Does Gentrification Displace the Urban Poor? The Case of *Bursa*, Turkey

Doğan Bıçkı[1], *Serhat Özgökçeler*[2]

ABSTRACT

Gentrification is probably the most debated category of all the urban renewal strategies. This is because, as a consequence of the gentrification process, there is a possibility that social change may occur that may lead to changes in the social pattern (Ball, 2002, p.833). This possibility is, for some, an inevitable consequence and for some others a case to be approached with relativity. Our stance in this study is that local conditions, such as cultural or historical capital, should be taken into consideration not only due to their formation but also to their consequences.

In this regard, the goal of the study is to identify whether the urban renewal observed in the Tophane Hisar district in Bursa, one of the historical cities in Turkey, could be analyzed through the concept "gentrification". In addition, if it could, what will its scope be? And is the displacement of the urban poor by gentrification an issue for this district?

Keywords: Gentrification, urban poor, neighborhood, displacement, ownership change.

---

[1]   *Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Administration at Mugla University.*

[2]   *Research Assistant in the Department of Labor Economics and Industrial Relations at Uludag University.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Gentrification can be defined as the "transformation of the deprived, low-income, inner-city neighborhoods into new wealthy areas based on population change and on improvements to the built environment" (Criekingen&Decroly, 2003, p.2454). The term was first coined in 1964 by sociologist Ruth Glass. She came up with it to explain the replacement of working or lower class people by middle class individuals in London (Glass, 1964). Gentrification has granted the researchers a variety of concepts since it was first introduced in 1964. There have been many additions to the gentrification, concept, also a subject of the old districts and old houses in the city centers. For example, what Dooling (2009, p.630) meant by the displacement of the homeless living in the parks open to the public was actually ecological gentrification, which also proved the productivity of the term "gentrification".

Gentrification is probably the most debated category of all the urban renewal strategies. This is because, as a consequence of the gentrification process, there is a possibility that social change may occur that may lead to changes in the social pattern (Ball, 2002, p.833). This possibility is, for some, an inevitable consequence and for some others a case to be approached with relativity. Our stance in this study is that local conditions, such as cultural or historical capital, should be taken into consideration not only due to their formation but also to their consequences.

In this regard, the goal of the study is to identify whether the urban renewal observed in the Tophane Hisar district in Bursa, one of the historical cities in Turkey, could be analyzed through the concept "gentrification". In addition, if it could, what will its scope be? And is the displacement of the urban poor by gentrification an issue for this district?

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Gentrification is quite a comprehensive term that is also translated into Turkish as "*soylulaştırma*", "*nezihleştirme*" or "*seçkinleştirme*" (Behar & Islam, 2006, p.1). Therefore, the attempts to define the concept lack some semantic properties as it is instrumental. To clarify the conceptual misunderstandings, all the meanings attributed to the concept should be discussed. Gentrification represents the following processes in the urban social theory.

The process includes the partial or complete take-over of the ancient, historical and cultural texture in the city center by the high-income groups

such as doctors, lawyers, and company managers of the low-income groups. This process is supported by national and local authorities both due to the contributions it could make to the city in many ways and to the increases it could cause in the tax income (Hackworth & Smith: 2001, p. 467).

There are many factors leading to the process of gentrification that can be interpreted as a return of the affluent people to the city based on the findings of the studies conducted in different countries.

There is an emerging tendency towards the city center due the reasons such as transportation facilities and proximity to the workplace (Cole, 1985, p. 152); accessibility to the cultural activities such as theatre, cinema, opera, exhibition, street shows (Butler & Robson, 2003, p.1791); the opportunity to express one's own individuality and the state of being different from others (Redfern, 2003, p.2364); the feeling of belonging to the area and society resulting from the experience of living there or a similar place before (Bridge, 2003, p.2550); an atmosphere of freedom encouraging the social diversity of the society (Ley, 2003, p. 2540).

It is possible to consider all of the factors of "gentrification" in question in the category of subjective or cultural motives. The studies concentrating on the subjective and cultural motives prioritize the characteristics that can be called "positive attributes" of gentrification in general, such as the emergence of an interactive space creating social diversity; the conservation of the historical and public architecture by the renewal and restoration efforts as a positive outcome and many more similar reasons. Slater (2006, p. 741) regards the discourse depicting the cultural advantages of the process as the *sugar coating* that can conceal the pitfalls.

While accepting the advantages provided by the gentrification process for urban renewal is inevitable, it can be claimed that it can bring about other social problems. In addition, the opportunity of cheap housing in the city center is lost as a consequence of the gentrification process, and therefore the low-income groups holding jobs in the center are forced to move to distant locations which also cost more. According to Slatter (2006, p. 752), gentrification, which should be defined as the colonization of areas by social classes, is also a factor that expands the social inequality because it ends the housing stock for rent to which working classes have access. With reference to South Parkdale, Canada, Slatter (2004, p.3229) claims that gentrification does not create an *environment* of social unity and social interaction but social tension and homelessness.

On the connection between homelessness and gentrification, some writers make a distinction between the private and public sectors. In their study where they demonstrated the renewal made in Glasgow and Edinburgh as an example, Bailey and Robertson (1997) reported that the renewal carried out by the private sector aims at the owners of the houses individually unlike those by social sectors which prioritize the community. They concluded that these efforts by the private and public sector succeeded in terms of the physical renewal of the district and the houses. However, they also concluded that, while the approach followed by the private sector caused gentrification, population exchange, the elimination of the settled groups and their displacement, the public sector allowed low-income groups to continue living in their current residence without being influenced adversely (p. 576).

The Rant Gap Theory developed by N. Smith sees gentrification not as the return of the people to the city centers but as the return of the capital. Therefore, in the process of gentrification lies the rant gap representing the difference between the value of the central real estate in the present time and the more values it will possibly gain in the future. The capital holders who invest in the physical structure of certain areas of the cities plan to possess this rant difference with the settlement of the affluent groups in these regions, which makes them the initiators of the gentrification process (Smith, 1979, p.545). Gentrification, as a rule, is known to involve the place in a city center, but it is also claimed to exceptionally involve the suburbs (Niedt, 2006: 99–120).

The Rant Gap Theory and the studies supporting this theory to a partial or large extent interpret this process as based on capital accumulation logic and as an adverse process by which the poor are displaced (Atkinson, 2004, p.126). Therefore, it turns out that there are two perspectives on which gentrification is theorized. One is the liberal humanist camp which tends to account for the process with reference to concepts such as lifestyles, culture, and consumption and demand (Clark, 1992, p.359). According to Featherstone (2007, p.105), who interprets gentrification in the scope of postmodernism:

> The process of gentrification is of interest because it not only points to the redevelopment of the cultural fabric of inner-city areas, it also provides a higher profile for groups within the new middle class who are in many guises the producers, carriers, consumers of lifestyles which entail the culturally sensitive 'stylization of life' and have developed dispositions which make them receptive to postmodern cultural goods and experiences. They therefore have direct and

indirect interests in the accumulation of cultural capital both on a personal basis, and in terms of that of their neighborhood and the wider city.

The other is the structural Marxist view that explains the process as based on capital accumulation, production for classes and demand. This view is compatible with those approaching the process in relation to class and seeing it as the spatial realization of the emerging middle class which carries out the functions of global capital (Bridge, 1995, p. 239).

Lees claims that both approaches are restrictive and the gentrification practice in the 1990's should be re-analyzed considering globalization (2000, p.392). Lees conceptualized gentrification-which he also called super gentrification- based on financers. On the other hand, H. Smith and Graves (2005, p. 421) also analyzed the process as part of the expansion strategies of global companies. Accordingly, the Bank of America supported the gentrification in the city centers because of the competitive superiority that it will have in the global labor and the respect it will be shown rather than the financial benefit it will bring. According to Zukin (1987, p.131), who defines the process as spatial and social differentiation, gentrification has been supported by the governments which plan to create an economic revival for the real estate investors and the landowners in the city centers in the years (1970–75), when the prices of petrol in the West Europe and America, and the inflation rates and the costs of the building increased. In the period in question, there was also a change in the urban renewal policies of local authorities. This change was in the supply of the financial assistance encouraging the houses to be restored instead of their elimination. This period can be regarded as the beginning of gentrification based on the small-scale restorations. Though gentrification is a process realized by private financing in theory, the support given by the local authorities made it easier for the credit providers to be involved in the process (Zukin, 1987, p. 132). The involvement of the local authorities in the process is directed towards expanding their own local tax potential because they can only cover 13 per cent of the sources they will use to produce service from the national budget. When considered that this proportion is close to 75 per cent in England, it is necessary to enrich the socio-economic potential of the city as well as enhancing the environmental quality in American cities (Atkinson, 2003, p. 2345).

The discussion of the scope and the quality of the gentrification process has ended, but what is slightly agreed upon is that space-specific differences may arise in different locations. Gentrification may come in a variety of forms and at different intensities in different cities, even in different places

of the same city. There is still a need for a new categorization as a comprehensive and foolproof definition has not yet been made (Clark, 1992, p. 358; Bondi, 1991, p. 196).

Criekingen and Decroly (2003), considering the examples of Montreal and Brussels, analyzed gentrification in the scope of urban renewal. To them, gentrification is not an ultimate stage that happened step by step through an evolutionary development of the process (p. 2451). Criekingen and Decroly rejected the idea of uni-dimensional foolproof gentrification and proposed urban renewal processes based on a set of different motives, each being unique to itself. These include *Gentrification, Marginal Gentrification, Upgrading Neighborhood Renewal and Incumbent Upgrading*.

Gentrification is the transformation of the poor settlement where low-income people live into renewed, rich settlements created by artificially beautified environment and settled by the middle class people as a result of the displacement of the poor. These transformations are observed in the cities home to the emerging middle class people as a consequence of global financial activities. On the other hand, *marginal gentrification* refers to the spatial and social renewal process arising as a result of the gathering of people, rich in cultural capital, but relatively limited in financial capital (p. 2454, 2456). For example, the transformations occurring due to the preferences of artists, travelers, cosmopolitans, single and childless couples and sometimes gays can be seen in this group.

David Ley, who investigated the role of the artists as well as of the anesthetizing of historical places in the process of gentrification, indicated that the aesthetic appearance and the historical nature of the places near Canadian cities constitute an important cultural heritage and a highly symbolic value, which creates an economic asset. Accordingly, the aestheticisation of the places cause the prices of real estate to rise and the artists are forced to move to cheaper places (Ley, 2003, p. 2540). The artists, in turn, become the victim of the renewal process to which they contribute.

Upgrading Neighborhood Renewal is typically observed in the bourgeois settlements owned by elderly people from middle and elite classes for an extended period of time. In these settlements, the renewals made on the buildings are limited to trivial changes that are to meet the special needs of those new comers. *Incumbent Upgrading,* considered to be one of the fundamental ways of urban renewal in the 1970s, is often implemented in places where people from the middle class have their own houses. For this reason, Incumbent Upgrading causes little or no population displacement (Criekingen & Decroly, 2003, p. 2456).

The designs of the writers for Urban Renewal show that all the ideal types are not performed at the same density and in the same way everywhere and that there are now new models and conceptualizations taking into account the socio-spatial peculiarities. With reference to the models proposed by Criekingen and Decroly, this study, accordingly, investigates social and spatial characteristics of the renewal around Bursa-Hisar.

III. METHODS OF THE RESEARCH

In this study, qualitative research analysis based on interview was employed. To this end, the interviews were recorded and then transcribed. In addition, during the interviews, structured question forms were used. The open-ended questions in the form were directed to the interviewees to guarantee the coherence of the interview. The form included questions to reveal the demographic features of those living in the building and to test the hypothesis of the theories related to gentrification.

The data for the study was collected between 7th and 30th March, 2009 from 24 participants –4 females and 20 males– who are the owners of the buildings located around *Molla Gurani, Kavaklı, Osmangazi* and *Alaaddinbey* and *Kale Street*, the oldest streets and districts of Bursa near Tophane-Hisar. These regions are especially investigated because they preserve their historical texture, and they are those where renewals and restorations were carried out. The names of the interviewees were used as pseudo names in the paper. In addition, a general manager of a firm, which has long carried out projects as developers in the regions, was also interviewed. The data from the interview shows the significance of the role that the developers play in the renewal of the region:

> We have been performing projects of building engineering in Bursa since 1989 and we have been involved especially in architectural projects since 1997. We have completed about 40 restoration and reconstruction projects since then. We can classify our projects into three groups: (1) the customer buys the house and has us do the restoration, (2) we buy the house and restore it to sell (3) we restore the house as in the original state. Another option is that we replace a house with a larger land around with a similar one to the original one and build one more in the rest of the land.

> (from the interview on 14 September 2006).

The interview with the developer firm yielded the first indications as to whether the urban renewal observed around Tophane can be associated

with the concept of gentrification. Within the three years after the first interview, it was decided that the sustainability of the renewal process be observed and that field work be carried out.

IV. FINDINGS

A) Demographic Features

a) Birth Places

When the birth places were considered, 18 of the 24 interviewees were born in Bursa and the others were born in other places and moved to Bursa for a variety of reasons. More specifically, two thirds of them were native settlers. Being a native to the country or city is regarded as an important feature in the theory of gentrification. It was reported that, especially at the end of the gentrification process experienced in West Europe and America, foreigners left the district and the natives started to live there more dominantly. However, in the context of Tophane, it seems possible to talk of a "nativization" arising from an exchange of natives with foreigners. It is also understood that native residents of the district are disturbed by this change:

> *Affluent people who are not originally from here such as doctors and jewelers have started to settle here gradually recently...*

> (TmX, 69).

> *100-150 people started to live in 4-5 apartments where years ago only 10 or 15 families lived. People we do not know came and settled here. They may be good people, but what may bring us together to know each other? If you asked the old state of this district, I should say that it was a place where the old natives settled and was a place of choice. This part (Ortapazar) of Hisar was a place where the most prominent people of Bursa lived such as merchants, tradesmen, high rank officials. However, I do not know what it is like now. Until very recently, you could not tell who was rich and who was poor. However, not this is changing...*

> (RmY, 57).

The native of the district is complaining about the newcomers. This complaint demonstrates that the uniformity of the city is gradually being eliminated and the general texture tends gradually to diversify and that the

class disintegration is inevitably to occur (Alver, 2007, p.58). In fact, the narrations of the recent gentrifiers support the concern expressed above:

> *Unfortunately, we are not in close contact with the neighbors around. We have been here for almost two years, but we can come together only with some people. At the same time, these people are affluent enough, and they come from the same cultural environment.*

(AñZ, 39).

b) Age Profile

The ages of those interviewed were in their forties and fifties-mostly in the middle-aged groups. Apart from this group, the number of people in their 20_s and 30_s equaled to those in their 60_s and above. Most of the people in the elderly group are, as expected, originally from Tophane and have long been living in their own houses. People between 25–55 were living in the two-third of houses classified as gentrified ones, which means almost all of the young people in the study live in the gentrified houses.

c) Marital Status and Number of Children

Most of the people who live in these houses are often married and have a nuclear family. One-fourth of them were single, and the others are married. Four of the six people coming from other cities to Bursa are married, and three of them have only one child. Those originally from Bursa often have two children.

When evaluated from a broad perspective, the percentage of single people in Bursa is above the Turkish national average of 12.8% and the number of children seems below the average. This does not support the idea that part of the new arrivals involved in the process of the gentrification consists of women living alone and couples without any children as indicated in the literature (Bondi, 1991, p. 191) because of the changing gender roles of the women and their participation in the working life. In fact, in this study there are only two women-headed households among all the home owners.

d) Indications About Education

It is claimed in the literature that gentrifiers have high cultural capital and therefore have jobs with high status (Bridge, 2001, p.206). The basic idea that gentrification is the replacement of low-income status group with high

income-status group is deeply related with educational status. This information found in the literature is quite in line with the case in Tophane. 18 residents born in Bursa (except three) are graduates of high school or university. Those coming from other cities to Bursa are all graduates of university. The education profiles of the interviewees reveal that those interested in such houses are rich in culture and education. The study of N. Uzun (2006, p.352) on the gentrification of Cihangir–Kuzguncuk, Istanbul and their neighbors indicates the high education levels of gentrifiers. The rate of the university graduates in Cihangir is 45.2% and 32.1% in Kuzguncuk. In this study the rate of university graduates is 50%. The results of these two studies show the relation between the demand for the gentrified houses and the education level.

e) Profession Profile

One of the main arguments in the theory of gentrification is the displacement of the dominant settlements of workers with the groups having professional jobs with high statuses and high income. The profession profile of the interviewees is consistent with those in the literature. Among them are the professionals such as administrators, technicians, accountants, architects, doctors, and engineers as well as jobs of commerce and service with high income such as jewelers, representatives, and textile businessmen. The jewelers have a distinguishing feature from the others, which was revealed during the interview with one of the managers of the building development company:

> *Those living in the best houses in Tophane are generally the jewelers from Kapalıçarşı. They have a different characteristic in that they want to have houses close to their stores which contain valuable assets. This is because they want to be able to reach their stores in emergencies and they want to bring valuable assets to their houses especially those they cannot keep in their stores.*

> (from the interview on 14 September 2006).

[a view of building on Kavaklı Street]

Though professional status is an important signal in terms of gentrification, it is far from sufficient, for there is no possibility of knowing whether a change in the status has occurred in profession unless it is known whether the house has been sold before and how long the owner of the house has lived there. Therefore, there is also a need for investigation as to whether houses have been sold before and when.

B) Ownership Status

From the data of the field work, a model with three categories emerged that shows whether the house has been exchanged recently and whether those living in the houses are landowners or tenants. These categories include tenants, those still owning the house they inherited from their family, and those previously sold and typically gentrified.

[i] Tenants

Five of the twenty-four houses interviewed were tenant occupied. The landowners sometimes have the renovations of the houses completed for rent. The tenants live in the same block as their landowners. Some tenants have been living in Tophane for 20–25 years. There is a similarity in the sense of belonging and in the interpretation of the neighboring relationships between the old dwellers in Tophane as tenants and those living in their own houses for a long time. However, the relatively new comers have different views on the sense of belonging and on the neighboring relationships:

There is a complete coldness in the relations of friendship and neighborhood rather than a warm approach.

(FfQ, 28).

[a street from Tophane where many of the tenants live]

[ii] Those inheriting the house from their family and still owning it

This group consists of elderly people who are originally from Bursa and who can afford the renewal of their own houses. The number of such houses is seven. Except for the tenants, there are people living in more than one-third of the houses (*7/19*) who have afforded to have the house partially reconstructed. These people see it as a firmly-attached identity worth being praised about to say that they are from Hisar or Tophane:

We say we are from Hisar. This is an important case. We have the same opinions as my wife and my children. Therefore, I have always said that I can't live anywhere else. One of the things that makes this district resemble us or makes it us is the vivid neighboring relations (although it used to be a more distinctive aspect). It seems that what makes this district so vivid is its environmental quality and its being one of the old Ottoman places.

I mean the age of your house is a kind of indicator of your nobility. This is very important! And we are proud of this feeling and we are still 'standing' we say.

The narrations of the commitment to the residence sometimes imply how hard it is to sustain this identity or include challenges:

> *If affluent people offered me millions, I would not sell my land here, though. Here is my heart, my life. We can never allow our Hisar to be replaced by blocks.*

(ßfQ, 65).

[two buildings of the example]

Perouse (2006) indicates that the regions having a cosmopolite identity such as Fener-Balat, Galata, and Kuzguncuk, İstanbul are more suitable to being gentrified and that the non-Muslim identity here is more attractive, more universal and more prominent for elites and middle classes. To him, "those seeking cosmopolite traces in historical districts" actually would also like to have the sense of belonging in the case of Kuzguncuk (Behar & Islam, 2006, p. 84–85). The non-Muslim history of İstanbul seems parallel to the "*Ottoman*" past of Hisar in Bursa. The sense of belonging to the district in Hisar is expressed through an "*Ottoman*" identity, functioning as a collective memory. The associations of this identity, far from being a reality and close to imaginary vision, are remarkably valued not only by those living here for a long time but also by those who have recently settled.

[iii] The houses whose owners were changed and typically gentrified

Of all those interviewed, the number of such houses under investigations is the majority. According to the calculation, excluding the tenants, 12 of the

19 houses have had several different owners so far. It seems interesting that 5 of them and the others have had different owners and were restored or reconstructed in 1980–1987 and 1995–2003 respectively. The statements of the manager of the firm working as a developer in the region give insight into the timing of the socio-spatial renewals in Tophane:

> *There were mostly craftsmen in this region between the 1930$_s$ and 1970$_s$; those people first moved to the districts where first blocks were erected around Çekirge, Kükürtlü and Acemler. The reason was on the one hand to follow the trend and on the other hand the settlement of the people coming from the countryside due to the abandonment of Tophane". The former Tophane people started to have difficulty in letting their children play outside. The families had to move when their neighbors did, for they did not know the new comers from the countryside. In the very beginning of the 1990$_s$, there started a trend to prefer houses with garden rather than living in blocks of apartments. They, for example, moved to Bademli (a town about 20 km far from the city center, a kind of "garden city"). For the last few years, people have tended to live in the city centre. This is because around Bademli there is a shortage of some social services such as schools, hospitals, etc. due to the limited population and those working in the city center need to travel a long distance, and there is also a traffic problem there".*

> *Another reason for returning to the city center is the fear of an earthquake. Those moving into the apartments in the 1970$_s$ and 1980$_s$ and stayed there felt the need for their old houses in the wake of the 2001 earthquake. There was also a trend to live in the houses among other people. The floor of these houses cannot be more than 9.5 meters tall according to the laws. There are a few blocks built before the region was taken in the scope of protection, which can be considered an exception.*

In the field study, it was learnt that of the twelve houses, three were reconstructed and nine were restored and used. One of the buildings surviving through the restoration –a historical one– is now run as a boutique hotel and changed its property/owner last year. Before the change in ownership of the property, the hotel that was owned by a well known architect of Bursa can be thought to a leading role in the renewal of the region. This hotel changed its owner but is run by its former manager.

[a building used as a boutique hotel]

One of the other buildings which create attraction in the gentrification of the region is a building, some part of which is used as a cafeteria and some part to run a painting course. The building owned by a couple, an architect and an art teacher, contributes to the revival of the region through the workplaces. Similarly, in the literature, there are also studies investigating the transformation of the workplaces in the process of gentrification with the renewals of the buildings (*for example*, *see*. Patch, 2004, p.181).

This model, which investigates what the property statuses of Tophane residents are and how the houses in the region are gentrified, is consistent with the model of Van Criekingen and Decroly (2003), except for marginal gentrification. In the last section, it will be questioned whether the gentrification displaced the poor residents.

C) Results of Property Ownership Change

Most of the articles in the literature of gentrification focus on the displacing effect, which emerges as a social problem. In this respect, whether an influence has occurred or not is interpreted from what the interviewee has told in the field work. There is an agreement among all the interviewees on the fact that the renewals have increased the value of the houses in a way. However, there is a more dominant understanding that these houses have not been purchased for rent but for owner residence for a long period.

> *There is a high expectation that, when such houses have been bought, restored, and used, they will increase in value*

> (ÑfQ, 51).

> *This is one of the leading cities where properties increased in value. We did the restoration and we are pleased. I recommend others who intend to renew these places for investment*

> (RmY, 57).

> *Yes, there may be a rent expectation in the long run, though not in the short. The rent value is doubled after the restoration. People usually restore such houses to live in and they do not have an intention to sell it right after the restoration. They invest money in the building just for the house and for living in it. You cannot see anyone expecting a rent here. You can see such expectations in Ayvalık, which is a tourist town. It is out of question that a house is restored by the support of TOKİ (Housing Development Administration) and sold in two years. I mean people restore their houses to dwell in*

> (MfQ,43).

Those who have been living in the same house for an extended period of time and the tenants cannot see a relation between the abandonment of the region by the low-income people and the value increase in the houses

following the renewal. However, nearly half of those settling in the region and those working as developers there can see that there is a relation:

> *While the old buildings in the districts, such as Pınarbaşı and Kavaklı, are renewed, the poor tenants living here were sent away because the houses increased in value. Therefore, people had to move into other districts*
>
> (TmX, 69).

> *The houses have been sold and bought. There are people coming outside. They force the old residents living here and especially the tenants to move into other places*
>
> (MmT, 34).

> *For example, when we moved here, there were tenants living here. They had to move into a street behind. I mean they went on living in Hisar. There are many similar families*
>
> (AñZ, 39).

> *Those who could not afford to restore their houses had to sell them and go away. This condition also forces the poor tenants to move as well. There are also many others living in the poverty, who have to leave when the inheritors sell the houses*
>
> (from interview on 14 September, 2006).

[some restored buildings in Tophane, Hisar]

V. CONCLUSION

As Lefebvre said, city center is the locus of urban life (1988, p. 15). The return to the city may have to do with the expectations that the economic theories claimed. However, this relation is for the developers, not for the residents. It is not that developers are trailing the residents because they are investing in a region of the city. What happens is that a region is rediscovered which lost its attraction and fell into disrepute for any reason as it harbors invaluable social values. In other words, an already gentrified

city is re-gentrified. In the process of re-gentrification, the new residents of the district do not think of substituting the former ones because they have connections with a wider cultural environment though they enjoy the historical texture and the nativity of the neighbors there. The way those that gentrify their houses perceive the area is laden with the associations of senses of acquaintance and the houses of those involved in the gentrification process serve for creating a history through the considerable use of the area.

As for the tenants to whom the former residents of the places entrusted their houses for a variety of reasons;

> *"Unfortunately, the tenants have great trouble in the houses before they are restored. I mean, these poor people have to live in conditions where mice and insects abound. On the other hand, if these houses are restored with some financial sources, then the landowners may start to live there. I think tenants live there before restoration, but after the restoration the landowners settle in these places"*

(MfQ, 43).

According to the witness of the residents, it seems highly likely that the tenants living in the old houses waiting to be renewed will not go on living there for longer time. If the house is well protected and continually renewed by its owner, then the rent value will rise and therefore low-income people will not be able to afford to live there. The solution is to organize low-cost housing systems in places not far from city center for low-income groups or to optimize the transport systems in ways not to increase the costs for those in the suburbs.

On the other hand, in the renewal of Hisar, except for a few, families renew their houses with their own financial budgets over a period of time. However, there are also those who cannot do so neither with their own money nor with credits. Therefore, these houses should be put under protection directly by the public sector and should be sustained with the people inside. To this end, on condition that the original state is not spoilt, these buildings should be made to function as boutique hotels, art galleries, private museums which can be thought of as an important solution in terms of the speed of the renewal process.

In conclusion, in the case of Tophane, Bursa the process of gentrification is still continuing in some places. Due to this process, it is highly likely that the low-income people will have to leave their houses for the newcomers in the

wake of the renewals. However, it should not be interpreted that there is a population exchange between the tenants and the landowners. After all, the houses in the district are predominantly used by the landowners. A possible adverse effect of the gentrification for the low-income people is that the old districts where there are some cheap alternatives for housing for the poor class will no more be an alternative for them. However, this does not mean that the old houses should be left to the poor people with all its deficits. Rather, as we indicated before, alternatives as affordable housing systems should be increased for the urban poor.

REFERENCES

Alver, K. (2007). *Steril Hayatlar: Kentte Mekânsal Ayrışma ve Güvenlikli Siteler* [Sterile Lives: Spatial Segregation in the Urban and Gated Communities]. Ankara: Hece Yayınları.

Atkinson, R. (2003). "Introduction: Misunderstood Saviour or Vengeful Wrecker? The Many Meanings and Problems of Gentrification", *Urban Studies,* 40 (12), 2343–2350.

Atkinson, R. (2004). "The Evidence on the Impact of Gentrification. New Lessons for the Urban Renaissance", *European Journal of Urban Policy*, 4 (1), 107–131.

Badcock, B. (1989). "An Australian view of the Rent Gap Hypothesis", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* 79 (1), 125–145.

Bailey, N. and Robertson, D. (1997). "Housing Renewal, Urban Policy and Gentrification", *Urban Studies,* 34 (4), 561–578.

Ball, A.M. (2002). "Gentrification in a Residential Mobility Framework: Social Change, Tenure Change and Chains of Moves In Stockholm", *Housing Studies*, 17 (6), 833–856.

Behar, D. and Islam, T. (2006). *İstanbul'da "Soylulaştırma": Eski Kentin Yeni Sahipleri*, [Gentrification in İstanbul: New Owners of the old City]. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bondi, L. (1991). "Gender Divisions and Gentrification: A Critique", *Transactions of the Instıtute of British Geographers,* 16, 190–198.

Bridge, G. (1995). "The Space for Class? On Class Analysis in the Study of Gentrification", *Transactions of the Instıtute of British Geographers,* 20 (2), 236–247.

Bridge, G. (2001). "Bourdieu, Rational Action and the Space Strategy of Gentrification", *Transactions of the Instıtute of British Geographers,* New Series 26, 205–216.

Bridge, G. (2003). "Time-Space Trajectories in Provincial Gentrification", *Urban Studies*, 40 (12), 2545–2556.

Butler, T. (2003). "Gentrification and It's 'Other' in North London", *Urban Studies*, 40 (12), 2469–2486.

Butler, T. and Robson, G. (2003). "Negotiating their Way in: The Middle Classes, Gentrification and the Development of Capital in a Globalizing Metropolis", *Urban Studies*, 40 (9), 1791–1809.

Clark, E. (1988). "Rant Gap and Transformation of the Built Environment: Case Studies in Malmö, Sweden 1860–1985", *Geografiska Annaler Series B, Human Geography*, 70 (2), 241–254.

Clark, E. (1992). "On Blindness, Centrepieces and Complementarity in Gentrification Theory", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series 17 (3), 358–362.

Cole, D. B. (1985). "Gentrification, Social Character, and Personal Identity", *Geographical Review,* 75 (2), 142–155.

Criekingen, M. and Decroly, J.M. (2003). "Revisiting the Diversity of Gentrification: Neighbourhood Renewal Processes in Brussels and Montreal", *Urban Studies*, 40 (12), 2451–2468.

Dooling, S. (2009). "Ecological Gentrification: A Research Agenda Exploring Justice in the City", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33 (3), 621–39.

Featherstone, M. (2007). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*, 2nd edn. London: Sage Publications.

Glass,R. (1964). London: Aspects of Change. Report No:3, Centre for Urban Studies, London, Mc Gibbon & Kee

Hackworth, J. and Smith, N. (2001). "The Changing State of Gentrification", *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 92 (4), 464–477.

Lees, L. (2000). "A Reappraisal of Gentrification: Towards a 'Geography of Gentrification'', *Progress in Human Geography*, 24 (3), 389–408.

Lefebvre, H. (1998). *Modern Dünyada Gündelik Hayat* [La Vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne]. I. Gürbüz (çev.), İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Ley, D. (2003). "Artists, Aestheticisation and the Field of Gentrification", *Urban Studies*, 40 (12), 2527–2544.

Niedt, C. (2006). "Gentrification and the Grassroots. Popular Support in the Revanchist Suburb", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28 (2), 99–120.

Partch, J. (2004). "The Embedded Landscape of Gentrification", *Visual Studies*, 19 (2), 169–187.

Redfern, P.A. (2003). "What Makes Gentrification 'Gentrification'?", *Urban Studies*, 40 (12), 2351–2366.

Slatter, T. (2004). "Municipally Managed Gentrification in South Parkdale, Toronto", *The Canadian Geographer*, 48 (3), 303–325.

Slatter, T. (2006). "The Eviction of Critical Perspectives from Gentrification Research", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 30 (4), 737–757.

Smith, H. and Graves, W. (2005). "Gentrification as Corporate Growth Strategy: The Strange Case of Charlote, North Carolina and the Bank of America", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 27 (4), 403–418.

Smith, N. (1979). "Toward a Theory of Gentrification A Back to the City Movement by Capital, not People", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45 (4), 538 — 548.

Uzun, N. (2006). "Kentsel Dönüşümde Yeni Bir Kavram: 'Seçkinleştirme'" [A New Concept in Urban Renewal: 'Gentrification'] in A. Eraydın (ed.), *Değişen Mekan* [Changing Space]. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.

Zukin, S. (1987). "Culture and Capital in the Urban Core", *Annual Review of Sociology,* 13 (-), 129–147.