It can be considered as an important development to keep the sustainability of the residents in the old city.
2.4.4. Social Changes and Social Sustainability in Historical Urban Landscapes of East-Central Europe

After the fall of Iron Curtain in 1989, several political, social, economic transformations appeared in cities of East Central Europe. Public administration was decentralized. While the central governments weakened, the power and influence of local governments and individual districts increased. Housing and urban land were privatized and the remaining public sector served mostly as a residual housing sector. The private sector and increase in the housing cost has affected the low-income groups and elderly people mostly. The effects of globalization and increasing commercialization have raised the demands for service sector buildings at the inner quarters in the city and the functional character of inner cities converted from residential to business use.

The maintenance of buildings was neglected during socialism so that many buildings were left to deterioration or demolition. The number of empty lots, which were used as parking areas has increased. After socialism, developers were not interested in renovating the buildings and new owners of the neighborhoods did not have the capital for regeneration of buildings. This situation caused the loss of several buildings with high architectural value. During 1990’s many vacant buildings were started to be destroyed for new constructions.

Moreover, the population or urban centers of East-Central Europe has radically changed with the post-socialism period. The weakening of residential function in the historic urban landscapes caused rapid migration of the original residents. On the other hand, aging population resulted as decline of the population in historic urban landscapes. Moreover, the increased number of elderly pensioners in city centers became a treat for social sustainability of these neighborhoods.

When younger and wealthier groups have left the centers as a result of physical decline, population of the historic urban landscapes became marginalized.
Elderly people and unskilled workers with children became the main social group in the historic urban landscapes. In addition, civil society organizations had lack of dominance at involvement in urban matters (Kovacs, 2008:12).

One of the districts that suffered from the rapid changes in political, economic, physical and social structure is Jewish Quarter in Budapest. Due to the rising problems in the historic city centers, prominent architect, intellectuals, artist and local people of the districts established an organization called “Vàš” (Veto). As a result of the campaigns and protests of this organization, Jewish Quarter was taken into territorial protection (Figure 16).

Figure 16: Demonstration in the Jewish Quarter, Source: Erzsébet Beliczay, 2009.

Another example from Budapest is the 8th district, which is close to city center. Surrounded by the prestigious areas and schools, this center became a slum area. During the 70 years After First World War, hardly any new buildings were constructed and buildings began to deteriorate that leaded abandonment of the areas by its original inhabitants which highly constituted of educated elite. Starting from 1970s, gypsies began to migrate to this center. After the fall of Iron Curtain, unemployment and impoverishment hit the community, which leaded drug dealing, street prostitution and other related crimes.
Due to increasing crime rates, spatial segregation began in the schools on which lower middle class parents living in the districts started to send their children outside and the Gypsy children concentration increased (Enyedi, 2004: 24-25).

Local Government of the 8th district had two main strategies in order to overcome the problems in this area. The first was the rehabilitation of housing development and the second was improvement of education system in schools.

It was revealed that reason of the low education level by the number of primary school dropouts was the curriculum designed for Hungarian children. Local government started a new service to teach youth how to develop their skills through the new methods applied in the kindergartens and primary schools. The project is financed by the district local government and helped the coordination of teacher’s union, Gypsy local government and NGO’s for social equality. Aiming a harmonious atmosphere and personal growth, kindergartens applied different methods for preparing the children mentally and physically for the primary school. Moreover, additional catch-up and skill development courses with workshops were provided to keep the Gypsy tradition alive (Enyedi, 2004: 25).

With respect to several different approaches on the revitalization in historic urban landscapes in East-Central Europe on which two of them were briefly explained above, some recommendation for local government officers were determined by the experts. One general consensus among the experts is that sustainable communities tend to be mixed communities that include certain range of housing tenures and household income levels. Preserving a healthy mix of social strata and types of housing in the neighborhood is also suggested for the socially sustainable communities. In addition, determining social characteristics and traditions as well as balancing the coexistence between vulnerable and wealthy groups and organizing capacity-building programs for the vulnerable groups were determined as important factors to provide socially mixed neighborhoods (Kovacs, 2008:14).
Putting emphasize on the modernization and renovation of the existing public sector and supporting the construction of new public rental units of higher quality in the areas were strongly supported by the experts. It was stressed that differentiating the public housing stock in terms of size and quality and making the area for the wealthy groups also allowed social mix and sustainability.

Giving the tenants the possibility to buy their public rental units and facilitating dispersal of vulnerable groups within the neighborhood also helped their stability in the area. Encouraging and assisting former tenants to return the area after rehabilitation were another factor to provide social sustainability of the neighborhood.

Involving local resident in the construction and maintenance work were stressed to raise their responsibility towards their environment. Helping resident to developing their own sources and giving them legal and financial support were also recommended to local authorities. Training and educating community workers and organizing personal help and courses for most problematic residents were also suggested for the integration of all community.

Providing the participation of everyone including low-income groups and ethnic minorities, creating new rooms or offices dedicated to community life, supporting civil society organization in the decision making process and implementations were also recommended by the experts.

In order to change the negative image of the neighborhoods, organizing local events and celebrations as well as sports and cultural programs, exhibitions, festivals, conferences and using the potentials of the media were recommended. These actions were also determined as a way to increase the resident’s attachment to the neighborhood (Kovacs, 2008:14).
2.4.5. **Revitalization of Community Livelihoods through Creative Industries in Borobudur, Indonesia**

Borobudur Temple Compounds, one of the greatest Buddhist monuments in the world located in the Kedu Valley, Indonesia, was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. However, the inadequate site management mechanism and the poor interaction between the local community and tourists who visit the temple are some of the major problems at the site.

Visitors who come to Borobudur left without visiting any other place in the area and not spend any money locally, which threatens the sustainable development of the surrounding Borobudur. A chaotic image that is created by the vendor stalls on which low-quality products are sold around the parking lot of the Borobudur Archaeological Park does not satisfy the visitor’s expectations. Because of the lack of a linkage between tourism and local economy, local people face difficulties in purchasing a stable power and a sufficient infrastructure in underdeveloped market (Nagaoka: 2011:1). Another problematic issue related to area is the active volcano on the Archipelago culminated destructive eruption and killed and injured many inhabitants of the surrounding villages in 2010. After the eruption, Borobudur Heritage Conservation Office immediately closed to the public to increase the security for the sake of the surrounding communities. Moreover, volcanic eruption has caused a negative impact to the local tourism and economy.

In order to recover the Temple with its surrounding communities and provide their accessibility once again, Ministry of Culture and Tourism invited UNESCO and local stakeholders. The consensus revealed in this meeting is that recovery of the area can be succeeded by the cultural tourism and the creative industry sectors in the region.

The first action defined in this meeting is to provide ash-cleaning operation from the temple with the participation of the community. 400 local community members joined the cleaning actions after the in-situ training (Figure 17).
Other activities relating with the community empowerment are the community-based cultural recourse mapping in the region, training for the production of local products of Borobudur and the community based cultural heritage tourism program.

In order to identify the needs and concerns as well as to provide the long-term sustainability of the area of the community, systematic classification of community’s tangible and intangible resources by mapping is recommended. As a result of this mapping, the cultural, natural and artistic heritage those have the potential to contribute to employment and poverty reduction are determined with the collaboration of archeologists, historians, anthropologist, tourism specialist and community representatives.

Another action organized by UNESCO Safeguarding Operation is to promote locally made handicrafts of Borobudur for the marketing. The volcanic soil around the Borobudur has a potential for the making unique and high quality ceramics and souvenirs. The workshops organized by UNESCO trained local producers on the ceramic craftsmanship knowledge that was passed from generations and the production techniques. Training activities of UNESCO project also covers for the jam production of local fruits. This training especially focused on the local women.
The local production not only stimulates local economic development for the surrounding areas, but also increases local people’s self-esteem and supports social cohesion (Figure 18).

![Image of local community training](image)

Figure 18: Training Local Communities on Local Jam and Ceramic Production, Source: Masanori Nagaoka, 2014.

The last action of the project is the local community-based tourism that includes handicrafts, ceramic making, local cuisine, traditional performances, small-scale village tours and guesthouse. However the hygiene conditions of local food factories and guesthouses needs to be improved first. UNESCO’s training workshop organized on local snack production in Borobudur for 110 local women from the surrounding villages of Borobudur increased knowledge on the local cuisine production as well as basic sanitation, hygiene, presentation and packaging of the products (Nagaoka:2011, 9).

The revitalization activities in Borobudur and its surroundings have been a good example for the sustainable development of the community through education and traditional skills and community-based tourism. While local people were educated more about the local construction and production techniques, they had a chance to produce their own sources for improving their economy and recognition of their neighborhoods. Moreover, the training activities are also an important factor to develop social cohesion and the place-attachment of the community.
Different examples throughout the world are analyzed to understand different conservation approaches for providing social sustainability in historic city centers. Each example focuses on a different aspect of social sustainability factor with respect to the specific problems that they deal with. Viva o Centro Program in Porto Alegre mostly emphasizes the importance of community participation and promotes the local jobs. Organizing fairs, events and festivals, the program introduces a positive image of the area as well as increasing place attachment of the local people. Marseilles Forum is an innovative example in terms of understanding the site and developing new relationship between community and the cultural heritage. It also promotes the job opportunities revealed from these relationships and increase the recognition of the site among visitors. Urban conservation of the Old City Yangzhou is a leading project in terms of active community participation in planning and decision process in urban conservation projects. Conservation of historical urban centers in East-Central Europe gives some guidelines on how to provide social sustainability in the changing dynamics of the world and mostly focuses succession social equity for the disadvantaged groups or minorities. Lastly, revitalization of community livelihoods through creative industries in Borobudur is an enlightening example in terms of encouraging communities for local production and local job opportunities through education.

All the examples show different practices for fulfilling sustainability factors. These practices can be used as a base for conservation of historic sites with respect social considerations. However, it is important to understand the each specific site with its content and develop alternatives accordingly.
2.5. A Proposal for General Guidelines, Tools and Process for the Social Sustainability in Historic Urban Landscapes

In the light of a comprehensive theoretical research that includes social sustainability literature, international declarations and documents, the role of social sustainability on the heritage conservation and various practices throughout the world; some guidelines, tools and principles are defined for the social sustainability in historic urban landscapes (Figure 19).

These guidelines and tools can be used as a base for assessing the overall situation in the historic urban landscapes in terms of social sustainability concept. Although this methodology gives a general understanding for the fulfillment of certain conditions, each historic site should be specifically analyzed in order to make healthier decisions.

In order to develop accurate conservation approach for historic city centers, it is important to understand the physical, functional, social and managerial aspects of each site. The relationship of the site with its surrounding and the city should be revealed in the analysis. The characteristic of buildings and open areas should be analyzed, the number of services and facilities and the quality of infrastructure system should be determined. Problems and needs of the physical conditions should be revealed with respect to the inhabitants’ thoughts.

Social structure of each site should also be analyzed accordingly in this process. Social surveys and in-depth interviews are the basic tools for this kind of analysis. Revealing the relationship between the inhabitants and the place is as significant as determining social characteristic of inhabitants such as origin, education and income level etc. Inhabitant’s needs, concerns and problems should also be taken into consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines of Social Sustainability in the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of life</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving living conditions of inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development of different services (Schools, Leisure, Art &amp; Crafts, parks, sport &amp; recreation, shopping that the community needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouragement of creative activities by different facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhancement of living environment of the inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Designing Public open spaces and green areas provide buffer zones for social gathering and public interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing the utilization of physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eliminating the vacant and left-over spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing appropriate lighting at night in the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provision of local shops, benches, trees, gardens and recreational facilities that encourages people to walk and exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion of neighboring activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with features of the local built environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Built Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing plans with integration of surrounding areas and the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing environmentally sustainable features and qualified design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Designing easily distinguished public and private spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning schemes that encourage people to physical activities such as bicycling, walking, public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reducing vehicle traffic and designing adequate car parking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving the infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Newly built housing with certain environmental and design protocols and with respect to the existing fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proper infrastructure and sanitary conditions in the living environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation of local jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job opportunities for local graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allocation of commercial and production spaces, services for local business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traditional production and art &amp; craft activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workforce for the construction activities for the renovation of traditional fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender Equity in the Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Inclusion &amp; Social Interaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote partnership and community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Range of services and facilities which the individuals desire to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public facilities such as schools, medical centers, sport facilities and community centers support leisure activity and improve the social attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing access and education well as cultural diversity and multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedestrian-oriented streetscapes could encourage outdoor activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase job opportunities related with heritage activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education &amp; Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of educational facilities within 500 or 15 min walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of children enrolled in schools inside the area should be increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training programmes for local production, local construction techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The after schools and youth development programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training programmes for disadvantaged or marginalized groups as well as women and minority groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workshops about the cultural and historical character of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum intrusion into natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maximum variation in a city’s physical, social and economic structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Efforts to create ecological system with attention to waste minimization and renewable water, energy and other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion of green spaces to promote the natural environment and foster recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Optimum balance between population and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimization of noise, air and visual pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building of health and wellness infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fairly Distributed Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participation of every member of the community in decision making process in conservation of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job opportunities and facilities close to the living areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public transportation should be provided with a manageable walking distance from the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local people should be allowed to visit access to the heritage buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Affordable access of heritage buildings to general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provision of disabled access for the people with special needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19: Principles for the Social Sustainability in Historic City Centers, (Developed by the Author in the light of theoretical researches)
As a result of these analyses, the site is evaluated with respect to the social sustainability factors and the related deficiencies and needs are revealed. In addition, values of each historic site should be defined by its inhabitants and stakeholders. Overlapping analysis, the values and evaluations of new alternatives for the conservation of historic urban landscapes are developed.

Conservation principles that are developed in this process should take social sustainability factors into the consideration. In order to develop quality of life the poor physical conditions of buildings and open areas should be enhanced in the light of the analysis. Housing and built environment should be improved according to the needs of the inhabitants. Public areas should be arranged for gathering people and promoting social interaction. Number of services and infrastructures should be handled according to the problems.

In addition, problems such as parking, air pollution should be overcome and precautions should be taken for the security of the site. Moreover, different facilities and activities should be provided for the increasing social interaction as well as social belonging. It should be guaranteed that everyone should be equally benefit from these services.

Inhabitants should be encouraged for understanding the site better with promoting education and skills. Different employment opportunities should be provided for different groups according to their abilities. Employment opportunities should also encourage inhabitants to use the potential of the site. Education related with the different employment opportunities should be provided by the local governments through workshops or meetings.
New alternatives should be discussed with local governments, experts and inhabitants in several meetings. Revision of the conservation principles should be arranged in the light of the discussions. After the revision of alternatives, responsibilities should be defined for different partners of the project including the inhabitants. Community should also be informed in every step of actions and further changes should be allowed according to the responses (Figure 20).
Figure 20: General Process for Developing Conservation Principles for Historic Urban Landscapes, Source Author
CHAPTER 3

THE CASE OF SAKARYA QUARTER IN ANKARA: A HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE WITHIN A CHANGING BIG CITY

3.1. Understanding the Place

According to general guidelines, tools and process for the social sustainability in historic urban landscapes that defined in the theoretical background, understanding the place with all its aspects is an important step in order to develop specific principles, strategies and proposals for each specific historic urban landscape. Within this, the general characteristic of the case study area, Sakarya Quarter is revealed including its physical, visual, functional and social aspects.

3.1.1 Location of the Site

Sakarya Quarter is located at the historic center of Ankara, Ulus. It’s being close to the two important attraction points, namely as Ankara Citadel and Hacıbayram, increases the significance of the area. Surrounded by the traditional fabric on north, the location of the site is on the axis between Citadel and Cebeci. The site is surrounded by two important roads: On the north, Ulucanlar Avenue mostly shaped by new high-rise apartments with commercial activities on their ground floors is located. The south boundary of site is defined by Talatpaşa Boulevard, on which Karacabey Bath which located. On the other side of Talatpaşa Boulevard, Hamamönü district takes place. The site reaches through Altındağ Municipality on the west.
On the other side of Talatpaşa Boulevard, Hamamönü district takes place. Hamamönü district which was a traditional residential area formerly; is now one of the most important attraction points for local tourists. Hacettepe University Hospital is another important facility that enlivens the area through students (Figure 21).

Figure 21: Sakarya Quarter With its Surrounding (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)

Figure 22: Sakarya Quarter With its Surrounding 2 (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)
Being close to the city center and new development areas, location of the area allows easy access to surrounding health services, administrative, commercial, educational, cultural networks in Ulus (Figure 23-27).

Figure 23: Commercial Network around Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)
Figure 24: Educational Network around Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)

Figure 25: Cultural Network around Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)
Figure 26: Health Network around Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)

Figure 27: Sports and Parking Areas around Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)
3.1.2 **Historical Background**

Located on the important trade routes and settled on the fertile lands; Ankara, one of the oldest cities in Anatolia, hosted many civilizations throughout the years. The Hittites were the first civilization that settled in Ankara in 20th century BC. Its capital –Hattutas- is 200 km away from Ankara. After the break down of Hittites in 12th century BC Phrgians, Lydians, Persians ruled the city.

Under the reign of Persians, Ankara became an important trade center on Royal Road. When Alexander the Great ended the reign of Persians on 4th century BC, Royal Road had lost its importance, though Ankara kept its strategic location on important roads (Aktüre, 1999: 6). When Anatolia was conquered by Roman Empire on 3rd century BC, Ankara became the capital of Galatian state. City expanded through piedmont outside the castle and new settlements were surrounded by an outer city wall (Aktüre, 1978: 110).

Ankara kept its strategic importance until the end of Byzantine period. After Byzantines, Ankara could not gain its importance back until Seljukids. In Seljukid period, city has developed and the castle was reconstructed. Before the Ottoman Period city was governed by Ahi organization. Agricultural and commercial activities developed on this period. Leatherworking and angora wool became the main components of commercial.

Ankara entered a new era with Ottoman reign. It became a gathering center for military on Fatih Sultan Mehmet’s period. City expanded from the citadel in the north to the south with various edifices such as mosques, tombs and külliyes in 14th and 15th century. Establishment of Sakarya Quarter approximately dates back to these centuries. The district around Yeşil Ahi Mosque was known as “Ahi Hacı Murad Quarter” on that period (Aktüre, 1978:130).
The city has been the capital of state on Kanuni period. Population increased with economic activities based on weaving in international and national markets. In 16th century the area around citadel and Atpazari was called "Yukarıyüz" while the area around Hacibayram and Karacabey Mosque and Bath was called "Aşağıyüz" where Sakarya Quarter is situated (Kandemir, 1932:132).

Quarter settlements in Ankara varied according to the religious, ethnic and economic situation of different groups. The prestige of the quarters showed itself with the topographical settlement. While Muslim quarters were usually on the periphery of castle, Non-Muslims lived close to center (Tunçer, 2001:32). Most crowded quarters were the ones which were close to commercial centers or the ones which surrounded these centers. Quarters where certain business group lived in had also high population density. The area that defines Sakarya Quarter today was composed of several smaller districts. According to the old census recording that belongs at the end of 16th century, one of those districts known as Ahi Hacı Murad Quarter was the most crowded quarter because of the its closeness to important commercial centers which are Koyunpazarı and Tahta’l-kal’anın (Ergenç:1995). Angora weaving was a part of production branch. According to recordings of housing markets, Özer Ergenç (1995) stated that Ahi Hacı Murad Quarter was one the quarters in which houses had workplaces with 3-5 stalls for weaving (Figure 28).
Due to Jelali Revolts in the beginning of 17th century, development of economic activities reduced, bazaars and quarters around Karaoğlan, Samanpazarı and Karacabey Bath were fired. A third city wall was constructed due to the attacks. Simeon stated on his itinerary that angora weaving was still an important activity for the city.

Due to the economic recession in 18th and 19th century, khans and bedestens were closed while At Pazarı Meydanı, Koyun Pazarı Street, Sefa Street, Pirinç Street, Posta Street, Saraçlar Street, Çıkırıkçiler Yokuşu, Anafartalar Street and Ulucanlar Street kept its commercial characteristic (Önen Mimarlık, 2000:6). Narrow and unorganized streets; neglected and poor image of houses was the spatial and visual reflection of economic problems (Denel, 1981:129). Sevgi Aktüre (1978) described Ahi Haçı Murad Quarter in 19th century as a district of middle income level shaped by tradesman and craftsman (Figure 29).
The housing fabric was damaged by the fires on 1881 and 1917 and two third of the town was destroyed (Şahin Güçhan, 1995:59). After these fires, a new city image appeared with widened roads, rectangular parcels and new building heights.

When the railway was completed in 1893, the number of markets and shops increased. Population also increased with the migration from different places after the completion of railway. Due to the migrations, house plans in quarters in Kaleiçi and Kalealtı changed. Places for washing and storing angora located on the ground floor of houses became useless while introverted character of traditional houses with sofa and courtyard continued (Önen Mimarlık, 2000: 7, 8).

In the republican period the city started to develop from Citadel to the peripheries. With expansion of the city to Yenişehir and Çankaya, Ulus and citadel lost its central characteristic which caused the neglection of the historic center. The districts that constitute the current area of Sakarya Quarter were defined in 1924 Ankara Map.
After the development of new plans for Ankara, the districts names changed. Up to 2007, the boundaries of Sakarya Quarter was composed of 8 smaller quarters namely as Çimentepe, Alpaslan, Oğuz, Akbaş, Turan, Özbekler, Nazim Bey and Akalar. In order to increase the quality of services, these quarters are unified by Altındağ Municipality and the area started to be called as Sakarya Quarter (Figure 31).
3.1.3 Conservation and Planning Activities in Ankara and Their Effects to Sakarya Quarter

In the beginning of the Republican period Ankara had a poor physical appearance and it did not have enough housing stock for the increasing population. As the new capital city and the new administrative center, a planned development became a necessity for Ankara. Therefore, many different plans were proposed for the city development.

First plan for Ankara in the republican period was made by Carl Christoph Lörcher in 1924. New center was proposed around the central station. Handling the old historic center and new settlement areas together, plan arranged lands for the new public buildings (Günay, 2012:5).

According to Lörcher plan, old building blocks are not enough for a new business center and old city pattern should be transformed. It was the main principal for Ulus and its surrounding. Only areas which thought to be protected were Ankara Castle, İstiklal Mahallesi and a part of Hacibayram. With respect to Lörcher Plan, Talatpaşa Boulevard and İstasyon Street was determined; Samanpazarı and Hamamönü was connected with Kazım Karabekir Street. Plan also suggested a new housing area called Yenişehir that shaped today’s Kızılay-Sıhhiye.
The idea for demolitions of historic city was found radical and inapplicable, while the proposal for Yenişehir was found appropriate (Gökçe, 2008:57). Due to the fact that plan had no perspective for the expansion of city, another plan was needed for the development of the city (Günay, 2012:5).

To develop a new master plan for Ankara, a competition was held in 1928 and three different proposals were asked for urban planners from European countries. Among these 3 plans, Herman Jansen’s plan was selected. Being one of the most important studies for the development of the city, Jansen Plan’s approach was to protect the historic urban fabric of Ankara including the Sakarya Quarter and expand the city around Ankara Citadel. Expanding form was planned with green belts which divided the quarters and Ankara Boulevard would have worked as the transportation axis that connected the old and new city (Figure 32).

Although Jansen Plan proposed no change in historic urban fabric, it did not consider how to conserve these areas. In addition, the plan could not handle the unexpected growth in the population and lost its feasibility in following years so that some changes were occurred in the practice. Therefore the area around Hacıbayram and the west part of historic fabric were completely renewed which leaded continuous high-rise formation and inner zones were transformed into distressed areas (Gökçe, 2008:58).
Another competition was held in 1955 for the new master plan for Ankara. Yücel-Uybadin Plan which was the winner of this competition proposed a high-rise formation with gridal plan rather than protecting the historic urban fabric in Ulus. This approach leaded new high-rise settlement around the main axles at Ulus. In addition, Building Height Arrangement Plan that was approved in 1960 arranged the height and the density of the buildings in Ulus.
According to this plan, construction of 8-floor buildings was allowed along Talatpaşa Boulevard while construction of 6 floor buildings was allowed along Ulucanlar Street. Therefore, Sakarya Quarter which was composed of traditional fabric was squeezed by those high-rise blocks on these 2 axes, leading disharmony between new and traditional fabric. This situation continued until today due to properties composed of various pieces, division of buildings, illegal additions, lack of sources for maintenance and repair. Hacettepe University was established after destruction of Kurtuluş and Kırgız Quarters in 1960 (Gökçe, 2008:58).

Ankara Master Plan was developed in Ankara Metropolitan Office between 1969 and 1990. Having a new planning understanding and process, the plan proposed expansion of the city to the peripheries. Even though a competition was held in the context of this plan to expand Ulus to Kazıkiçi Area, this project could not find a chance to be practiced (Gökçe, 2008:60).

1990 Ankara Master Development Plan aimed to expand the city to the peripheries. This plan predicted the development of Ulus Historic Centre into the Kazıkiçi Area. For this purpose, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality has organized a competition in 1993. However, this project has never been implemented (İlçan&UTTA, 2012: 182).

At the end of 1980’s, important changes have been occurred in national economic politics concerning the responsibilities of local authorities. As a result, the boundaries of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality have been shaped. After the transfer of Ankara Metropolitan Master Plan Bureau to Ankara Metropolitan Municipality in 1984, Middle East Technical University City and Regional Planning Department was asked to develop an upper scale plan for 2015 in order to develop a legal document for Ankara Urban Transport Plan and Subway Project. According to this plan new metropolitan boundaries were defined that included settlements on the peripheries while Ankara West Corridor was defined as a central axis that decentralized the city (Ceylan: 2003).
After 1990 Master Plan, in order to solve the problems related with changing city dynamics and macro form and to stop uncontrolled development, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality started planning studies for 2025, in 1993. 2025 Ankara Master Plan contributed the development of the South West Corridor of the city. It also aimed to eliminate the unbalanced development of residential and industrial areas. Another principle of this plan was the continuation of the idea in the 1990 Master Plan that promoted city development through corridors. However, this plan is criticized by the lack of theoretical background and unification that would guide the development dynamics of the city (Günay, 2005).

While 1990 Ankara Master Development Plan and Planning Studies for 2015 and 2025 Ankara Master Plan proposed the expansion of city macro form, they did not propose a concrete solution for the conservation of Ulus Historic Centre including Sakarya Quarter.

2023 Capital City of Ankara Master Development Plan Report has also mentioned Ulus Urban Conservation Site on its planning activities. According to the plan report, site management should be provided for historic, archeological sites in Ulus. The report suggested a comprehensive study that evaluates local characteristics and dynamic of the site. The financial and socio-economic of dimensions in the conservation as well as defining the relations with the rest of the city are suggested in order to create a unified conservation approach in the site. The planning report also suggested the collaboration of universities and scientific associations as well as Directorates of Conservation, Implementation and Supervision (KUDEB) while carrying out the projects related with the site. As a planning strategy, the preparation of a Conservation Development Plan for Ulus Urban Conservation Site was suggested in the plan report (İlçan&UTTA, 2012: 193).
Up to 1982, on which the Ankara Master Plan came into force, all the planning decision made for Ulus were limited as a part of development of the whole city. Starting from 1972, the study of High Council of Immovable Monuments and Antiquities specially focused on Ulus in the context of ‘conservation’. In the following years, it was decided that the conservation activities should be continued with respect to a plan. In addition, Middle East Technical University suggested that all the planning decisions should have ‘site’ understanding. With respect to this understanding, the decision of ‘High Council of Immovable Monuments and Antiquities’ for Conservation and Development Plan of Ankara Historic Centre was approved in 1980 and site boundaries were defined for historic center of Ankara.

According to this decision, 1\(^{st}\), 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) Degree Urban Conservation Site and 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) Archeological Site were determined. Except the public schools on south boundary of the area that were built after 1930, all of the area in Sakarya Quarter was defined in the 2\(^{nd}\) Degree Urban Conservation Site, while the only small part on the west side of Sakarya Quarter was determined in the Archeological Site. Sakarya Quarter kept its boundaries with the following decisions of High Council of Immovable Monuments and Antiquities that were approved in 1985 and 1986 (İlcan&UTTA, 2010:196-200).
After determination of site areas, different projects were held in Ulus and its surrounding. Ankara Citadel Conservation Project, Hacibayram Conservation Project, Suluhan Pedestrian Project, Çıkrıkcılar Yokuşu Pedestrian Project, Anatolian Civilisations Museum Pedestrian Projects, Kar Yağdı Sultan Tomb Pedestrian Project, Hasircilar-Osmanlı Crossing Arrangement.
Other than the plans that studied city of Ankara as a whole, different plans were held for Ulus Historic City Centre Urban Conservation Site between 1990 and 2005. First of them, ‘Ulus Historic City Center Conservation an Improvement Plan’ prepared by Raci Bademli, was the winner of a competition organized Ankara Municipality Urban Planning and Reconstruction Directorate in 1986. The plan was approved in 1989 by the ‘Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage’. It supported the idea that Ulus should keep its central character together with Kızılay, therefore it should be conserved and improved. This plan expanded the 1st degree Urban Conservation Site in a way to cover Archeological Site and it proposed the cancellation of Building Height Arrangement Plan on Urban Conservation Site.

Ankara Municipality arranged another competition for Ankara Castle Conservation and Development Plan in 1988 in which Raci Bademli and his team from METU won the first prize. This plan suggested commercial, traditional production, touristic and cultural facilities at the outer part of the Citadel. In addition, plan proposed change of use in registered buildings as well as the buildings that should be conserved, environmental projects for squares, regulations in pedestrian and streets, promotion of tourism based use at the inner part of the Citadel (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:196-255).

While the studies on ‘Ankara Castle Conservation and Development Plan’ were still going on, ‘Ulus Historic City Center Conservation an Improvement Plan’ mostly focused on Hacı Bayram Mosque and its surrounding area. In the scope of ‘Ankara Old City Fabric Planning, Rehabilitation and Conservation Project’, the preparation of ‘Hamamönü and its Surrounding Conservation Development Plan’ was brought up in 1997 and it was found appropriate in principle in 2003.

‘Ankara Old City Fabric Planning, Rehabilitation and Conservation Project’ and the projects prepared for İnci and Dutlu Streets evaluated in 2004 by Ankara Cultural and Natural Assets Conservation Board and found appropriate. Later the plan was approved by Altındağ Municipality in 2006, however it was not approved by Ankara Metropolitan Municipality so that the plan could not be in force (Figure 34).
The area that was studied by this plan consisted of the south and east side of the Citadel as well as a part of ‘Ulus Historic Centre Urban Conservation Site’. Plan proposed 4 different zones defined as ‘vitalization zones’, ‘new construction zones’, ‘new project zones’ and ‘comprehensive transformation zones’ (Sudan: 2012: 40-41). According to this categorization different vitalization zones, new construction zones and new project zones were defined for Sakarya Quarter. Valorization zones were determined as the “areas to encourage of function transformation”. Commercial activities, pensions, restaurants, coffee shops, culture-art centers were given priorities on this zone. In addition, different settlement conditions were proposed according to different uses (socio-cultural, recreational, commercial etc.) at the new construction zones. Settlements on this zone were thought to be arranged by the current lot organizations or new lot organizations consolidated by different lots. Moreover, lots on the new projects zones were thought to be consolidated or expropriated (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:259-260).
Due to its preparation with respect to planning legislation and limitations in 1980’s and the high cost of expropriation, ‘Ulus Historic City Center Conservation and Improvement Plan’ faced difficulties in practice in the following 15 years in which it was in force. Therefore, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality cancelled this plan on 14\textsuperscript{th} January 2005.

After the cancellation of ‘Ulus Historic City Center Conservation and Improvement Plan’, Altındağ Municipality started the studies for a new conservation development plan to create “Urban Transformation and Development Project Area” by defining Ulus Historic city center as “Renewal Area” in the name of law. No 5366 “Law Concerning and Use by Perpetuating of Worn-out Historic and Cultural Immovable Objects”.

To carry out the planning studies for the renewal area, a contract was signed with Hassa Mimarlık Mühendislik İnşaat San. Ve Tic. Ltd.in 2006 (Sudan: 2012: 41).

The conservation strategy of this plan focused on conserving various urban and architectural characteristic from different periods that created the historic diversity of Ulus. These periods were defined as Roman Period, Seljuk-Ottoman Period as well as Early Republican Period. In addition to overcome the problems related with dysfunction and subsidence, it was aimed to create commercial, touristic, cultural and recreational areas by restoring or reconstructing with respect to residential, commercial and cultural development of the site as well as creating new transportation decisions (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:272).

With respect to the strategies mentioned above in the plan report for ‘Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal Area Conservation Master Plan and Conservation Plan’, traditional residential areas were defined in two groups namely as ‘Residential Areas to be Conserved” and “Residential Areas to be Renewed”. Citadel and Hamamönü area including the Sakarya Quarter were defined as “Residential Areas to be conserved” and the sustainability of the traditional residential function of these areas were supported. Other than registered lots or the lots to be conserved, the lots for new buildings were proposed with a planning strategy in which the formation of these new buildings should not follow any standardization but should reference the surrounding traditional fabric of each building. In addition the formation along the Ulucanlar Street was limited to 3 storey height in order to eliminate the negative effects on the area between Talatpaşa Boulevard and Citadel including Sakarya Quarter.
The planning decisions were criticized by different institutions such as Chamber of City, Gazi University Faculty of Engineering-Architecture, Department of City and Urban Planning; Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Architecture. The general opinion was that the plan was inappropriate with the legislation as well as it was lack of a participatory planning process. While Gazi University stated that 1/5000 Conservation Master Plan and 1/1000 Conservation Development had components against principles of legislation, conservation, city planning, public interest; METU mentioned that the preparation of these plans were vague in terms of legal framework and the planning process were lack of analysis and evaluation phase on which the planning decisions did not stand on an accurate base (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:279-280).

In spite of many criticism, objections and due process; ‘Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal Area Conservation Master Plan and Conservation Plan’ was approved by Council of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality on 15 June 2007. However, Chamber of City and Regional Planning, Ankara Branch resorted to the judgment stating the inappropriateness and contradictions on the legislation during the preparation and approval process. In addition, it was stated that the plan neglected the previous conservation plans, analysis and evaluations and general conservation principles by damaging the archeological site as well as demolishing the many important buildings for Ulus. All these objections resulted in the favor of Chamber of City and Regional Planning, Ankara Branch and ‘Ankara Historic City Centre Urban Renewal Area Conservation Master Plan and Conservation Plan’ was cancelled so that Ulus Historic City Center did not have conservation site plan anymore (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:288-292).

Due to the fact that Ulus had no longer a conservation plan, ‘Ankara Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage and Renewal Area’ determined ‘Transition Period Conservation Principles and Terms of Use’ on 18 December 2008 for Urban Conservation Site which includes Ulus, Hamamönü and Citadel Area.
The principles and terms concerned the use site area, repair of registered and non-registered buildings and approach of these buildings in different situations such as fire, demolition etc., new settlements, monuments in the site area, green areas, infrastructure, urban landscape and street furniture and so on.

Council of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality defined the boundaries for ‘Ulus Historic City Centre Renewal Area’ including 130 hectares in Ulus and Citadel Area. Ulucanlar and Hamamönü area were left out of Renewal Area with the decision of Council of Ministers on January 21st 2010. In addition, on 12 December 2010, ‘Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage’ decided that ‘Transition Period Conservation Principles and Terms of Use’ concerning the urban conservation site on which Hamamönü and Ulucanlar were left out from the Renewal area were appropriate. Chamber of City and Regional Planning asked for the cancellation of ‘Transition Period Conservation Principles and Terms of Use’ on 26 June 2011 (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:295-300).

The project for ‘Ulus Historic City Centre, Conservation Development Plan’ on 1/5000 scale was tendered to UTTA Planlama, Projelendirme&Danışmanlık Ltd. ŞTİ on 17 March 2011. Although the plan was approved by Council of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality on 15 March 2013, Ankara Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage No.2 demanded the some changes related to plan on the council meetings. When the changes are done, the suitability of the plan was accepted by the Regional Council on 18 December 2013. After the publishing the banns, the petition of objection were taken into consideration by Council of Municipality and the corrections related to these objections were corrected by UTTA. Although the plan was approved for the second time on February 2015 by Council of Municipality, the lawsuits still go on due to the objections of Chamber of Architects related to some registration decisions on the plan (İlçan&UTTA).
Due to the long lawsuit process, implementation projects that derived from an integrated Conservation Development Plan for Ulus Historic Centre are beside the point right now.

Lack of an approved Conservation Development Plan, many public institutions such as Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ankara Governorship, Altındağ Municipality and Directorate General of Foundations held different implementation projects at Ulus Historic City Centre piecemeal.

Among these projects, Altındağ Municipality was responsible for Street Rehabilitation Project in Hamamönü area. The aim of this project is to regenerate Hamamönü Area, on which its traditional urban fabric for were neglected for many years, with respect to its historic characteristic, to create a livable environment by façade and street rehabilitations and to transform this area into an attraction point for tourists. In this scope, implementations were held in 85 edifices at Dutlu Street, İnci Street, Fırın Street, İnanlı Street and Mehmet Akif Street and 138 edifices in Hamamönü Street, Can Street and At Pazarı Street. The projects being held at the Sarıkadın Street, Koyun Pazarı Streets, Filiz Street, Kurnaz Street and Sarıca Street are almost finished. The restoration projects of Karacabey Complex, Tacettin Mosque and Mehmet Akif Ersoy House are completed (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:306-308).

Although the implementation projects in Hamamönü were found successful in order to create a more livable environment and enliven the area as well as creating new job opportunities for different groups, they are criticized negatively from many other aspects.

One of the main criticisms was related with the technical aspect of these projects. Reconstructing prototyped replicas using traditional material and construction techniques, the interventions was lack of technical and scientific approach and did not respect the traditional urban fabric (Sudan: 2012: 144).
The other criticism was related with the transformation on the image of this area. While Hamamönü had a traditional character mostly composed of residential building before the implementations, it was transformed into an attraction point for tourist.

Most of the residential buildings were expropriated so that the tenants who lived in that area had to leave their houses. Therefore, most of the buildings were begun to be used for commercial purposes. These transformations on which stakeholders were not taken into consideration caused a severe change in the social structure of this area (Figure 35).

Figure 35: Hamamönü Area Before/After Implementations. Source: Altındağ Municipality.

After the implementations in Hamamönü, the studies continued at Sakarya Quarter. The implementation projects around Karacabey Complex and its surrounding, the Street Rehabilitation Project on Gebze Street and İnci Street together the restorations of a few mosques on this area are almost finished. While some of the buildings on this area kept its residential function, the lots expropriated by Altındağ Municipality are reserved for the utilization of different associations, private offices and restaurants. By the year 2015, the implementations of the area between İnci and Gebze Streets are the latest agenda of Altındağ Municipality (Figure 36).
Figure 36: Implementations of Different Institutions on Sakarya Quarter. Source: Ankara Ulus Historic City Centre Urban Conservation Site Development Plan Report, İlçan M&Planlama, Projelendirme, Danışmanlık, UTTA (2010).
Figure 37: Ongoing/Completed Implementation Projects in Sakarya Quarter. Source: Author and METU Graduate Program of Restoration, 2014.

Figure 38: Some of the Rehabilitated Buildings in Sakarya Quarter Utilized by Different Associations, Source: Author.
Figure 39: Latest Situation of the Implementations Projects in Sakarya Quarter, (Showing the Situation on May 2015), Prepared by Author, Base Map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Figure 40: Timeline for Conservation and Planning Activities Related with Sakarya Quarter
3.1.4 Current Situation of Sakarya Quarter

In order to evaluate the site and create strategies in the most efficient way, different characteristic that reflect the current situation of Sakarya Quarter should be determined. In this content, physical, visual and functional characteristics as well as the socio demographical characteristic of the community should be determined. After the analysis on general characteristic of Sakarya Quarter, a general assessment will be done regarding to the social sustainability factors so that more efficient strategies and actions can be generated for the conservation of Sakarya Quarter.

3.1.4.1 Physical, Visual and Functional Characteristics of the Site

Sakarya Quarter is situated between two main axis namely as Ulucanlar Avenue and Talatpaşa Boulevard. The level difference between Ulucanlar Avenue and Sakarya Quarter that shaped by the natural topography lines weakens the site’s relationship with north. However, this situation enables qualified panoramic views and vistas from Ulucanlar Avenue (Figure 41-43).

Figure 41: Panoramic View of Sakarya Quarter from Hacıayvaz Mosque. Source: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio of 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Sakarya Quarter is mostly composed of traditional residential fabric. One of the main elements that constitute the urban fabric of Sakarya Quarter is the narrow streets defined by the continuous walls of the traditional houses or courtyards. There are also streets defined by open spaces on one side. At Ulucanlar Avenue and Talatpaşa Boulevard, the streets are wider and defined by high buildings. The pedestrian and vehicular density in the site is usually lower than the main roads which surrounded the site. The vehicular and pedestrian density in the site gets denser around public schools that are close to these 2 main axes. Although the narrow streets are not very suitable for vehicle access, the vehicle density is usually medium or low on those areas (Figure 44).

Perception of the streets is enriched by the colorful courtyard or building walls, projections or the trees extended from courtyards. These streets are usually used by the inhabitants for both access and social interaction.
Figure 43: Street Pattern in Sakarya Quarter, Prepared by Author, Base Map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio of 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration, Photographs: Author
Figure 44: Traffic Type and Density in Sakarya Quarter, Source: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio of 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
At the intersection of the streets; nodes and ‘meydans’³ are located as important gathering points surrounded by monumental and religious buildings, fountains as well as shops and those places are also used for gathering (Figure 45). Gardens of the schools and mosques are other public open spaces. Some of these public spaces are also used for car parking area. Other than these defined open areas, there are lots of empty lots scattered in the site that disrupt the visual image of the site as well as having a potential for security problems (Figure 46). These empty lots are being used as parking areas. Pavement materials of the open areas are verified as stone, screed, earth and asphalt.

Figure 45: Public Open Areas in Sakarya Quarter, Prepared by Author, Base Map, Photos: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration

³ “Meydan” is an Arabic word suggests a place where people congregate and compete, a sort of area or square.
The current function of the buildings varies in the site. While the area mostly constitutes of traditional residential buildings, commercial, educational, cultural and administrative buildings are also scattered around the site. Most of the buildings are constructed with traditional construction and material techniques.

Mostly built in 19th and 20th century, traditional residential buildings show the main characteristics of Ankara houses. They are mostly 2 or 3 storey houses with courtyards. They are built in stone or mud brick masonry or timber frame with brick or mud brick infill. Buildings can be situated in the courtyard or main facade or side faces can face to street. Main buildings may also sit on the whole lot (Figure 47).
Courtyards are important architectural elements in the traditional residential buildings (Figure 48). Courtyard is defined as the part of the lot that is connected to street where vehicles, animals, well, tandır⁴ and toilet take place. It is determined as the extension of rural lifestyle to the urban site as a part of the production based lifestyle. Garden, on the other hand, is determined as the small part of the courtyard on which vegetables and flowers are planted. It is mentioned that the size of the courtyard and gardens are related with whether the owners are consumers or producers (Tuncer, 2002:46). Materials of courtyard walls can be brick, mud brick, and rubble or cut stone. In some cases these materials are used together. Some courtyard walls have wall copings covered with pan tile.

---

⁴ Tandır: oven consisting of a clay-lined pit or a large, earthen jar buried in the ground
Figure 48: Courtyards in Sakarya Quarter, Prepared by Author, Base Map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
“Taşlık”⁵ is placed at the ground floor providing service spaces for upper floors. While kitchen is placed on a thick wall nearby the taşlık on the courtyard, it is situated in the ground floor if it is inside the house. Toilets are also situated at the courtyard for hygienic purposes. However, after the 19th century toilets became the part of the interior plan scheme.

While the ground floor is usually designed for service and storage, first floor is composes of a sofa on which the daily activities take place and the surrounding rooms for sitting, sleeping, eating and hosting.

Projections are important facade elements of the houses. The projection of Ankara Houses set in layers corbelled on top of each other. This special type of projection is called “Ankara Projection”. Beside “Ankara Projection” there are projection with bracings and covering. Their plan types can be triangular or rectangular. Even if it is not common as closed projections, open projections are also used in the later period buildings. Open or closed, projections enrich the mass configuration of houses and the perception of streets (Figure 49).

![Figure 49: Projections, Source: Author](image)

---

⁵ Taşlık: courtyard or entrance hall paved with stones, Source: http://www.sozlusu.com/turkce_kurtce_sozluk-107/ta%C5%9Fl%C4%B1k-anlami-1-2.html
Doors and windows are other important features of the facades. While the courtyard doors are usually wooden batten or wooden paneled, entrance doors are wooden and have two wings. In some cases, there is top window on the entrance doors.

Some of the houses have stairs that emphasize the entrance. The windows are usually smaller and in square shape in ground floor, while upper floor windows are wider and their proportions are \( \frac{1}{2} \) or \( \frac{1}{4} \). Long and narrow ones can be sash or winged. Sash windows with pediment, profile or arch are dated in late Ottoman Period. Wooden or metal railing and shutters are other elements of the window. Eaves on top of building that are straight and inclined downwards or upwards are other architectural elements on the facade. Moreover, variety in facade color of the houses also enriches the urban fabric.

Mass configuration of the traditional houses are conserved or almost conserved with minor additions or removals that do not change the legibility of the houses. While changes on the facades usually occur with minor changes in finishing materials and/or material and/or proportion of architectural elements, some buildings are separated vertically and/or horizontally on the plan for accommodating different households. However, street rehabilitation projects around Karacabey Bath held by Altındağ Municipality that constructed prototyped replicas using traditional material and construction techniques do not match with the intact characteristic of rest of the site.

The overall structural and material conditions of the houses according to the surveys held by METU Graduate Program of Restoration in 2014, most of the surveyed buildings are in good condition in terms structure and material with minor finishing problems or have surface deterioration in material. There are also buildings with slight structural problems or material decay that needs simple repair. Buildings that have severe structural and material problems or partially/totally collapsed buildings lost their functionality and need detailed repair.
In addition, the sanitary conditions of most of the buildings that interior survey sheets were applied have low spatial adequacy. Due to this fact, sanitary conditions need to be designed in a new place or need repair (Figure 50).

Figure 50: Structural Conditions of Buildings in Sakarya Quarter, Source: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Sakarya Quarter has high density of religious buildings. Due to the lack of public open areas, religious buildings that scattered around the site become important gathering places for the inhabitants. While most of the restoration projects of mosques have begun, some of them are completed (Figure 51).
Figure 51: Religious Buildings in Sakarya Quarter, Prepared by Author, Base map: METU Graduate Program of Restoration, 2014, Photos: http://www.envanter.gov.tr/, last accessed on 25.01.2015)
Karacabey Bath that locates on Talatpaşa Boulevard is an important attraction point for visitors. Constructed in 1444 by Karaca Bey, it is a part of Karacabey Complex. Square planned dressing rooms have mud brick walls and roof, while other part was built in rubble stone masonry and have brick superstructures on top. Hamamönü and Hamamarkası districts take their names from this bath. Its restoration project was held by Altındağ Municipality and it serves for both women and men (Figure 52).

Figure 52: Karacabey Bath Before Intervention (http://yavuziscen.blogspot.com) and Karacabey Bath Today (www.tarihikaracebeyhamami.com)

Fountains are other important features of the urban fabric. Öksüzce Fountain was built in 1784 with large stone blocks and has a niche with pointed arch. Kadıoğlu Fountain was built in 15th-16th century with cut stone and brick. Today, its upper part is being used as a balcony by the dwelling that built adjacent to it. Yeşil Ahi Fountain was built in 17th-18th century with large cut stones and brick. Although all three fountains are not in use today, they define the intersection of streets and create nodes for social interaction (Figure 53).
In addition to the fountains being used as a part of dwelling, use of spolia in some buildings also reflects the multilayered character of the area throughout the history.

The area also has high density of public schools. İnönü Primary School, Cebeci Primary School and Cumhuriyet Primary School are the public schools around the site. Especially Cebeci Primary School is an important building from Republican Period. Designed by Bruno Taut and Franz Hillinger, Cebeci Primary School is one of the representative examples for educational buildings in Turkey with its rational and functional character (Goethe-Institute Ankara:2010).
Having the architectural characteristics of Republican Period, the schools provide the education for children as well as working as gathering places for both children and their parents (Figure 55).

Figure 55: Educational Buildings in Sakarya Quarter, Prepared by Author, Base Map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration,
While the site is mostly composed of traditional buildings, new settlement is usually formed on Ulucanlar Avenue and Talatpaşa Boulevard. New buildings have 10-12 stories with 30-35 m height. While their ground floors are used for commercial activities, upper floors are usually used for residential purposes (Figure 56).

![Figure 56: New Building Along Ulucanlar Avenue, Source: Author](image1)

In addition to the buildings in the peripheries, there are also few new buildings in the site which are not harmonious with the historic tissue. In spite of these new buildings, it is observed that the overall image of the traditional fabric is conserved (Figure 57).

![Figure 57: New Building in Site That Are Nor Harmonious With Traditional Tissue, Source: Author.](image2)
As a result of the analysis on the physical, visual, functional aspect of the place are revealed. It could be stated that Sakarya Quarter has a central location. Creating an axis between Hamamönü and Ankara Citadel, the area is defined by two important roads which provide easy access to different services. With its street pattern, public open spaces, traditional buildings together with its courtyards, religious and educational buildings it can be said that the site mostly conserved its traditional character. However, the site is threatened by the new development and implementations on its surroundings areas.

3.1.4.2 Social Characteristics of the Site

In order to reveal the social characteristic of the site, social surveys were applied to inhabitants by the author with the collaboration of METU Graduate Program of Restoration 2014, REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio. 53 questionnaires were applied to inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter. While 46 of them were held with users of residential buildings, the rest was held with users of commercial buildings. The outcomes of the study were documented by REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014 using GIS and utilized as a source in this study. In addition, Ulus Historic Centre Urban Conservation Plan Report prepared by UTTA Planning, Architecture, Urban Design & Consulting LTD. Co. was also used as a source while revealing the social characteristic of the site.

Having around 10000 inhabitants in its boundary, Sakarya Quarter is the second most crowded neighborhood in Ulus Urban Conservation Site after Ankara Castle (Figure 58). Although it is hard to estimate the exact settled population due to the hospitals, dormitories and administrative institutions in Ulus, distribution of population with respect to neighborhoods are determined by the headman of the each district (İlçan & UTTA, 2010:111).
According to Ulus Historic Centre Urban Conservation Plan Report, %53.20 of the population of Ulus Historic Centre is man while %46.80 of the population is woman. Due to the fact that Ulus has a central location and provide job and accommodation opportunities for people with low income groups, the man population is mostly composed of young population with 20-14 age range (Figure 59). This young male population is usually composed of unskilled labors. On the other hand 30-34 age range comes forward in the female population (İlçan&UTTA, 2010:109).
Both in Sakarya Quarter and Ulus Historic Center, the education level is low. While only %0.75 of the population is illiterate in Sakarya Quarter, most of the population graduated from primary school (Figure 60).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Sakarya (%)</th>
<th>Kale (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okur yazan olmayan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okur yazan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İlköğretim</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>67.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lise veya Dendi okul</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>67.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Üniversite</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>67.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toplam</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 60: Level of Education: Source: İlçan&UTTA,

The population of Sakarya Quarter has low income level like the other neighborhoods in Ulus Historic Center. The average income is around the minimum wage level. According to the survey that was held by the METU Graduate Program of Restoration in 2014, the most of the population have income level between 1000-1500 TL (Figure 61).

Figure 61: Income Level in Sakarya Quarter. Source: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
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The working field of Ulus Historic Center is mostly composed of service and manufacturing sectors. While manufacturing industry becomes ahead of the sector distribution, it is followed by wholesale and retail sale trade and construction works. Public services, transportation, communication and storage are the other important sectors in Ulus (Figure 62).

![Sectoral Distribution in Ulus](image)

Figure 62: Sectorial Distribution in Ulus Historic Center, Source: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration

Most of the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter are from nearby cities of Ankara. While the migration from Konya become ahead of this distribution, Kayseri, Niğde, Çorum are the other cities which inhabitants migrate from (Figure 63).

On the other hand, it is realized that the original habitants of Sakarya Quarter are less in number. It is also determined that people from other districts of Ankara like Kızılcahamam and Beypazarı choose to live in this site.
There are several reasons for the site selection. The most common reason is the job opportunities related with the central location around Citadel and historic city center. The other reason affecting site selection is the suggestion of relatives. People who already live in the area are usually so pleasant that they suggest the site to their relatives. Due to the fact that Hamamönü region has turned into a recreational area and lost its residential character after implementation projects, some people who had lived in Hamamönü chose moving to Sakarya Quarter (Figure 64).
Duration of inhabitance is variable in the site. As well as there are people who have been living in Sakarya Quarter over 25 years, there are also people who move to the area on late years. Although many people come from outside lately, there is a social cohesion between the people who live in the area for years and the people who move to area later from outside (Figure 65).
When the occupancy status is analyzed, it is determined that tenants constitute the majority the people on which the survey is made with (Figure 66).
According to the number of occupants per house, a dwelling is mostly shared by 3-5 persons. This number is followed by 2 persons per dwelling. From this result, it could be determined that the dwellings are not in over use and can fulfill the existing inhabitant capacity (Figure 67).

![Figure 67: Number of Occupants, Source: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration](image)

### 3.2 Re-Understanding the Place through its Inhabitants

The assessment of the Sakarya Quarter by its inhabitants is determined according to the surveys and in-depth interviews held with various people from the site. In the content of this study, the needs, concerns, opinions of inhabitants related with their living environment are revealed.

The study also enables to capture their way of living and using the way of using the site in order to develop healthier strategies for this community.

According to the surveys, most of the inhabitants are pleasant living in this site and have a high sense of belonging. Because of the fact that they adjust the way of living in Sakarya Quarter, most of the inhabitants do not prefer moving outside the neighborhood (Figure 68).
People who wish to move outside the site mentioned that they would prefer the better life conditions and quality that an apartment flat would provide. Most of the problems of inhabitants are related with the bad physical conditions in the houses. Sanitary conditions and roofs are the most problematic issues and most of the repairs are held at these parts of the traditional houses. However, most of the people are incapable of affording the repair costs for worsening conditions of traditional houses and not aware of the loans or funds provided by different institutions. The other consideration of the inhabitants is the vacant and neglected houses that affecting the overall image of the site. They wish that these buildings should be rehabilitated for creating a better living environment.

Another major concern of the inhabitants is related with the heating system. The entire houses use coal or wood for heating which causes air pollution. Inhabitants mentioned that they would prefer natural gas for heating in their neighborhood. Some of the inhabitants also concern about the car parking areas scattered all around their neighborhood. They need a limitation of the vehicle access and car parking in order to make the open areas more spacious.
Another reason people do not wish to move out is the peaceful and harmonious environment they built with their neighbors. Most of the inhabitants mentioned that one of the most important things they would appreciate in their neighborhood is the close relationship with their neighbors. On the other hand, inhabitants that have been living for longer years in Sakarya Quarter are not pleasant the fact that most of their previous neighbors had moved to other place. Despite this fact, people who live in the area for many years and the people who come outside on later years live in cohesion.

![Social Interaction Places](image)

**Figure 69: Social Interaction Places, Source: Author.**

Places that inhabitants would prefer to interact vary according to the gender and age. Women mostly prefer to gather on their houses, courtyards. Doorsteps and streets are other important places that women choose for interaction (Figure 70).

Women also stated that Kanuni Sabuni Mosque is an important node for them to gather especially in summer time. In addition, preachments organized weekly at Yeşil Ahi Mosque create opportunities women to come together.
On the other hand, men in Sakarya Quarter usually prefer to socialize in “Kahvehane” on the İnci Street that looks one of the main squares in the neighborhood. Mosques are other important gathering places for men. For special occasion like wedding, engagements and ceremonies, inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter use the main squares of the neighborhood.

Although the people in Sakarya Quarter are able to gather on different places in the site, they are need in of open green area on which they can sit and relax. On the in-depth interviews with some of the inhabitants stated that instead of going surrounding areas like Mehmet Akif Park, they would prefer an open area in their own site. They also added that the triangular shape “meydan” in front of “kahvehane” used to be green but now its physical characteristics has changed after its renovation and it do not serve as a open green area any longer.

Besides men and women, children usually prefer to play on streets. Especially the streets around the main squares enable children to ride bicycle. Other than the streets, gardens of public schools other interaction places for the children (Figure 71).

---

6 “Kahvehane” is a place where people can socialize, chat or play table games while drinking their tea, coffee or beverages.
One of the biggest considerations for the children of Sakarya Quarter is the lack of a playground area reserved only for them in order to play as they wish. According to children, one of the vacant lots can be used for this reason. Football, volleyball and basketball ground and swimming pools are other wishes of children related with the site. Mehmet Ali Küçükay (9) states that they are surrounded by the concrete buildings and car parking areas all around; they also want a green area for relaxing and breathing (Figure 72-73).
Although they want to spend most of the time in their neighborhood, inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter benefit from different services and facilities around the neighborhood. They usually go Samanpazarı or Cebeci Pazarı for shopping as well as the markets at Talatpaşa Boulevard and Ulucanlar Street. Inhabitants benefit from various the hospitals around their area. They stated that their relatives also visit themselves to go to these hospitals for their health problems. Parks around Sakarya Quarter are other places that inhabitants choose to go for relaxing. Ulucanlar Children Park and Mehmet Akif Ersoy Park are two parks most inhabitants prefer to go. Hamamönü, Hacıbayram, Ankara Citadel, Anıtkabir, Atatürk Forest Farm and Zoo are other places that inhabitants are would prefer to visit (Figure 74).

![Figure 73: Pictures Drawn by the Children of Sakarya Quarter on What They Need in the Site, Source: Author.](image)

![Figure 74: Places for Visit Around Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author.](image)
Another important aspect on evaluation of the site is the consciousness of inhabitants on the reconstruction actions in Hamamönü. Although they appreciate the fact that the area is more organized, clean and more secure, majority of the people are not pleased about the changes in the social structure of the site.

Knowing the fact that the tenants had to leave their houses after the owners of the houses rent their properties to municipality for commercial and recreational purposes, the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter are afraid to encounter the same situation. Hanım Doğan (53) who runs a tailor shop stated that even if the buildings look more beautiful than before, it has no meaning of it when there is no inhabitant who lives in it. She also added that she does not want any more shops in the Hamamönü, but she wants to see the children running on the streets.

3.3 Assessing the Place

In the light of the analysis on understanding the general characteristic of Sakarya Quarter, general assessment are determined on the physical, visual, functional aspects of the place as well as the conservation activities of the local municipality so that values, problems and potentials of the place can be revealed to develop principles, strategies and proposals for Sakarya Quarter.

3.3.1 Assessment of the Physical, Visual, Functional Aspects of the Place through Social Sustainability Factors

In order to develop conservation principles and new alternatives for Sakarya Quarter with respect to social sustainability factors, an overall evaluation needs to be done in the light of the theoretical research and site analysis. Basic necessities to fulfill certain social sustainability criteria were discussed in the previous chapter of this study. Physical, functional, visual, socio-demographical characteristic of the site were determined in this chapter. In addition, the site was defined once again through the values, needs, and way of living, concerns and the problems of the inhabitants. As a result, values, problems, potential of the site will be revealed as a guide to develop new principles and alternatives for the future of the site.
Sakarya Quarter has a very central location. Accessibility to other important centers of Ankara can easily be provided by walk, bus, dolmuş and subway. The site has also easy access to the various important health services as well as educational, cultural, recreational facilities and parks. The central location of the area that provides different job opportunities is also an important reason for the inhabitants to choose Sakarya Quarter for living. As far as its location is concerned, it could be observed that the site can fulfill the accessibility factor, as well as contributing inhabitants’ quality of life. Despite its being surrounded by different networks, it can be said that Sakarya Quarter is not well integrated with its surrounding.

Although the site is located at the Ulus Historic Center, the traditional character of the surrounding area of the site has been damaged by the new development as well as the implementation actions which are lack of unified conservation approach.

Ulucanlar Avenue and Talatpaşa Boulevard that surround the Sakarya Quarter at the north and south, has mostly composed of new high-rise buildings. In addition, the implementations project that was held in Hamamönü by Altındağ Municipality has changed the physical, functional as well as the social characteristic of the site. Squeezed by the new developments and implementations, Sakarya Quarter managed to keep its traditional characteristic.

This situation gains Sakarya Quarter a special characteristic. However, this character of the site has been threatened by the implementations projects that are held as a continuation of the previous conservation actions. When Sakarya Quarter is evaluated in terms of the planning and conservation actions of its surrounding, it could be stated that conservation actions should be held with respect to conservation development plan that embrace a unified approach in urban scale. In addition, the conservation actions should follow a certain design guidelines that are prepared by experts in order to create a healthier housing and built environment for the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter.
Traditional fabric of Sakarya Quarter is mostly conserved except the ongoing rehabilitation projects around Karacahamam Bath and Gebze Street. The on-going projects followed the same technical approach with respect to material and construction technique. However, there has not been sudden change in the functional character at these areas. In this case, new approach should be developed with respect to the material, technique and architectural features of the site in the following actions. Moreover, the functional changes should not affect the unity the site.

Public open areas are important components of traditional urban fabric that promote social interaction in the site. Mostly street and nodes are social interaction points in daily life especially for women and children. On the other hand, squares are used as gathering places especially for special occasions and ceremonies. Although public areas are used as gathering points, the design of these areas does not specially lead people for gathering during daily activities.

Instead, social interaction of the inhabitants is shaped organically and randomly between inhabitants. In addition, there is a lack of open green areas that inhabitants could benefit. Inhabitants usually use the surrounding parks around the site.

In this sense, open spaces and green areas design should be reconsidered to create more suitable environment for gathering and social interaction. In addition, outdoor activities could be developed by the elaborately pedestrian-oriented design.

One of the problems related with the physical character of the site is the empty lots scattered around neighborhood. The empty lots not only disrupt the image of the area, but also endanger the safety of inhabitants. However, these empty lots could be transformed into defined areas that can be used for providing services for the inhabitants. In addition, demolished or partly demolished buildings in those empty lots should be regulated with certain design guidelines so that they can serve for the community of Sakarya Quarter in various purposes.
Sakarya Quarter has a high dense of religious buildings. Residential buildings not only serve as a place for religious practices but also a gathering place for both women and men. Considering the number of the religious buildings at the site, religious, it could be observed that these buildings have a potential to be used as for meetings or other organizations for the inhabitants on the decided schedule.

Residential buildings, where most of the daily life takes place, are one of the most significant features of the traditional fabric. As the extension of rural lifestyle to the urban site, traditional houses with courtyards are suitable for the production and storage activities. However, this characteristic of courtyards has lost its importance over time. In this sense inhabitants can be promoted to use courtyards more effectively.

Most of the residential buildings have minor or major material and/or structural problems that affect the inhabitants’ quality of life. For that reason, most of the buildings need maintenance and repair or extensive repair and restoration.

In addition, sanitary conditions of most of the houses should be improved in order to develop quality of life factor. However, low income of the inhabitants makes it difficult for them to afford these repairs. Considering this situation, different funding sources from should be introduced for the conservation actions for sustaining the physical characteristic of traditional fabric.

Infrastructure is another important subject affecting the built environment of the inhabitants. One of the main problems related with the infrastructure is the use of charcoal for the heating that causes air pollution at the site. Most of the inhabitants stated that they would prefer natural gas as the heating system for their residential buildings. Being a more practical heating system, natural gas would create a healthier building environment for the inhabitants.
Another problem related with the infrastructure is parking. Inhabitants usually prefer to park their vehicles on the vacant lots scattered in the site. Moreover, the traffic flow at the some narrow streets endangers the pedestrians flow. In this sense, parking areas and traffic flow should be organized more effectively in order to increase the quality of built environment. Another issue that should be taken into consideration related with the infrastructure is street lighting. As one of the elements that provide the safety in the built environments, street lightings should be designed appropriately and be empowered at insufficient places.

Sakarya Quarter serves different job opportunities to their inhabitants taking advantage of its central location. The working sectors are mostly based on manufacturing industry, who sale and retail sale trade. However, an organized system that supports the local production is not in question for those activities. In that sense, the allocation of commercial and production spaces as well as services local businesses are needed in order to enliven the economic activities in and around the site.

Construction and prosperity works are another important working sector in Ulus. However, inhabitants are usually labeled as unskilled workers in this sector.

Considering that Ulus has a rich traditional fabric which needs maintenance and repair, the skills of these workers can be improved to be used in related construction actions and an important economic source can be created for the inhabitants.

Another problem in employment conditions of Sakarya Quarter is the lack of the gender equity. While the most of the working group constitutes of men, most of the women do not have a job. In order to create equality in the economic activities, new job opportunities should be provided for the women. Being a suitable job opportunity for the women, traditional production as well as the art and craft activities has a strong potential to include women in the economic development of the site.
Considering the number of educational facilities in and around the site, it could be stated that Sakarya Quarter can fulfill basic conditions for education. However, the target group of these facilities is limited to youngsters and certain schedule. There are not any training programs or workshops for the men or women. Certain training programs for the local production, local construction techniques and other related topics not only help the inhabitants to improve their skills but also creates new job opportunities. Moreover, after school and youth development programs could be initiated to provide further education for the youngsters.

In addition, inhabitants’ sense of place in Sakarya Quarter is generally shaped by the physical use of the area and the social interaction with each other. They are not well informed or trained about the cultural, historic and architectural characteristics of the site. Certain training programs or workshops for the inhabitants concerning these characteristics of the site not only help inhabitants to understand their living environment healthier but also increase their sense of belongings to the site. Moreover, this kind of education would be useful to create new job opportunities.

Development of the community participation is another problem for Sakarya Quarter. It could be stated that inhabitants are not involved in the design, implementation and monitoring process on the on-going conservation activities of their living environment.

In addition, inhabitants who are mostly consisted of low-income group who cannot afford to repair and maintenance of their houses, are not well informed about the different funding options from different institutions. Moreover, conservation regulations on the registered buildings limit the interventions to the traditional houses. Therefore, inhabitants become reluctant to make repairs in their houses that threaten the quality of their environment and their sustainability in the site.
In order to improve community participation in the site, all the stages of conservation activities are needed to be in accordance with the inhabitants’ needs and wishes. Inhabitants should be allowed to make repairs and changes in their houses according to the certain design standards that are determined by the experts and inhabitants together. All the inhabitants should be informed about these standards and municipalities should raise awareness on the conservation.

In case of giving new functions to vacant traditional buildings after their rehabilitation, the needs and thoughts of inhabitants should be taken into consideration. Moreover, municipalities should inform and encourage inhabitants to benefit from funding opportunities from different institutions.

A general assessment has been made on the physical, functional, visual, social characteristic of the site as well as the values, needs, and way of living, concerns and the problems of the inhabitants in the light of the social sustainability factors. As a result; the general values, problems and potential has been revealed. In order to develop new principles and the strategies for the conservation of Sakarya Quarter, each aspect of this evaluation should be taken into consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Potentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>- Not very integrated with surrounding networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Filling the certain needs of the inhabitants with the services on</td>
<td>- Decay or urban fabric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the surrounding area.</td>
<td>- Empty lots and demolished buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traditional urban tissue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Built Environment</td>
<td>- Structural and material problems in traditional houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historic, Cultural, Architectural, Functional Values of</td>
<td>- Change/loss in spatial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Residential Houses</td>
<td>- Characteristic of traditional fabric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Courtyards, Gardens</td>
<td>- Lack of an well-designed public spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Religious Buildings</td>
<td>- Lack of Green areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public Open Areas</td>
<td>- High Rise Buildings on Ulucanlar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>- Lack of Qualified and Skilled Workers</td>
<td>Population of Sakarya Quarter as a potential for workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Different job opportunities in Ulusa and its surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Skills</td>
<td>- Low Education Level of the Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existence of different educational facilities on the surrounding</td>
<td>- Lack of awareness in heritage conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area.</td>
<td>- Lack of traditional and local knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of education for skill development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>- Use of charcoal as heating system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visual pollution of deposit areas</td>
<td>- Noise and visual pollution of vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>- Easy Access to important centers in Ankara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Easy Access to different services</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Integration with multidimensional network in the city and its surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Health</td>
<td>- Acceptance of the site as safe by its inhabitance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low crime rates</td>
<td>- Lack of awareness on cultural, historical, architectural values of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Place &amp; Cultural Identity</td>
<td>- Problems related with legal and financial framework of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acceptance of place as home by inhabitants</td>
<td>conservation actions that forces inhabitants to leave the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of Belonging &amp; Place Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High level of place attachment of inhabitants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social Interaction</td>
<td>- Lack of a well-designed public spaces that leads people to interact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Equal distribution of Services</td>
<td>- Current open public open areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community Participation</td>
<td>- Empty lots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not engaging the community in conservation of Sakarya Quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inhabitant’s being eager to participate on conservation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current open public open areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 75: General Assessment of Sakarya Quarter according to Social Sustainability Factors, Source: Author.
Figure 76: Values of Sakarya Quarter in Site Scale, Source: Author, (Google Earth, Last accessed on 22.01.2015)
3.3.2 Assessment of the Conservation Activities of the Local Municipality

As far as the physical character of the site concerns, it could be said that, the implementation projects in Sakarya Quarter that are applied by the municipality is lack of a unified approach and the integration of the site with its surrounding as well as Ulus Historic Centre is weak. The implementations are usually applied piecemeal and in building scale.

Another criticism is related with the quality of the implementations. Building the replicas of traditional buildings with same construction technique and material are being contradictory with the scientific conservation principles. In addition, the standardization on the façade colors and materials disrupts the richness of traditional fabric.
The legal and administrative framework of the conservation actions for Sakarya Quarter is as much problematic as the piecemeal implementations resulted from the lack of an approved “Conservation Development Plan”. The tension between the inhabitants and Altındağ Municipality gets stronger every day while the implementations expand throughout the site. As a result, the sustainability of inhabitants in Sakarya Quarter is threatened.

As a part of the legal process on implementations, Altındağ Municipality gives some options to the landowners. Generally, Municipality is able to reach the heirs of the property even if it is not used recently. In case of not being able to reach any heir of the land, Municipality starts the expropriation and save the related costs in national bank to be given to the heirs. When the Municipality contacts the owners or heirs, they either ask for the proper intervention of the buildings by the landlords or gives notice them the expropriation of their property. If the building is not in a very bad condition, maintenance or simple repair is suggested as intervention by municipality.

While the expenditures related with the exterior repairs can be covered by municipality, the expenditures of interior interventions are expected to be paid by the landlords. If the building is in a severe condition, the landlords are asked to prepare the restoration project. In addition, if the building is registered, the landlords can benefit from the various tax reductions including the value-added taxes of services related with planning process.

However, due to their low income level, most of the landlords are not able to cover for the intervention expenses. In addition, most of the lands have multiple owners so that building a consensus on the buildings gets more difficult. Thus, the most of the lands are being expropriated by the municipality for a small fee which does not satisfy the owners’ expectations. As a result, regardless of being a tenant or owner, most of the inhabitants are forced to leave their houses. The interventions of the buildings on which the lots are expropriated are held by municipality.
After the implementations, buildings are usually sold to different associations or private offices and utilized by them so that the social structure of the site starts to change gradually and endangers the functional unity of the site.

Most of the conflict arises from limited budget of the Municipality reserved for implementations. While Municipality utilizes some of the public financial aids, they do not benefit from the helps that can be provided from international institutions and private sector as well as the voluntary work.

In addition, the type implementation on which the buildings are demolished and reconstructed with new construction techniques and materials increases the expanses of interventions. In this content, Altındağ Municipality needs scientific consultation from different experts in terms of providing finance and quality of physical interventions. The utilization of the buildings after the interventions should be also determined by the help of experts in order to develop Sakarya Quarter in the best way.

Although the effort of Altındağ Municipality on providing many different services to create a better living environment is appreciable, the dialogue between Altındağ Municipality and the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter on the legal process needs to be improved. Inhabitants are not usually informed about the variety of financial aids they can benefit from different institutions. Altındağ Municipality should promote the inhabitants about benefiting from these sources.

On the other hand, a council composed of representatives from inhabitants is necessary in order to convey their thoughts and concerns to municipality in a better way. Thus, the existence of a unit that would act as a mediator between inhabitants and the municipality seems as a necessity for building a consensus on the legal process of conservation activities.
As a result, the important amount of population is very likely to be forced to move out, unless the owners of the properties are not able to cover for expanses related with intervention. In the legal and financial process of those activities, this population has no voice on determining their future on the site. It could be stated that the thoughts, concerns and the needs of the population are ignored in this process.
CHAPTER 4

PRINCIPLES, STRATEGIES AND PROPOSALS FOR THE CONSERVATION OF SAKARYA QUARTER VIA SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

In order to develop principles and strategies for the conservation of Sakarya Quarter a detailed study has been carried out. Development of social aspects in conservation agenda has been determined as a part of the theoretical background. Becoming a prominent concept in conservation of historic urban landscapes, social sustainability concept has been defined and critical social sustainability factors in historic city centers have been determined. The theoretical background of this concept is supported with the different examples throughout the world. As a result, a general proposal is prepared including general guidelines, tools and process for the further part of this thesis. Understanding the site with its all physical, visual and functional, social characteristic of the site, re-understanding the site through the opinions of the inhabitants and making a general assessment in the light of the social sustainability factors was held as the following part of this framework.

In the light of all these studies, this chapter mainly focuses on what kind of conservation approach can be followed for Sakarya Quarter by providing the sustainability of its inhabitants and empowering the community as well. In this content, general approach and principles for conservation of Sakarya Quarter will be defined and new strategies and actions for empowering the place according to these principles will revealed. Each strategy and actions will be held in detail. Moreover, the outcomes of the strategies will be shared with different stakeholders in order to take feedback for revision.
4.1. General Approach and Principles for the Conservation of Sakarya Quarter

One of the most important things that revealed in the general assessments on the site is that although they are not the original inhabitants of the site, the current inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter built up a strong relationship with the site. As a result of this bond, they spend their life in harmony and inclusion. Having a strong sense of belonging, they do not want to leave the site. However, their physical environment needs to be improved in order to increase their quality of life and certain services must be provided for fulfilling the needs of the inhabitants. Despite this fact, the inhabitants are not capable of maintaining and enhancing their living environment economically. In addition, they are lack of awareness and knowledge on conservation of their physical environment and use the potentials of the area as an economic source. It is also revealed that the current conservation and planning does not look out for the public interest and mostly focused on how to deal with the expanses of the on-going implementation that resulted as the expropriation of the residential buildings.

Considering these general evaluations, the scope of the following studies is finding alternative ways to create a better a living environment for the community while preserving traditional character the site, to develop economic sources for the community and to raise awareness and knowledge of the inhabitants on the conservation the site and utilization of different sources on the site in order to provide their sustainability. The general approach and the principles for the conservation of Sakarya Quarter are derived from this vision.

According to the mutual relationship of the place and the people, sustaining the inhabitance of the community should be the priority in the heritage conservation in Sakarya Quarter. Thus, linking heritage conservation and the socio-economic development of its community should be main approach in the conservation of the site.
Conservation of the Sakarya Quarter should be handled in a way that improves the quality of inhabitant’s living conditions and the well-being of the community. Within this, recognition the identification of the values and meanings related with Sakarya Quarter by its present community and all the intangible and tangible values shaped by the interaction of people and the place should be used as a guideline while developing strategies. Respecting the values of the past communities that was associated with Sakarya Quarter throughout the history and providing their sustainability should also be taken into consideration.

Moreover, developing a community-driven conservation approach for preserving the cultural heritage of Sakarya Quarter by giving the community an active role in the decision making and management process of all the related projects as well as providing the collaboration of different stakeholders and experts is significant for handling the different issues related with the site in a more integrated way.

The strategies, actions and proposals that will be developed for Sakarya Quarter should be integrated with Ulus Historic City Centre and city of Ankara. In addition, long-term effects and the feasibility of every project should be taken into consideration with respect to context of the site.

Creating a healthy and environmentally friendly physical environment is important for increasing the quality of inhabitants’ living conditions. The interventions that will be held for this purpose should respect the traditional urban characteristic of the site and avoiding any kind of result that disrupt this character. Creating a safety environment for inhabitants that would contribute social inclusion and sense of belonging is also an important consideration in shaping the physical character of the site. The accessibility of different service that the community needs should also be provided for the well-being of the community.
While enhancing the physical characteristic of the site, economic development of the site should also be provided by creating new sources or using the potential of existing sources. Promotion of local production, traditional and cultural characteristic of the site should be utilized for this purpose. Every member of the community should be promoted to participate in related actions that will be determined for the site. Education and skill development should also be promoted for the community in order to raising their awareness on the conservation of the site as well as learning to utilize the sources of Sakarya Quarter.

Finding different sources that would provide financial, technical aids for the revitalization of Sakarya Quarter and shaping a legal, administrative, financial framework of the strategies and actions are important in terms of providing the feasibility of the projects. Promoting collaboration of local governments, community and multidisciplinary work of experts is also necessary for shaping an integrated approach for conservation of Sakarya Quarter.

4.2. Developing Strategies and Actions for Conservation of Sakarya Quarter and its Inhabitants

In the light of the general approaches and principles determined for the conservation of Sakarya Quarter and sustainability of its community, the strategies and actions has been defined. According to their content and action area, the strategies and actions are divided into three main category and related sub-categories.

First group of actions and strategies namely as “Conservation and the Maintenance of the Physical Environment” mainly focuses on increasing the quality of the living environment of the inhabitants as well as heritage conservation in Sakarya Quarter.
The second group labeled as “Creating New Sources and Job Opportunities” deals with the socio-economic development of the community in Sakarya Quarter. In the content of this part, three main job opportunities namely as production, work force for construction and tourism are introduced for providing new economic sources to the community. All of the job categories promote the utilization of different potentials of the site as well as different target group in the community. The administrative and financial framework of are also determined for each job field.

The last part of the strategies and action mainly covers for the community empowerment through education. This part has two sub-titles. Raising awareness on the heritage conservation focuses on proposing new approaches and tools in order to increase public awareness in order to provide their active participation in the heritage conservation as well as its recognition in different platforms. The second action group defined as “Education and Skill Development” discusses the tools for teaching the community on skill development for traditional knowledge, local production in order to provide socio-economic development of the site. The administrative and financial framework of these actions is also given in detail (Figure 78).
4.2.1 Conservation and the Maintenance of the Physical Environment

When historic districts are considered in their urban context, it is important to keep in mind that they are more prone to become isolated from the rest of the city on which are inhabited by certain social groups. For that reason development of historic districts should be integrated with the overall urban development so that they do not become segregated part in the cities. After Transition Period Conservation Principles and Terms of Use, the conservation and planning activities in and around Sakarya Quarter are handled without an integrated conservation plan, focusing on buildings rather than networks and interactions with a wider area. Therefore, as an important part of the city of Ankara, it is a necessity to develop a “Conservation development Plan” for Ulus historic center with an integrated and sustainable approach that would consider its long-term effects.
The law suits related to the objections of UTTA Planning, Architecture, Urban Design & Consulting LTD. Co. for Ulus Historic City Centre Urban Conservation Site Management Plan are still on-going and have not reached its final stage. Conservation and rehabilitation activities and related projects for Sakarya Quarter in the future should be regulated with respect to this integrated plan.

One of the biggest objectives for Sakarya Quarter is to provide the sustainability of the traditional and cultural characteristics of place together with its inhabitants by improving their living conditions and creating a healthier building environment. Therefore, it is necessary to develop the existing traditional fabric to fulfill certain needs of the inhabitants. Considering this fact, providing different services that would fulfill the needs of inhabitants in Sakarya Quarter is one the major concerns for the development of the site.

Due to its central location, the surrounding of Sakarya Quarter is able to fulfill administrative, cultural, recreational, commercial, health, sport, and educational services to its inhabitants. However, it is necessary that development of Sakarya Quarter should be integrated to multidimensional network in the city and its surroundings in the light of the inhabitant’s needs.

In this sense, the existing physical components of traditional fabric in Sakarya Quarter can be utilized to provide certain services to its inhabitants after the necessary rehabilitation actions.

As the important elements that shape and function the city, public open spaces contribute the social mix by providing meetings dialogue and exchange information and cultural between inhabitants. Shaping the identity of the districts, they determine the quality of urban spaces (UNESCO, 2008:16). Thus it is necessary that public open spaces should be physically, socially and economically integrated in the fabric of modern townscape.
In addition, they should also respond the needs of local economic, social and cultural life. In this context, some general design principles are needed to be followed by the experts in order to create qualified public open spaces for the inhabitants.

According to urban design guidelines in historic settings, successful public open spaces should be attractive, safe, uncluttered and should work for the all the people that utilize that space including elderly and disabled people. Paving, planting, lighting, orientation, shelter, signage, street furniture and routes are important features for successful public open spaces (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment: 2000).

Successful public space should have a system of open and green spaces that respect the natural features and should be accessible. Usually, the junction points of streets as a part of the pedestrian routes are more likely to be convenient by the all users. Street trees and street light can be used to emphasize the routes leading to the public realms. Use of trees, water, other planting also helps to create attractive public spaces and enriches the biodiversity of environment. However, it should be noted that the public space design should be in harmony with the traditional character of the site.

It is important that the public space should be in relationship with the surrounding buildings providing a certain purpose for its users. The design of public open spaces should not lead any left over spaces without a function that would detract the place’s sense of identity. In this situation, the loss of identity can cause security and safety problems. On the other hand, the public open spaces that are overlooked by the buildings can help inhabitants to feel more secure.

Local climatic conditions such as daylight, sunlight, wind, temperature as well as orientation of the buildings should be taken into consideration in public space design. Work of art and well-designed street furniture integrated into the design of public spaces give identity and enhance the sense of place.
Design characteristics of street furniture such as seating, attractive lamp posts, raised planters, litter bins, railings, kiosk, artistic elements etc.; pavement in different texture and color; and interconnectivity of streets have also important effect to create more satisfied physical appearance for people (Porta&Renne: 2005: 51-64). Streetscape design should also take account of the need for maintenance, resistance and vandalism.

Existing public open spaces labeled as “meydans” are already situated at the junction points of frequently used streets that are surrounded and overlooked by the traditional houses. Although, the location of the “meydans” are suitable for creating qualified public open spaces, they should be redesigned by following certain design guidelines that are mentioned above so that they could promote the social interaction and outdoor activities among inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter.

As one of the important interaction points for the women of Sakarya Quarter, doorsteps can also be carefully designed to promote this interaction. Thresholds, sitting places or tactile paving or use of color can be proposed to define these areas more dominantly. In addition, similar treatment with can be applied for shop fronts for create more defined places for users.

In this context, the open area of “kahvehane”, one of the most important gathering points for male inhabitants in Sakarya Quarter, can be re-designed for creating a more qualified public open area for its users.

Designing parks and playground areas for children as well-as youth friendly spaces is another consideration shaping the physical character of the area. Encouraging young people to engage with their communities through designing various public spaces not only serves for the young population of Sakarya Quarter, but also develops their sense of belonging. Organizing projects in schools, universities, and public parks, different programs with the active participation of the child and youths of Sakarya Quarter can help creating a meaningful attachment to these places.
Ease of movement in public open spaces is another consideration for creating successful public open spaces. As important features of the public open spaces, streets should offer more than just traffic channels but should emphasize pedestrian oriented characteristic that inhabitants would feel safe.

It has been stated in the assessment that narrow streets that shape the traditional urban tissue of Sakarya Quarter are not suitable for the high vehicle flow. The vehicle flow would also appear a problem that endangers safety of pedestrians. In this sense, it is crucial to give priority to pedestrians in the movement hierarchy. In order to prevent incontinence of the pedestrians, vehicle movements and service provision should be controlled and only be allowed in certain points. In addition, street should encourage movement and activity so that they can encourage walking and cycling. New routes should be regulated according to existing routes and movement patterns. For this purpose, the pedestrian and permitted service access that defined for the site is shown (Figure 79).

![Proposed Pedestrian and Vehicular Access for Sakarya Quarter](image)

Figure 79: Proposed Pedestrian and Vehicular Access for Sakarya Quarter, Prepared by Author, Base map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Regulating the parking areas is as significant as controlling the pedestrian and vehicle access in order to provide convenient pedestrian movement in the site. For this purpose, car parking should only be allowed in certain points close to the service accesses so that it does not interrupt the pedestrian movement in the site and do not disrupt the image of public open spaces.

One of the main features that contradict with the traditional characteristic of the site is the high rise buildings settled in Ulucanlar Street. Considering the level difference of between Sakarya Quarter and Ulucanlar Street, the high rise buildings act as a barrier that disrupts the image of the site. In this context, the decreasing of the building heights could be one solution. However, the projects that will be derived from this solution may not be feasible in terms of time and economy. For this reason, providing openings on certain points on the high rise buildings of Ulucanlar Street would be a more proper solution in order to break the barrier effect as well as increasing accessibility and permeability to Ulucanlar Street.

The openings should be regulated with respect to the extension of existing street pattern and the dominant public open area. The design of the openings should promote the continuity of pedestrian flow through Sakarya Quarter as well as the certain routes and axis that will be defined for integrating the site with its surrounding (Figure 80).

The conditions of traditional houses are one of the most important considerations that affect the inhabitants’ quality of life in Sakarya Quarter. Maintenance, repair and proper alteration is necessary in order to fulfill the needs of the inhabitants as important as preserving the historical and architectural character of the traditional houses. The material and structural condition of most of the traditional houses in Sakarya Quarter was analyzed by METU Graduate Program of Restoration in 2014. Moreover, in the content of the Ulus Historic City Centre Urban Conservation Site Management Plan prepared by UTTA, a similar analysis was applied for the whole area.
Figure 80: The Proposal on the Openings on Ulucanlar Street, Base map: Source: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration, Revised by Author
In the light of this analysis, the type of material and structural problems that each traditional house has is determined. While periodic maintenance and simple repairs is needed for some buildings, holistic repair and restoration project is suggested for the ones in bad condition or collapsed/partially collapsed ones. “Periodic Maintenance” usually covers for the simple interventions that do not change the structural, material and architectural features of the buildings such as roof, paint and wash, roof and gutter repair. “Simple Repairs”, usually includes for changing deteriorated materials and the missing architectural elements or renewing inner or outer plaster with respect to the original ones. The type of the intervention to each traditional building in the Conservation development Plan should be decided with respect to this analysis and shown in Figure 81.

The spatial adequacy of the sanitary condition of the traditional houses is also a problem for the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter. Most of the inhabitants are not content with the sanitary conditions and the most of the intervention that inhabitants apply is related to this problem. However, there is not a certain guideline for the design quality of the sanitary conditions so that most of the interventions are not suitable with the traditional character of the houses. Therefore, certain design guidelines for sanitary conditions should be determined by experts considering the most convenient options for the inhabitants.

One of the most important crucial considerations for designing wet spaces is not to change the legibility and the character of the original plan scheme and façade organization of the traditional houses. Moreover, the wet spaces are designed in the courtyard; they should be respectful to the lot organization. The wet spaces should preferably be accessible from the interior of the houses. The additions should be in harmony with the existing architectural style of the traditional houses with proper material and workmanship while being distinguishable. The interior of the wet spaces should have the enough spaces for circulation and equipment as well as providing water and electricity in order to fulfill the needs of the inhabitants.
Figure 81: Intervention Types on Exterior of Traditional Buildings, Derived and Extended by Author from the map of REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Another concern that affects quality of life in the traditional houses is the courtyards
that have lost their spatial characteristic based on production. Even though, the
courtyards are used for storage, drying as well as gathering place for inhabitants
today, the courtyards become more undefined space and lost its function as a
production space throughout the years. In this sense, the design of the courtyards
should be reconsidered in the conservation development plan. The spaces for storage,
drying, production, the pavement together with green areas should be organized in
order to create a more satisfied living environment for the inhabitants. The
interpretation of the production activity in the courtyard would also help to promote
inhabitants to create their own sources.

The variety in the facade color of the houses is one of the significant elements that
promote the richness of the urban tissue. Considering the previous implementations
of Municipality in Hamamönü that neglected this characteristic, it is important to
emphasize to preserve the variety of façade color of the traditional houses in the
future implementations.

The buildings that are usually in bad physical condition can be re-functioned after
their rehabilitation and the empty lots that act as subsidence lands could be allowed
to new settlement. Feasibility of the new building projects should be carefully
considered in terms of budget, permission and expropriation process and should
work in accordance with the Conservation Master Plan. It is important to research the
lots by an archeologist if there is any archeological or historic relic or not before the
new construction process. After the archeological research on the lots, the
corresponding Cultural Heritage Conservation Board decides to give the permission
for new construction according to the legal process and ownership status of the lot.

Determining the function of each new building is another significant consideration.
The function of each building should be decided in response to inhabitants needs and
concern the potentials and problems of the site. Design guidelines and the type of
implementations should also be developed with commission of experts focusing on
the inhabitants’ concerns and needs.
According to new design principles in historic districts, new development should respond to urban structure, urban grain, density and mix, scale, height, materials and detailing, landscape, views and landmarks as well as historical development (Architecture+Design Scotland: 8).

It is also important that new development has its own character and legibility. Adaptability and diversity are other important objectives for new design principles in the historic districts. New buildings in Sakarya Quarter should be designed with respect to these considerations.

In the light of the basic design principles defined above, the new building design should be in harmony in the traditional urban and architectural characteristic of Sakarya Quarter. While boundaries of each new building should respect the original cadastral pattern and street characteristic of Sakarya, lot coverage of new construction should not exceed the surrounding lot coverage values. The heights of courtyard walls that would surround the each lot should respect the existing ones (METU Graduate Program of Restoration, 2014).

The architectural style of the these buildings, should be in harmony with the general characteristic of traditional Ankara Houses in terms of height, façade organization that reflects the plan scheme of the buildings, roof type etc. Whether they are built in traditional or new construction technique and material, the new buildings should be distinguishable from traditional ones.

Enhancement of the infrastructure is one of the objectives to create healthier living environment for the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter. The use of coal for the heating system that causes air pollution is one of the main problems that inhabitants concern about their environment. Therefore, the use of coal should be eliminated and natural gas should be the main heating source in the site.
Street lighting is another infrastructure problem related with the security of the site. Increasing the number of street lightings especially in the streets with low pedestrian use would help to increase the safety of the streets. Moreover, garbage and sewage system re-organized to serve a better environment for the inhabitants.

4.2.2 Creating New Sources and Job Opportunities

Providing various economic sources for the inhabitants in historic city centers is as significant as improving inhabitants’ the quality of life and in order to provide the sustainability of the local people in their neighborhood. Understanding the characteristic of the site as well as its relationships with inhabitants is one of the important considerations for creating new sources and job opportunities.

According to the potentials, values and the capacity of the Sakarya Quarter as well as the inhabitants’ social profile three major economic activities is suggested for the site namely as production, work force for construction rehabilitation and related actions, tourism.

4.2.2.1 Production

First activity determined for the site in order to develop economic source for the inhabitants is production. Considering Sakarya Quarter as a site between Hamamönü Area which accommodates recreational activities mostly for local people and Ankara Castle together with Hacıbeyram as culturally and historically important for both international and national tourists, the production activities would have a potential for enliven the site as well as providing economic source for its inhabitants.
Defining the type of the production and the program concerning the activities related to this production is the first consideration re-designing the chosen area. Due to the fact that Sakarya Quarter has a dominant residential character, the scale of production activities should be determined in a way that does not disrupt this character as well as not forcing the capacity of the site. Thus, traditional art and craft products and refreshments that are indigenous to Ankara that inhabitants can produce quickly and easily with minimum technical equipment can be considered the preferred production activity for Sakarya Quarter in the first place. However, the content of the production type should be extended by the experts and entrepreneurs together with the skills and opinions of inhabitants in Sakarya Quarter.

Moreover, agricultural production can be considered as another alternative production branch. In this content, grape, wine, honey, Angora goat, Angora cat, weaving, leather trade can be considered as important income sources for both Sakarya Quarter and Ulus Historic Centre. Experimented in many sites throughout the world, urban agriculture is seen as an efficient way to utilize the empty land in urban sites as well as creating a healthier eco-system for the inhabitants. In addition, food production provided from urban agriculture can be seen as an economic source for the inhabitants. Despite its many advantages to the urban sites, the feasibility of such agricultural activities in terms of physical and environmental suitability, time, and money should be controlled by the experts and entrepreneurs in different fields. The willingness and skills of inhabitants in such activity should also take as an important consideration. In terms of the feasibility and applicability, agricultural activity in Sakarya Quarter as an economic source can be considered a long-term project in the future for the site.

After defining the type of production according to the capacity and the characteristic of the site and the inhabitance, the production areas in the site should be chosen and designed according to the requirements of related activities. Existing building and lot stock are important physical places having strong potential to accommodate production activities.
Especially, empty lots and buildings in Sakarya Quarter determined in site analysis should be given priority to be utilized for production activities. However, the high cost of rehabilitation, repair and maintenance actions that would be held in order to provide qualified spaces for production activities as well as the expropriation process that would take a long period to negotiate with several landlords would enforce the sources of Altındağ Municipality and affect the feasibility of the production related projects. Thus, concentration of the production related facilities on a certain point would ease the feasibility of the projects in terms of cost and time. Being one of the biggest empty areas in site the lot no: 416/20 is proposed for expropriation in order to carry out production related activities. It’s being close to Ulucanlar Street is another advantage of this area in terms of providing easy access for service. Thus, careful land investigation should be held before any construction.

After land investigation, new construction activities can be initiated. The utilization of the other vacant lots as production areas should also be considered in the future planning decision of Sakarya Quarter.

Allocation of production and selling units as well as service spaces together with open areas should be designed according to the requirements of this type of production. The marketing area of these local products may not be limited within the Sakarya Quarter. Hamamönü, surrounding bazaars and the shops at Ankara Castle can be utilized for other marketing areas.

Associations and private offices located on the buildings of Sakarya Quarter where the implementations were applied can be considered as other significant places that inhabitants can serve. Especially, the female population of Sakarya Quarter can provide the daily catering requirement of the people that work at these places so that they can contribute the economic development of the area.

In addition, the courtyard of the traditional houses which are the reflection of production based lifestyle in the city could be the extension area of the production activities.
As suggested before, the production should be in small scale that does not force the physical capacity of the traditional houses. The production areas in the courtyards should be designed in a way that does not disrupt the original plan scheme of the houses. Storing and drying places should also be taken into the consideration as a necessity for production activities.

Regarding to the administrative and the economic framework of the production related actions, Altındağ Municipality will be the general coordinator. Experts from different fields related with various subjects ranging from marketing to design of the production areas should provide consultation to Altındağ Municipality.

The general outline of the production projects will be shaped according to the socioeconomic profile of the community as well as their wishes and the capacity. Moreover, the community should be informed and promoted in every stage of the planning process. A Community Council composed of the chosen members in Sakarya Quarter should provide the perpetual dialogue between municipality and the inhabitants.

Incentive Policies, as well as the donations and sponsorship of the NGOs and private entrepreneurs will be the main financial source in order to carry out the production actions. In addition, the EU Funds, World Bank Funds and the financial aids of the other international organization can be utilized as the financial sources in order to carry out production activity (Figure 83).
Figure 82: Production Areas for Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author, Base Map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Figure 83: Production Workforce for Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author
4.2.2.2 Work Force for Construction

Ulus Historic Centre has a significant traditional building stock that needs maintenance, repair or restoration. In addition, new construction that would provide different services is also necessary for development of the site. Thus, a serious amount of labor requirement arises from this necessity.

Similar to the other sites in Ulus Historic Centre, Sakarya Quarter is populated by community with low income level. Especially, construction and prosperity works are one of the main sources of income. Thus, the population of Sakarya Quarter has an important work force potential in restoration and construction activities in Ulus Historic Centre. However, despite the fact that the male population of Sakarya Quarter is familiar with construction and prosperity works, they are lack of knowledge in traditional construction techniques and material. In addition, they are not labeled as qualified workers other construction areas.

In the manner of training the qualified workmen in the conservation of cultural heritage, Association of Enterprises in Preservation and Restoration (KOREFD) has become one of the leading institutions in Turkey. Economically supported by European Union Funds in the content of Active Labor Market Programs, KOREFD has been organizing workshops since 2007 with the help of General Directorate of Foundations. After completing the workshops, the participants can work in the field of conservation. Moreover, UNESCO can also provide technical help to governments for carrying out similar activities for the conservation of cultural heritage. In this sense, Altındağ Municipality can carry out a program in Sakarya Quarter with the help of KOREFD and other related institutions accordingly. Similar program can also be applied for the construction of new buildings.
As a result, not only an important workforce for rehabilitation of the traditional fabric in Ulus would be provided, but the economical development of Sakarya Quarter would be promoted. Moreover, the quality of workmanship in construction and rehabilitation would improve with the increasing number of qualified labors in order to create a healthier living environment in Ulus.

Figure 84: Working Area for the Construction Activities, Source: Author, Base Map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Figure 85: Workforce Frame Work for Construction in Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author
4.2.2.3 Tourism

Besides its traditional urban fabric that has cultural and historic significance, Sakarya Quarter has a strategic location between Hamamönü and Ankara Castle together with Hacı Bayram Area. While Hamamönü serves for local tourist with recreational facilities, Ankara Castle and Hacı Bayram have become an attraction point with its historic and cultural character. Despite its important location, Sakarya Quarter is not as recognizable as those areas among visitors. Thus, location of Sakarya Quarter should be utilized in order to provide the continuation of visitors between Hamamönü and Ankara Castle as well as Hacı Bayram. In this terms, the tourism can be considered as a tool for providing the recognition of cultural heritage in Sakarya Quarter and sharing its values with the visitors as well as contributing the economic development of the site.

UNESCO World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme create an international framework for the cooperation and the coordination in order to achieve sustainable tourism and economic development throughout the world. The program provides the partnership between public, private and voluntary sector on planning, action and impact on World Heritage Conservation. In the content of these responsibilities UNESCO WH+ST Program define certain objectives. These objectives are as it follows:

- Integration of sustainable tourism principles into the mechanism of the World Heritage Convention

- Strengthening policies, strategies, frameworks on sustainable tourism for protecting and managing cultural and natural heritage;

- Promoting the stakeholder engagement in planning, development and management of sustainable tourism empowering local communities-

- Providing stakeholders and tools to manage tourism efficiently, responsibly and sustainably based on the local context and needs.
-Promoting quality tourism products and services that encourage responsible behavior among all stakeholders and foster understanding and appreciation of world heritage (UNESCO WH+ST Action Plan 2013-2015).

In the light of the objectives that UNESCO WH+ST, a similar a tourism action framework should be determined for Sakarya Quarter. One of the most important considerations while introducing tourism in the site is not to disrupt or to force the traditional residential character of the site. It is also important to be respectful to the daily life and of the inhabitant while carrying out the tourism activity. Thus the tourism activities should be determined accordingly.

Considering the main objectives that mentioned above, organizing heritage walks from Hamamönü Area to Castle through Sakarya Quarter can be suggested as a simple way to increase the recognition of the site. In the light of this purpose, a cultural route from Hamamönü to Ankara Castle should be determined (Figure 86). The organization of the visitor circulation can be arranged in a way that introduce visitors both traditional residential buildings and religious buildings of Sakarya Quarter. Thus, the distribution of the visitors can be provided from İnci Street as one of the main axis to the inner core of the site. In addition, one of the residential houses that are not currently in use can be utilized as a model to show visitors the daily life in the traditional house of Ankara. For this purpose, Altındağ Municipality can purchase one of the residential buildings and carry out the restoration projects with the help of conservation specialist, art historians etc.

Moreover, as a part of the heritage walk, the group can also visit the production areas together with some courtyards that are determined in advance so that they can buy the products that inhabitants make in order to make a further contribution to the economic development of the site.
The number of visitor groups and the schedule for the heritage walks should also be determined according to the capacity of the site. For this purpose, a group of 10-15 people for each tour would be suitable considering the capacity of the site. The number of tours should also be limited accordingly.

The target group as the guides that carry out the heritage walks would be selected from the young population of the Sakarya Quarter. The necessary education for the cultural and historic characteristics of the Ulus Historic Centre will be given the youngsters through the workshops. These workshops can be organized by the help of Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate of Tourism Training as well as the Tourist Guide Association (TUREB), Association of Turkish Travel Agencies. The funding of the projects can be provided from Ministry, EU Fund, international associations such as World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations as well as private investors (Figure 88).

In addition to the tourism model, generating a museum related with the cultural history of Ulus can also provide economic contribution to the area. For this purpose, one of the traditional buildings that are not in use can be utilized after purchasing and restoration process by Altındağ Municipality. While Altındağ Municipality carries out the general coordination of the project, a group of specialist in the field of museology, art history, conservation of culture heritage etc. can organize the content of this museum. The visitor number as well as the visiting hours of the museum should also be determined according to the capacity of the site.
Figure 86: Sakarya Quarter as a Linking Area for Tourism Activities, Prepared by Author, Google Earth Last Accessed on 20.07.2015.

Figure 87: Proposed Area for Tourism Activities, Prepared by Author, Base Map: REST 507 - Planning and Design in Urban Conservation Studio 2014, METU Graduate Program of Restoration
Figure 88: Tourism Framework for Sakarya Quarter, Source: Author
4.2.3 Community Empowerment through Education

The last strategy defined as a part of conservation for Sakarya Quarter is the community empowerment through education. The aim of this strategy is to raise inhabitants’ awareness and understanding on cultural, historical and physical character of the area in order to provide their active involvement in preservation, promotion and recognition of cultural heritage. It also aims to teach inhabitants how to create their own sources related with cultural heritage and contribute the economic development of the site. In the content of these main objectives, two activities are defined for the community of Sakarya Quarter.

4.2.3.1 Raising Awareness on the Heritage Conservation

As a dynamic concept, cultural heritage evolves according to its relationships with people. In order to provide the sustainability of cultural heritage, general understanding should be created among the community that cultural heritage engages with. In this context, raising awareness of communities has an important role in achieving the preservation of the cultural heritage. Recognition of cultural heritage among the community also increases their sense of belonging and their willingness to preserve and promote the cultural heritage accordingly.

In this manner, there are important projects that international institutions carry out in the world. One of them, UNESCO Heritage Education Programme aims to acknowledge young people in the conservation, protection and promotion of cultural heritage as well as making them important actors in the development of cultural heritage. The Heritage Education Programme has organized various projects, skill development training courses, educative workshops and seminars in different countries with the help of UN Funding. In the content of this program, the type of activities that especially focused on creating an understanding on the cultural heritage and developing tools for expressing the cultural diversity are shown below:
- Exploring the concept of creativity, cultural expression, hands-on workshops in audiovisual arts, the spoken word and visual art

- Promotion of the arts and the diversity of cultural expressions through safeguarding tangible and intangible heritage

- Innovative educational materials on heritage education, of World Heritage in Young Hands educational Resource Kit such as cartoon series (United Nations Youth).

Running projects that involves the young people in place making of community spaces increase their sense of belonging to the areas. Young people who engage in community projects also develop a strong sense of pride and ownership of their local public spaces and communities in general. They also develop more healthy relationship with community adults by developing community skills less likely engage in risky behavior. Establishing youth organization, youth centers, sporting clubs, drama clubs, and recreational centers can be determined as different ways in order to reach the youngster to provide promotion of their participation. In order to not to be tokenistic on these projects, draw the full attention of youngsters, experts from social sciences can be involved in the projects (Milard, 2015).

The similar tools for raising awareness for the cultural heritage can be applied to young population of Sakarya Quarter in order to promote the conservation of the site. Under the coordinator of Altındağ Municipality and Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the social agencies can work together with artists in order to organize different activities. These activities can the enable youngsters to explore their living environment and culture more efficiently through different tools as such art and media. As a result, the active participation of the young people in the promotion and preservation of cultural heritage can be provided. Moreover, these activities also help to create a relation between young people and the different stakeholders in the field of conservation (United Nations Youth).
International Fund of Cultural Diversity and UN Funds are important international financial supporters to promote such activities. The incentive policies, donations and voluntary work of NGO’s and private investors can also be an alternative to provide financial aid.

Similar activities that would raise awareness on preservation of cultural heritage should also be organized for the other age groups in the Sakarya Quarter. Even if the content of the activities would not be as much dynamic as the ones that are organized for the youngsters, it is easy to create a general understanding and on cultural heritage for the elders. The workshop or meetings that would be organized on the public buildings that those groups usually utilize on Sakarya Quarter or walks around the site with specialist on conservation of cultural heritage can increase the knowledge and their sense of belonging. For the organization of such activities Altındağ Municipality would be the main coordinator.

In case of inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter might be distanced in participating such kind of activity, different stakeholders such as mukhtar, imam can be put in charge in order to promote participation and providing a dialogue between inhabitants and municipality. The dialogue between experts and community that carry out the activities should also be provided with the help of those stakeholders.

Increasing the recognition of cultural heritage in different platforms is also important in order to provide financial aids or voluntary work for the development of the site. Publications, DVD’s, posters, postcards, and leaflets can be considered as influential tools in the promotion of the Sakarya Quarter. In addition, videos, short movies or documentaries can be shoot related with Sakarya Quarter can also contribute to the recognition of the site. On the other hand, different logos designed by youngsters that resemble the actions in the site can draw attention of masses. Using social media can also be important tool for community of Sakarya Quarter to reach their problems to the large masses. In this manner, such kind of work can be carried out under the collaboration of Altındağ Municipality and Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Figure 89).
4.2.3.2 Education and Skill Development

Developing skills through education not also helps people to utilize the potential of cultural heritage as a source but also encourages them for new jobs and professionals as a part of socio-economic development of the site.

It also helps to improve social inclusion and the sense of belonging among inhabitants creating a healthier social environment for the community of Sakarya Quarter. In order to provide community empowerment in Sakarya Quarter, inhabitants should be supported by the education and skills development according to field of operations defined in the previous part of this chapter namely as production, work force for construction and tourism. In this content, the objectives of the education and skill development action with respect to the Sakarya Quarter are defined as it follows:

- Organizing skill development training on the product design, quality, business, plan preparation and market linkage

- Encouraging the professional development of inhabitants for local art and craft products

- Supporting training programs on local construction techniques and materials

- Promoting training programs for youngster in order to provide employment in the creative industries (tourist guides, museums, entertainment etc.)

- Promoting gender equity and increase the involvement of female population in production activities in Sakarya Quarter
Figure 89: Community Empowerment Through Education Framework for Sakarya Quarter. Source: Author
4.3 Legal, Administrative and Financial Framework for Conservation of Sakarya Quarter and its Inhabitants

In terms of the feasibility and sustainability of the projects concerning principles, strategies and proposals for the conservation of Sakarya Quarter, it is significant to determine the legal administrative and financial framework of the actions.

Local authorities such as Municipalities or Metropolitan Municipalities are responsible for the conservation and the restoration of natural and cultural assets. In order to carry out implementations and actions related with the cultural assists, the municipalities establish Directorates of Conservation, Implementation and Supervision (KUDEB) and Branch Offices of Conservation, Implementation and Supervision (KUDEM). Moreover, Special Provincial Agencies (SPA) can also use their budgets for the infrastructure, maintenance and repair, social cultural and scientific activities as well as common projects and services with national and international organizations; NGO’s in order to conserve the cultural assets (Madran, Özgünül, 2005).

Special Provincial Agencies can also establish projects offices composed of different experts on conservation of cultural heritage. These offices are responsible for preparing the all the projects of immovable cultural assets on the supervision of SPAs, when the owners of the cultural property can’t afford to carry out repair and restoration. These offices can also work with universities and research institutions to take consultancy. Moreover, project offices are responsible for the implementation and the supervision of the projects that are approved by the Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage. Another responsibility of STAs is to establish education units in order to train local workers for the rehabilitation of cultural heritage (Madran, Özgünül, 2005).
High Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage (HC) and Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage are two significant institutions that supervise implementation of the services related with conservation of natural and cultural heritage in terms of scientific principles.

HCs determine the resolutions for conservation; provide the correlation between RGs; give briefings to Ministry of Culture and Tourism in order to prevent possible complications on implementations and evaluate the oppositions of different institutions on the decision of Conservation Councils. RCs on the other hand are responsible to fulfill duties defined by Law. No. 2863, article 57, with respect to HCs’ resolutions. These responsibilities includes registration and categorization of cultural heritage, defining the “Terms of Transition Period” in the following three months after registration, making decisions related with interventions on the site approved by “Conservation Development Plans” and so on (Madran, Özgönül, 2005).

Directorates of Conservation, Implementation and Supervision (KUDEB) work within the body of municipalities. One of the main responsibilities of KUDEB is to supervise the implementation of projects for immovable cultural properties approved by Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage and prepare the related documents for permission. KUDEB are also responsible for the implementation of decision of Conservation Development Plan approved by RCs. Moreover, KUDEB are charged for preparing the regulations on the financial aids and technical people when the owners are not capable of funding the implementations (Madran, Özgönül, 2005).
In accordance with the legal and administrative mechanism defined above, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality, Altındağ Municipality, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Branch Office of Conservation, Implementation and Supervision, Ankara Regional Council for Council are responsible for all the related implementations on Sakarya Quarter as a part of the Ulus Historic City Centre. Consultation of universities, research institutions, associations and private office with experts on conservation is also important for creating a scientific approach for the implementations. In this manner, UTTA Architecture, Urban Design& Consulting are leading institution for preparing the Conservation Development Plan for Ulus Historic Centre.

Middle East Technical University Graduate Program of Restoration and Preservation of Historic Monuments and KORDER are two leading institutions that provide consultation to Altındağ Municipality on the implementations and planning decision on conservation of Sakarya Quarter.

In addition, a council established by the community of the Sakarya Quarter should act as a mediator between the municipality and the community. While the municipality will be informed about the needs and concerns of the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter, the inhabitants will learn the latest technical and legislative process of the conservation activities in their quarter by this council. Organizing regular meetings with community and the municipality, the council will build a consensus between citizens and municipality on the conservation of the site.
Providing the financial source is one of the main considerations for the implementations related with conservation of cultural heritage. Since the inhabitants of the historic city centers are usually composed of low-income groups who can’t afford the carry out the implementations and most of the local authorities have not enough budgets for conservation of cultural and natural heritage becomes a problematic issue in terms of finance. Thus, alternative financial framework should be offered in order to provide the conservation of cultural heritage (Madran, Özgünül, 2005).

One of the sources that can be used for the immovable cultural assets in the ownership of the natural person or legal identity is the “Ministry of Culture and Tourism Grants”. This grant can provide financial, technical and equipment aid to owners (Madran, Özgünül, 2005).
Another financial aid that would promote local authorities for the maintenance, repair and restoration of cultural heritage is the “TOKI Loans” within the Law No. 2985 Concerning the Housing Estate. The priority of the projects is determined by "Housing Development Administration of Turkey" (Madran, Özgünül, 2005).

"Contribution Margin for Conservation of Immovable Cultural Assets" that promotes municipalities to serve in the field of conservation is another financial source. Within the Real Estate Tax Law, %10 of the real estate taxes can be reserved for this source to fulfill expropriation, planning and project together with implementation services. For the preparation of Conservation Development Plan, General Directorate of Provincial Bank and Special Provincial Agencies can provide grants from their budgets to be reserved for Municipalities" (Madran, Özgünül, 2005).

The immovable assets on conservation sites that are prohibited for construction can be exchanged with immovable assets of treasury. In order to benefit from this exchange, the immovable assets should be on 1st and 2nd Degree Archeological site or 1st degree natural conservation site and it to be registered in cadastre. In addition, there should not be any discrepancy on the ownership and the cultural asset should be in the content of conservation development plan.

The Immovable assets in the ownership of legal identities located on the conservation site areas that are prohibited for construction on the other hand, can be exchanged to immovable assets of Municipalities and Special Provincial Agencies. However, due to the fact that there are not much immovable assets that belong to municipalities and Special Provincial agencies in Ulus Historic City Centre, it is not possible to use this service for Sakarya Quarter (Madran, Özgünül, 2005).

Immunity from taxation is another financial opportunity that the owners can benefit. According to this financial aid, the owners of immovable cultural and natural assets do not pay for inheritance and transfer tax.
In addition, the owners that benefit from related project of registered immovable cultural assets are exempt from the value added taxes of these projects. Moreover, during the own age and transfer operations for immovable cultural assets; judgments fees, notary fees, tax judgment fees, land registry cadastre fees and other related fees are not paid. Within Municipal Revenues Act; all the repair and construction works on immovable cultural assets are also exempt from the related taxes, fees and costs (Madran, Özgönül, 2005).

“Law on Promotion of Cultural Investments and Initiatives" provides opportunities in order to carry out conservation and the sustainability of intangible cultural heritage and utilize them as a feature that provides economic benefit for the country. In addition, Act. No 5228 provides tax reductions on the activities organized by associations, foundations, municipalities, SPAs etc. or the activities of the activities are approved by Ministry of culture and tourism. The donations and financial aids for the maintenance repair and restoration cost of the first group buildings that are registered in the name of associations and institutions including foundations and municipalities under the governance of “General Directorate of Foundations” can be reduced from income within the Law No. 5035. Lastly, Act No. 5466 concerning the preservation and utilization of immovable historical and cultural assets provides new opportunities for planning and implementation activities by accelerating approval and investigating process of the projects, expropriation and property change (Madran, Özgönül, 2005).

Private sector is another branch for providing financial aids for the preservation of cultural heritage. Donations, sponsorships and voluntary work that can be created by the NGOs, associations and private entrepreneurs can be utilized as an economic source. Moreover, international institutions such as World Bank, European Union, Council of Europe, European Investment Bank, ICCROM, and UNESCO can provide financial aids for the projects preserving the cultural heritage.
Concerning the legal, administrative and the financial framework for the principles, strategies and proposals about the conservation of historic urban landscapes, local municipalities are the main actors beyond any doubt. According to the Municipality Law, the municipalities are responsible for creating the entire physical and social infrastructure in the name of public interest. Providing housing services for the community is also included in the missions of municipalities.
Therefore, placing the public interest in the center of conservation principles and strategies as well as creating a unified and sustainable approach should be the main scope of the municipalities. Within this, both Altındağ Municipality and other local municipalities in Turkey should not follow a way that expropriate the traditional residential buildings and eliminate their inhabitants in order to cover the related expenses in historic urban landscapes, but should aim to keep the residential use of the properties for the sake of those inhabitants after the purchasing the buildings. In order to provide such service for the communities, Municipalities should search for all the national and international financial sources.

4.4 Re-discussing the Proposed Strategies and Actions with the Stakeholders

In order to get more efficient results and increase the feasibility, it is necessary to discuss the strategies and action for Sakarya Quarter that are proposed in this chapter with different stakeholders and revise them accordingly. Within this, in-depth interviews has been made with experts, municipality and the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter. Strategies and the actions that are proposed in the content of this thesis are shared and their feedbacks are taken into consideration. Moreover, different opinions referred in the meetings organized by Altındağ Municipality with Middle East Technical University, KORDER and different professionals are also added in this part.

4.4.1 Discussions with Experts

On November 2013, two different meetings are organized with the participation of Altındağ Municipality, METU, KORDER and professionals. Different ideas and approaches are discussed on what kind of conservation approach can be determined for Sakarya Quarter.
One of the common ideas about Sakarya Quarter is the urgent need of a “Conservation Development Plan” that held Ulus Historic Center with an integrated approach. With respect to this plan, Sakarya Quarter needs to be integrated to the cultural and social network of Ulus together Ankara Castle, Hacıbayram and Hamamönü Area.

In order to achieve this, projects with minimum time and budget are suggested in Sakarya Quarter for creating an attraction point as well as defining an axis between Ankara Castle and Hamamönü through Sakarya Quarter. The content of these projects are defined as restoration of a monumental building, new building design in the historic settings, street rehabilitation project, landscape designing in the site, the façade rehabilitation on Ulucanlar Street. Thus, the first project area is defined as an area consisting İnci and Sarıca Streets which are suitable for creating an axis that passes through Ulucanlar Street.

On the other hand, sustaining the inhabitance of the community in Sakarya Quarter is seen crucial for keeping the general characteristic of the site. In this way, the site would be also utilized constantly during a day. The utilization of some of the buildings as dormitories for students of the surrounding universities is suggested as a way to keep the site in use both day and night.

Another problem the experts referred during the meetings is related with the quality of the Municipality’s implementations. Reconstructing the traditional buildings in new construction technique and material not only corresponds to general principles of conservation but also increases the budgets. Thus, a consultation mechanism that would work together with Altındağ Municipality is suggested in every step of projects including preparation, approval and implementation. In this manner, signing a protocol between METU, KORDER and Altındağ Municipality is proposed in order to provide consultation on project design and technical details. In order to build a consensus between Municipality and experts, the training of Municipality personnel is also recommended.
In terms of finding economic sources to the projects such as EU Funds, Ministry of Culture and Tourism Funds and sponsorship from different associations are discussed as alternatives. In addition, the promotion of programs on training qualified workman in the conservation of the site is also proposed as a way to decrease expanses.

In addition to these meetings, an in-depth interview is made with Makbule İlçan and Ahmet Uzel from UTTA Planning, Architecture, Urban Design& Consulting LTD. Co", which is the office responsible for preparing “Conservation Development Plan” for Ulus Historic City Centre, on May 2015.

One of the most important concerns of UTTA is the long and never ending approval process of Conservation Development Plans in the scale of 1/5000. Although the plans have already been approved for 2 times by the Ankara Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage, it has not been entered into the effect yet due to the objections of professional chambers.

This situation also obstructed to develop further implementation plans in smaller scales that correspond to Conservation Development Plan. This situation leads Altındağ Municipality to develop various different projects piecemeal.

As a respond to latest news on the planning process, UTTA refers once again the urgency of approval of Conservation Development Plan in order to develop implementation projects for the intervention on buildings in a more accurate way. The infrastructure system is another issue that needs to be carried out immediately. Extension of the streets in order to ease the accessibility of service vehicles is also on the agenda of Sakarya Quarter.

Moreover, reduction the height of buildings on Ulucanlar Avenue and Talatpaşa Boulevard that disrupt the traditional fabric of Sakarya Quarter has become a topic on both UTTA and Altındağ Municipality agree on.
The increasing number of expropriations and purchasing by Altındağ Municipality is another issue that was discussed. It has been stated that the inhabitants are forced to expropriate their houses with notice of default unless they can cover for the repair or restoration expenses for their houses.

Tenants, on the other hand, have no chance at all but leaving their houses in this situation. It has been referred that Altındağ Municipality should vary their economic sources to carry out the conservation activities. However, even if the Municipality gives so much effort to keep the utilization of the buildings, it is usually achieved by purchasing the property by different associations.

Beypazarı is suggested as a case in terms of following the conservation approach by sustaining the inhabitance. However, UTTA also stated that it is much harder to follow such approach because of the changing social structure of Ulus Historic Center. The major part of original inhabitants in Ulus has already moved to other parts of the city because of the changing image of the historical center. Thus, it has become an obstacle to keep the sustainability of the residential use in the site with the current inhabitants.

Although commercial and tourism activities is suggested preferably for Sakarya Quarter, UTTA points out that these activities leads use of the site in only day time. Thus, the functions such as pensions, dormitories for universities that would promote using the site during the whole day should also be considered for Sakarya Quarter. UTTA also suggested that it is more suitable to purchase the buildings from landlords instead of expropriation in order to eliminate the injustices between inhabitants.

4.4.2 Discussions with Altındağ Municipality

As a part of this chapter, another in-depth interview is made with professionals from the Conservation Unit of Altındağ Municipality. In addition, the general opinions and considerations of Altındağ Municipality on the meetings with METU, KORDER and other professional also take part.
As the date of May 2015, Altındağ Municipality has almost finished the first part of their implementations between Municipality Building and Gebze Street and started the preparation of second part which covers an area between Gebze Street and İnci Street. Although the rehabilitation activities still go on, the tension between community and Altındağ Municipality has not been solved yet.

First of all, Altındağ Municipality is very eager on revitalization of Sakarya Quarter. In order to enliven the site, they lean towards to different alternatives from experts. Thus, municipality does not limit itself only with the renovation of buildings. Different proposals on landscape and environmental design, new building design, reduction on the height of the buildings on Ulucanlar Avenue and Talatpaşa Boulevard etc. can always be welcomed by Altındağ Municipality for the welfare of the site.

On the other hand, financing the project becomes one of the most important considerations that municipality focuses on revitalization of Sakarya Quarter.

Although Municipality is very eager to serve and help the inhabitants in many ways, finding the economic source for the implementation results as a major conflict between Municipality and the community. Municipality stated that although they offer the inhabitants to cover for the expanses related with the intervention on the exterior part of the houses, the inhabitants are not willing to pay for the interior implementations or be in a part of any project related with the enhancing the physical environment of their site. The existence of multiple heirs of one land also hardens to build a consensus on the buildings.

Another problem is the high rate of payments the landlords demand for purchasing of their properties. Municipality stated that inhabitance ask for high prices because they know that value of their property would increase after the interventions. This situation forces municipality to follow the expropriation process for traditional buildings to carry out the implementations.
After the renovation of the buildings that Municipality carries out, they purchase the buildings to different associations, private office etc. in order to keep the site alive as well as covering implementation expanses.

Municipality stated that there are also landlords that collaborate with them and carry out the projects for the renovation of their buildings themselves even if their level of income is not different from the rest. Moreover, they mentioned that some of landlords who had moved out from Sakarya Quarter have returned after the renovations. The Municipality added that willingness to cooperate is the key for the inhabitants’ welfare.

The empowering of the community is another discussion topic with Altındağ Municipality. Municipality once again stated the unwillingness about the participation of inhabitants in such promoting activities. For this reason, when Municipality is asked for promoting as similar working field like the art and craft bazaar that settled in Hamamönü, it has been stated that this is not on their latest agenda.

Although they have been organizing many different training workshops for women in order to create job opportunities on which even women from other places of Ankara can participate, they referred that the female population of Sakarya Quarter does not prefer to participate such activities. In brief, according to Altındağ Municipality conducting any type of production activity in Sakarya Quarter is not very likely because of unwillingness of inhabitance.

4.4.3 Discussions with the Inhabitants

The last part of the in-depth interviews has been made with inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter in order to determine their opinions related with the site. The social surveys that were held in the site analysis will also be the use as a guideline to define the consideration of the inhabitants.
With the initiation of the rehabilitations on the second part of site, the inhabitants become more concerned than before. Some of the inhabitants stated that they have been forced to negotiate on the expropriation of their property by the municipality. The price they demand for the purchasing of their buildings is usually above the limits that Municipality can afford. They stated that it is normal to demand higher price for their properties considering market value of their property would increase after the interventions. The tenants whom the buildings they live in are being expropriated are hopeless and wait to move out.

On the other hand the landlords whose lots are registered are much more moderate towards the Municipality since they can benefit from different tax incentives. In addition, tenants who do not have a direct problem with municipality are more continent about the services of the municipality. One consensus on the inhabitants is that, they are all willing to live in Sakarya Quarter after the rehabilitations if the municipality can find a solution for finding economic sources.

In the content of creating new job opportunities for the community, inhabitants state that they are continent in participating related actions. In case of promoting tourism related activities, inhabitants have a positive opinion.

They want Altındağ Municipality to reveal the true potential of site as an attraction people for outsiders referring that Sakarya Quarter is as much significant as Hamamönü and Ankara Citadel. In this content, inhabitants demand the support of Ministry of Culture and Tourism to carry out related actions.

Promoting local production is also another issue that inhabitants support. General opinion of women on preparing refreshments, art and craft products and other related stuff in order to provide income is positive. However there are also women who approach this issue with suspicion. Male population of Sakarya Quarter also state that especially women are more prone to these activities and they would support women if it would contribute the economic development of the site.
Regarding the content of the production, inhabitants stated the site is not very suitable for agricultural production. However, they added that there are some people in their neighborhood who sell the local products from surrounding villages and they can also carry out a similar activity.

Most of the men in Sakarya Quarter are familiar with the construction works. Although they are not very enthusiastic on participating the construction in their neighborhood because of the conflicts they have been living with Municipality, it has been realized that male population of Sakarya Quarter has a strong potential to be utilized as the workforce for construction activities on Ulus Historic Centre.

4.5 General Assessment

The general approach and the principles for Sakarya Quarter aim to provide heritage conservation in the site as well as empowering its community with its active participation in the action in order to provide their sustainability for the future generations. The strategies and the actions derived from these principles are categorized in three different groups according to their content.

The first strategy titled as “Conservation and the Maintenance of the Physical Environment” aims to increase inhabitants’ quality of life and create a better living environment for them by making suggestion on the regional and buildings scale.

Providing the economic development of the community by revealing out the sources of the site is another strategy that. In the content of this strategy, production, workforce for construction and tourism action are determined in detailed suggestions together its legal and financial framework.
Lastly, in order to raise the awareness of the community and promoting their active participation in the conservation of Sakarya Quarter, the strategies and actions are determined through education. Similar strategies are also developed for the skill development in order to teach inhabitants to use the sources of Sakarya Quarter more efficiently. The related financial and legal framework of the proposals also described accordingly.

In addition the legal, administrative and financial frameworks of these strategies have also been determined.

The outcomes of the strategies, actions and proposals that are driven are shared with experts, Altındağ Municipality and community in order to and make further revisions by evaluating different perspectives. In the light of the interviews held with UTTA Planning, it could be stated the concerns are mostly related with the physical and managerial aspects of the conservation development plan for Ulus Historic Centre. Being one of the most experienced offices related with the conservation of Ulus Historic Centre, they are not content with the long approval process of the conservation development plan that restrains them to develop further implementation projects with a unified approach.

Considering their statements on the social character of the site, it could be stated they are not convinced on providing the sustainability of inhabitants due to the constant change in the social structure in Ulus Historic Centre. Referring the changing social structure of the site, they lean towards to making some functional change in the area mostly based on commercial activities. This situation can be evaluated as negative effects on the sustainability of the inhabitants of the site.

On the other hand, it is revealed by interviews that financial framework of the implementation projects is the main consideration of Altındağ Municipality. According to the statement of the municipality, main financial aids constitutes of the governmental aids. Within this, the private and institutional aids should be introduced to municipality as alternatives.
The legal and administrative framework of conservation activities that force the landowners to expropriate or sell of their properties is another consideration that should be changed with the regulations. Within this content, the collaborative work between local and central governments is significant.

Another problem related with the municipality is the lack of collaboration with the experts. In this content the municipality needs consultation on developing a scientific conservation approach including the active participation of the inhabitants in Sakarya Quarter.

The lack of communication between community and municipality on promoting community development and raising awareness can also be considered as a problem. Although some training programs and educational services provided by municipality are present, the promotion of the community to participate on those activities is weak. In this sense the need of a mediatory council that would act as a bridge between community and the municipality is urgent.

Although there are some complications on the conservation activities of municipality, it could be stated that they are very eager and enthusiastic about the development of the site in every terms. Within it, the scientific consultation and providing technical and financial aid and building a consensus with the community are seen necessary for the municipality.

Lastly, the interviews of the inhabitants showed that they are very concern on the ongoing implementation projects in Sakarya Quarter. Especially the legal process on the financing the intervention cost increased the tension between inhabitants and the municipality. Regardless of these problems, they are still willing to keep their inhabitance in the site after the implementations. In addition, they are also eager to contribute the economic development of the site by participating the determined job opportunities in this study.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Historic urban landscapes are not only composed of the natural and the built environment, but also of the social and cultural practices as well as the values, meanings and identification of the communities that are engaged with them. They continuously evolve as a result of the interaction with the communities and transfer themselves to future generations. Thus, in order to provide the sustainability of the historic landscapes, it is important to provide the sustainability of the communities that interacts with it.

On the other hand, different forces such as rapid and uncontrolled urbanization, industrialization, mass tourism and gentrification have started to affect both the physical and social structure of historic urban landscapes negatively. As a result, not only the psychical characteristic of these districts has degenerated, but the social structure that is in relation with those places begins to collapse. Therefore, conservation of historic urban landscapes as well as the sustainability of the communities that are engaged with them is endangered.

Luckily, the discussions on the concept of cultural heritage have shifted from the idea of “preserving the psychical characteristic” into “preserving all the intangible and tangible values of cultural heritage together with its community” in the international conservation agenda throughout the years. Engaging the active participation of the communities and recognition of local values, meanings, beliefs, traditions and needs of the communities becomes essential for developing strategies in heritage conservation.
In addition, bridging the heritage conservation and empowerment of communities by using heritage sources has been accepted in conservation practices.

Although the discussions on the heritage conservation in the international platform have broadened, the legal, administrative and financial frameworks of conservation practices in Turkey are mostly limited and disregard the relationship between place and the community. Therefore, the changing forces still continue to disrupt the link between cultural heritage and communities in historic districts in Turkey and endanger their sustainability to future generations.

In this thesis, a discussion on developing an alternative conservation approach by defining principles, strategies and proposals for historic urban landscapes and providing the sustainability of the communities that interacts with them was held via the concept of social sustainability. In the light of this scope, the thesis was carried out through the case study area Sakarya Quarter in Ulus Historic Centre. Despite being surrounded by many forces that change its traditional characteristic and social structure, Sakarya Quarter still keeps its traditional characteristic. Moreover, even though they are not the original inhabitants of the site, the current residents of Sakarya Quarter live in harmony and cohesion and not disrupt the traditional characteristic of the site.

However, the ongoing conservation practices in Sakarya Quarter led by Altındağ Municipality started to change the both physical and the social structure of the site that generate a conflict with community and endangers the sustainability of their inhabitance in the site. As a response to this problem, the thesis has questioned what kind of alternative conservation approach can be determined for Sakarya Quarter via the concept of social sustainability.

Accordingly, a comprehensive theoretical study has been carried out to reveal the relationship between people and heritage conservation. As the leading concept of this study, social sustainability and its role and development in heritage conservation was discussed.
Charters, declarations and the publication of various institutions are utilized to understand the issue on a global level. In addition, the social sustainability factors and its basic requirements in historic urban landscapes were defined. The study was supported by the various examples that focus on different aspects of social sustainability practices for the heritage conservation throughout the world. As a result of this theoretical study; general guidelines, tools and processes for the conservation of historic urban landscapes and to provide the sustainability of the communities that engage with those places were determined. This framework was utilized as a base in further parts of this study.

Therefore, in the light of the site analysis and literature survey, the general characteristic of Sakarya Quarter has been understood. This study enables to reveal the physical, visual, functional and social aspects of the Sakarya Quarter. In addition, the comprehensive research was carried out to understand the effects of the planning and conservation activities that have been held in the Ulus Historic Center and Sakarya Quarter. The problems between Altındağ Municipality and the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter on the conservation practices in Sakarya Quarter are also included in this research. Valorization and identification of the site by the community of Sakarya Quarter was also defined in the light of social surveys and in-depth interviews. The information that was gained by all the analysis has been evaluated in the light of social sustainability factors in order to understand the values, problems and potentials of the site in order to develop principles and strategies.

As an outcome of all of these studies, it is apparent that although the current inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter are not the original residents of the site, they have built a strong bond with the site and spend their lives in a harmonious way that correspond to the characteristic of the site. Although their physical environment needs to be developed in order to increase their quality of life and to respond to their needs, they do not have the economic power to maintain or enhance their living environment. In addition, there is a lack of public awareness and knowledge on how to use the potential of site as a source for economic development.
The general approach and principles for the conservation of Sakarya Quarter and sustainability of its community, based on those general assessments, were determined. These general principles suggested the enhancement of the physical environment while conserving its traditional characteristics, providing all the services that the inhabitants need to improve their quality of life, creating economic sources for the inhabitants by using the potential of the site and raising the awareness of the inhabitants both in preserving their common heritage and using the sources of the site.

Derived from these principles, the strategies and actions are developed accordingly. The strategies and actions have been divided into different categories according to their content. Conservation and enhancement of the physical environment for Sakarya Quarter, utilization of heritage sources for the economic development of the community and empowerment of the community through education are the main subjects that are held in those strategies. The legal, administrative and financial frameworks of these strategies are also defined in the content of this thesis.

In order to increase the feasibility of the study, the strategies have been shared with different stakeholders. As a result of in-depth interviews containing the opinions of Altındağ Municipality, the expert and the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter are included as a guideline to further revision of the strategies and actions for the future.

To conclude, this thesis can be accepted as an introductory study to define an alternative approach in terms of bridging heritage conservation and sustainability of the communities in historic urban landscapes. Formulating a methodology through the concept of social sustainability in heritage conservation that includes general guidelines, tools and process; the thesis aims to make a contribution to the conservation of Sakarya Quarter and sustainability of its inhabitants through principles, strategies and proposals.
This study can also be utilized as a guide for local authorities to develop alternative solutions by placing the public interest in the center of conservation practices in the historic urban landscapes so that both the sustainability of the community and the place can be achieved.

The strategies and actions that are determined for Sakarya Quarter and its inhabitants in this study should be developed with the collaborative work of Altındağ Municipality, experts of different disciplines. More importantly the inhabitants of Sakarya Quarter should be positioned in the center of the conservation of their site and they should be given responsibilities in empowering and providing the sustainability of their community.

The guidelines, tools and process that are defined in the theoretical study of this thesis can also be utilized as a methodological guide for developing principles and strategies in conservation of other historic urban landscapes. However, considering that each specific site has its own character and dynamics, certain changes might be needed in further studies.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLES WITH THE INHABITANTS OF SAKARYA QUARTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>ID (block, lot)</th>
<th>Date (02/02-05/03/20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Okula Hala devam eden bineyer var mı? (evet/diğer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet: 16 Sen 11 Sen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neredesiniz? (Ankara/Diger)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nereden bu mahalde yapmışsınız?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hastora ya daha mı?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bu mahalde yapılmış işin menşesini mutsuz mu?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Başka bir mahalleye yapılan işin düşüncüyorsunuz?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet: Neden?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin tarif eder mi?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin belirleyen kim?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daha önce burada mı yapmışsınız?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin tarif eder mi?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin belirleyen kim?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evet:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table Data**

- **Daha önce burada mı yapmışınız?**
  - Evet
- **Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin tarif eder mi?**
  - Evet
- **Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin belirleyen kim?**
  - Evet
- **Daha önce burada mı yapmışınız?**
  - Evet
- **Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin tarif eder mi?**
  - Evet
- **Evetinizi verdiğiniz işin belirleyen kim?**
  - Evet

---

220
Evet: X

Siz ait taşkın bir öğrencimiz var mı?

Hayır:

Telefonunuz (+) Çınarlık Mak. ( ) Balıkçı Mak. ( ) Bez Dede ( ) Değil ( )

Evinizde btlgtsayer ve internet var mı?

Hayır:

Mahalle deprem ne sıklıkta bulunur? Ne alınışta?

Nerede? (ev, eğitmen, akraba vb.)

Neyle gidiyoruz? Nasıl?

Evinin yapılışı tamirat ve insanlar hakkında ne düşünüyorunuz? Hamomin/hamamın

Memnuniyetinizi neden? Değişmiş neden?

Yeşilimizde Hamomin/hamamın içindekti ne düşünüyorsunuz?

Ev ( ) Hayır ( )

Toplu kırsal ve kültür herhangi bir

Belediyeye dergi ya da

Mahallenin yı yanlan b禹 yanları neleri?

Bu çevrenin korunması için sizin öğretmenliği

Bu çevrenin korunması için gerçekleştirecek

Geçmiş korunmasının son évini ve yaşantısı

Aylık Geçmiş

Eviciniz tescili olup olmadığını bilmiyor musunuz?

Notlar:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hane Bireyleri</th>
<th>Yapı</th>
<th>Cinsiyet</th>
<th>Eğitim</th>
<th>Medrek</th>
<th>Çalışan Yer</th>
<th>Sonayi Güvençe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11,10</td>
<td>E- homer</td>
<td>ssk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11,10</td>
<td>Calğım</td>
<td>ssk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>ssk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ssk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cıkışta Hale desen eden bireyler varsa rüksad adı/vardır: Ne...<br>Ne zaman/hediyen geldiğini? Etkinlik: Hayır: \[\text{siyasi dönmeye} \]<br>Hayır: \[\text{Neden/Hangi mühalle:} \]<br>Evinizin yeri ne taraftan zarar alındı?: \[\text{Beslenmenin yerinin ne olur?} \]<br>Nasıl değişti?: (mesaj atma:)<br>Yaş da: (mesaj atma:)<br>Evet/Neden: \[\text{Bu evde yaşayan topluluk} \]<br>Neden/Neden: \[\text{Burdı oturumunu:} \]<br>Evet/Neden: \[\text{En çok hangi odamlar} \]<br>Yaş ki burada mı yaşarınız?: \[\text{Evet}\]<br>Yeni tarifdeki işe Nasıl ağırlık verir mi?: \[\text{Evet/Neden/Hende} \]<br>Yapılan değişiklikleri nerede depoluyorsunuz?: \[\text{Evet/Neden/Hende} \]<br>Yenilenen memnun oldugunuzda değişiklikleri belirtiniz mi?: \[\text{Mutfak, O. Odası, Y. Odası, WC} \]<br>Hangi odaları新加す?: \[\text{Yatıçakın boğulduğunu belirtin} \]<br>Evet/Neden/Hende/Ne zaman?: \[\text{Evet/Neden/Hende} \]<br>Yapılan the yerler var mı?: \[\text{Evet/Neden/Hende} \]<br>Tamamı ile isteyen yerler var mı?: \[\text{Evet/Neden/Hende} \]
Kompütnicin de gösüyün müsnnu? Ne sıkka? Nerede? (ev, kabaktiv.)

Sehir degien mısısırınız gilıyur mu?

Geliyınca Ankara da ve mahallede nerede götürúününüz?

Dügünler kuttakalar ve mahallede mi yapıyur? Nerede?

Tarihinın, mahallerin iyileştir deneyiminin mahallerindeğinden memurum olmu? Ne döppisysişimdr?

Araba motoraslıt ile aracını var mı?

Yer sere park ediyorunuz?

Sise ait bagla bir mısısırınız var mı?

Evet/Nerede:

Evet:

Televizyon:

Çamışlar ({) Bulak Mak. (} Buz Dolabı (} Oğlak (} Ferff)

Evinde bilgisayar ve internet var mı?

Evet:

Mahnle de gösüyün müsnnu? Ne ameşlə?

Neredeyey (lüx, ayeryubı.)

Neyile gilıyurunuz? Nasit?

Belediyenin yapılış tamıret ve ingasat haktını ne düşünürünüz? Mahanlıhı/Hamartık

Memnununzu neden? Değişiklik neden?

Vakınınısta Hansimbe hizmetli olun, ne düşünürünüz? Sakarya mahallede ve kendı evlerini 

Büyük bir pay biten merist?

Yukarıya gülçe dü miracles hatları (a)

Evet:

Sevişmesi

Evet:

Hayır ( ) Hayırın nadinot ( )

Beldeye dişin yapışa si de evinin tamamı yeper mıını?

Mahallenizde yı yılın yentı yentı yentı nefer?

Bu peşerin konrunun için size gøre düşülüünü 

Bu peşerin konrunun için gerçekleştirecek düşünürün müsnnu? Sıcka kımer kattıkda bulununuz?

Bu peşerin konrunun için gerçekleştirecek düşünürün müsnnu? Nasil yar akını?

Genellerinin konrununun için evlere ve parkınma 

Genellerinin konrununun için evlere ve parkınma 

Genellerinin konrununun için evlere ve parkınma 

Genellenen evleri için arıllı evlerini 

Aracının maddi deşgıcında atırg ( ) Tıcalın cinsellikleri ( ) 

Bölgenin gelipmesi ( ) Diğer ( )

Aylık:

600 (300)

Evinin teselli alıp olnmişde bilyör müsnnu?

Rötar:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Date: /2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor:</td>
<td>ID (block, lot, no):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soru</th>
<th>Evet ( )</th>
<th>Hayır ( )</th>
<th>Neden?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tedirinin yaşamasını tehdit eden yapılar veya kuruluşlar; zarar görebilir mi?</td>
<td>Evet ( )</td>
<td>Hayır ( )</td>
<td>Neden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kültür haklar altındaki yapıların veya alanların zarar görebilir mi?</td>
<td>Evet ( )</td>
<td>Hayır ( )</td>
<td>Neden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belediye dış cephe için zarar görmeyecek mi?</td>
<td>Evet ( )</td>
<td>Hayır ( )</td>
<td>Neden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahallenizin memnuniyetini etkili olacak yanlıklar var mı?</td>
<td>Evet ( )</td>
<td>Hayır ( )</td>
<td>Neden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendi mahalde olumlu bir değişiklik olursa, olanı olur mu?</td>
<td>Evet ( )</td>
<td>Hayır ( )</td>
<td>Neden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çevre önemiyle ilgili bir değişiklik olursa, olanı olur mu?</td>
<td>Evet ( )</td>
<td>Hayır ( )</td>
<td>Neden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu çevre önemiyle ilgili bir değişiklik olursa, olanı olur mu?</td>
<td>Evet ( )</td>
<td>Hayır ( )</td>
<td>Neden?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Notes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hane Bireyleri</th>
<th>Yap</th>
<th>Çinleyet</th>
<th>Eğitim</th>
<th>Mezlek</th>
<th>Çalıştığı Yarım</th>
<th>Sosyal Güvençe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Okula Hala devam eden bireyler var mı? 

Nerelisini? Ankara: 

Yılda kaç yıl bu mahallede yaşamıyor? 

Bu mahallede yaşamaktan memnuniyetiniz? Evet: Hayır: 

Ev sahibi mi? Ev sahibi mi? 

Yapıda ne anlatınız? Mürekkep: 

Yapının tamiratı yapılıp yapmadı? Evet: Hayır: 

Tamirat isteyen yerler var mı? Evet: Hayır: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muhtar</th>
<th>O. Odası</th>
<th>Y. Odası</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>Harek.</th>
<th>Arılık/Saha</th>
<th>Diğer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Görevinizde görevliyor musunuz? Ne sıklıkta? Nerede? (öv, kahvehane.)

Sehir dışında misafirkeniniz geliyor mu?

Gelişme Ankara ve mahallede nelerle gölünürünüz?

Bu görevin koruması için işe göre düzenli olan kişiler sunuluyor musunuz? Size kimler katıldıktan sonra?

Bu görevin koruması için gerçekleştirecek gizlilik veren yer var mı?

Çevrenin korunmasını için evcinsiz ve yasalحمامlarla katı olmak olarak düzenli korunuyor musunuz? Nasıl?

Evinizin tescilli okul olmadığını biliyorum musunuz?

Aşırı: Yoksü evec o evec pot.

Notlar:
METU - GRADuate PROGRAM in Restoration
RESTORE PLANNING AND DESIGN URBAN CONSERVATION
ANKARA - SAKARYA QUARTER FIELD STUDY SPRING 2013-2014

Prof Dr. Niyazi Hakan Götkesen, Asst. Prof. Dr. Güher Bingöl Albeniz, Res. Ass. Leyla Üstünöz

Address: ___________________________  ID (block, lot, no): ___________________________
Surveyor: ___________________________  Date: / 2015

Tıkıncin yapımı tarafların yapım ihtimalinde kredi vermek istiyor musunuz?
Evet ( ) Hayır ( X)

Evette yararlanmak istemiyorsanız?

Kültür Bakanlığının karşılık verdiğini biliyor musunuz?
Evet ( ) Hayır ( )

Evette yararlanmak istemiyorsanız?

Bebek'te oy caçası için yardıma bulunma talebiniz vardır.
Evet ( X) Hayır ( )

Hayır nedeni?

Evette ne kadar harcansınız en pkok?

Mahallenizde memnun musunuz? (Mensenizdeki yerin ne?)

(Memnun değil) Mahallenizin kısı vector neler?

Hamamın ve arkaında belediyeniz yarışığa teklif/tevârlerini hiç teklif etmiş mi?

Evet ( ) Hayır ( )

Neden?

Kendi mahalleniz ve çevresi için böyle yarışma istemiyor musunuz?

Neden?

Araçınızın bulunduğu arıtma, sosyal ve kültürel, yapımı gelyenmiş?

Bilgelerinizi ( )

Diğer ( )

Bu araçınızın korunması için size göre değişikliklerin yapılmasını sağlayarak yer almasını sağlar mı?

Halk ( )

Sosyal ( )

Diğer ( )

Bıza araçınızın korunması için giderleştireceğiniz gelirlerden yer alırsınız? Hassı yer almırsınız?

Evet ( X) Hayır ( )

Masif ( )

Gönlünlü gelir ( )

Diğer ( )
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Tobinin yapısına terk etmek istemedik mi?
Evet ( )
Hayır ( )

Evetlen ya da yaştan istemem mi?
Evet ( )
Hayır ( )

Kültür Bahçemim kargıktı?
Evet ( )
Hayır ( )

Belediye derişçe için yüzünden bulunmaya zorlanma izin mi?
Evet ( )
Hayır ( )

Evette ne kadar harcansın çok?

Mafulleriden memnun muyunuz? (Memnuna şair yanıt neler?

[Memnun değil]Mafullerin köşü yanıt neler?

1. Memnun

Hamamini ve arkaında belediyenin yapılışı tahliye edilecek akıl mı?

2. Neden?

Kend-mevcurleri ve bir rendre içinde böyle bir şeylerden izin mi?

3. Neden?

Cerrahin korunmasına asıl dikkat edilmeli kaynakları ne?

4. Aracının maddi degerinde arınır ( )

Seçil ve kültürel

Büyük miktarda ( )

Bu süreçin korunmasına asıl dikkat edilmeli kaynakları ne?

5. Aracının maddi degerinde arınır ( )

Seçil ve kültürel

Büyük miktarda ( )

Belediye yerine SOR ( )

Bu süreçin corunmasına asıl dikkat edilmeli kaynakları ne?

6. Aracının maddi degerinde arınır ( )

Seçil ve kültürel

Büyük miktarda ( )

Diger ( )

Additional Notes